UNDAF MIDTERM REVIEW REPORT

Skopje, June 2013

INTRODUCTION

In early 2013 the UNCT in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia carried out a midterm review of its 2010-2015 UNDAF. At this mid-point of UNDAF implementation, the UNCT wanted to assess the continued relevance of UNDAF goals and objectives and progress towards them; reconfirm the UNDAF's contribution to national development priorities; and identify any gaps and lessons learnt that could feed into the remaining implementation period.The finalisation in mid-2012 of two large joint programmes (on Domestic Violence and Inter-ethnic Dialogue) added to the relevance of a midterm review, as some programme cycles had come to an end.

The objective of the review was to achieve a concise assessment of the UN's key contribution to each outcome under the UNDAF and pause to jointly reflect on important lessons learned, remaining challenges and opportunities for strengthened inter-agency coordination and planning. The UNCT also decided it was a good moment to update the Monitoring and Evaluation framework of the UNDAF, to complete missing information and revise targets or formulations as required. As UN Women had earlier been mandated to conduct a gender assessment of the UNDAF Monitoring and Evaluation framework, the UNCT decided to include this aspect in the midterm review. To this end, a gender specialist was engaged during the review to support in developing a more gender sensitive M&E framework.

In this brief report, the process of the midterm review and its main findings will be presented. The first section will introduce the UNDAF 2010-2015 and its focus areas, the second will outline the method and process of the review, while the third section will present the main findings and conclude. The revised Monitoring and Evaluation framework and progress assessments per UNDAF Outcome are annexed to this report.

1. FYR Macedonia UNDAF 2010-2015

UN activities are carried out in the framework of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for 2010-2015. The UNDAF was developed in an inclusive manner, in partnership with the Government, and it sets out the priorities for UN Agencies' work in the country. All agencies present in the country at the time were involved – UNDP, UNICEF, WHO, UNIFEM, UNFPA, IOM, UNAIDS, UNHCR, ILO and UNESCO – as well as the non-resident UNEP and UNIDO. The UNDAF focuses on supporting national efforts to meet national development priorities and the overall goal of EU integration "particularly in areas inherent to the UN's mandate and where the UNCT has a proven track record of experience and expertise and unique ability to access and utilise international know-how and comparative experiences, particularly from successful transition countries."[1]

The UNDAF for 2010-2015 builds on the analysis and priorities set out in the National Development Plan 2008-2013 and other national strategic documents on development, the previous UNDAF (2005-2009) and its subsequent evaluations, as well as the 2006 Strategic Review of UN Activities in

---

[1]http://www.un.org.mk/files/pdfs/about/UNDAF%202010-2015%20final%20design%20ENG.pdf

light of the Country's EU Accession and the European Commission's annual Progress Reports assessing the country's progress towards EU membership.

The UNDAF is centred on three key Outcome areas; Social Inclusion, Local Governance, and Environmental Protection and climate change. Cross-cutting themes that run through all of the programmatic activities are human rights, gender equality, interethnic cohesion and capacity building for transparent, responsive governance. The three UNDAF Outcomes are as follows:

Social Inclusion area/UNDAF Outcome 1 - By 2015, the socially excluded will have increased access andimproved quality services and opportunities to enjoy full and productive lives.

Local Governance and Territorial Development area/UNDAF Outcome 2 - By 2015, local governance andterritorial development is enhanced to promote equitable development and inter-ethnic and socialcohesion.

Environmental Protection area/ UNDAF Outcome 3 - By 2015 the central and local level authorities haveimproved capacities to integrate environment and disaster risk reduction into national and localdevelopment frameworks, and communities and CSOs participate more effectively in environmentalprotection and disaster risk reduction planning, implementation and monitoring.

Each UNDAF Outcome is complemented by three Agency Outcomes, more tangible than the UNDAF Outcomes and accompanied by a sub-set of programme interventions. [Please see UNDAF matrix below.]

UNDAF 2010–2015

UNDAF PRIORITY 1 Social Inclusion	UNDAF PRIORITY 2 Local Governance	UNDAF PRIORITY 3 Environmental Protection
By 2015, socially excluded people will have gained increased access to improved quality services and greater opportunities to enjoy full and productive lives.	By 2015, local and regional governance will have been enhanced to promote more equitable development and greater inter-ethnic and social cohesion.	By 2015, authorities will have developed improved capacities to integrate environment and disaster risk reduction within national and local development frameworks.

UNDAF PRIORITY 1 — Social Inclusion

OUTCOME 1.1 Capacities of national institutions to develop and implement human resource development policies and programmes addressing needs of socially excluded improved

Output 1.1.1 Active labour market measures targeting the socially excluded developed and implemented

Output 1.1.2 Entrepreneurship capacities and private sector development

Output 1.1.3 Capacities of the national education system increased to provide quality and relevant basic education and increased access to early learning opportunities

OUTCOME 1.2 Social services better respond to the needs of the socially excluded and the most vulnerable

Output 1.2.1 National social care and protection policies and governance improved to provide quality services for vulnerable groups

Output 1.2.2 National policies and mechanisms for prevention of domestic violence and protection of the victims in place

Output 1.2.3 Systems and capacities for juvenile justice established and operational

Output 1.2.4 National health legal and policy frameworks respond to the needs of the socially excluded and the most vulnerable populations

Output 2.5 Socially excluded and most vulnerable populations access quality health services

OUTCOME 1.3 Social inclusion policy making processes are evidenced based, inclusive and take a cross-sectoral approach

Output 1.3.1 National capacities on statistics, monitoring and evaluation of social inclusion related issues improved

Output 1.3.2 National capacities strengthened to ensure the needs of children, women and socially excluded are reflected in the policy making, public finance management and impact evaluation

UNDAF PRIORITY 2 — Local Governance

OUTCOME 2.1 Local Government operates in a more effective and transparent manner

Output 2.1.1 Capacities of national and local level institutions strengthened to design and implement a more transparent, predictable and sustainable local financing

Output 2.1.2 Innovative arrangements for efficient and quality service provision, including use of information technologies designed and implemented by promoting public-private partnerships, outsourcing and inter-municipal cooperation

Output 2.1.3 Local government units have improved technical and organizational knowledge, skills and resources for evidence based management and financing of local public services

Output 2.1.4 Institutional and human capacities at national and local level improved for implementing decentralized competencies

Output 2.1.5 Mechanisms and local stakeholders capacities for fighting corruption enhanced

OUTCOME 2.2 Policy and institutional framework at national and local level enhanced to promote and operationalize regional development

Output 2.2.1 National and regional bodies have improved technical, human and operational capacities for implementing regional development policies

Output 2.2.2 Regional development programmes reflecting sectoral policies developed and implemented in at least three planning regions

Output 2.2.3 National institutions responsible for coordination of regional development policies have developed tools for monitoring and evaluation

OUTCOME 2.3 National and local level institutions and non-governmental actors promote inter-ethnic dialogue and social cohesion

Output 2.3.1 Capacities of the national bodies and local commissions dealing with inter-ethnic relations, strengthened to incorporate ethnic dialogues and cultural diversity into local actions

Output 2.3.2 Capacity of the Education System to enhance multi-ethnic cohesion and to promote cultural diversity at local level strengthened

Output 2.3.3 Civil society empowered to monitor local governance practices and engage in inter-ethnic and inter-cultural dialogue

UNDAF PRIORITY 3 — Environmental Protection

OUTCOME 3.1 National policies better address climate adaptation measures and demonstration programmes respond to climate change challenges

Output 3.1.1 Vulnerability assessments, impact costing, policy options and integrated territorial plans for climate change adaptation developed

Output 3.1.2 Demonstration energy efficiency and renewables initiatives implemented assistance for financing projects through the clean development mechanisms supported

Output 3.1.3 National awareness on climate change issues raised and competencies of CSOs to influence national and local level decision making improved

OUTCOME 3.2 National capacities for management ecosystems, biodiversity conservation & sustainable use of natural resources improved

Output 3.2.1 A National network of protected areas is established, by strengthening planning, financing and management practices

Output 3.2.2 Capacity building programmes and demonstration models for integrated watershed management are implemented in the Prespa Lakes Basin

Output 3.2.3 A management plan for Ohrid world heritage site is prepared and implemented

Output 3.2.4 A trans-boundary dialogue and a Man & Biosphere Reserve co-management scheme facilitated for the Prespa region

OUTCOME 3.3 National authorities are better able to reduce the risk of and respond to natural and man-made disasters

Output 3.3.1 A national framework for regular assessment of disaster risks developed, to provide disaggregated data to relevant categories, in support of decision making and piloted at local level

Output 3.3.2 Risk reduction practices adopted and piloted in at least two environmental hot spots

The UNDAF 2010-2015 Outcome matrix.

