



“PROMOTING INCLUSIVE LABOUR MARKET SOLUTIONS IN THE WESTERN BALKANS”

Final Project Evaluation Report

Thomas Vasseur, Independent consultant (Thomas.vasseur@gmail.com)

Lyons, France

June 2018

Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
KEY FINDINGS	4
CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES	5
RECOMMENDATIONS	6
1. INTRODUCTION	8
1.1. PROJECT BACKGROUND	8
1.2. EVALUATION PURPOSE	13
1.3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION	13
1.3 EVALUATION QUESTIONS	14
1.4 METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS	14
2. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	17
2.1. RELEVANCE	17
2.2. EFFECTIVENESS	22
2.3. EFFICIENCY	26
2.4. IMPACT	30
2.5. SUSTAINABILITY	33
2.8.3 VISIBILITY	35
3. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES	36
3.1 CONCLUSIONS	36
3.2 LESSONS LEARNED	38
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	42
ANNEXES	47
ANNEX 1 – RESULTS-ASSESSMENT FORM FOR FINAL PROJECT EVALUATIONS/REVIEWS	47
ANNEX 2 – LIST OF REVIEWED DOCUMENTATION	47
ANNEX 3 – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES	47
ANNEX 4 – FIELD VISITS PLAN	47
<i>Inclusive Labour Market Solutions in the Western Balkans – Final Evaluation</i>	2

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADA	Austrian Development Agency
ALMPs	Active Labour Market Programmes
BiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
CO	UNDP Country Office
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CSW	Centre for Social Welfare
ECOFIN	Economic and Financial Affairs
ERP	Council Economic Reform Programme
ESAP	Employment and Social Affairs Platform
EU	European Union
FYR Macedonia	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
ICM	Integrated Case Management
ILMS	Inclusive Labour Market Solutions Project
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
LEP	Local employment partnership
MLSP	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
MEF	Montenegrin Employers' Federation
PES	Public Employment Service
PIA	Participatory Inclusiveness Assessment
PWD	Persons with Disabilities
RAS	Refugees and Asylum Seekers
RCC	Regional Cooperation Council
SAE	Serbia Association of Employers
SWI	Social Welfare Institutions
TEP	Territorial Employment Pacts
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
YGS	Youth Guarantee Scheme
WB	The World Bank
WB6	Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, FYR Macedonia, Kosovo** ¹ , Montenegro, Serbia

¹ References to Kosovo* shall be understood to be in the context of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999).
Inclusive Labour Market Solutions in the Western Balkans – Final Evaluation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“Promoting Inclusive Labour Market Solutions in the Western Balkans” (ILMS) is a regional and multi-country project, rich and diverse in activities and present at all levels of institutional and non-institutional interaction with issues of labour exclusion affecting a number of vulnerable individuals and their communities. The challenge is as wide as it is complex as it involves changing perspectives of institutions towards delivering services that effectively enable marginalised groups to enter or re-enter the labour market. It also aims at building an up-to-date, accurate, qualitative and quantitative understanding of social and labour exclusion. ILMS embraces a comprehensive approach by supporting a more effective inter-institutional interaction and involving all concerned stakeholders through policy-level as well as project-level interventions.

KEY FINDINGS

Relevance

ILMS enjoys a strong policy and pragmatic relevance and fits precisely to local, national, as well as sub-regional priorities in building more efficient, adapted and responsive solutions involving the resources and expertise of all relevant actors. While ILMS is strategically fully supportive of labour-inclusive actions in the region, it lacks the clear formulation of a strategic framework that would assure all project partners (i.e. Centres for Social Welfare, Municipal Employment Agencies, National Employment Services, ministries of labour and social policies, the private sector, the civil society) that there will be a continuation of the present project so that sustainability is ensured.

With a presence on multiple frontlines in the region, from policy level to project level, ILMS has displayed a strong ambition, expressed through an impressive array of activities, but lessened by insufficient financial and human resources. The spread of activities – while all unanimously appreciated – is such that, maintaining ILMS’s coherence and the awareness that all stakeholders are part of a single project has required significant efforts.

Effectiveness

Given its limited resource and timeframe, ILMS has achieved remarkable results and built a deep interest and the willingness of institutions, the private sector and the civil society to pursue further the path towards developing inclusive services. The ILMS project team who has spared no efforts to constantly consult and mobilise project partners is to be commended for its dedication and personal commitment. However, if ILMS has won the “buy-in” of institutions, the road to the institutionalisation of collaborative, multi-stakeholders practices, tools and methods remains long.

UNDP and ILO have proven effective partners as both agencies combine the field presence, experience and expertise that ILMS requires.

Efficiency

ILMS has offered very good value for money when looking the cost per activity rate. However, this has been made possible thanks to very intense UNDP and ILO ILMS project staff commitment and is not sustainable on the longer-term.

Impact

Even if it is hard to capture, ILMS has made an immense first “mind-changing” impact on its partners, especially at the local level. It has raised expectations and desire to go further in the reform process and created a moral commitment of the project to not stop its intervention at this early stage.

ILMS has also produced very concrete impact in the field through its TEP interventions. While some sub-projects have produced promising results when judiciously integrated in existing UNDP programmes, some others have disappointed mainly because of insufficient financial resources made available by the project.

Sustainability

ILMS has secured the first but essential steps that open the way to a promising sustainability: Awareness, interest, buy-in and already some elements of ownership of innovative practices. For this reason alone, there is a strong case for ILMS to consider a further project phase.

CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

The regional dimension of ILMS is not just an add-on but offers a strong added-value as it allows all of the targeted countries and territories to benefit from the experience of its neighbours and use it for its own benefit.

ILMS suffers from an unfair syndrome: Most of the great impact it creates, and while ILMS is “everywhere”, it is not visible. This fact calls for a pro-active and creative stance in that respect, with the help of digital technology.

ILMS is a “knowledge monster”: it generates so much great and useful knowledge from its numerous activities. There is a clear risk of a part of it being lost or not followed upon if not managed properly. Here again, web-based technology can be of great assistance.

While favouring a participative, two-way bottom-up and top-down approach, ILMS still is to tackle the reconnection of its activities between the central and local institutional level.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A continuation of the ILMS intervention is required to progress towards sustainability

The project has successfully raised awareness and strong interest of local and central institutions. While it has secured the “buy-in”, ownership yet of new, inclusive-driven labour markets measures is still to be achieved as those measures still needs to be developed. And those measures have also not yet been developed in the various Western Balkans countries. This is especially the case in Kosovo*, much time still needs to be invested in the policy dialogue and legal reforms, as well as the visibility of promoted models. Similarly, methodologies (self-assessment of inclusive service) has received the highest appreciation from the institutions that have practiced it. The project has also raised high expectations now that institutions have a better understanding of their needs.

2. The project needs a formal strategic framework to be outlined

There should not be an ILMS phase II without a detailed long-term strategic framework. ILMS need to place itself in time into a longer-term process but also in space vis-à-vis other related regional interventions such as ESAP.

3. Review the level of intervention of ILMS vis-à-vis ESAP

Prior to review UNDP and ILO’s respective roles and responsibilities in a possible ILMS II phase, the evaluation recommends to a strategic positioning review of both ILMS and ESAP project to increase their synergy and impact.

4. The recommended ILMS phase II requires thorough preparation

This involves taking stock of lessons learned, best practices in the respective countries/territories to formulate component and activity-level recommendations.

5. The ILMS requires further financial support and wider donor mobilisation

Discontinuing the support to a highly relevant intervention, with a genuine longer-term potential of institutionalisation would jeopardise the project acquis to date as well as the goal of the intervention: implementing durable reforms.

6. Review the respective roles and responsibilities of UNDP and ILO for a streamline implementation

ILMS is a tree with many branches and leaves: 6 different contexts, multiple levels of intervention plus the regional dimension. Addressing this complexity requires a clearer definition of roles.

7. Streamline coordination

In line with Recommendation 6, ILMS should appoint one full-time Focal Staff for each Country/territory to ensure the smooth coherence, coordination and reporting of all activities at the field and regional level. At the Country/territory level, each of those six focal staff, shall ensure close coordination of interventions between UNDP and ILO.

8. Build a proper knowledge management system

The recommended ILMS Phase II will continue to manage, produce and exchange a sizeable volume of information. If not systematised, managing such a task may impede implementation.

9. Develop an upgraded 2.0 TEP

TEP financial resources have been too little, significantly reducing its potential. A more ambitious approach should be developed, with more resources with the objective of establishing replicable successful models.

10. Develop a detailed workplan for the further implementation of the Integrated Case Management

For institutions to use a tailor-made ICM, a substantial effort needs to be deployed, especially in context where much needs to happen on the legal and capacity side.

11. Increase ADA visibility

ILMS, apart from TEP concrete interventions is not a type of intervention where physical visibility is offered a strong place.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. PROJECT BACKGROUND

UNDP and ILO jointly implement a sub-regional project titled Promoting Inclusive Labour Market Solutions in the Western Balkans, with an objective to assist public employment services (PES) and centres for social work (CSW) in their efforts to build more inclusive labour markets. For this purpose, the project supports mandated institutions in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kosovo*², Montenegro and Serbia.

ILMS's **overall budget** amounts to **1,575 M Euros** (composed of the following contributions: ADA: 1 M EUR, UNDP: 0,5 M EUR, ILO: 0,075 M EUR) and its implementation has stretched over a 26-month period, from **01 May 2016 to 31 June 2018** (including a 2-month no-cost extension).

The project is co-funded by Austrian Development Agency (ADA) and aims to introduce new and improve existing models, practices and systems for provision of holistic support to people at risk of exclusion from labour market; better outreach to job seekers and inactive population; more effective information dissemination of labour market information, training and employment opportunities.

Tackling specific labour market barriers of unemployed youth and other vulnerable groups who are unlikely to be reached by standard active labour market policies is central to this project, which is expected to be achieved through three interlinked outputs:

1. Labour market governance: Public employment and social service agencies capacitated to provide user-centred approaches, with a focus on vulnerable and hard-to-employ groups;

Activities under this output include:

- ✓ Participatory audits on capabilities and competences of public employment services and centres for social work; both at central and local levels.
- ✓ Guidelines and toolkits on individual case management (ICM).
- ✓ Capacity-development of PES and CSW staff in the design and use of ICM for labour inclusion of disadvantaged groups.
- ✓ Identification of solutions for information exchange between CSP and PES
- ✓ Capacity-development of designing holistic, EU scheme inspired, youth employment programmes.

1. ² This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo* declaration of independence. All further references to Kosovo* in this document should be understood in this manner.

- ✓ Central-level capacity development of PES and MoL on support services for refugees and asylum seekers on the Western Balkans labour market.
- ✓ Building the resilience of host communities by enhancing access to employment opportunities and services for asylum seekers in TEPs, PES and CSWs.

2. Innovation for fostering inclusive labour markets: Innovative programmes developed and promoted to tackle the employment of vulnerable groups and foster inclusive labour markets;

Activities under this output include:

- ✓ Introduction/enhancement of new/existing services of job search and mediation facilities.
- ✓ Mainstream social mentorship method.
- ✓ Establishment of business leadership network for people with disabilities.
- ✓ Establishment of horizontal partnership network for the creation of territorial employment pacts.

3. Knowledge systematization for effective policy making: Convergence towards EU and global good practice enhanced through peer learning and support.

Activities under this output include:

- ✓ Preparation and dissemination of comparative reports, guidelines, checklists, toolkits.
- ✓ Participation and substantive contribution to the regional platform on employment and social inclusion in partnership with the RCC, ILO, EC.
- ✓ Organisation of for a and policy clinics for peer exchange and learning from best practices.
- ✓ Preparation of policy papers/issues brief with examples of good practices on youth and social protection.

The project proposes a wide-spectrum, “3D” a region-wide, multi-level, multi-stakeholders approach. The 3D – local, central and regional level – method is designed to enhance a two-way – bottom-up and top-down – interaction between central and local institutions, but also to include a wide range of consultations for the involvement of the private sector, the civil society and the disadvantaged unemployed. This way, the ILMS combines the implementation of concrete interventions in the field with policy-level consultations and has established multiple partnerships with the above-mentioned stakeholder categories.

At the time of writing this report, the final implementation report was in the making and so, the evaluation was only able to access the previous progress report, submitted in May 2018 and covering the period 01 January – 31 December 2017.

Here is a summary of the key achievements for this period:

Output 1:

- “**Participatory inclusiveness assessment** methodology for PES agencies was designed with **27** practitioners and implemented in WB-6.”
- “Comparative review of the status-quo, guidelines and good practices on **Integrated Case Management** are prepared.”
- “A **toolkit with a step by step approach** for implementation of Integrated Case Management prepared and adapted to different national contexts.”
- “Youth employment status reviewed with 100+ practitioners and EU's **Youth Employment Guarantee Scheme** adapted to WB6.”
- “52 practitioners from PES and CSW agencies attended the sub-regional practitioners’ workshop on **Integrated Case Management (ICM)** to discuss ICM standards, agreed minimum principles for implementation, codes of cooperation between PES, CSW and CSOs, essential competencies of case managers, and **national roadmaps for ICM** implementation.”