2. REVIEW PROCESS

Effective Monitoring and Evaluation is a clear priority mentioned in the UNDAF 2010-2015. The UN Country Team committed to "rigorous monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF" and established three UNDAF Outcome Working Groups (OWGs) to define realistic indicators for each outcome and measure progress towards the set goals. A Monitoring and Evaluation calendar was included in the UNDAF to support these efforts, foreseeing an update of the indicator framework and a midterm review in 2013. The OWGs, under directions from the lead Agency in each outcome area, were tasked with annual reporting under each outcome and in addition function as forums for information exchange, contributing to enhanced coordination and collaboration among UN Agencies. Regionally based (non-resident) and specialized UN Agencies are also part of the OWGs, ensuring coordination of all UN supported activities in the country.

The UNCT decided to keep the midterm review light, but fully in line with UNDG guidelines. The focus was on substantive inter-agency discussions that allowed programme staff to critically assess progress towards results and the appropriateness of the M&E framework. The discussions also established the current situation in the country and emerging issues that require attention. In line with UNDG guidelines on UNDAF Reporting that encourage the use of data from existing reporting processes, the UNCT decided that the review would be based primarily on existing UN assessments and internal annual progress reporting. Where possible, these rely on national data and statistics, at times complemented by other sources of information. The midterm review focused on reporting the UN's contribution to results at the outcome level, as suggested by UNDG guidelines; in this case the focus was on the nine Agency Outcomes in the 2010-2015 UNDAF. As per the UNDG's Standard Operational Format & Guidance for Reporting Progress on the UNDAF[2] *"Outcomes describe the intended changes in development conditions and normally relate to changes in institutional performance or behaviour among individuals or groups which partially result from UNCT cooperation.".* Focusing on the Agency Outcome level allowed the UN Agencies to think about their joint impact and share information about how the work of each Agency has contributed to changes in institutional performance in specific priority areas.[3] At the same time, this approach allowed UN Agencies to identify perceived gaps – factors that as long as they remain unaddressed can compromise the attainment of UNDAF outcomes – and opportunities for greater inter-agency planning and coordination.

The UNCT recognized that the midterm review presented an opportunity to review outputs (adding new ones or deleting discontinued ones) where necessary and adjust the indicator framework, so that the UNDAF continues to accurately reflect UN ambitions in the country and also clearly demonstrates UN's strong commitment to gender sensitive programming. The UNDAF and Agency Outcomes remain unchanged.

---

[2] http://www.undg.org/docs/11096/Standard-Operational-Format-and-Guidance-for-Reporting-Progress-on-the-UNDAF.pdf
[3] Annual reporting focuses on the output level and doesn't necessarily highlight the aggregate effect of Agencies' programmes and activities towards achieving the joint outcome.

Method

The midterm review was carried out with the support of an international UNDAF consultant, well familiar with the country programme. A local gender specialist was engaged to support the engendering of the Monitoring and Evaluation framework. In close collaboration with the UNCT, the Resident Coordinator and the Resident Coordinator's Office and the three UNDAF OWGs, as well as the Human Rights and Gender Theme Group and the UN Theme Group on HIV/AIDS, the UNDAF consultant prepared and facilitated the central inter-agency discussions and provided quality support to update the Monitoring and Evaluation framework.

The review discussions were organised as half-day workshops with each Outcome Working Group. (The Social Inclusion OWG met for a full day due to the significant amount of project interventions in this area.) To guide the discussion, the UNDAF consultant had prepared a tool, including a likert-scale rating of progress for each Agency Outcome, so that each workshop resulted in a rating and concise narrative review of progress towards the three Agency Outcomes under each UNDAF Outcome. This included the UN's key contribution to the outcome, gaps that remain to be addressed to achieve the outcome, lessons learned and suggestions for revisions to the M&E framework. [The tool is annexed to this report.]

These discussions, that took place over a week in Skopje, were preceded by a data collection effort that involved the Resident Coordinator's Office, the OWGs and the Thematic Groups in the country. For each Agency outcome, progress data was gathered using an 'indicator tracker' to allow for a factual assessment of progress. This exercise also clarified which indicators needed reassessment, due to the lack of information available, the formulation of the indicator or due to changes in programme activities. Those outputs under which agencies had not been implementing activities were withdrawn and some new indicators were included to reflect new project interventions or gender components. Significantly, the midterm review also presented an opportunity to include activities of UN Agencies that were not part of the UNDAF formulation process but now implement activities in the country and coordinate with the OWGs.[4]

After the series of review discussions with members of the Outcome Working Groups and Thematic Groups, the findings of these discussions and suggestions for revisions were presented to the UNCT for discussion and validation. The UNCT agreed with the overall assessment of the OWGs and Thematic Groups and decided that a comprehensive update of the Monitoring and Evaluation framework should be carried out by the OWGs, with technical support from the UNDAF consultant and the gender specialist, in order to incorporate gender sensitive indicators where appropriate.

This process was completed a month after the review discussions and the updated M&E framework was validated by the UNCT. [The updated framework is annexed to this report.]

It is important to note that assessing UNDAF progress does not merely provide the UNCT (and the UN more broadly) with an evaluation of its achievements over a specific period, but also serves to increase the UN Agencies' accountability for results and our partners' understanding of the UN's work. Indeed, the UNDG encourages the UNCT, as well as Government and key partners to share

---

[4]Even if these activities will not formally fall under the UNDAF 2010-2015, it is useful to include them for internal coordination and planning purposes. For instance, FAO activities are now reflected in the updated M&E framework and the FAO national coordinator regularly updates the UNCT and Environment OWG on implemented activities and results.

information on those results to which they contribute, so as to strengthen mutual accountability. This midterm review clearly demonstrates that the UN is on track to achieve its goals set for 2015 and provides the Government and UN partners with a concise evaluation of progress so far.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The UNCT and the UN staff involved in the midterm review found it an interesting and useful exercise, one that can help improve the focus, inter-agency collaboration and accountability for results of UN in the country. Below is a summary of the conclusions and findings of the review, including also the recommendations made by the UNDAF consultant.

An earlier UNDAF Evaluation, conducted after the first year of UNDAF implementation, confirmed that the UNDAF 2010-2015 is strategic and of good quality. It established that the UNDAF is focused and not too broad; complete, with resource mobilization targets set out by UN agency, as well as agency responsibilities for outcomes and indicator tracking; includes good quality, substantive and numeric indicators; and includes a realistic set of risks/assumptions linking outputs to Agency Outcomes and ultimately UNDAF Outcomes.

Some aspects of the UNDAF could however be strengthened, as also highlighted by the UNDAF consultant during the midterm review. While the UNDAF is well formulated, three of the Agency Outcomes are formulated as Outputs and would benefit from reformulation. As a formal revision would be labour and process intensive, the UNCT and the Outcome Working Groups agreed to internally and informally correct the level of the Agency Outcomes for the purpose of analysis and reporting. The UNDAF consultant also found that some of the Agency Outcomes 'hide' the right-holders and a more people-centred approach would benefit progress analysis and reporting. During the review discussions, UNCT members and Thematic and Working Group members defined the stakeholders for each outcome and agreed to focus on the right-holders and duty-bearers in future analysis and reporting efforts. The UNDAF consultant supported the UNCT decision to review the results framework and provided technical support and advice throughout the process. Updating the results framework with accurate baselines, progress data, targets and reliable means of verification was one of the main pillars of the review. Further, the UNDAF consultant recommended the UN Agencies regularly update data on funds spent under each Outcome and Output. This will support an accurate assessment of effectiveness and efficiency of UN interventions, and serve as a proxy for degree and timeliness of delivery.

The UNDAF consultant's findings and the earlier UNDAF Evaluation conclusions were accepted by the UNCT. Therefore, as mentioned above, the focus of revision was on the output level and indicators for measuring progress, ensuring an up to date results framework is in place for the remaining programming period. To reflect the current reality, a limited number of new outputs were added where required and outputs no longer planned to be achieved were subtracted (please see revised results framework in annex). The gender specialist assessed the indicators and baselines from a gender perspective, looking at the availability of sex-disaggregated data against the outlined indicators and suggesting the inclusion of a number of new gender relevant indicators. As a result, the results framework for each Outcome Area now better reflects the results achieved in terms of

empowering women and achieving equal opportunities and equal services for women and men. In the Social Inclusion Outcome Area, 23 indicators now either break down results per sex or measure a specific gender aspect. In the Local Governance Outcome Area the respective number is 10, while in the Environment Outcome Area it is 9. The new indicators will ensure the UN measures its results more effectively and can evaluate the impact of programmes on the situation of both women and men in the country.

Progress assessment

In addition to a revised results framework, the midterm review resulted in a concise narrative assessment of progress towards the Agency Outcomes. The review discussions revealed that the UN is currently on track to achieve most of the outcomes included in the UNDAF; out of nine Agency Outcomes, the Outcome Working Groups, Thematic Groups and UNCT assessed that six are *somewhat above* the level of progress expected, while only three are *somewhat below*.

The Agency Outcome Assessments annexed to this report provide a more detailed account of the conclusions of the UNCT and the OWGs and Thematic Groups per each Outcome, below are some of the main points raised.

In the **Social Inclusion Outcome Area**, progress has been somewhat mixed. Under Outcome 1.1, policies for human resource development have improved and there is a strengthened strategic and institutional framework in place. Support for the socially excluded is more targeted and informed by stronger normative principles. The UN has provided technical support for all the relevant institutions; during the development of the important National Strategy on Alleviation of Poverty and Social Exclusion strategy, during the establishment of the Economic and Social Council and the introduction of a national minimum wage. The UN works closely with Government on Active Labour Market Measures, which include targeted measures for refugees, women, victims of domestic violence and other vulnerable groups.

Under Outcome 1.2., however it becomes evident that the delivery of social services for socially excluded and the most vulnerable has been somewhat reduced due to funding pressure (owing partly to the international economic crisis). While specialised social services have been somewhat improved and access to social services for the most vulnerable has been simplified, social services need to become more targeted and localised in order to reach the people in need. The UN has supported the Government to move away from its reliance on cash benefits towards delivering quality, responsive services for targeted groups, based on analysis and data. The UN has further supported local leadership for social services, to bring services closer to the right-holders, and worked to enhance gender equality and the concept of equal opportunities at the local level. The UN Joint Programme on Domestic Violence has supported the Government to deliver tailored services for victims of domestic violence and supported cross-institutional cooperation and knowledge sharing.

Under Outcome 1.3., progress has been somewhat below the expected level, and increased efforts are needed for social inclusion policy making to be evidence based, inclusive and cross-sectoral. Mechanisms for cross-sectoral consultations and data collection have been set up by national partners, but remain underutilised. The UN has supported the Government with a generation of studies and knowledge on social policies and continuously advocated for more inclusive policy making, based on factual assessments of citizens' needs. With UN support, many CSOs, academia

and state institutions have increased their capacities to generate and use statistics and other data for policy planning and advocacy purposes.

In the **Local Governance Outcome Area**, progress has been good but competing Government priorities have implied challenges in terms of accelerating Regional Development. Under Outcome 2.1., local government units have become more transparent and effective, as they have achieved higher fiscal autonomy and met nationally set targets for effectiveness. Decentralisation has progressed. The block financial transfers, such as the ones in education, social protection and culture have contributed to improved outreach of services. Municipalities are now subject to regular audits and all of them have signed a Code of Ethics. The UN has provided continuous support to the decentralisation process, especially through capacity building for fiscal decentralisation and the introduction of innovative tools for decentralisation, such as Inter-Municipality cooperation, integrity systems and normative tools like the Code of Ethics.

Under Outcome 2.2., the UNCT and Thematic Groups agreed that further efforts are required to fully operationalise regional development. Although all eight planning regions in the country now have functional Centres for Regional Development (some established with direct UN support), the funds allocated to them remain below the level expected. The law on Regional Development is not fully implemented. The UN was supporting the development of the Regional Development Strategy and continues to support the Centres to apply a people-centred, human rights based approach to planning and demonstrate an integrated development approach. Going forward, it will be important to focus also on shifting population dynamics and how this can be taken into consideration in the Regional Development Strategy.

Under Outcome 2.3., the UNCT agreed that institutions and non-governmental actors now have better capacities to promote inter-ethnic cohesion. Inter-ethnic incidents have been contained and managed in a measured manner. There has been progress in implementing inter-ethnic education, both formal and non-formal. The representation of non-majority communities in the public administration has further increased and the Parliamentary Committee on Inter ethnic relations now meets regularly. The UN has supported this progress through its Joint Programme on Inter-ethnic Dialogue and Cohesion, which for the first time brought together some of the most important national actors in the field, and encouraged them to take the lead on the issue. Importantly, the UN has also supported life skills based education and introduced the gender perspective into inter-ethnic dialogue. Working with media associations and higher education has further strengthened civic involvement in promoting inter-ethnic relations.

In the **Environment Outcome Area**, the UNCT found progress somewhat above expected for all three Agency Outcomes, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. Under Outcome 3.1., this is due to several factors, such as enhanced political and public awareness about the implications of climate change and therefore increased commitment to adopt legislation facilitating the use of renewable energy sources, promoting energy efficiency, reassessing the development of the energy sector and introducing resource efficient cleaner production practices and less polluting technologies. The UN has supported the Government to grasp the economic impact of climate change through advanced studies, to develop the National Climate Change Health Adaptation Strategy, to introduce monitoring, verification and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) under the European Emissions Trading Scheme, and to actively participate in the Rio+20 conference and the post-2015

sustainability discussion. In addition, the UN has supported several pilot projects on energy efficiency measures and the introduction of resource efficient, cleaner production installations in industry.

Under Outcome 3.2., progress can be attributed to positive institutional and legislative amendments, which have led to more effective policy implementation in the sphere of biodiversity management. The UN has supported the Government in these processes, especially working with the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning. The UN has also supported the Government to develop the first ever Watershed Management Plan, in line with EU regulations, and work to preserve shared natural resources in its border areas.

Under Outcome 3.3., the country's capacities for disaster risk reduction have increased and there is now increased awareness of the link between climate change and disasters. National institutions work closer together and the analytical capacities of the Crisis Management Centre have improved. There is also more effort to ensure resilience at the municipal level. In this area, the UN has supported multi-risk assessments and the incorporation of gender considerations in disaster preparedness and prevention plans. The UN has also supported disaster awareness through innovative means such as smart phone applications and interactive games for youth and children. The UN's work on safe management of chemicals has been important to reduce their harmful impact on the environment.

Identified challenges

While this snapshot of progress highlights how the UN has supported national actors and delivered tangible results for right-holders, there are a number of challenges remaining and some emerging issues present themselves when analysing UNDAF implementation so far. Many of these are shared across Outcome Areas and are common to most programmes. The identified challenges are also often seen as precisely those gaps that need to be addressed in order to ensure the UNDAF Outcomes are obtained by 2015.

There is consensus in the UNCT that comprehensive, holistic approaches are needed to many of the remaining development challenges. This will require planning that considers the inter-linkages between goals and interventions, as well as increased coordination between all actors involved. However, the UNCT agreed UN collaboration on programmes should build upon agencies' competitive advantage and added value from joint projects, as well as a clear willingness to implement joint activities. A cross-sectoral approach within Government is also needed, one that fosters closer coordination between institutions. Further capacity building efforts to strengthen programme coordination within Government bodies is thus needed.

When assessing progress towards UNDAF Outcomes, it becomes clear that the UN must focus even more on reaching those on the margins of the socially excluded. There is a feeling that discrimination still prevents some of those most in need from receiving adequate services and gaining access to education and employment and that this must be addressed in programme activities. The Roma community continues to be more disadvantaged than any other group and this warrants attention in the upcoming period. In general, the UNCT, Thematic and Outcome Working Groups agreed that the UN must place people at the centre of all development efforts. The voice of stakeholders must be heard in order to deliver effective programmes – this also supports a human rights based approach.

In addition, the gender perspective should be a central consideration in all UN activities – mainstreamed across interventions rather than perceived as a separate programme.

Going forward the UNCT finds it important to continue to engage with civil society and enhance civic engagement in decision making for development. Currently, there are mechanisms for inclusive policy making in place, but efforts are needed to ensure they are effectively used. Focusing efforts on ensuring timely implementation of introduced legal and policy frameworks more broadly will also be important during the remaining UNDAF implementation period. With enhanced capacities, civic organisations can play an important watchdog function in this regard.