Output 2: Innovative programmes introduced to tackle employment of vulnerable groups and foster inclusive labour markets ILO has mobilized two employers’ organizations to establish business networks to support inclusiveness in employment of disadvantaged groups.

- With **human-centred design thinking methodology (HCD)**, the project brought together PES and CSW practitioners, CSOs, experts and end- users to collectively re-think and redesign public services according to end-user preferences and priorities. Two selected themes for human-centred design thinking were

- i. **Young people’s access to information** in the labour market

- ii. Motivating and **activating people with disabilities and discouraged people** to join the labour market

Practitioners empathized with end-users, defined the service-delivery bottlenecks. Having validated the findings through ethnographic research conducted in Montenegro, Albania and Serbia, practitioners and end-users collectively ideated and prototyped the following innovative solutions:

- an **on-line interactive map** displaying job offers on NES website in Albania.
- a **Facebook page** for the Centre of Information and Professional Services with tailored content on jobs, career guidance and support for youth in Montenegro.
- improved use **of alternative communication channels** for reaching out to persons with disabilities in Serbia.

- 94 practitioners attended human-centered design workshops and produced 15 innovative prototypes.



• "Through **business leadership networks**, employers' organizations in Serbia and Montenegro were mobilized to establish business networks to support inclusiveness in the employment of disadvantaged individuals. Serbian Employers Association involved over **30 SMEs to create Network for Employment of Persons with Disabilities**, while Montenegrin Employers Federation mobilized over **50 women** from senior and top management from both private and public sector to promote **gender equality in business and management**."

• 6 municipalities were selected to pilot **territorial employment partnerships** (TEPs) to address local employment challenges. Territorial audits were conducted to diagnose job-creation potentials and labour market barriers. Over 130 individuals, representing local institutions and change agents were mobilized to set up TEPs and design bespoke employment measures for identified disadvantaged groups.

During 2017, all six municipalities, selected to pilot territorial employment partnerships, as a model for addressing the local employment challenges have made a breakthrough in the implementation. An in-depth diagnostic of the jobs creation potentials and labour market

barriers – the so called territorial audits were completed in 6 municipalities. Local institutions and change agents were mobilized to set up local partnerships and design bespoke employment measures, which meet the specific characteristics and needs of the disadvantaged groups. The proposed activities under the 5 TEPs, which have been developed so far shall involve 1,043 end beneficiaries, which are expected to result in 372 new employments.

With the aim of promoting social innovation and client-orientation in public service provision, the project initiated a number of capacity development events on human-centred design. A total of 67 employment and social counsellors as well as end-users from the WB6 except BIH received a first-hand human-centred design thinking training. Insufficient and inadequate access to information on the jobs and training opportunities for young people and the lack of user friendly services to persons with disabilities have been identified as two major gaps in the current format of providing services. Ethnographic analyses were conducted in Albania, Montenegro and Serbia to provide further insights from end users about the obstacles they are facing in accessing employment services, which shall be used for prototyping and piloting new solutions in delivering the particular service.

Output 3: Convergence towards EU and global good practice achieved through peer learning and support

First Policy Clinic with the title Promoting Integrated Case Management in the Western Balkans was organized in Serbia, bringing together 52 participants including high-level policy-makers from the WB6 i.e. Minister and Deputy Minister level, PES and CSW practitioners as well as international experts and practitioners to exchange expressing and share their policy vision around three thematic areas:

- ❖ Collaboration between public employment and social welfare agencies in case management;
- ❖ Compact service delivery models in case management: One-stop shops and beyond; and
- ❖ Going on-line: The use of digital tools in integrated service provision

Concept of peer learning exchange, tools and mechanisms for its implementation were developed and presented to participants from PES on a regional workshop while the first cycle of peer exchange was successfully organized in 2017.

Based on the exchanges between the consultant and UNDP, the activities remaining to be completed at the end of 2017 are close to completion and are projected to be operationally finalized by the end of June 2018.

1.2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

ADA, UNDP and ILO have commissioned, under the management of UNDP, a final external and independent evaluation of the project “Promoting Inclusive Labour Market Solutions in the Western Balkans” with a main learning and accountability purpose, with the following principal purposes:

- Reflect on experience: a. identify achievements and shortcomings, b. advise the current and future project on theoretical as well as operational possibilities for improvement.
- Providing evidences regarding the extent to which the results achieved justify the resources spent taking into consideration the project’s goals and priorities.
- Increase understanding by providing evidence-based inputs to UNDP, ILO, ADA and project stakeholders implementer’s about the intervention’s assumptions, strategies, and limits.
- Highlight project-specific data and benchmarks that informs and improves the communication between UNDP, ILO, ADA and project stakeholders.

The evaluation has additionally sought to (a). review the relevance of the continuation of the intervention and (b) formulate concrete recommendations in relation to a possible further project phase, provided the need for such a situation is confirmed through this external review.

1.3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Scope

The evaluation has reviewed the Project’s Logical framework Matrix, including its strategic framework, key objective and targets and the activities, gathered around three main outputs, developed to attain the project goal.

More specifically, the assignment has assessed the following crucial areas:

- The design and coherence of the project, including the log frame matrix. A review of the theory of change and its assumptions against its application real project

- The extent to which the project has achieved its objectives including the improvement of beneficiary institutions and lives of designated project beneficiaries.

Review results, each of which tied to its respective output, and their compliance with strategic priorities as explicitly outlined (Annex 1), i.e., were the outputs achieved? What progress towards the outcomes has been made?

- Identify strengths and weaknesses in terms of planning, management, implementation and monitoring.

- Measure the extent to which gender aspect was taken into account.

The social inclusion and vulnerability dimensions primarily addressed by the project have been thoroughly reviewed throughout this external review, with a particular attention to the specific characteristics of each of the vulnerable groups targeted by the project.

This external review has encompassed the overall project duration, i.e., the initial proposed period from 31 May 2016 until 31 December 2017 and the results achieved during the project extension time (ending on 30 June 2018) to date, on the basis of available information.

1.3 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The development of evaluation questions forms an important methodological component of such an assignment and entails the design of an evaluation matrix which articulates the logic relating OECD evaluation criteria, to questions, judgement criteria, related indicators, rating and relevant sources of information. Such a matrix has been developed and tailored to the project. Additionally, this evaluation has filled the “Results-Assessment Form for Final Project Evaluations/Reviews”; a standard practice and requirement for ADA-funded interventions.

1.4 METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

The external review of the project has applied a comprehensive process; guiding the assignment from its inception to the production of the present report, according to a sequence of activities, organised around the following phases:

Preparation phase (April 16th to 30th):

1. Remote start-up meeting with UNDP/ILO to clarify the TORs, agree on the planning of activities.
2. Desk review and analysis of project-related documents
3. Remote evaluation meetings with UNDP and ILO to coordinate the preparation of the field phase

4. Submission and finalisation of the evaluation workplan, including a detailed field visit schedule as a matter of priority
5. Submission of an inception report featuring the design of the evaluation methodology, information collection tools, workplan, key evaluation questions
6. Logistics and stakeholder interview arrangements with the support of UNDP/ILO country offices.

Interview and field phase (May 1st to May 19th):

7. Travel to and within the Western Balkans region to hold stakeholder interviews and visits to project sites in the six countries/territories of project
8. Remote interviews with stakeholders located outside the Western Balkans

Reporting phase (May 21st to June 5th)

9. Compilation, processing and analysis of information
10. Presentation of key findings to UNDP/ILO
- Drafting of the final evaluation report
11. Submission of the draft final evaluation report
12. Review and feedback comments to the reports from ILO and UNDP
13. Systematisation of feedback comments and submission of a final version of the report

This review has followed ADA evaluation requirements and used mainstream OECD/EU/UNEG evaluation criteria (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability) and used standard social science tools (evaluation matrix, interview formats and technique, desk review and literature research) to collection quantitative and qualitative information.

The information gathered was then used to (1) identify findings resulting from the triangulation of the data and information collected, (2) draw conclusions based on the findings, and (3) formulate of recommendations clearly related to conclusions. The project performance has been measured against the original logical framework of the project.

The findings of this evaluation have used and crossed quantitative and qualitative data from three major sources of information:

- Desk review: ILMS project literature (project proposal, progress reports), activity-level written products (public institutions audits, assessment, territorial audits, YEP workshop reports...) and publications relevant to the various sectors of intervention of the project (national, regional, EU policy documents relating to employment, social inclusion, youth...).

The desk review has allowed to identify key information with the following purposes:

- Understanding of project context and key aspects required to inform the evaluation
 - Verifying the relevance of the project intervention (policy level)
 - Identify specific questions that will inform the key evaluation questions
 - Cross-check information collected during interviews with material evidence
 - Complement collected data with contextual publications
- Interviews: 81 individuals were interviewed in this evaluation with the following breakdown per country/territory: Albania: 14, Bosnia and Herzegovina: 11, FYR Macedonia: 8, Kosovo*: 14, Montenegro: 16, Serbia: 12, Regional level: 4. All project stakeholder categories were interviewed. ILMS is a complex, multi-country project, where multiple activities have generated the production of numerous reports and publication. Given the short time available to the consultant to review and absorb a substantial amount of written information, the field phase has been instrumental in providing confidence and credibility in the findings of this evaluation. Indeed, the field visit has provided an opportunity to meet with all stakeholder categories in each country/territory and at the regional level. Open-questions were directed to social welfare and employment institutions at central, provincial and municipal level; to civil society actors, the private sector, job seekers from vulnerable communities. This is in addition to representatives from international organisations associating with the project. The consistency of opinions and feedback expressed during interviews, across the region and the type of actors, is considered by the evaluator as a solid foundation for establishing findings with a strong level of confidence, and in the context of an external review of a modest dimension.

Limitations

The time available to conduct this external review has been tight, especially in light of the complexity of the project, the number of activities, stakeholders and countries involved.

Given the time constraint, a significant effort has been invested in the preparation and the implementation of the field interview phase, which involved extensive travels across the Western Balkans and interviews with an important number of stakeholders.

As the duration dedicated to compiling the information gathered and drafting the final report has also limited to meet the delivery deadline. Therefore, the present report prioritised the development of the recommendation section; a key expectation from this independent review.

2. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This section presents the findings resulting from the analysis and triangulation of information collected from the different sources (project documentation, relevant literature, direct individual interviews, focus group discussion.)

2.1. RELEVANCE

This section reviews the importance of the relevance or significance of the intervention regarding local and national requirements and priorities?

This section is answering the following initial Evaluation Matrix Questions:

2.1.1 Clarity of project purpose and objectives: Are they measurable and supportive of national priorities in the relevant sector (employment, social welfare, EU integration priorities?)

2.1.2 To which extent programming and monitoring mechanisms include purposeful indicators that allow measurement of progress towards achievement of objectives?

2.1.3. To what extent has the project responded to the priorities of the groups targeted by the project?

2.1.4. To what extent have the project objectives and activities been updated in order to adapt to changes in the sector?

2.1.1. Relevance, clarity of objectives. Relevance to national, regional policies.

Finding Relevance 1 (FR1)

The strategic and policy relevance are strong and comprehensive, obviously resulting from a long-term field experience and analysis.

The project proposal clearly explains how it is supportive of all the existing national and regional-level policy instruments in the countries/territories of intervention.

The ILMS is also fully in line with sectoral EU priorities for the Western Balkans, in relation to Employment, Private Sector Development, Social Inclusion, the Environment, Youth and Gender. It also is completely in line with the various reforms, national strategies and actions plans established or on-going in the 5 countries/1 territory of intervention. The gradual introduction of new integrated approaches to enhance the institutions' capacities to make their domestic labour market more inclusive to the most excluded categories is an effective step towards institutional integration of user-centred methodologies and attitudes.

Equally, the applied implementation approach has ensured required flexibility to, rather than imposing, adjust to the current state of practices and reforms, on-going in the respective

places of implementation. It also is very fit to the regional aspect as it closely interacts with the Regional Coordination Council (RCC) and it is coherent with EU accession priorities reflected in the EU progress reports across the region. Finally, ILMS offers an accurate response to the on-going dialogue between the EU and the Western Balkans accession candidates.³

Both UNDP and ILO have a long active presence in the field of employment and social inclusion in the Western Balkans. The two UN agencies have been closely monitoring and supporting the development of labour and social reforms in the various countries/territory of the region. UNDP and ILO are indeed stakeholders in the regional and national policy processes in the countries/territory of intervention. As a matter of fact, they are fully aware of the policy context and priorities and the ILMS is the result of a thorough consultation with policy-makers and the project document establishes clear linkages with the various existing strategies, policies and actions plans in the several sectors of intervention.