Ultimately, The UNDAF midterm review proved to be a useful exercise that showed the UNCT which areas warrant specific focus over the two coming years. The need for a holistic, comprehensive approach to many of the development issues was stressed on several occasions as an enabling factor for achieving results. In bringing together the UNCT and all the inter-agency groups within the UN in Skopje, the exercise also strengthened inter-agency information sharing and provided ideas for enhanced coordination within and across Outcome Areas. Regionally based agencies were involved both during the preparatory phase and the review discussions and their contributions were valued by the Resident Coordinator and the UNCT.

The midterm review further served as a good preparatory exercise for the development of the next UNDAF for the country, which will start in 2014; showing the UNCT and staff what has worked well so far and which areas and emerging issues require further attention going ahead. The results of the internal review will be shared with Government and provide a good basis for further discussion on the UN's role in supporting the country in reaching its development priorities and progressing towards its overall goal of EU accession and sustainable development.

UNDAF Mid-Term Review

AGENCIES OUTCOME 1.1.:			
Capacities of nat. institutions[5] to develop and implement **Human Resource development policies and programmes**[6] that address the needs of the **socially excluded** improved *($22.7m – UNDP, UNICEF, IOM, ILO, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNFPA, UN Women)*			
Indicators	*Baseline 2010*	*Target 2015*	*Status 2013*
% of children age 0-6 enrolled in some type of Early Childhood Development	11% (2007)	33% (2015)	14%
Unemployment rate	35.2% (2007)	29.6% (2015)	30.6% (Q3 2012)

Defining "socially excluded"
Since 2009, socially excluded groups became visible in the human resource development policies and programmes. Prior to 2010 the definition of "social exclusion" for policy planning and formulation was not existent. Now, the Government has a National Strategy for Reduction of Poverty and Social Inclusion that defines the concept. A one-size-fits all approach has been abandoned in favour of tailored support to socially excluded groups. There is now better coordination among actors of human resource development, and coordination is institutionalized.

Institutional Changes – new structures and strengthened existing structures
There are a number of newly set-up structures that facilitate and support HR development policies and programs for the socially excluded. These include (but are not limited to):
Economic and Social Council: Policies and laws go through a process of formal consultations between the Government and social partners in the newly established Economic and Social Council (ESC). The ESC purpose is maintaining a social dialogue, in order to provide for the creation of favourable conditions for economic and social stability. It has so far held 16 meetings (on average more than one every two months) at which important Laws and policy documents were screened.[7]
The Law on Minimum Wage was adopted for the first time: the minimum wage was set through a process of social dialogue at a level of 39.6% of the average gross wage (8050 Denars in 2012). It applies to all sectors except the leather and textile sectors, where it is gradually introduced.
The parliamentary working group on the rights of children: created in 2010 with the purpose of initiating and screening child-rights related legislation. A National Child Rights Commission and Inter-ministerial Group on gender equality were also established.

Strengthened Strategic Framework
A number of strategies have been developed that guide and support the HR policies and programs development, as they have specific provisions for the socially excluded:
- National Strategy to Reduce Poverty and Social Exclusion
- Safe Motherhood Strategy
- Gender Equality Strategy
- Immunization Strategy

---

[5] Ministry of Labour and Social Policies, vocational training institutions, adult learning institutions, Ministry of Education.

[6] on a) competencies, b) qualifications, c) employment

[7] Examples of such laws include: Law on labour relations; Law on social protection; Law on child protection; Law on occupational safety and health; Law on employment and insurance in case of unemployment; Law on minimum wage; Law on payment of wages; Law on European workers council; Law on adult education; Law on health insurance; Law on pension and disability insurance; Law on mobbing; National Qualifications Framework; National Action Plan on Youth employment 2015; Amendments to the Law on Adult Education and subsequent regulation for verification of vocational training programmes and licensing of training providers Operational Plans on ALMM; EU progress reports; Initiatives regarding energy poverty, prices of energy, Law on Early Childhood Development, Family Law, Law on Social Protection.

Normative framework and programs for the socially excluded

The country has adopted a Law on Minimum Wage (MW), set at a level of 39.6% of average gross wage in the previous year (currently 8050 Denars). The MW is gradually introduced for leather and textile sectors until 2015, thus limiting the initial impact. Targeting of the operational plan for active labour market measures has been improved, to include specific measures for socially excluded groups. In 2012, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy was for the first time able to draft the operational plan for active employment without external support. The number of verified vocational training courses has increased from 0 in 2009 to 44 in 2012 and they now include occupations reflecting the ambitions of both women and men. The share of women included in the training programme for occupations demanded/deficient on the labour market has increased from 0 in 2010 to 39% in 2011 and 2012 cumulatively (131 out of ca 335).

The **Convention on the Rights of Persons With Disabilities and its Optional Protocol** were ratified in December 2011, four years after the country signed the convention. The National Body for the Implementation of the Convention the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was established in November 2012, following the December 2011 ratification of the Convention. The June 2012 Inter-sectoral government Body on Coordination of the Implementation of Human Rights Recommendations also has an important role in ensuring focus on social inclusion.

There are now policies and a national programme for **refugees**. Prior to 2010, no **refugees** attended pre-school or obtained work permits. In 2012, 35 refugees obtained work permits and 13 refugee children attend pre-school.

Implementation of the 2009 law that made **secondary education mandatory,** combined with textbooks provided free of charge and transportation for children living further away from schools, increased school attendance. (Roma primary school net attendance increased from 61.1% to 85.6%; completion rates doubled from 44.6% to 97.4%; transition to secondary education doubled from 27% to 98%.) Teacher training increased numerical literacy of teachers by 15% in 2012 compared to 2009 and their pedagogical skills by 7%. Since early 2013, the country has a law on Early Childhood Development**.** The Conditional Cash Transfer program ensures social financial assistance beneficiaries whose children regularly attend secondary school obtain additional financial support.

The Ministry of Agriculture now has specific affirmative provisions within the newly introduced farming subsidies scheme in place that specifically targets young farmers and women farmers.

The health policy has been revised to allow for universal health coverage for all citizens. The university curriculum now includes specific training of health professional to support members of socially excluded groups

RATING OF PROGRESS SO FAR:

□ clearly **below** what was planned

□ **somewhat below** what was planned

X **somewhat above** what was planned

□ **clearly above** what was planned

WHAT ARE THE UN's KEY *CONTRIBUTIONS* TO THE OUTCOME?

- UN's support to policies and practices of the Ministry of labour and social policy, Employment Service Agency, Adult Education Centre, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Justice;
- With the UN's support, the Economic and Social Council was established and functions regularly;
- UN technical assistance and support provided in the process of development of the National Strategy on Alleviation of Poverty and Social Exclusion strategy;
- Law on Early Childhood Development: assessments and costing was supported by the UN;
- 30 employment centres were supported to effectively implement active labour market measures;
- Curricula for raising capacities for health and social workers supported;
- With the UN's support, in the period 2012-2012, 3.033 new jobs were created, 35.3% of them for women;
- As a result of UN advocacy, the country set a minimum wage and implemented ratified Convention on minimum wage;
- The UN supported the National Action Plan on Youth employment;
- Technical support and guidance provided towards revising the National Action Plan on Child Rights (2012 -2015).

ARE THERE *GAPS* TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES BY 2015?

- Rising inequality and income disparities (GINI Coefficient = 40.2%);
- Access to and knowledge about social services among the socially excluded, especially health services; knowledge of decision makers about their obligations in line with international treaties;
- Corruption and nepotism involved in accessing, retaining and improving an employment;
- Addressing the 'margins' of socially excluded
- National and municipal statistical and M&E capacity to track the implementation of policies remains weak.

HOW CAN *PLANNING AND COORDINATION* BE IMPROVED?

- UN agency level budget reporting against the UNDAF requires standardization.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE UPDATED IN THE *M&E FRAMEWORK*?

- Certain M&E indicators (at outcome as well as output level) require revision and updating, as well as engendering.

AGENCIES OUTCOME 1.2.:

Social services[8] better **respond** to the needs of the **socially excluded and the most vulnerable**
($14.8m –UNICEF, IOM, UNFPA, WHO, joint programmes)

Indicators	Baseline 2010	Target 2015	Status 2013
% of 2 year olds covered by basic vaccination programme (fully immunized)	93% (2009)	98% (2015)	91,3% (2011)
No. of municipalities that have programmes for social protection and services	0 (2009)	30 (2015)	16
% of women using modern contraceptive methods	13% (2011)	25% (2015)	12,8% (2011)
% of Roma women using modern contraceptive methods	7% (2010)	13% (2015)	7,2% (2011)

Mostly due to the financial crisis, **funding** and the scale of **delivery** of social services for socially excluded and the most vulnerable has been **reduced**.