Among other key instruments the project is highly supportive of several specific objectives from the South East Europe Strategy 2020 – Jobs and Prosperity in European Perspective (RCC) As well as the IPA II Regulation 2014-2020 and its strategic framework.

The ILMS activities are clearly aiming at raising awareness and enhancing capacities of the relevant actors to address exclusion and poverty through social protection and activation programmes targeting vulnerable groups.

[Finding Relevance 2 \(FR2\)](#)

ILMS is lacking a clear formulation of the longer-term strategy it pursues.

While the initial proposal clearly describes its logical framework, it does not clearly describe its final or sustainable objectives; neither does it describes various phases leading to its final goal.

While ILMS proposes to enhance the capacities of institutions, its progress towards reaching a longer-term objective is, however, not marked with the necessary benchmarks paving the way until those institutions will be fully able to deliver inter-institutional collaborative and human-centred services. More than just indicators of implementation progress, the project

³ Reference to official events: “COM(2018) 65 final COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS”

The Economic and Financial Dialogue between the EU and the Western Balkans and Turkey
Brussels, 23 May 2017 JOINT CONCLUSIONS OF THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE EU AND THE WESTERN BALKANS AND TURKEY

needs to fit into a scale equipped with progress markers towards institutions are in full capacity of delivering user-centred approaches, inclusive of hard-to-employ groups.

The theory of change of the project is aiming at raising-awareness, building interest and capacities though it does not describe the process of achieving impact. Then, with reference to the previous paragraph, the transformative process leading to sustainability (i.e., the institutionalisation of introduced practices), is also missing or insufficiently described. ILMS appears as the first of several phases that will lead to durable change.

2.1.2. Project and monitoring mechanisms

Finding Relevance 3 (FR3) The project design has a strong relevance, weakened by an excess of activities and a certain disconnection of the asylum seeker component from the rest.

With an array of activities approaching multi-geographic levels (municipal, provincial, central), multi-strategic levels (policy, programme, project), multi-actor, multi-country/territory and regional, there is a perception of the project attempting to tackle all fronts at the same time. The evaluation has identified a risk of over-burden to the project staff, stakeholders and a challenge to take stock, digest, and make an effective use of all the outputs. This also raises the issue of strategic positioning of the project as it intervenes both at policy (policy clinic), programming (TEP) and project level (employment-generation schemes). The evaluation has found that the scope is potentially too wide for a single project, especially within this budget range.

TEP in brief

TEP aims to address the root causes of unemployment of hard-to-employ groups in a holistic manner; to promote economic development and employment through inter-connected roles and responsibilities of local and national level stakeholders, building on the prior experiences of UNDP in targeting youth, women and ethnic minorities through profiling system.

TEP involves creating partnership to better link employment policy with other policies in order to improve the employment situation on the regional and local level. TEP includes stakeholders from the public sector, private sector, employment service and centres for social work, educational institutions, business centres and equivalent, civil society and job seekers' representatives.

TEP is designed to have a stronger focus on labour market challenges and barriers for accessing formal labour market by specific vulnerable groups. The activities/service lines of TEP could expand beyond the "conventional" income generation or other ALMPs. TEP is not a rapidly implemented one-off intervention, but an evolving institution that has to be consciously developed over a longer period of time.

Finding Relevance 4 (FR4)

The implementation approach is highly consultative, participatory and flexible to securing interest, buy-in and future ownership of beneficiary institutions. The project approach has obviously given a strong consideration of all constraints inherent to multi-country, multi-level and multi-stakeholders interventions.

A key achievement of this project is that its participatory and consultative approach has raised awareness, obtained the interest and secured the buy-in of all institutions and stakeholders across the Western Balkans.

While this is an essential condition for institutions to deliberately adopt newly introduced practices, the evaluation clearly sees that the ILMS remains merely a first step of a longer strategy leading to institutionalisation.

The “3D” or 3-dimensional approach (i.e. involving a simultaneous intervention at local/provincial level, central level and regional level) is particularly appropriate to be inclusive of all stakeholder, including the vulnerable unemployed, combine field practice with national policy vision. More focus could have been put on the traditional weak institutional linkage between the central and local level. Though, this is a focus potential more relevant to the recommended next phase of ILMSP where piloting should involve both levels more intensively.

The consultative and participatory attitude standing behind each project activity involving institutions has been unanimously appreciated across the region.

Finding Relevance 5 (FR5)

Both UNDP and ILO are relevant implementing agencies for this project as they combine the technical expertise and field operability required by the country-tailored and regional dimension features of the ILMS. The relevance of the respective roles and responsibilities of each agency could be further reviewed.

The two agencies offer all the expertise, experience, operational capacity, credibility that such a project as ILMS requires. However, the rationale that has guided the division of the respective roles and responsibilities has not appeared very strongly to the evaluation. In practice, UNDP and ILO have worked very well together, based on willingness and dedication. However, the external perspective on agencies’ role is that relevance and efficiency can be increased, when reviewing the level of intervention (central, local), the nature of activities, and the mobilisation of expertise. The division of responsibilities at the activity level versus broader component level has not facilitated the overall perception of the coherence of the project to local stakeholders who have not always connected, sometimes been aware, that

the various activities did belong to a single project. ILMS may have provided a more formal explanation about the allocation of responsibilities between UNDP and ILO to all project stakeholders.

[Finding Relevance 6 \(FR6\)](#)

Monitoring mechanisms are relevant and the implementation follow-up has been effectively performed.

The outcome and activity-level indicators have been relevant to monitoring implementation progress. Project partners have been systematically provided the space and opportunities to express their satisfaction feedback.

The project would benefit from establishing a strategic-level monitoring framework, so progress towards key strategic milestones, such as the institutionalization of new practices can be measured.

2.1.3. Relevance to targeted groups

[Finding Relevance 7 \(FR7\)](#)

The project is highly relevant to local, central institutions and their need to reform their policies and practices. The concrete, TEP-based interventions have also directly answered the needs of the most vulnerable groups, with variations in sustainability of created jobs; often undermined by limited financial resources.

The involvement of the private sector in several of the ILMS activities (TEP, Business leadership networks, publications on inclusiveness of people with disabilities to the private sector...) has confirmed this stakeholder can make an instrumental contribution to making PES and CSW policy and delivery of user-centred services gain in efficiency and effectiveness.

Private firms across the Western Balkans being directly confronted with the maladjustment of the legal environment to employing job-seekers from vulnerable groups, have a thorough understanding of the concrete obstacles faced by the hard-to-employ as well as the employers who hire individuals from this category. The interviewed employers have underlined that the private sector is overall insufficiently consulted and involved by the PES and CSW in the development of solutions to make employment more accessible to vulnerable unemployed groups. Similarly, interviewees considered the ILMS activities as a tremendous opportunity to raise their voices and the awareness of institutions concerning the relevance of their role in the formulation process of user-centred solutions. This has also been echoed by local PES and CSW interviewed. The evaluation sees the private sector's positive contribution in raising the awareness of the legal, policy and practical obstacles to labour inclusion, their capacity to contributing and proposing concrete solutions for that matter, as well as their capacity to play

a role in labour reforms, as an indicator to increase their involvement in any future intervention similar to ILMS.

Interviewees, including the vulnerable unemployed who have been in interaction with the Public Employment Services and Centers for Social Welfare have clearly explained how the project has helped them understand their major challenges and make them aware of possible solutions. Several of the TEP have provided relevant answers to territorial inclusive employment challenges, though their potential impact has remained limited by the amount of resources dedicated to individual interventions. The feedback from local firms in Vranje, for instance, indicated how much of a clear vision and understanding the private sector has about labour inclusion challenges. And such a project as ILMS cannot afford to deprive oneself from such an enlightened contribution.

2.1.4. Adjustment to changes in the sector of intervention

[Finding Relevance 8 \(FR8\)](#)

The flexible and consultative project approach has been highly relevant to adjusting to changes, starting with establishing the project during the inception phase.

The elevated number of project activities has stretched the project flexibility to the maximum and has intensively and extensively tapped in the human resources. Not to repeat the findings of the previous section, the evaluation has found the elasticity demonstrated by the project is the clear result of two aspect: the project approach (stakeholder consultation) and human dedication (also using in-country agency presence to get the support required).

2.2. EFFECTIVENESS

This section assesses the extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved. Assesses the effectiveness or impact of the project compared to the objectives planned (comparison: results vs plans)

This section is answering the following initial Evaluation Matrix Questions:

2.2.1. To what extent has the project achieved its planned results, including the improvement of beneficiary institutions and lives of designated project beneficiaries?

2.2.2 To what extent have the service delivery mechanisms and management practices been appropriate for achieving the expected objectives?

2.2.3. To what extent all categories of end-users (including youth, female, Roma, the disabled, long-term unemployed...) have been able to access the project supported services?

2.2.4. To what extent has the project adapted to changing external conditions in order to ensure benefits for the target groups and the achievement of planned results?

2.2.5 To what extent have the target groups been satisfied with the services provided?

2.2.1. Achievement of results, Improvement of beneficiary institutions, lives of beneficiaries

[Finding Effectiveness 1 \(FE 1\)](#)

Overall most target results have been achieved, apart from some of the activities related to asylum seekers.

A summary of key achievements has been listed under this Report's [Section 1.1 Project Background](#). Though, this could be considered as a minimal requirement, reaching activity and component targets remains a major accomplishment. ILMS is content-rich (activity-intensive), its installation requires a long and substantial preparation phases, involving, among other steps, interactions with an impressive number of stakeholders. The inception phase has absorbed close to a quarter of the time allocated for implementation and has further squeezed an already dense implementation schedule. Unsurprisingly, a project extension was necessary to implement the long list of activities, and still, the evaluation has found the timeframe tight, especially, since the project cannot independently set the pace of implementation but depends on institutions' availability.

2.2.2. Appropriateness of delivery and management mechanisms

[Finding Effectiveness 2 \(FE 2\)](#)

The project has made the best use of limited staffing to ensure the overall delivery of activities. However, a more appropriate division of tasks among ILO and UNDP, as well as more project staff could have been more effective.

A tight management and coordination, using personal involvement of UNDP and ILO regional and country staff has compensated a disproportion between the volume of work and the human resources allocated to conduct the numerous tasks. The distribution of activities has been logically made based on the agency's pre-existing operational capacity presence in the country as well as on the level of intervention though not systematically. For instance, in former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro, UNDP is closely working with both the Ministry of Labour and the National Employment Agency, thus at the policy and programme level but also during the project implementation. The countries/territory of the region are characterized by varying stages of developments in terms of state of reform progress, requiring tailored interventions. Notwithstanding, the ILO and UNDP presence is not uniform across the region. These elements are indicating that the distribution of management

roles and responsibilities has to take into account agency and country context specifics, but also the specific technical and operational capacities at regional level.

2.2.3. Accessibility of target groups (end-users) to project services

[Finding Effectiveness 3 \(FE 3\)](#)

The multi-level and multi-stakeholder approach introduced by the project has ensured an effective access of project activities to intended beneficiaries at various levels of implementation (hard to employ beneficiaries at the municipal level, institutions at all central and local levels). The multi-stakeholder modality of TEP-based interventions has also permitted a thorough identification, outreach and selection of vulnerable beneficiaries excluded from the labour market.

Institutions, civil society organisations, employers and the unemployed involved in ILMS activities have praised the opportunities created by the project for being involved at each of their respective level, from women victims of domestic violence to Ministry of Labour representatives. The project has created the conditions to involving a wide range of actors. One challenge though is for the project to continue maintaining this access and relations with stakeholders over time. The evaluation has noted that ILMS has intelligently used each agency's already established relationships in the country to implement project activities.

2.2.4. Adaptation to changing conditions to ensuring achievement of results

[Finding Effectiveness 4 \(FE 4\)](#)

ILMS project team has gone out its way to maintain a high level of flexibility to adjust to the availability of the institutions' – especially central level institutions (ministries of labour, national employment agencies) already busy agenda to obtain a high degree of involvement and interest in the promotion of innovative practices ILMS has introduced.

This is especially true for regional events where bringing together representatives of institutions from 5 different countries/1 territory at the same place and at the same time represents an evident challenge and time-consuming effort.

2.2.5. Target group satisfaction

[Finding Effectiveness 5 \(FE 5\)](#)

Project events - trainings, exchange workshops, self-assessments have been very positively welcome overall and qualified as “mind-changing”. The feedback recorded from participants from attending institutions and other stakeholders indicates a very high level of satisfaction across various activities.

The satisfaction relates to the novelty of the approach and the tools introduced by ILMS. Institutions' consultation during the design of ILMS but also as a constant way of interacting during the development and implementation of activities have created a genuine feeling of ownership of the project activities and processes enabling a full involvement of project partners. Central and local PES and CSW have equally appreciated the innovative approaches proposed by the self-assessment and audits tools. For most, this was a first and a striking experience where employment and social services could review their practices and develop an awareness of their gaps in terms of practices towards achieving more efficient and user-centred services.

Municipal or provincial level institutions have expressed their strongest satisfaction as they have been involved in a combination of theoretical and practical activities and this has helped connecting both aspects.

Central level institutions satisfaction is also strong, but given, the pressure of reform-related work and the coordination of other international programmes, they have expressed a concern of their absorption capacity and the timeliness and synchronisation of external interventions with their national agenda.

Equally, the civil society organisations and private companies interviewed have found ILMS as offering a rare and valuable opportunity to be consulted and involved in the development of human-centred services, thanks to their direct connection to and understanding of the reality faced by hard-to-employ individuals. Through ILMS, they have been able to demonstrate the value of their contribution and the acknowledgement from the institutions as indispensable actors to develop inclusive active labour solutions.

Final beneficiaries' satisfaction is overall very strong, based on the sample of interviewed beneficiaries, however, with varying degrees in the stability of the employment situation the project has offered. With the exception of the TEP in Vranje where the involvement of the local authorities has been limited, the other four TEP interventions have generated durable employment opportunities as these interventions entailed substantive and complementary effort and investment from local authorities and other connected initiatives. In the municipality of Mojkovac for instance, further to the TEP intervention, the Ministry of Agriculture has provided additional support to targeted raspberry producers. Depending on the level of local actors' investment, TEPs have delivered promising employment outcomes which can extend beyond the project duration. In cases where positive employment outcomes are unlikely to endure, the project's small budget size can be the explanatory factor.

In addition, qualitatively, the degree of exclusion from the labour market remains a determining factor. In the case of the Roma community across the Western Balkans, the low

level of education and the combination of aggravating factors such as a poor health, high discrimination require a deep and comprehensive intervention that small-scale budget alone cannot finance.

2.3. EFFICIENCY

This section evaluates the extent to which objectives have been achieved economically by the development intervention. Assesses the efficiency or utilization ratio of the resources used (comparison: resources applied vs results)

This section is answering the following initial Evaluation Matrix Questions:

- 3.1. How efficiently have project resources been converted into results?
 - 3.2. To what extent have the project activities been delivered on time?
 - 3.3. To what extent have the project means been optimally utilised (in the most efficient way compared to other alternative means of implementation)?
 - 3.4. To what extent have the project management and coordination mechanisms allowed efficient implementation?
 - 3.5. Are the project costs proportionate to the achieved results?
-

2.3.1. Efficient use of resources to achieving results

Finding efficiency 1 (FEF 1)

The project scores very high when comparing the allocated financial and human resources with the number of activities delivered. However, this approach is not sustainable in the long run.

The high cost per activity efficiency rate is primarily the result of tremendous commitment of staff who combines both the experience and the skills for the tasks. However, while this can be considered as a success in the short run, maintaining such a high ratio is exposing to an overload of work for the project staff in the mid-term.

The actual implementation of ILMS activities only represent the emerged tip of the iceberg. Indeed, the participatory nature of ILMS has involved significant preparation work: verifying interest and availability from participants, mobilizing and recruiting external expertise, identifying venues, controlling the quality of outputs and ensuring events products are being used are time-consuming endeavours. The equation inspired from the industry stating that quality is determined by time and money also applies in this case.

The project has a strong value for money when looking at the cost per activity. However, this is done at the expense of human resources and is not considered sustainable in terms of management in the long run. The value for money is strong when comparing a relatively small budget size compared to the number activities, the number of countries and the regional

dimension. While value for money is good in terms of costs of activities, it is still too early to determine whether the value for money is strong in terms of producing lasting results. And as further detailed in the sustainability section of this report, the likeliness of achieving sustainable results will be significantly secured by continuing the ILMS intervention beyond the present phase.

Finding Efficiency 2 (FEF2)

The level of financial, human and time resources has not been adequate to the level of ambition of the project.

Without entering into details, the comparison between the number, nature of activities – especially TEP and regional workshops, which are costly by nature – and the overall budget provides a strong indication that the budget was underestimated or the scope of activities were overestimated. The motto “It is sometimes expensive to go cheap” can be applied to this project. Hopefully, this is not the case, as this project has achieved key steps towards sustainability. This is mostly owing to the project team’s impressive level of effort and dedication. Without such personal involvement, there is a strong likeliness those results would not have been achieved.

Finding Efficiency 3 (FEF 3)

The territorial employment approach has brought efficient results. However, the TEP project interventions component is disproportionately smaller than the preparation effort.

As an introductory note to this finding, it is worth mentioning that the TEP model is not new and has been implemented in the past in other regions of the world. However, those earlier TEPs were larger in scale and in monetary value as they often took place in economically depressed areas where no other significant job creation investments were existing. In the context of ILMS, TEP schemes have been planned as small component since the main purpose lied in introducing the territory-based approach rather than offering a major financial investment in the municipalities of interventions. As a matter of fact, a part of the TEP process with the ILMS consisted of identifying other job-creation interventions in the selected areas so those could be included during the TEP audit phases and so TEP smaller interventions could be developed in synergy with existing programmes.

Indeed, the overall methodology, involving the territorial audits and pacts has been praised by the interviewed stakeholders and is considered as an efficient way of mobilizing multiple actors in addressing employment inclusion issue of a specific administrative area. However, the size of interventions – while enabling the creation of sustainable jobs – is too low in scale and budget to match the depth of the problem and create a significant impact at the municipal level. In Vranje, for instance, generated employment outcomes are unlikely to continue unless further donor funding is made available. In Mojkovac, the combined subsidies support of the Montenegrin Ministry of Agriculture is a welcome synergy to increasing the sustainability potential of raspberry producers. However, in general, there is an issue with the grant size of

individual interventions: The numerous small business development experiences in the Western Balkans has demonstrated that individual intervention averaging USD 50,000 are highly insufficient to create an active labour market, let alone a labour market outreaching to the most marginalised.

2.3.2. Timeliness of activity delivery

[Finding Efficiency 4 \(FEF 4\)](#)

A tight project duration with a long, underestimated installation phase, caught up thanks to intense staff dedication

As already mentioned in the relevance findings section, the evaluation considers the project duration is too tight for a long-term change-oriented intervention such as ILMS. To start with, deploying a project with multiple activities, multiple level of interventions, multiple actors, multiple countries/territories on top the regional dimension, can be expected to require a considerable start-up phase before it can engage into activities. With limited project staffing and institution representative availability as two other constraints, 20 months or 24 months is indeed very short to achieving project goals.

2.3.3. Optimisation of use of resources

[Funding efficiency 5 \(FEF 5\)](#)

The project has realized a strong optimisation of resources. The possibilities of cost-efficient alternatives are usually limited when project resources are limited.

While not always timely, ILMS activities have been delivered with modest costs and limited human resources. This is considered as an achievement when considering the number of external consultancy required by the nature of activities. Regional events are usually costly actions as they involve travel, accommodation and related costs for a short duration. The use of technology in remote communication sometimes offers a cheaper alternative. ILMS staff in the region did not have the opportunity to meet physically during the project implementation phase. However, since there is so much knowledge and experience accumulated within the ILMS team, the evaluation believes, provided an ILMS II comes to life, that organizing a project team meeting should be considered as a matter of priority, not only during a possible ILMS II preparation effort, but also, at least once a year. Indeed, the same way institutions benefit from exchanging experiences from the region, the project team must be provided with the opportunity to share experiences, perspectives on similar activities implemented in different contexts.

2.3.4. Project management and coordination mechanisms

[Finding Efficiency 6 \(FEF 6\)](#)

Both internal and external coordination mechanisms have functioned well as they are needs-based.

Internally, be it at country or regional level, UNDP and ILO have maintained an intense level of exchange; which has proven highly relevant in a project requiring so much flexibility, given the number, diversity of events as well as the management of numerous external consultants. Had money and time allowed, organising regional project staff experience capitalisation workshop could have been beneficial for the exchange of experience in the course of implementation.

External coordination with the RCC and ESAP: Fine-tuning coordination with the RCC ESAP project has taken some time for ILMS, deeply involved in the project setup during the inception phase. Various constraints, including a longer-than-estimated ILMS start-up phase has made it difficult for both ESAP and ILMS to synchronize the timing of some activities (peer reviews of employment agencies services firstly introduced by ESAP on the broader topic of employment inclusion, and then presented by ILMS on the same topics but with a specific focus on vulnerable groups) of a similar nature – resulting in consecutive, rather than simultaneous implementation of such related undertakings. The evaluation understands this has only very occasionally happened without negative effects to the project or on the stakeholders. However, this is calling for special attention to both projects to carefully plan activities, despite all of the many constraints of implementing regional events that are complementary and regional in nature.

[Finding Efficiency 7 \(FEF 7\)](#)

The high delivery rate of the ILMS is an indicator of an efficient project management and coordination mechanisms, under tight staffing conditions. Lesson are to be learned from the division of roles and responsibilities between UNDP and ILO.

This efficiency is seen as the result of intense and regular exchange between UNDP and ILO both at regional and country level. Having UNDP and ILO managing certain activities at different level have given the impression of a disconnect, with activities belonging to two distinct projects.

There has been an intelligent and efficient integration of the ILMS to existing UNDP and ILO country programmes. Such is the case in Kosovo where the ADA-funded INTERDEV has provided significant expertise and transfer of knowledge as well as hands-on know-how to the Gjakova TEP. Sometimes combining ILMS resources with other interventions targeting employment has created synergy and added value.

Overall, the management task has been complicated by having different staff managing different activities making it time and energy consuming to follow all activities and gather information.

2.4. IMPACT

This section reviews the extent to which the development intervention has contributed to reaching higher level development objectives. Assesses the immediate impact of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those affected.

This section is answering the following initial Evaluation Matrix Questions:

2.4.1. What are the direct impact prospects of the project and to what extent have they contributed to reaching higher-level objectives?

2.4.2. To what extent has the project had indirect positive and/or negative impacts?

2.4.3. What are the broader effects and impacts of the project, including on cross-cutting issues (gender and environment)?

2.4.4. Has the programme made a real difference to end-users 'lives'?

2.4.1. Main direct impact and contribution to higher objectives

Finding Impact 1 (FI 1)

“Mind-changing”: Owing to a highly participatory approach and innovative tools, ILMS has achieved a very strong “buy-in” of institutions and changed their perspectives on their own practices.

ILMS has created a strong impact across the region. Often referred to as “mind-changing” or “this is the right thing”, across the region, across stakeholders, the evaluation has gathered a strong appreciation of the relevance of the [ILMS approach](#) (see section 1.1. Project Background, page 10 for a description of the ILMS approach) and the importance of the issues it tackles. Employer associations are deeply and increasingly committed to inclusiveness, CSW and Employment offices have become aware of their gaps in capacities, vision of labour inclusion, ministerial authorities are more than open to ILMS as a contributor of their change. In a single word, stakeholders want more of the project. Now that they are aware of all the gaps and the work ahead, there is a strong feeling and request to be involved in the development of tools and practice that will enable institutions to deliver human-centered services.

Moving up from the project to the strategy level, more precisely, when referring to a progress scale towards institutionalisation, the project has achieved the following results: awareness

raised, interest confirmed, buy-in secured, some indicators of ownership at municipal level identified.

In brief, the indicators, essential for the project to move towards sustainability have been validated during the present phase of ILMS.

2.4.2. Indirect positive and/or negative impacts

Finding Impact 2 (FI 2)

There are examples of concrete steps that go beyond “buy-in”.

These sorts of impacts stand between the direct and indirect consequence of the ILMS intervention. Whatever the case, ILMS has done more than sparked an inter-institutional dialogue but has, in some instances, initiated a change in the collaboration between institutions at the local level. In Mojkovac, the project intervention has sparked a dialogue between the CSW and the employment office who have made the joint decision to increase their collaboration and share respective data on users in order to crosscheck information on the same individuals. Regional employment office in Pale is also going to take concrete steps towards a more efficient collaboration with the CSW.

Finding Impact 3 (FI 3)

Special attention is to be paid to the TEP individual interventions

Numerous findings can potentially be extracted from TEPs since these interventions are substantial and potentially projects on their own. While, the evaluation believes TEP interventions are worth a closer review, the present assessment has focused on an impact-based findings since this is about concrete, employment-generating interventions.

The idea behind the TEPs was to promote the model of public-private-civil society partnership as well as to support UNDP Country Offices, local communities in mobilizing additional contributions. The impact of this approach has proved successful as it has attracted additional contributions in several instances, thus increasing the impact of TEPs in terms of job creation:

- In Baldushk/Tirana, the local community has contributed additional 70,423 USD;
- The project has mobilized additional 396,500 USD from the Government of the Netherlands for the BIRAC (BIH) TEP,
- The TEP Gjakova is also expected to mobilize another USD 66,550,
- The Swiss Development Cooperation is expected to make a significant contribution to financially support implementation of TEP priorities in Gostivar and so is the EU Delegation TEP priorities i.e. youth employment.
- In Mojkovac the municipality provided in-kind contribution, besides subsidies provide by the ministry of Agriculture.