Public spending on health, education and social protection (as % of budget)				
	2009	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**
Education	14.56	14.19	13.29	13.21
Health	15.02	16.46	15.55	17.00
Social Protection	50.45	49.49	44.33	44.21

Public spending on health, education and social protection (as % of GDP)				
	2009	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**
Education	4.91	4.53	4.59	4.49
Health	5.06	5.25	5.37	5.78
Social Protection	17.01	15.79	15.32	15.03

- For **health** services, for example, the UN estimates that only 8%-15% of funds planned have actually been disbursed.
- For social policies for **children**, a similar reduction has taken place.
- For education, there has not been a clear reduction in funding.

In some cases, funding levels have not significantly decreased, but funds were **re-programmed** from service delivery to cover debts of previous years.

In preparation for the UNDAF, the UN had identified **two areas** of social services where improvement is paramount: a) to move away from a reliance on **cash benefits** towards the delivery of **social services** and to clearly **separate** them, b) to move away from **generic social** services to **localized, better targeted** social services for the socially excluded and most vulnerable.

- With regard to separating cash benefits to social services, progress is **limited** so far. The Government now has a **National strategy for development of Social Protection (2011-2021)** that is calling for such a separation in the long run. Electronic databases, one for social service beneficiaries and another for cash benefits recipients are in place, potentially reducing the workload for CSW staff, and making eventual separation of the services and cash payments feasible.

- With regard to **specialized social services**, some progress has been made:
  - 17 **municipalities** now have local strategies and related action plans for social protection, inclusion or poverty reduction
  - There are now 11 **youth friendly** services in Centres for Public Health
  - Coordination and cooperation between service providers in the area of **domestic violence** has dramatically strengthened; there are now 6 shelters for victims of domestic violence; furthermore, special counselling services for perpetrators of domestic violence are also available.
  - 4 municipalities have carried out in-depth assessment of local vulnerabilities and stock-taking of capacity gaps of local service providers
  - Local governments have developed local action plans on equal opportunities
  - Since 2010, **refugees** can now benefit from financial assistance

Access to social services for the socially excluded and most vulnerable through Centers for Social Work has been somewhat **simplified** – the number of documents required has been reduced, photocopies are being accepted instead of originals in many instances, Roma information centers provide assistance to those in need of help when applying for services.

---

[8] Health, social protection, education, (temporary) housing, domestic violence

Little change in level of discrimination – Focus Group Discussions with Roma social service/cash beneficiaries indicate discrimination is still present.	**RATING OF PROGRESS SO FAR:** □ clearly **below** what was planned X **somewhat below** what was planned □ **somewhat above** what was planned □ **clearly above** what was planned

WHAT ARE THE UN's KEY *CONTRIBUTIONS* TO THE OUTCOME?

- the UN's **technical assistance** to **assess the needs** and **frame the response** to the needs of the socially excluded and the most vulnerable
- the UN's support to raise **awareness** for more responsive social services among rights holders and national institutions
- the UN's demonstrations of **local** leadership for services
- The UN's promotion of gender equality and the concept of equal opportunities at local level
- the UN's support to the long-term **Strategy for Alleviation of Poverty and Social Exclusion**
- the UN's support to establish curricula – including a module on gender equality - standards and trainings of trainers to (**re)certify social workers**
- the UN's support to the governments and CSO's **domestic violence response – awareness raising, capacity building,** and support for **improving quality standards and expansion for free legal air services** provided by CSOs
- **Support to implementing a social services data base at the Centres for Social Work,** ensuring a link with the data on social benefits database set-up by the World Bank ("SPILL")

ARE THERE *GAPS* TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES BY 2015?

- Insufficient quantity and coverage of social services, need for better **tailored** services which are decentralized and **closer to the clients** remains
- Problems of **coordination** and **monitoring** of the implementation of plans and strategies related to social services
- Need to improve access of social services to **Roma and socially excluded** people
- Persisting **discrimination** against some groups when requesting social services, particularly against Roma
- **Outsourcing** of social services to specialized NGOs, or through PPP, to close gaps in public service delivery and knowledge as to how to involve the private sector in service provision.
- Lack of functional and systematic system of collecting and sharing disaggregated data necessary for policy implementation

ARE THERE ANY *LESSONS LEARNED?*

- **Funding** has to follow the needs for social services, not the institutions or infrastructure ("**equitable financing on local level**")
- **Evidence and data** is required for proper planning and setting policies
- Lack of a **legal**, **standardized definition** by the state who is a member of a "socially excluded" group is unhelpful
- When having a holistic approach to policy reform things work well – ex. Database and training for social workers

HOW CAN *PLANNING AND COORDINATION* BE IMPROVED?

- Collaboration should build upon agencies competitive advantage and be done only when there is clear advantage and a willingness to implement it;
- more **informal** *coordination* would be useful – especially during planning
- more work on **conceptual issues** of social protection is required

WHAT NEEDS TO BE UPDATED IN THE *M&E FRAMEWORK*?

- Some indicators at outcome and output level require updating, revising and engendering

AGENCIES OUTCOME 1.3.:

Social inclusion policy making processes are evidence based, inclusive and take a cross-sectoral approach
($8.6m –UNDP, UNICEF, IOM, UNIFEM, UNFPA, ILO, WHO, UNESCO)

Indicators	Baseline 2010	Target 2015	Status 2013
National Social Inclusion Strategy endorsed and updated	no%	updated	endorsed
% of EU social inclusion (Laeken) indicators for which data are available for Macedonia	0%	100%	100%
% of EU social inclusion (Laeken) indicators that can be disaggregated by sex and urban/rural	0%	100%	0%

Overall, inclusion, cross-sectoral and evidence based social policy making remains **unsystematic and non-institutionalized**, mostly **ad-hoc** and driven by **external partners**, including the UN. **Funding** and the **sustainability** of the use of evidence, an inclusive and cross-sectoral approach remains doubtful. Some progress has been made in setting up mechanisms, but attitudes and the level of implementation remains largely unchanged:

INCLUSIVE
To a limited extent, there are now better mechanisms for inclusive social policy making.
- The Government Rules of Procedures from 2008 include a mechanism for obligatory internet publishing of initiatives for public information and comments but they are implemented to a limited extent by some Ministries on ad hoc basis only. Parliament reviews are public and some Committees are open for participation. Yet, the Parliament rarely uses the formal "public discussion" institute – only once in the UNDAF period, in 2011, for the draft Law on Youth (total use since 2008: 4 initiatives). Civil Society Organizations are – to some degree – involved to participate in discussing social policies
- Ministries, inter-ministerial bodies and ad hoc task forces
- A number of coordination bodies which allow for a more inclusive approach to policy making are in place (on disabilities, domestic violence, social inclusion, etc.)

EVIDENCE
The use of evidence for policy making remains weak. Perception that data is being used selectively. The national institutions with funding and capacity to conduct research (e.g. the Institute for Social, Political and Juridical Studies, the Institute for Public Health) remain underused. However, some progress has been made:
a) the UN receives more sophisticated requests from the government e.g. on evaluating employment measures, which indicate a greater demand for evidence
b) The National Strategy on domestic violence: - a common survey used to generate data for the strategy
c) Gender equality strategy based on previously generated evidence with support from the UN and an assessment of National Action Plan on Gender Equality (2007-2012) implementation by the OSCE

CROSS-SECTORAL
For gender, mechanisms are in place, but only used sporadically (mainly fostered by donor-driven support). For HIV/AIDS, there is now a section in the National Strategy for Reduction of Poverty and Social Inclusion. On poverty, round tables and bottom-up approach applied to ensure inputs and vertical coordination between central and local level policies

RATING OF PROGRESS SO FAR:

☐ clearly **below** what was planned

X **somewhat below** what was planned

☐ **somewhat above** what was planned

☐ **clearly above** what was planned

WHAT ARE THE UN's KEY *CONTRIBUTIONS* TO THE OUTCOME?