In the case of Vranje, the municipality was not able to contribute with additional funding, mainly due to centralized/hierarchical system for allocation of public resources. Although

formally local authorities have a say in the selection of employment measures, which can be funded from the Government, the authorities are offered *de facto*, a very restrictive list of employment programmes (mainly public works and training) to choose from. Hence, their potential for experimenting, piloting in new/innovative employment programmes is limited. The rationale here was at least to offer some alternative models of ALMPs.

The evaluation comprehends the common rationale underlying TEPs as the intention to showcase an alternative to pre-dominant existing model in the Western Balkans, often involving government-funded, top-down ALMP programmes.

While in the case of ILMS, TEP have proven successful in mobilizing additional or complementary funding, an effort to develop more thorough, ambitious economic development plans, based on the potential of specific territories would certainly be welcomed. There is a high stake for TEP interventions to produce a sizeable impact in terms of stable employment generation so that it earns credibility locally and can be used as a replicable model.

The evaluation recognizes however this raises the question of the relevance of having larger, more ambitious TEP-like intervention within or outside such projects as ILMS? One part of the answer is that ILMS is relevant in sparking the interest and mobilize funding as the TEP methodology – more specifically the TEP audits – provides an analysis of the potential of the territory and offers a relevant tool for potential investors.

2.4.3. Broader effects and impacts, including on gender and environment

[Finding Impact 4 \(FI 4\)](#)

Understanding exclusion to reduce discrimination. Discovering the value of individuals instead of the burden they are often perceived as, is a precondition for institutions to change the perception of their own roles.

ILMS, through its self-awareness exercises, peer-review workshops and related events has brought together institutions and other stakeholders to take a closer look at the factors of social exclusion. By increasing their level of understanding, they have taken a new perspective on vulnerable communities, look at their potentials rather than just their limitations.

If minds have changed overall, all vulnerable groups are not equally placed in front of prejudices. And as much as there is a link between the level of prejudice and the degree of social exclusion, there is also a relation between the level of effort to be invested and the degree of social exclusion. Under a very general consideration, the Roma community remains the most underestimated group in terms of likeliness and capacity to integrate to the active working society.

The gender aspect recovers a complex diversity and nuance of gender-based social exclusion. If on the one hand, the visibility generated by the business women awards delivered in Montenegro has been strong, the improvement of the conditions of women victims of

violence in Vranje is expected to require a broader investment. Indeed, social exclusion is all about nuance and the combination of factors (prejudice, financial vulnerability, cultural difference...) that determine the degree of exclusion and the degree of effort required in developing inclusive active labour measures.

The environment aspect has also benefited from a positive impact, not only as it has been promoted as a strong topic of public interest and concern, but even more so, when it is connected to the inclusiveness of its economic potential in relation to, for instance, the promising perspective of organic food production.

2.4.4. Impact of on beneficiaries' lives

[Finding Impact 5\(FI 5\)](#)

Most TEP interventions have demonstrated a capacity to produce positive impact, especially on local institutions and the hard-to-employ. However, there is room to increase its potential impact.

The territorial approach is understood as supporting the process of enhancing a strong multi-stakeholder involvement in the design of inclusive labour market solutions. (Please see the section 2.1.2 Project Monitoring Mechanisms for a more detailed presentation of the TEP model).

The territorial focus of the TEP model has successfully mobilized and built interest of a wide range of stakeholders at local level. The case of the TEP in Vranje has indicated that, without a strong involvement of the municipality, and, in the absence of synergy with other job-creation programmes, the small budget size of TEP interventions remained insufficient to create sustainable employment solutions. However, when, for instance, combined with complementary UNDP interventions, such as honey producers in Kosovo*, this model demonstrates its full potential. Probably, if TEP is able to catalyse key economic stakeholders and focus on attracting investments, an enhanced version is likely to increase the potential impact of TEP, in terms of job creation and a highly inclusive local economic development.

2.5. SUSTAINABILITY

This section identifies to which extent the project positive effects or impacts are sustainable. Indicates how the sustainability or permanence of the intervention and its effects are to be assessed.

This section is answering the following Evaluation Questions:

2.5.1. Taking into account available project financial resources, how are the services (and integrated mechanisms), created or enhanced by the project, likely to continue in the future?

2.5.2. What are the factors likely to influence to continuation of the existence and delivery of the services (and integrated mechanisms) enhanced by the projects in the future? To which extent have the services and integrated mechanisms been institutionalised?

- 2.5.3. What lessons learned, and best practices emerged from the project experience so far?
- 2.5.4. What recommendations can be formulated for the future of the project goals?

2.5.1 Sustainability of project results

Finding Sustainability 1 (FF 1)

Clarifying whether sustainability means institutionalisation

The relevance section of this report indicates that ILMS seems to constitute the first phase of a longer intervention where achieving sustainability is the ultimate goal. This is a strategy-level decision to be made. Three central questions may help in this process. The first one is for the project: “How much of the project results, introduced approaches, will the public institution use in the long term?” And the second question to UNDP and ILO is “What is the role and space for both agencies in this process?” The third question is to donors: “What share of the process is to be financially supported by international donors and at which point Western Balkans governments will assume the cost of the process?”

Taking the example of Integrated Case Management, the feedback from interviewers indicates that ILMS has enabled PES institutions to get an understanding of the tool, perform self-assessment to identify the next steps necessary to conduct the process of building a tailored ICM. However, those steps correspond to substantial activities (functional review of services, legislation analysis...) of a process that needs to be developed. Centres for Social Work also need to undergo a similar process which implementation will require times and the continuation of the ILMS project.

To date, the evaluation has gathered enough elements confirming the key pre-conditions validating the continuation of the process towards sustainability, have been met: Not only the awareness and interest are strong, but the request for the ILMS to continue has been consistently expressed by the consulted stakeholders during the field evaluation mission.

Clarifying whether sustainability means institutionalisation

“How much of the projects results, introduced approaches, will the state institution use in the long term?” This is the key question for the project to answer concerning sustainability. As an answer to that question, the evaluation sees ILMS as the first phase of a strategic intervention where achieving sustainability is the long-term goal. This calls for a longer-term strategy-level decision to be clearly formulated.

This then raises the issue of financial support: “How much of this longer-term effort will ADA, UNDP and ILO be supporting?”

Both EU accession and SDG processes are equipped with funding instruments but are also mobilizing other individual state donors who could be approached to bring their financial contributions.

2.5.2 Sustainability factors and conditions

[Finding Sustainability 2 \(FF 2\)](#)

The theory of change and the strong EU accession asset of the Western Balkans region

The theory of change underlying ILMS is actually already guided by a well-defined and overarching process: the EU accession. This process is also coherent with and supported by the global development agenda: The Sustainable Development Goals and the specific targets established in each country/territory of the region. Indeed, there are common dynamics and deep links between negotiation chapters and SDG targets, as well as common goals of two processes, revealing a high degree of complementarity of the two development agendas.

Both SDGs and EU accession process propose pathways with tailored targets, instruments and resources made available to achieve those aims. Each of the approaches proposed by the UN and EU are also supportive of one another, for instance with EU chapter making reference to UN SDGs and proposing coherent benchmarks (in terms of eradicating poverty, fighting discrimination...). Notwithstanding that the theory of change should be specific to each Western Balkan country/territory, SDGs and negotiation chapters already offer essential overarching elements guiding the theory of change.

Now that ILMS has raised a strong interest in the region, pursuing the effort in developing the practices and tools has become a factor of sustainability as, not continuing the intervention, may cause the momentum to fall down if the process is not accompanied over time.

2.8.3 VISIBILITY

Most institutions are aware ADA is the donor of the ILMS. Physical visibility in this project mainly exists through project events (workshops) and publications and reports. The three donor logo – ADA, UNDP and ILO – effectively appear on all products.

The evaluation has been able to verify ILMS has a consistent physical visibility as all of its products are marked with the donor and implementer logos of ADA, UNDP and ILO.

When it comes to the awareness of the various stakeholders, while UNDP and ILO were systematically mentioned, ADA was referred to in a number of instances, though slightly less systematically.

Beyond the sole awareness of ADA being the main financial supporter to ILMS, the evaluation believes it is important that all project stakeholders are also aware of donors' strategy and their specific involvement and contributions to employment and social inclusion. It will enable actors at all level, especially at the local level to have a wider vision of all the concerted efforts being deployed and how local initiatives are being connected to higher, policy level efforts. It is meaningful for all actors, regardless of their level of intervention or mandates to be able to situate themselves on the map of initiatives supporting labour reforms, as well as knowledgeable of the specific contributions of international agencies.

Austria, Germany and Switzerland, have developed significant experience and expertise over several years of interventions supporting employment in the Western Balkans. **In the case of a further ILMS phase, the evaluation recommends a specific visibility strategy to be developed**, with the objectives of raising stakeholder's awareness of the larger picture of existing strategies and interventions, how they relate to it, especially for local-level stakeholders who sometimes feel isolated from this sort of information.

The visibility of those past interventions is important so that the agencies from those countries are consulted systematically when new programmes are planned in the region.

3. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

3.1 CONCLUSIONS

1. ILMS has achieved the objectives of an initial phase that is part of a longer process towards sustainability. Buy-in: yes; institutionalisation: not yet. New practices have been promoted; capacities of institutions are yet to be built.

The pace of reform progress in the Western Balkans is not linear as it is heavily conditioned by the development of both country but also regional political contexts, especially during election periods. The main risk for interventions such as the ILMS is that outputs that have not been made sustainable, i.e. institutionalised and entered into formal practices; can disappear when there is turn-over of state institution employees, among other possible situations. One way of addressing these overwhelming situations is to (1) ensure there is a continuity in the implementation of such projects, (2), ensure this continuity is extended until minimum indicators of sustainability (i.e. institutionalisation) are met, (3) indicators of ownership are also met for each phase or milestones on the path to the formal institutionalisation of the new practices developed within the project.

2. Regional but country-driven: While facing similar challenges, WB countries and territory also differ much in terms of progress. A strong regional value of ILMS is the circulation of very relevant experiences among within WB countries.

The Western Balkans countries and territories are also experiencing specific contexts, distinctive from one another, by the overall political stability, the speed of reforms, administrative and legal constraints. Those factors heavily condition the environment into which ILMS activities are deployed and makes it hard to advance the overall project altogether at the same speed. Those factors actually set Western Balkans apart into “different leagues” in terms of readiness and speed of progressing capacity.

3. Value for money

Value for money needs to be driven by the reality of the Western Balkans context and the sustainability of the intervention. This means that time, people and money need to be sufficient in quantity to implement a project of this nature and ambition. This implies that, especially for longer-term, reform change interventions, good value of money should not be measured only on the basis on cost per activity but also on a realistic estimation of the time necessary to achievement durable changes.

Additionally, in the perspective of sustainability there is another dimension to value for money: engaging in ILMS can only offer good return on investment if the commitment stretches until institutionalisation is achieved.

4. The implementation of the territorial approach needs revision as there is an imbalance between the level of expectation raised by process and the size of the proposed interventions.

Implementing territorial audits and pacts is a sizeable effort mobilizing numerous local actors in order to identify the deep potential of a territory. In principle, it involves an ambitious analysis raising ambitious solutions. In turn ambitious solutions required a matching level of resources. An achievement of TEP is the strong interest it has raised with stakeholders. While TEP has already produced credible results overall, a deep review of this first-time experience is deemed necessary as the evaluation found there is a potential to increase the impact as long as lessons are identified and used to develop upgraded TEP model.

5. Visibility: Strong impact low visibility

Capacity-building projects are by nature exposed to the challenge of rendering its impact visible. ILMS has produced a strong impact though with a limited visibility. With activities spread across the region and through various levels, building a unified visibility is a task that requires a strategic approach.

3.2 LESSONS LEARNED

1. The inception phase is essential to establish the project

As already mentioned several times in this report, ILMS is both a rich and complex project. And for every such project, the phase preceding the launch of activities is as long as it is crucial.

2. Knowledge management is an essential asset for a project that produces so many outputs at all level.

There is an important stake for ILMS to ensure all of the lessons learned, analysis, audits and other knowledge outputs to be properly managed – especially given the wealth of information generated within the region. This is a must for circulation the appropriate information to the appropriate user. If this is not happening, there is a risk the initial achievements of the ILMS will be not be capitalised and used to move forward in the process.

3. A project operating through so many topics, activities, levels and countries/territories demands a high level of interaction, coordination for its overall coherence be maintained.

Ensuring that all involved stakeholders understand ILMS is a single effort driven by a single overarching objective is a challenge. This requires all actors at all levels to be informed about the coherence of the other activities engaged simultaneously. This is a reminder for ILMS as this has not been completely achieved.

4. A strong project coherence also encompasses a strong link between the central – policy - level and the local – implementation – level.

Moving further from the previous lesson learned (number 3), special attention is also to be paid to the link between central and local institution level. The strong centralisation culture of State institutions has not favoured a culture of inclusiveness of the local level in central-level decision-making processes. For instance, TEP-like interventions have highlighted some obstacles relevant to ministerial domain but have not systematically been brought up to that level, as it seems they have not sufficiently gotten involved into these territorial activities. Somehow, ILMS is similarly challenged in its coherence, by “putting back together the many pieces of the project puzzle”. UNDP or ILO country offices are not always fully aware of all the other ILMS activities implemented, for instance at the regional level or in other countries. And this is making it difficult for all of UNDP and ILO field staff to maintain an overview of the project in its entirety.

5. The multiplicity of ILMS interventions requires a wide range of skills, experience, expertise: a long list of competencies for UNDP and ILO to choose to bring a clarity of roles and responsibilities in a complex project in a complex context.

The evaluation understands the definition of the respective contributions and roles of UNDP and ILO is not a straightforward exercise as multiple factors have to be considered in order to

establish the most coherent and efficient interaction of both agencies when engaging into implementation.

Indeed, while there are clear distinctions in terms of intervention capacities between the two agencies (UNDP operational capacity enabling field level interventions, ILO operating at the central – institutional – level), there are specific activities and areas where the expertise of both agencies is necessary.

Besides a field implementation capacity, UNDP is also bringing policy expertise at the central level, in particular in terms of promoting better connection between employment and social protection policy objectives and institutional collaboration between PES and CSW. Review of legislative environments, expert contribution of regional platforms on employment and social inclusion, development of ICM curriculum and toolkits and CSW competences, ()

ILO has also a wide array of expertise on methodologies available and relevant to a next ILMS phase. In the current ILMS, this UN agency has already provided tools and methodologies highly valued by partners. This has included: Participatory audits on PES, design of Youth Employment Programmes (also designed by UNDP), production of comparative, analytical reports

Besides responsibilities relating to the project internal coordination and mechanisms, each of the activities proposed in a potential following project phase, will require a precise identification of the expertise sought, so as to decide in which case UNDP or ILO is best placed to provide the know-how.

6. There is no sustainability without the institutionalisation of capacity development

The loss of institutional memory is a common fact characterizing numerous previous interventions in the Western Balkans. In Albania, for instance, 25 years of international projects, 25 years of continuous funding have not been enough to completely ensure the institutions of practices introduced. This relates to both lesson learned number 2 and conclusion number one, as interventions supporting the implementation of structural reforms must have the capacity to manage the knowledge produced and aim to accompany processes until practices are actually owned by institutions.

7. Closer ILMS/ESAP collaboration to exercise more leverage on the level of central institutions

Beyond the issue of inadequate (financial and time) resources allocated to the ILMS, stands a question of the strategic positioning of the ILMS vis-à-vis ESAP. The 3 dimensional approach of ILMS is and has proven very relevant. However, with limited funding, the project has had to cope with (1) enhancing the cooperation/interaction between local and central level authorities, (2) exercise leverage to get more ministry level commitment towards the integration of innovative practices. Since the RCC, and especially via its ESAP, enjoys a direct and privileged access to central authorities in the region, the evaluation is inviting UNDP and ILO to consider using its close coordination with ESAP to increase its leverage (maybe through

joint ILMS/ESAP messages and activities involving central level institutions?) on this level (One “D” of the “3 Dimensions”). In summary, the observation here is not about the ILMS “3-D” approach being over-ambitious, but rather to consider joining ESAP and ILMS forces when addressing central level institutions.

8. If the answer is yes (ILMS was too ambitious), should the strategic level be reviewed and the interaction with RCC ESAP require some adjustments?

Considering on the other hand that ILMS local level intervention would have seen its impact elevated if more leverage was applied at the same central level, is there an opportunity to better harmonize the complementary interventions of two projects addressing similar topics with a similar approach but at different levels? This certainly is a matter of discussions for the future of both ILMS and ESAP.

9. The development of inclusive labour market solutions absolutely needs to integrate the private sector perspective.

The dedication and contributions of the private sector to the extent it was involved has been an awareness-raising experience for the project itself: the importance of their specific role and perspectives in inclusive labour market solutions. ILMS has given a hint of how relevant and enlightening employers’ connection to employment reality is to reforming active labour measures. And it definitely calls for more of their involvement in the future of such a project. Getting the wide spectrum of relevant stakeholders on the topic of employment and social inclusion is both a challenge and necessity – if not a priority in the Western Balkans. Unfortunately, a number of international projects see its impacts limited by the fact it insufficiently taps into all of the resources, experience and expertise of indeed the many – more than institutions usually consider – relevant actors. This brings once again backs to the question of resources. Mobilizing stakeholders with modest budgets is a challenge that needs to be recognized by all.

10. A demanding but very relevant approach to build strong ownership.

The ILMS highly consultative, participatory and flexible approach is one “jewel” of the project and certainly one key ingredient of the success of the intervention. This approach is highly relevant to the topic and context and needs to be further cultivated in case ILMS is sustained.

11. Not all TEP interventions are equal and some specific professional sectors seem to offer particularly strong employment potential for the targeted categories.

The TEP interventions, such as in the case of Baldushk, Mojkovac or Gjakova/Gjakovica have revealed a strong connection between territorial natural assets, employment perspectives opened by the exploitation of those assets and the inclusiveness potential of employment those sectors can generate. The example of organic food is promising in terms of answering multiple challenges: Preventing rural migration of isolated communities, accessible to

unemployed with low education, strong product value creation, concrete domestic and international market demand.

3.3. BEST PRACTICES

A wealth of best practices, and probably more to be identified...once time for this is made available

Given the density of the project and the number of activities, there is a wealth of potential lessons learned and best practices that are still to be identified or formally recorded. The evaluation exchanges with the stakeholders and the project staff have indicated there is informally a great amount of knowledge and project experience to be tapped in. The volume of experiences is actually probably so large that it has to be managed in an organised and strategic manner. Otherwise, much is at risk of not being utilised in the future.

While the evaluation is not in a position to demonstrate the universal replicability of good practices generated through the implementation of ILMS, the similarities among Western Balkans country contexts indicates there is a strong potential such practices can be used throughout the region.

The evaluation, for instance, has identified areas where lessons (see lessons learned 11 from the 3.2 Lessons Learned section) from project implementation can contribute to upgrading the TEP intervention model or increasing the focus on the interaction between institutions at the central and local levels.

Specific sectors of intervention seem to offer such a potential in addressing the remote and marginalised unemployed – such as organic food production and digital marketing, that they are worth a special attention in the future.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The project has won the buy-in of institutions who are now eager across the region to acquire the newly introduced tools and practices, with some already having taken concrete steps in that direction in some cases. A key objective for the recommended second phase of the ILMS is to secure the buy-in and build own by moving toward country-specific audit of practices, develop country-tailored methodologies and pilot new tools.

STRATEGIC-LEVEL RECOMMENDATION

→ RECOMMENDATION 1. *A continuation of the ILMS intervention is required to progress towards sustainability*

The project has successfully raised awareness and strong interest of local and central institutions. While it has secured the “buy-in”, ownership yet of new, inclusive-driven labour markets measures is still to be achieved as those measures still needs to be developed. And those measures have also not yet been institutionalised in the various Western Balkans countries. The project has also raised high expectations now that institutions have a better understanding of their needs.

Achieving the long-term objective of the ILMS requires the intervention to be pursued. **Thus, the evaluation strongly recommends a following phase of ILMS to be developed**, building on the results achieved, using the established regional set-up.

The design of an ILMS PHASE II will require the implementation of the following recommendations: **Formalising a strategic framework and entering into a PHASE II preparation process.**

→ RECOMMENDATION 2. *The project needs a formal strategic framework to be outlined*

There is no ILMS phase II without a detailed long-term strategic framework. ILMS needs to place itself in time into a longer-term process but also in space vis-à-vis other related interventions such as ESAP.

The following actions are suggested

- Define the limit of the ILMS intervention strategic objective (tools developed and adjusted to the specifics of each country? Inclusive labour practices integrated at the local level? Inclusive labour measures fully institutionalised at both central and local level?)
- Define the strategic level of intervention **in coherence with ESAP strategic objective and in consultation with RCC**
- Build the strategic path of ILMS (into the possible sequence of phases=projects leading to a sustainable strategic objective)
- Define strategic progress indicators towards sustainability (indicators of the gradual but durable integration of project results)

→ RECOMMENDATION 3. *Review the level of intervention of ILMS vis-à-vis ESAP*

Prior to review UNDP and ILO's respective roles and responsibilities in a possible ILMS II phase (see Project-level recommendation section), the evaluation recommends to a strategic positioning review of both ILMS and ESAP project to determine the following:

- Compare policy, central-institution level intervention of ILMS and ESAP, in order to review if there are similarities in interventions and whether some central-level activities can be conducted jointly
- Since the RCC is a Western Balkans inter-governmental body, it is recommended that ILMS uses ESAP's "privileged" access to central-level governments to maintain a commitment towards the institutionalisation of ILMS introduced methodologies and the consideration of lessons learned from ILMS field practices

→ RECOMMENDATION 4. *The recommended ILMS phase II requires thorough preparation*

- Mobilise ILMS project team to take stock of lessons learned, best practices in the respective countries/territories to formulate component and activity-level recommendations
- Organize an ILMS staff regional workshop to review the following:
 - Review the overall coherence of the continuation of project components and activities
 - Review the coordination, management staffing needs and support
 - Review the knowledge management mechanisms
 - Review the complementary and best distribution of UNDP-ILO country level roles
- Identify the level and type of international, possible national expertise needed for ILMS PHASE II in order to establish an estimated planning of expertise needs. (if necessary seek the advice of consultants already involved in ILMS PHASE I)

RECOMMENDATIONS TO DONORS

→ RECOMMENDATION 5. *The ILMSP requires further financial support and wider donor mobilisation*

Discontinuing the support to a highly relevant intervention, with a genuine longer-term potential of institutionalisation would jeopardise the project acquis to data as well as the goal of the intervention: implementing durable reforms

- Further financial commitment from ADA, UNDP, ILO is recommended
- Since ILMS is highly supportive of EU-level strategic priorities but also EU strategic, policy and programmes supporting the accession process of the Western Balkans countries, ADA, UNDP and ILO, also with the involvement of the RCC, should jointly mobilise other EU member states to step in. Switzerland and Germany, for instance, are already actively engaged in the employment sector and would be very relevant potential supporters of ILMS.

PROJECT-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS

➔ **RECOMMENDATION 6.** *Review the respective roles and responsibilities of UNDP and ILO for a streamline implementation*

ILMS is a tree with many branches and leaves: 6 different contexts, multiple levels of intervention plus the regional dimension. Addressing this complexity requires a clearer definition of roles. The following are elements that should help both agencies in doing so:

- Reporting lines: as the project-holder UNDP should continue to keep the overall management and reporting role. This means that all reporting should be centralised by UNDP at country/territory level and then channelled to the regional level. This is expected to ensure field offices are fully aware of all – country-level and regional-level project events. This should help fill the gap knowledge from the country perspective of all level of activities.

- **ILMS Phase II should be equipped with a full-time position in each of the WB6.** Following the above-suggesting reporting line, it is recommended that a full-time ILMS Focal staff is appointed in each country/territory. This full-time position should at least cover a reporting (to regional project level) function, a coordination/facilitation function and have an overview of all ILMS activities in each country/territory. The exact job description of this position (or these positions in case the competences required are allocated between a UNDP and an ILO staff) will depend on the proposed design of the next ILMS phase.

- The general management recommendation is to keep the management line as simple as possible: UNDP would keep a supervision role in implementation, while ILO would fulfil and advisory role and a supplier of methods, tools and international expertise.

- Implementation of activities: With the objective of keeping the implementation management line as simple as possible, the evaluation recommends all activities to remain under UNDP management but with varying level of ILO involvement depending on the nature of activities and the level of intervention.

The direct management responsibility of each activity, between UNDP and ILO, should be determined based on the agency displaying the most relevant combination of expertise and experience for that activity.

In situations where activities require the expertise of both UNDP and ILO, it is recommended to have the implementation management to be placed under one agency while the other may have an advisory role. This is to avoid confusion of project partners towards the division of roles and responsibilities between the UNDP and ILO.

➔ **RECOMMENDATION 7.** *Streamline coordination*

- Internal coordination: In line with Recommendation 6, ILMS should coordinate activities through it ILMS Country/territory Focal Staff. In turn, the focal staff, should ensure ILO is update and involve in all relevant activities.