- Support to policy and legal framework for social inclusion (education, health, juvenile justice, equal opportunities)
- Studies and assessment leading up to the **Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Strategy**
- Role of the UN as **advocate** and **convener** for inclusive, evidence-based and cross-sectoral social policy making
- Generation of studies and knowledge on social policies (e.g. MICS 4, Survey on the Living Standards of Roma; Performance monitoring of active labour market programmes implemented in 2007-2010; Gender Pay Gap study; Rural Women Status Study, Use of Social Work Services from a Gender Perspective etc.)
- Support to develop national capacities to **produce and use evidence** for policy making (CSOs, Academia, Government Officials)

ARE THERE GAPS TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES BY 2015?

- **Available data** for policy making is not used, is only selectively used, is not widely exchanged within a department, ministry or unit and with other players
- Limited capacity to **interpret statistical data** and **use it effectively**
- **Lack of updated census** data (2002) affects other data
- Lack of Government **commitment** to use evidence and an inclusive and cross-sectoral approach
- **Monitoring and evaluating** the implementation of plans and strategies is inadequate
-

WHAT NEEDS TO BE UPDATED IN THE *M&E FRAMEWORK*?

- M&E Indicator framework will have to be revised, updated and engendered

UNDAF Mid-Term Review

AGENCIES OUTCOME 2.1.:
Local Government operates in a more **effective** and **transparent** manner *($9.3m – UNDP, UNICEF, UNIFEM)*

Indicators	Baseline 2010	Target 2015	Status 2013
% of total revenues of local governments from *local* revenues	42.3% (2010)	TBD (2015)	46.9 (2012)
% of municipalities with local budgets that address the needs of groups with special needs	TBD (2010)	TBD (2015)	8% (2012)
Reduction in illegal constructions	0% (2007)	50% (2015)	3% (2012)

- Municipalities have obtained higher fiscal autonomy and are subject to stricter and more operational T&A platforms;
- Progress of the 84 municipalities and the city of Skopje towards more effectiveness and transparency varies greatly.

EFFECTIVENESS:
- Slight increase of revenues from local sources: 43.3% - 46.9% of revenues is coming from local sources;
- Many municipalities met minimum criteria for effectiveness: all except one moved from level 1 to level 2 of fiscal decentralization; a set of criteria had to be fulfilled;
- This affected also functional decentralization in three areas: education, social protection, culture; most importantly: functional decentralization of education; with standards set centrally; effects on schools not measurable yet: no new PIRLS data available (last data from 2010);
- The outreach of services has improved, significantly due to alternative solutions for service provision, such as IMC, PPP. Only through UNDP supported Inter-Municipality Partnerships, more than 800, 000 people now have access to new services;
- Citizen's participation: Prioritizing through community forums has been introduced in the municipal statutes- 59 municipalities held "citizen forums", 51 changed their statues accordingly; the weakness is that these forums are mainly donor supported.

TRANSPARENCY
- The Law on information adopted in 2008/9 was put into effect ; implementation needs to be improved (eg.OSI assessments show lack of implementation);
- Municipalities are subject to regular audits;
- A number of T&A tools have been introduced at local level;
- All municipalities have signed up to the Code of Ethics;
- ISO certification became obligatory for all public bodies (8-10 municipalities obtained ISO certification as pilot);
- Integrity policy has been initiated. 10 municipalities have already adopted it, currently the process of incorporating integrity systems in national legislation is ongoing;
- New budgeting principles have been tested- 4 municipalities now have local plans for budgeting and fiscal monitoring based on a client satisfaction survey.

RATING OF PROGRESS SO FAR:

□ clearly **below** what was planned

□ **somewhat below** what was planned

x **somewhat above** what was planned

□ **clearly above** what was planned

WHAT ARE THE UN's KEY *CONTRIBUTIONS* TO THE OUTCOME?

- Moving forward the overall decentralization policy framework and in particular the core policy work on fiscal decentralization (the Decentralization Programme, Action Plan, M&E framework, Fiscal studies, support to the IMC policy etc.);
- Estimation of revenue capacity; expenditure needs; model of fiscal equalization;
- Introduction of innovative tools (IMC, ISO certification, Code of Ethics for municipalities, Integrity system etc.);
- Introduction of citizen-based service and budget planning;
- Introduction of gender responsive budgeting – initiative action for agenda;
- PIDP;
- IT-based social accountability tools;
- Regional Centre for Digitalization of Cultural Heritage – functional with 6 staff.

ARE THERE *GAPS* TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES BY 2015?

- Civic perspective / obtaining data on perceptions;
- Multi-annual budgeting;
- Capacity to deliver at municipal level;
- Weak capacity of civil society to create demand for information and require systematic accountability;
- Lack of coordination between institutions;
- Vertical communication between municipalities and centre;
- Capacity of municipalities to also create enabling environment for satisfying of additional community needs.

ARE THERE ANY *LESSONS LEARNED?*

- Systemic work is critical.

HOW CAN *PLANNING AND COORDINATION* BE IMPROVED?

- "UN polygon" at municipality level; 3 agencies work on local budget; find an enhanced way to coordinate;
- Work plan coordination (Jan every year).

WHAT NEEDS TO BE UPDATED IN THE *M&E FRAMEWORK*?

- Slight revision is needed to simplify some of the indicators.

AGENCIES OUTCOME 2.2.: **Policy and institutional framework at national and local level enhanced to promote and operationalize regional development** *($6m – UNDP, UNFPA)*			
Indicators	*Baseline 2010*	*Target 2015*	*Status 2013*
No. of Regional Development Plans approved	0 (2010)	in all regions	8 (2013)
% of GDP distributed to municipalities for regional level	0.04% (2010)	1% (2015)	0.02%[9] (2013)

- While in 2009 6 **Regional Development Centres** were functioning, now all 8 regions have fully functioning Regional Development Centres with staff and funding and they implement a programme according to the standard guidelines of the Government.
- All eight Regional Development Centres now have a Five-Year **Regional Development Programme** and annual action plans. The operational framework of the Centers is gradually expanding (eg. Waste Management)
- Formally, the **funds** directly received by the Regional Development Centres from the Bureau for RD remains very low (). Funds are mostly channeled through line Ministries. However, centers have managed to mobilize funds from alternative sources.
- The law on regional development not fully implemented.

RATING OF PROGRESS SO FAR:

□ clearly **below** what was planned

X **somewhat below** what was planned

□ **somewhat above** what was planned

□ **clearly above** what was planned

WHAT ARE THE UN's KEY *CONTRIBUTIONS* TO THE OUTCOME?

- UN was one of the partners for the Government in developing a Regional Development Strategy.
- The UN supported the set-up of two Regional Development Centres. It supported the centres in a human rights based approach to planning and also in securing funding.
- The UN supports the Regional Development Centres to demonstrate an integrated development approach. – Vardar PR is the focus of the UNDP work on increasing institutional, social and economic capacities, including for considering vulnerable groups in planning.

ARE THERE *GAPS* TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES BY 2015?

- Agree on and establish a method to measure fiscal transfers to regions* (politically challenging)
- Competitiveness and innovation in regional planning
- Rural development (Compare EU IPARD)
- Better include sensitivities to population trends and a focus on people in the planning process
- Streamlining and coordination of regional fiscal transfers

ARE THERE ANY *LESSONS LEARNED?*

- Persistence pays off
- Politics affect the attainment of this outcome
- The outcome is important also for specialized UN agencies' work and this should be taken into consideration
- The gender element is important

---

[9] channelled by the Bureau for Regional Development

AGENCIES OUTCOME 2.3.:			
National and local level institutions and non-governmental actors promote inter-ethnic dialogue and social cohesion *($9.6m – UNDP, UNICEF, UNESCO)*			
Indicators	*Baseline 2010*	*Target 2015*	*Status 2013*
Progress towards improved institutional environment for inter-ethnic relations[10]	0	4	3

- Overall, state and non-state actors succesfully **managed** to contain inter-ethnic conflicts – (2012 incidents confirmed this). IE challenges became much more overt, but institutions proved able to deal with the challenges.
- Integrated **education** (2010)
- **Non-formal education** more interethnically mixed
- The representation of non-majority ethnic groups in the **public adminstration** has increased
- The parliamentary **commission for inter-ethnic relations** started to have formal sessions. The Badinter principle continues to be implemented and a list of laws have been identified for review.

RATING OF PROGRESS SO FAR:

☐ clearly below what was planned

☐ somewhat below what was planned

X somewhat above what was planned

☐ clearly above what was planned

WHAT ARE THE UN's KEY *CONTRIBUTIONS* TO THE OUTCOME?