- It is recommended that UNDP/ILO ILMS staff meet physically once a year. As much as technology is necessary for the exchange of information, the exchange of ideas and experience among project staff – especially in case ILMS Phase II relies on full-time positions

– gathering physically ILMS staff will be essential to identify internal and external lessons learned and suggest corrective actions.

- **External coordination:** Close coordination with the RCC, and especially its ESAP project is crucial, especially since ESAP is likely to have a Phase II. In case of the ILMS Phase II, close coordination/consultation of ILMS and ESAP preparation will be needed to maximise the coherence and impact of both interventions. Since ILO is located in the same building where RCC sits, the evaluation recommends for the ILO ILMS position (who will continue coordinating the identification and supply of international expertise, as well as deal with tools and methodologies) to entertain a regular exchange of information, besides remote coordination with the UNDP ILMS Project Coordinator.

→ **RECOMMENDATION 8. Build a proper knowledge management system**

The recommended ILMS Phase II will continue to manage, produce and exchange a sizeable volume of information. If not systematised, managing such a task may impede implementation.

- It is recommended that all project stakeholders have a minimum level of information about the diversity of ILMS activities. This implies for an overview ILMS implementation information is easily accessible to all, with regular updates and at any time.

- **The production of short ILMS Quarterly Activity updates as a compilation of country/territory activity updates should be made available to all stakeholders at all levels.**

- **UNDP should have a dedicated ILMS Webpage** (possibly hosted by UNDP Website) where with reporting, events, tools, methodologies, success story sections could be developed.

- **The design of written products (audits, assessment, workshop notes...) should be made visually friendly, allowing for an easy identification and follow-up of decisions, actions...**

- **Basic guidelines** (where to find information, simple user-friendly formats for reports, when are reports available, who is responsible for what, follow-up on decisions....) **could be developed to keep control on the management of knowledge production and its use.**

- **An online tool to host ILMS knowledge products could also be used by the project to monitor the progress of implementation: e.g. on online calendar of events with online confirmation of attendance, and workshop output reports available after completion.**

→ **RECOMMENDATION 9. Develop an upgraded 2.0 TEP**

TEP financial resources have been too little, significantly reducing its potential. A more ambitious approach should be developed, with more resources with the objective of establishing replicable successful models.

- Increase significantly the value of individual TEP interventions: Only select one vs multiple interventions.

- **Strengthen the economic aspect of the TEP mode:** Focus the value chain to establish a financially sustainable model (organic food offers such a potential). This will require expert

inputs (value chain, market access...). Subsistence farming does not generate sufficient revenues, a model building strong added value is necessary.

- Provide a wide array of business support to vulnerable unemployed, including mentorship over a sufficient period of time (minimum 6 months).

- Use a stronger TEP 2.0 to obtain a full cooperation between Ministries, local Employment Offices, local CSW, Private Sector, Civil Society: consider partnerships

- Involve/invite central authorities in the process to take in possible lessons learned from TEP 2.0 and propose adequate support.

→ RECOMMENDATION 10. Develop a detailed workplan for the further implementation of the Integrated Case Management

*For institutions to use a tailor-made ICM, a substantial effort needs to be deployed (see finding FF 1 under section **2.5.1 Sustainability of project results** especially in context where much needs to happen on the legal and capacity side. The evaluation has identified some of the following key steps to be implemented in the future:*

- Continue with peer learning sessions to discuss practice from EU countries

- Conduct functional assessment of PES (ILO related tools and methodologies can be made available for this activity).

- Use PES functional assessment to formulate recommendations on the required changes and the process guiding to integrating changes

- Strengthen the central-local level institutional interaction by inviting representatives of both levels so the central level consults and collects information on new practices from the local level

- Conduct an audit of IT systems and databases in order to design an integrated information system comprehensive of all relevant data necessary to develop user-centered counselling.

→ RECOMMENDATION 11. Develop a specific ADA visibility strategy

ILMS, apart from TEP concrete interventions is not a type of intervention where physical visibility is offered a strong place.

- Use the recommended online platform to provide strong ADA visibility

- Use ILMS knowledge products to include a one paragraph on ADA's commitment to inclusive employment

- Introduce ILMS workshops and other events with a short introduction on ADA's commitment to inclusive employment

- Similar to ESAP, consider developing a 2 minutes film presenting ILMS and make it available online.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1 – RESULTS-ASSESSMENT FORM FOR FINAL PROJECT EVALUATIONS/REVIEWS

ANNEX 2 – LIST OF REVIEWED DOCUMENTATION

ANNEX 3 – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

ANNEX 4 – FIELD VISITS PLAN

Annex 1: Results-Assessment Form for Final Project Evaluations/Reviews

This form has to be filled in electronically by the evaluator/reviewer. No evaluation report will be accepted without this form. The form has to be included at the beginning of the evaluation/review report.

Title of project: Promoting inclusive labour market solutions in the Western Balkans	
Contract Period of project: 01/05/2016 to 31/12/2017 (extended to 30 June 2018)	
ADC number of project:	
Name of project partner: UNDP	
Country and Region of project: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kosovo ⁴ Western Balkans region	
Budget of this project: 1,575,000 EUR	
Name of evaluation company (spell out) and names of evaluators: Thomas Vasseur, independent consultant	
Date of completion of evaluation/review: 05 July 2018	
Please tick appropriate box:	
a) Evaluation/review managed by ADA/ADC Coordination Office	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Evaluation managed by project partner:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please tick appropriate box:	

⁴ This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence. All further references to Kosovo in this document should be understood in this manner.

a) Mid-Term Evaluation Review	b) Final Evaluation	c) Mid-Term Review	d) Final Review								
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Others: please, specify:											
<p>Project Outcome (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix – Results Framework):</p> <p>Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded</p>											
<p>For Final Evaluation: Project Outcome: To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? <u>Please, tick appropriate box</u></p> <p>Outcome(s) was/were:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; padding: 5px;">Fully achieved:</td> <td style="width: 25%; padding: 5px;">Almost achieved:</td> <td style="width: 25%; padding: 5px;">Partially achieved:</td> <td style="width: 25%; padding: 5px;">Not achieved:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>				Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:			X	
Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:								
		X									
<p><u>Please, also explain your assessment: What exactly was achieved and why? If not achieved, why not?</u> (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)</p> <p>It is important to understand that this is not a rating of ILMS performance but a rating of the contribution of the ILMS project to attaining the outcome as stated in the proposal. The final evaluation report indicates into more details that “an inclusive and sustainable growth” is a <u>long-term, strategic</u> objective. While ILMS is a major step (and achieved successfully in terms of project objective), the evaluation considers it only as forming the initial phase of a longer-term intervention whose strategic objective could correspond to the outcome as formulated in the initial project proposal. As a matter of fact, the evaluation is raised the need to clearly develop the long-term strategy to which ILMS perfectly fits in. Thus, the chosen “partially achieved” rating corresponds to the fact the ILMS is approaching the expect “outcome” but that the intervention needs to continue further.</p>											

Project Outputs: To what extent has the project already achieved its outputs according to the Logframe Matrix ? Please, tick appropriate boxes

Output 1 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):

Output 1

Public employment and social service agencies provide user-centered approaches, with a focus on vulnerable and hard-to-employ groups
Public employment and social service agencies provide user-centered approaches, with a focus on vulnerable and hard-to-employ groups

Output was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved: x	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------	---------------

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

The evaluation would like to bring some nuance to the rating by bringing the indicator closer to the “fully achieved” box. The evaluation would give this component an “8” on a 1 to 10 rating scale. The reasons for this is that while on the one hand, not all activities have been, its achievements have often highly been depending on the national context in the countries/territories of the region. Indeed, it is about acknowledging that engaging closely with national and local institutions, implies recognizing the influence of national contexts on the timely achievement of objectives

Thus, the project has not failed in its capacity to deliver but has been confronted by the depth of influence on local context on its activities.

Another example is the partial completion of the activity 1.7 related to building capacities on support services for refugees and asylum seekers. This was clearly an over-ambitious endeavour in some countries where addressing asylum seekers situation at large scale in relative new and therefore calls for an effort that goes beyond a single project phase duration.

Output 2 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):

Output 2

Innovative programmes to tackle employment of vulnerable groups and foster inclusive labour markets

Output 2 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
	x		

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

Similarly, to rating Output 1, the evaluation is rating Output 2 in the higher side of “almost achieved”, or the equivalent of a “8 out of 10 rates”. The review cannot rate output 2 as “fully achieved” as some activities are behind schedule – such as the TEP planned to be implemented in Gostivar. However, again, time and time-consuming constraints (such as identifying external experts) have been identified as obstacles to a timely implementation. Overall though, the quality of implementation is also considered and justifies a rating that is slightly above or that stands at the top of the “almost achieved” rating.

Output 3 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):

Innovative programmes to tackle employment of vulnerable groups and foster inclusive labour markets

Output 3 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
x			

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

The rating for this component can be considered as fully achieved, even though admittedly the nature of the activities under this component are more qualitative than quantitative and thus make measuring a difficult task. The quality of outputs (repots) but also based on interviewee feedbacks is strong enough to justify such a rating. This external review has also observed, for the 3 components overall that, while some activities were not fully realized because of the difficulties as explained earlier, the effect of the majority of intervention have gone beyond the expected, once again, in terms of raising awareness, building a thorough

understanding of the gaps and efforts required ahead, but also in transforming the minds of instructions in a renewed perception of their role towards offering human-centered services.

Impact/Beneficiaries:

How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from this project directly and indirectly? Please, explain

Output 1:

- **Participatory inclusiveness assessment** methodology for PES agencies was designed with **27** practitioners and implemented in WB-6."

- 52 practitioners from PES and CSW agencies attended the sub-regional practitioners' workshop on **Integrated Case Management (ICM)**

Output 2:

- 94 practitioners attended human-centered design workshops and produced 15 innovative prototypes

- "Through **business leadership networks**, employers' organizations in Serbia and Montenegro were mobilized to establish business networks to support inclusiveness in the employment of disadvantaged individuals. Serbian Employers Association involved over **30 SMEs to create Network for Employment of Persons with Disabilities**, while Montenegrin Employers Federation mobilized over **50 women** from senior and top management from both private and public sector to promote **gender equality in business and management**."

At the time of writing this report, 5 TEPs, had been developed and involved 1,043 end beneficiaries, which are expected to result in 372 employments. This is excluding the TEP in Gostivar, which implementation has started late in the process.

Output 3:

- 22 PES practitioners from WB6 were presented with tools and mechanisms of the European Mutual Learning Programme

- Policy Clinic on ICM was organized with 52 high level representatives from four EU countries and the Western Balkans.

Besides representatives of state institutions or the direct beneficiaries of TEP interventions, the project does not have sufficient survey material that would allow to provide an exact

number of beneficiaries. This is especially the case given the diversity of activities. Here is how the beneficiaries of this project can be categorized:

- Local (municipal or regional) Institutions:

Dozens of employees from the local Employment Offices and Center for Social Welfares (and related social services institutions) have benefited from ILMS.

- Central (national institutions):

Dozens of central level central institution employees have benefited from ILMS activities. This has involved various level of hierarchy from national employment agencies, as well as ministries of labour and social policy.

- Private Sector:

Several employer associations from the region have been involved in ILMS activities while an important number of private companies, members of national employers' associations have indirectly benefited from the various initiatives (publications on inclusiveness on the work place...) realized by national associations of employers.

- Civil Society:

Several dozens of local NGOs have benefited from the numerous field interventions of ILMS across the region. This includes human-rights based NGO such as those protection and supporting the integration of women victims of domestic violence, people with disability or discriminated communities such as the Roma.

- Unemployed women and men from communities excluded from accessing the labour market:

Over 800 women and men have been the direct beneficiaries from over 15 individual interventions implemented within the frame of the 5 TEP established by ILMS.

What exactly has already changed in the lives of women, men, girls, boys and/or institutions from this project? Please, explain:

Taking the same beneficiary categories as defined above, here is how ILMS has changed the lives of the beneficiaries:

- Local (municipal or regional) Institutions:

Some of the changes experienced by local institutions includes:

- Engage into multi-stakeholder processes and dialogue to develop inclusive labour-access solutions
- Increased aware about institutions shortcomings in practice, processes, capacities and results-oriented services

- Exposure to and practice of innovative approaches (ICM) through TEP interventions

- Central (national institutions):

Some of the changes experienced by central level institutions include:

- Increase of awareness of gaps and shortcomings in practice and policy
- Widening knowledge and perspective on its own practice through exchange of practices and policies in other EU and WB countries
- Offered opportunities to learn from ILMS field practices to improve protocols, action plans and programmes

- Private Sector:

Some of the changes experienced by the private sector include:

- Awareness raised on making working environment more inclusive
- Awareness raised on the role and leverage of private sector on policy making and institutional settings in the development of economically sound and human-centered labour accessible solutions
- Stronger social responsibility culture and stronger network to establish a stronger and more inclusive

- Civil Society:

Some of the changes experienced by the civil society include:

- A stronger stake and voice in the dialogue with local authorities and institutions, especially in relation to the human-rights based dimension of the labour-inclusive process
- Increased capacities in profiling and participation to labour-inclusive solutions through concrete TEP interventions

- Unemployed women and men from communities excluded from accessing the labour market:

- Increase technical knowledge and job search skills through training
- Short and longer-term employment through concrete TEP interventions
- Business creation or development through concrete TEP interventions
- Increased income for the beneficiaries and their families

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain:

The project enjoys a strong female representation in almost all of the ILMS project activities. And this is indeed not just about representation or about a quantitative presence of women in the labour sector, generally characterized by a predominant male place. The female actors of the ILMS intervention have had decision-making roles (head of central or local level state institution units) in the project and have significantly and actively contributed to the project outputs.

The evaluation has not identified any significantly negative effect or impact in relation to gender. On the contrary, the project activities have change stakeholder's perception towards women in a positive manner and with an improved consideration of women capacities and role on the labour market. The Montenegro business women awards supported by ILMS offer a very good illustration of this.

If applicable, which institutions have benefitted from this project/programme and how?

See above answers in this section

Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues:

Gender: To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal gender-assessment considered and implemented?

Gender was strongly mainstreamed in the project. It was actually done in a very efficient manner, not just through ready-made statements who do not always just convinced when they remain statement. The involvement of women in outputs and concrete interventions has provided very convincing venues for women to engage into actions and therefore demonstrate their professional capacities. The impact of this was strongly felt during interviews.

Social Standards: To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged? Please, explain

The project has not only used existing social standards within institutions, but, through the promotion of inclusive measures, has advocated for and introduced higher standards from other EU countries' practice. ILMS has actually done more than just monitoring social standards, it has invited institutions and other relevant stakeholders to review their own practices and social standards to identify gaps and weaknesses. Indeed, ILMS has been successful in raising awareness and building a strong interest within institutions to establish higher social standards. The repeated request for the profiling of vulnerable categories from social welfare centre is an indicator of the institution's willingness to develop higher social standards.

Overall/Other Comments:

ANNEX 2 – LIST OF REVIEWED DOCUMENTATION

Title	Type of report	Author
ILMS Project Proposal	ILMS Project	UNDP
ILMS 2017 Annual Progress Report	ILMS Project	UNDP
Comparative Report on Integrated Case Management for Employment and Social Welfare Users in the Western Balkans	ILMS Project	UNDP
Guidelines for cooperation between PES and CSW regarding Integrated Case Management for Employment and Social Welfare Users in the Western Balkans	ILMS Project	UNDP
Action Plan for Improved Inclusiveness of the National Employment Services - Albania	ILMS Project	ILO
Action Plan for Improved Inclusiveness of the National Employment Services – Bosnia and Herzegovina	ILMS Project	ILO
Action Plan for Improved Inclusiveness of the National Employment Services – FYR Macedonia	ILMS Project	ILO
Action Plan for Improved Inclusiveness of the National Employment Services - Kosovo*	ILMS Project	ILO
Action Plan for Improved Inclusiveness of the National Employment Services - Montenegro	ILMS Project	UILO
Action Plan for Improved Inclusiveness of the National Employment Services - Serbia	ILMS Project	ILO
Toolkit for strengthening Integrated Case Management for Employment and Social Welfare Users in the Western Balkans	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Pact Baldushk	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Pact Birac	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Pact Gostivar	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Pact Gjakova	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Pact Mojkovac	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Pact Vranje	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Audit Baldushk	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Audit Birac	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Audit Gostivar	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Audit Gjakova	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Audit Mojkovac	ILMS Project	UNDP
Territorial Employment Audit Vranje	ILMS Project	UNDP
Situation of People with Disability from a labour and employment perspective	ILMS Project	Serbia Employers Association
Employment of People with Disability – Guide for Employers	ILMS Project	Serbia Employers Association

Summative report on the policies, service provision modalities and active labour market policies targeting youth	ILMS Project	ILO
South East Europe 2020		Regional Cooperation Council
WB Enlargement strategy excerpts	Compilation	Various

ANNEX 3 – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES – EVALUATION FIELD VISIT		
Name	Professional title	Organisation
REGIONAL LEVEL STAKEHOLDERS		
UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH)		
Vesna Dzuteska Bisheva	Employment Specialist/ Regional Project Manager of ILMP	UNDP
ILO DWT for Central and Eastern Europe		
Daniela Zampini	Employment and Skills Specialist	<u>ILO</u>
Katarina Crnjanski Vljacic	Regional Project Manager of ILMP	ILO
Valli Corbanese	Expert in integrated case management	ILO (independent consultant)
ADA		
Monika Tortschanoff	Programme Manager, Albania, Kosovo*, Western Balkans/Danube Region	ADA
RCC		
Nand Shani	ESAP Team Leader	RCC
ALBANIA STAKEHOLDERS		
Etleva Mertiri	Programme Officer	ADA
Enkelejd Musabelliu	General Director of Economic Development	Municipality of Tirana
Eno Ngjela	Programme Analyst	UNDP Albania
Jodrina Kadare	Programme Officer	UNDP Albania
Zhuljeta Harasani	National Coordinator	ILO Albania
Linda Rama	HDPC Director and ILO PIA consultant	HDPC
Dajna Sorensen	Deputy Minister (in charge of Employment and VET)	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

Rustem Strugaj	Director of Rural Development	Tirana Municipality
Piro Rapushi	TEP consultant	ILO Consultant
Zef Gjeta	TEP consultant	ILO Consultant
	Mayor	Baldushk
TEP beneficiary	(cow farmer)	Baldushk
TEP beneficiary	(green house)	Baldushk
TEP beneficiary	(demonstration farm)	Baldushk
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA STAKEHOLDERS		
Bosnia and Herzegovina		
Alexandre Prieto	Programme Manager,	UNDP
Sanela Muharemovic	Junior Economic Consultant	UNDP
Haris Huskic	Head of Active Labour Market measure	Federal Employment Institute
Gordana Latinovic	Deputy Director	Employment Institute of Republika Srpska
Nada Markovic		NGO "Women" Bratunac
Vesna Eric		NGO "Women" Bratunac
Vladan Ivkovic	Director	CSW Milici
Ivan Bukovic	Director	Vis Company in Vlasenica
Goran Petrovic	Director	CSW Zvornik
Zorana Perkovic	Director	NGO "Humana Druzstvo"
Marko	Coordinator	Milici Municipality
FYR MACEDONIA STAKEHOLDERS		
FYR Macedonia		
Biljana Zivkovska	Head of Unit for Public relations, communication and international cooperation,	Employment Service Agency
Suzana Ahmeti Janjic	Programme Analyst, UNDP	UNDP
Valentina Nushkova		UNDP

Emil Krstanovski	National Coordinator for Macedonia	ILO
Harald Fugger	Attaché to the Austrian Embassy	Austrian Embassy in FYR Macedonia
Mirjanka Aleksevskia Mr.		Min. of Labour and Social Policy
Dushan Tomshic		Min. of Labour and Social Policy
Blagica Petreski	Director and consultant to the project	Finance Think
KOSOVO* (1244)⁵ STAKEHOLDERS		
Kosovo* (1244)⁶		
Gunther Zimmer	Counsellor & ADA Country Director	ADA
Albulena Zaimi	Task Manager/program officer	ADA
Ylber Aliu	Head of the Division for monitoring Employment Offices	<u>Kosovo*</u>
Ada Shima	Programme Manager, UNDP	UNDP Kosovo*
David Svab	Sustainable Development Programme Analyst	UNDP Kosovo*
Alessandra Roccasalvo	Deputy Resident Representative	UNDP Kosovo*
Valbona Bogujevci	Assistant Resident Representative	UNDP Kosovo*
Bekim Ermeni	former Director, Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Development	Gjakova/Djakovica Municipality
Shpat Nivokazi	current new Director, Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Development	Gjakova/Djakovica Municipality
Florin Dautaga	President of Beekeepers Association Flora - TEP beneficiary	Beekeepers Association Flora
Ylber Aliu	Head of the Division for Employment Policy	MLSW
Levent Koro	Labour Market Expert	<u>Independent Expert</u>
Drin Haraqia	Director General	Kosovo* Employment Agency
Muhamet Klinaku	Head of Department of the Labour Market	Kosovo* Employment Agency

⁵ This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo* declaration of independence.

⁶ This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo* declaration of independence.

MONTENEGRO STAKEHOLDERS		
Montenegro		
Igor Topalovic	Deputy Resident Representative	UNDP
Miodrag Dragisic	Programme Coordinator	UNDP
Boban Gledovic	Advisor in Directorate for Labour Market and Employment, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare	UNDP
Zvezdana Oluic	Head of PR & Marketing Sector (and Adviser for Women's Entrepreneurship)	Montenegrin Employers Federation
Tanja Raznatovic	Adviser for Members Support	Montenegrin Employers Federation
Ana Sebek	Independent Advisor to the Directorate for Investments, SME Development and EU Project Management	Ministry of Economy
Ljubica Kostic-Bukarica	President	Business Women Association of Montenegro
Vesna Babic,	CEO Luxtech Ltd and Awardee of Montenegro Women Business Manager Awards	Luxtech Ltd
Jevrosima Pejovic		Employment Agency of Montenegro
Gordana Vukcevic		Employment Agency of Montenegro
Ivana Vujošević		Employment Agency of Montenegro
Mira Vukovic	Head of Employment Agency in Mojkovac	Employment Agency of Montenegro
Nikola Vloavic	Head of Agro Business Center	Agro Business Center Mojkovac
Milan Fustic	Raspberry production farmer and project beneficiary	Mojkovac

Luka Furtula	Raspberry production farmer and project beneficiary	Mojkovac
Milica Ristic	Head of Department for relations with the civil society	Municipality of Mojkovac
SERBIA STAKEHOLDERS		
Serbia		
Irma Lutovac	National Project Coordinator	UNDP
Dejana Kuzmic	Secretary of International Cooperation	Serbia Employers Association
Jelena Vasic	Head of the Active Labour Market Measures Department, Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs	
Suzana Antic Ristic	Project Coordinator	SOS NGO
Dragana Marjanovic,	ILO regional consultant to the project	Independent consultant
Dejan Bajramovic	Director of NGO Yurom	Yurom NGO
Ivana Tasic	Director	Center for the development of social protection services in Vranje
Sanja Kostic	Psychologist	Center for the development of social protection services in Vranje
Aleksandar Stojanovic	Project Coordinator	Center for the development of social protection services in Vranje
	Director	Company "Mikromodeli"
A.B.	Woman victim of domestic violence employed through TEP	Vranje
B.A.	Woman victim of domestic violence employed through TEP	Vranje

PROPOSED TIMETABLE (TENTATIVE)																															
YEAR	2018																														
MONTH	APRIL															MAY															
DAY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
1. INCEPTION PHASE																															
1.1 Desk review of project material & context relevant documents																															
1.2 Start-up meeting Skype session: questions and answers, Field phase dates...																															
1.3 Inception report with detailed methodology, workplan, data collection tools, field visit schedule,...																															
1.4 Confirmation of meeting dates (Montenegro, Albania in priority)																															
2. FIELD PHASE																															
2.1 International travel (Lyon-Skopje), travel to Vranje																															
2.2 Interviews (I) in Vranje (May 3) and travel to Belgrade (T)																															
2.3 Interviews (I) in Belgrade (May 4) and travel to Srebrenica (T)																															
2.4 Interviews (I) in Srebrenica (May 7) and travel to Sarajevo (T)																															
2.5 Interviews (I) in Sarajevo (May 8) and travel to Mojkovac (T)																															
2.6 Interviews (I) in Mojkovac (May 9) and travel to Podgorica (T)																															
2.7 Interviews (I) in Podgorica (May 10) and travel to Pristina (T)																															
2.8 Interviews (I) in Pristina (May 11) and travel to Gjakova (T)																															
2.9 Interviews (I) in Gjakova (May 14) and travel to Tirana (T)																															
2.10 Interviews (I) in Tirana (May 15)																															
2.11 Interviews (I) in Tirana (Baldushk) (May 16) and travel to Gostivar (T)																															
2.12 Interviews (I) in Gostivar (May 17) and travel to Skopje (T)																															
2.13 Interviews (I) in Skopje (May 18), remote interviews																															
2.14 International travel (Skopje-Lyon)																															
3. REPORTING PHASE																															
3.1 Drafting & submission (S) of draft evaluation report to UNDP																															
3.2 UNDP feedback comments to evaluation report																															
3.3 Systematisation of feedback comments and submission of final evaluation report																															