- First ever needs assessment conducted and recommendations supported by UN: 60% implemented already
- Through joint programme on IE dialogue and cohesion, Government took the lead on coordinating IE work in the country; important actors were for the first time brought together (eg. SIOFA and the Agency for Small Communities)
- Life skills based education: 100% coverage in mixed areas
- Gender perspective introduced in IE issues: e.g. gender in mediation
- Dispute resolution mechanism introduced, including a trained pool of mediators
- School of Journalism and Public Relations now offers specialization studies in inclusive journalism and has a UNESCO chair in Media, Dialogue and Mutual Understanding.
- The work on outcome 1-decentralization indirectly contributes to this outcome

ARE THERE *GAPS* TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES BY 2015?

- A reconciliation is required which goes beyond the agency outcome
- Civic perspective is important

HOW CAN *PLANNING AND COORDINATION* BE IMPROVED?

- The UN joint programme on Enhancing Interethnic Dialogue has helped significantly to bring more coherence to the work of the UN.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE UPDATED IN THE *M&E FRAMEWORK*?

- Slight revision needed

---

[10] Scale 0 to 4: 1 point: functioning inter-ethnic committees at local level (at least 10); 2 points: Law on Integrated Education adopted; 3 points: media better able to sensitively report on inter-ethnic issues; 4 points: inter-ethnic Parliamentary Committee operational (i.e. quality of mtgs, ability to meet quorum…)

AGENCIES OUTCOME 3.1.:

National **policies** better address **climate adaptation measures** and **demonstration programmes** respond to **climate change challenges** *($12.7m – UNDP, UNIDO, WHO, UNEP, UNESCO)*

Indicators	Baseline 2010	Target 2015	Status 2013
No. of sectorial policies which have been taking into account climate change	0 (2010)	3 (2015)	4 (2012)
No. of programmes addressing climate change issues implemented by the central government municipalities, CSOs	0 (2010)	5 (2015)	10 (2012)
Expenditure to date (USD & %)		1,056,176 USD	

Progress since 2010:

Legal framework: New Law on Energy was adopted in order to comply with the obligations towards the Energy Community and other relevant EU policies. The Law on Environment Protection was amended to better address the requirements of the UNFCCC and the respective EU climate change directives.

Institutional framework: National Council for Sustainable Development was established, and the composition of the National Climate Change Committee was extended to better reflect representation of all relevant sectors. Climate Change Office in the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning was established, and in addition, most ministries have nominated climate change focal points responsible for mainstreaming climate change issues into their respective sectors. There is evidence that topics related to climate change are more present in the media on national level, and awareness of the public is on a higher level than five years ago.

Policy/Implementation: The country features high energy intensive growth (2.5 times higher than the average for OECD Europe). Limitations in energy supply, insufficient use of renewables and low energy efficiency are one of the key structural issues and unless important investments in infrastructure are made by 2020 the country will become a net electricity importer. The Government has started to address these issues by investing in new hydro power plants, adopting relevant secondary legislation that will facilitate the use of renewable sources, as well as promotion of energy efficiency products and technologies.

A set of strategy related to development of the energy sector by 2020 have been adopted (Energy Development Strategy, Energy Efficiency Strategy, Renewable Sources Strategy), and they better address the climate change issues in the country as they are more based on in-depth analyses of the sector, and appropriate modeling. The country has initiated an action that will create an enabling environment for introduction of monitoring, reporting and verification of GHG emissions, and more balanced and sustainable green growth.

Also, a National Climate Change Health Adaptation Strategy, and Heat and Cold Waves Action Plan have been adopted, accompanied by Guidelines on Communicable Diseases and Climate Change for the health workers.

Numbers of municipalities have prepared Energy Efficiency Programmes ad Action Plans and started implementation of the priority measures for energy efficiency in public buildings. Voluntarily system for tracking of energy cost of public buildings was established and functional, hosted by ZELS.

Companies in the industry sector have started to introduce resource efficient cleaner production practices and less polluting technologies.

> RATING OF PROGRESS SO FAR:
>
> ☐ clearly **below** what was planned
>
> ☐ **somewhat below** what was planned
>
> **X somewhat above** what was planned
>
> ☐ **clearly above** what was planned

WHAT ARE THE UN's KEY *CONTRIBUTIONS* TO THE OUTCOME?

- Economic Impact of Climate Change – National Case Studies for Energy demand, Water use for irrigation and electricity production which paves the way for further in-depth research on climate change;
- Support for development of the National Climate Change Health Adaptation Strategy, a Heat Health Action Plan and Guidelines on Communicable Diseases and Climate Change for health workers, and establishment of an Early Warning System for Heat Waves;
- Roadmap for Introducing Monitoring, Reporting and Verification of GHG Emission for participation at the EU Emission Trading Scheme;
- Support for the Rio + 20 Conference on Sustainable Development and Post 2015 discussions
- Tools for municipalities, esp. ExCITE software, that allows local government units to generate energy consumption statistics for public buildings
- Number of demonstration and pilots of energy efficiency measures through implementation of refurbishments of kindergartens, schools and hospitals that have potential for reduction of energy consumption and thus costs, and CO2 emission of public buildings by 40%-60%.

- Introduction of Resource Efficient Cleaner Production in number of installations and training provided for more than 100 employees

ARE THERE *GAPS* TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES BY 2015?

- Insufficient administrative capacities on national and local level to implement strategies and action plans, and to enforce the adopted laws.
- Insufficient capacities for climate change research and modeling, economic and social impact analyses, cross-sectoral analyses.
- Limited financial resources allocated for implementation of systemic renewables and energy efficiency actions
- Insufficient awareness of the key decision-makers on climate change issues

ARE THERE ANY *LESSONS LEARNED?*

- Innovative approached for promotion and explanation of the climate change issues should be explored
- The voice of different stakeholders and players should be taken into consideration while planning, developing and implementing climate change related projects
- Economic and social impact of climate change should be more taken onto consideration and thus national capacities for these type of analyses and research should be further strengthened

HOW CAN *PLANNING AND COORDINATION* BE IMPROVED?

- Better information sharing between resident and non-resident agencies, e.g. through more regular meetings of the Environment UNDAF Working Group, as well as with other UNDAF WGs.
- Creation of synergies among the programmes/projects of different agencies through joint programmes/projects, and better utilization of various knowledge products developed by different agencies
- Organization of joint events

WHAT NEEDS TO BE UPDATED IN THE *M&E FRAMEWORK*?

- The indicators should be revised
- Specific Output and Indicators should be added to reflect the contribution from the FAO

AGENCIES OUTCOME 3.2.:			
By 2015, national capacities for management of ecosystems, biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of natural resources improved *($6.9m – UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO)*			
Indicators	*Baseline 2010*	*Target 2015*	*Status 2013*
No. of sectoral laws and bylaws, regulating sustainable use and management of natural resources adopted, changed or amended	10 (2008)	20	ca. 100
Expenditure to date (USD & %)			4,053,954 USD

Progress since 2010:

Legal framework: The new Law on Water was adopted setting new directions for management of waters in the country fully in line with the respective EU Directives. Number of other laws were changed and/or amended, and bylaws and regulations have been adopted related to the Law on Waters, Law on Nature, and other relevant laws.

Institutional framework: Responsibilities for water protection and management have been transferred from the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy to the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning.

Policy/Implementation: The first National Water Strategy has been adopted providing a basis for operationalization of the water management system at national level, and a few pilot watershed (river basin) management planning processes have been initiated. Besides the UNDP supported Prespa Lake Watershed Management Plan, the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning is currently working on preparation of River Basin Management Plan for Bregalnica and gap analysis, identification of next steps and an outline of the Strumica River Basin Management Plan.
There is a progress in valorization of the protected areas and development of management plans for various protected areas, better information and data on the existing biodiversity in the country.

RATING OF PROGRESS SO FAR:

□ clearly **below** what was planned

□ **somewhat below** what was planned

X **somewhat above** what was planned

□ **clearly above** what was planned

WHAT ARE THE UN's KEY *CONTRIBUTIONS* TO THE OUTCOME?

- Introduction of an integrated ecosystem management in the Prespa region and demonstration of this approach through a number of activities in the areas of agriculture, forestry, fishery, wastewater and solid waste management (biodegradable waste and pesticide packaging);
- Development of the first ever in the country Watershed Management Plan which is in line with the EU Water Framework Directive,
- Long term support for maturation of the collaboration and management of the shared natural resources through the example of the Prespa Lake, and development of a number of key strategic and planning documents on trans-boundary level (Strategic Action Plan for the Prespa Region, Trilateral Sustainable Tourism Development Strategy, Trilateral Fish and Fishery Management Plan, trilateral Action Plans for protection of priority species and habitats in the prespa Watershed).
- Contribution to improved legal framework, and capacities of the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning for nature management through drafting of seventeen by-laws, establishment of a National Biodiversity Information System, development of a National Catalogue of Species, establishment of a National Representative Network of Protected Areas, guidelines for preparation of management plans for protected areas, and number of valorization studies and management plans for different categories of protected areas;
- Development of the Management Plan for the Ohrid Lake, UNESCO Heritage Site, and initiation of the process for proclamation of Osogovo Mountains and of Ohrid-Prespa Region as a Man and Biosphere Reserve.

ARE THERE *GAPS* TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES BY 2015?

- Insufficient administrative capacities on national and local level to implement strategies and action plans, and to enforce the adopted laws
- Limited financial resources allocated for protected areas management and nature conservation
- Insufficient awareness of the key decision-makers on issues related to nature management and conservation

ARE THERE ANY *LESSONS LEARNED?*

- Innovative approaches and financial incentives should be used in order to promote nature protection and conservation (e.g. payment for ecosystem services)

- More attention should be put on exploring the links between the poverty and social dimensions and environment protection.

HOW CAN *PLANNING AND COORDINATION* BE IMPROVED?

- Better information sharing between resident and non-resident agencies, e.g. through more regular meetings of the UNDAF Environment Working Group, as well as with other UNDAF WGs.
- Creation of synergies among the programmes/projects of different agencies through joint programmes/projects, and better utilization of various knowledge products developed by different agencies
- Organization of joint events

WHAT NEEDS TO BE UPDATED IN THE *M&E FRAMEWORK*?

- The indicators should be revised
- Specific Output(s) and Indicator(s) should be added to reflect the contribution from the FAO

AGENCIES OUTCOME 3.3.:			
By 2015, **national authorities** are better able to **reduce the risk of** and **respond to** natural and man-made disasters *($7.12m – UNDP; UNEP, WHO, UNESCO)*			
Indicators	*Baseline 2010*	*Target 2015*	*Status 2013*
Multi-hazard monitoring system based on GIS for disaggregated data collection to feed and monitor risks, threats and damages in a sex-, age- and other demographic and social factors developed	No	Yes	Yes
No. of industrial hotspots remediated	0	3	2
Expenditure to date (USD & %)		2, 263,354 USD	

Progress since 2010:

Legal framework: Several Laws have been amended and or changed as part of the process for transposition of the relevant EU Directives related to chemicals management, and Integrated Pollution and Prevention Control. Work on transposition and implementation of the Seveso II Directive is progressing. The Seveso Directive obliges Member States to ensure that operators have a policy in place to prevent major accidents. It applies to industrial installations where dangerous substances are used or stored in large quantities, mainly in the chemicals, petrochemicals, storage, and metal refining sectors.

RATING OF PROGRESS SO FAR:

□ clearly **below** what was planned

□ **somewhat below** what was planned

X somewhat above what was planned

□ **clearly above** what was planned

Institutional framework: National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction have been established as a coordination and consultation forum, consisting of representatives of all relevant Ministries, local governments, private sectors, academic institutions and NGOs. The National Focal Point for the Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA) reports regularly on the progress achieved towards the priority actions set in the HFA, and the country actively participates at the global meetings related to disaster risk reduction.

POPs Unit (Persistent Organic Pollutants) and the Environmental Office of The Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning are the key institutions dealing with industrial hotspots, industrial pollution and risk, and together with the Ministry of Health are responsible for safe management of chemicals.

Local government has increased responsibilities in disaster risk reduction and management especially related to firefighting, floods prevention, etc.

Policy/Implementation: Methodology for multi risk multi hazard assessment has been adopted provided for preparation of the Country Risk Profile, and analytical capacities of the Crisis Management Centre have improved. Gender considerations have been mainstreamed in the key analytical and policy documents related to disaster risk reduction. Preparedness of the schools, kindergartens and hospitals in the case of emergency has been improved. Municipalities increasingly recognize that they have to invest in disaster risk reduction and hence number of municipalities that implement small scale disaster risk reduction measures on local level has increased.

The country joined the EU Civil Protection Mechanism which opens an opportunity for utilization of the IPA funding that will further advance civil protection and disaster risk reduction actions on national and local level.

National Action Plan for Safe Management of Chemicals was adopted. Phasing-Out and Elimination of PCBs and PCB-Containing Equipment have been initiated and 150 tones have been combusted. Numbers of feasibility studies and plans for the major environmental (industrial hotspots) have been developed, and remediation activities in two sites have been implemented.

WHAT ARE THE UN's KEY *CONTRIBUTIONS* TO THE OUTCOME?

- Development of a National Methodology for Multi-Risk and Multi-Hazard Assessment and a database on historical events that contributed to improved analytical capacity of the Crisis Management Centre by making available more accurate data and information on historical hazardous events thus providing for detection of trends of the occurrence of certain hazards and risk, and the exposure and the vulnerability in the country.
- Incorporation of gender consideration into the analytical and planning process and plans through Web Based Gender Repository Database and Web Based System for Learning, Exam and Survey, and Data/information basis for improved gender based analysis, monitoring and evaluation of gender activities and gender mainstreaming in the crisis management/disaster risk reduction.
- Increased awareness on disaster risk reduction on central and local level through development of interactive children game, implementation of earthquake simulation exercises in schools, kindergartens and development of evacuation plans, implementation of small scale disaster risk reduction measures on local level, and development of a smart phone application for disaster risk reduction.

- Promoting the link between climate change and disaster through an integrated pilot climate and disaster risk assessment in the South-Eastern Region of the country.
- Pilot assessments of hospital safety in crisis situations have been performed in two pilot hospitals (Prilep and Bitola) and over 80 health facilities, using the WHO Hospital Safety Index Tool Methodology;
- Environmentally sound management system for disposal of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and PCB-containing equipment established, public awareness increased and cooperation among key stakeholders, government, public and private enterprises involved in PCB management improved thus reducing the threats to human health and the environment posed by PCBs
- Development of the National Action Plan for Safe Management of Chemicals (SMC) that sets a path forward for the country to mainstream the highest priority SMC issues in the development planning processes and plans and expresses Government commitment towards the implementation of environmentally sound chemicals management.
- Rehabilitation of Lojane Mine Site and implementation of a comprehensive set of measures that improved the mining process in Bucim Mine thus significantly reducing the negative impact to the underground water and air.

ARE THERE *GAPS* TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES BY 2015?

- National Disaster Risk Platform is insufficiently utilized as for a forum for discussion among various players on all levels and achievement of an agreement on important issues related to DRR in the country.
- Unsatisfactory collaboration and coordination among the key national agencies dealing with DRR is averting further progress of the disaster risk reduction, as well as response and recovery from disasters.
- Stronger mechanisms needed to test, simulate and evaluate DRR activities.
- More consideration should be given to the vulnerable groups, especially to persons with disabilities
- Low penetration rate of risk transfer mechanisms and insurances against risks
- Disaster Risk Reduction is still not mainstreamed in the local development level plans and thus more funds are spent on disaster response and recovery than on prevention and preparedness.
- Lack of legislative and inter-sectoral sustainable mechanisms for implementation of the International Health Regulations (IHR).

ARE THERE ANY *LESSONS LEARNED?*

- There is a need to further promote the disaster risk reduction vs. disaster response and recovery, and to ensure that funds for disaster risk reduction are earmarked in the state and municipal budgets
- There is a need for broader inclusion of non-specialized players in risk reduction activities, and not to focus only on the emergency agencies which are mandated to address these issues

HOW CAN *PLANNING AND COORDINATION* BE IMPROVED?

- Better information sharing between resident and non-resident agencies, e.g. through more regular meetings of the Environment UNDAF Working Group, as well as with other UNDAF WGs.
- Creation of synergies among the programmes/projects of different agencies through joint programmes/projects, and better utilization of various knowledge products developed by the agencies
- Organization of joint events

WHAT NEEDS TO BE UPDATED IN THE *M&E FRAMEWORK*?

- The Indicators should be revised

ANNEX II – REVISED MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Attached as separate document.