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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The evaluator finds that in a nutshell the project has set a strong foundation for greater transparency and use of Open Data in Serbia. It achieved more with less, adopting a low cost: high impact approach, which led to the achievement of significant results. These included increasing the interest in open data and recognition of its value among stakeholders, as well as showcasing the value of data and engaging citizens. Particular successes included the release of open data related to air pollution and transport in key Serbian cities. The project successfully established all core elements of an open data ecosystem – the legal framework, a coordination mechanism (Open Data Working Group) and a data publishing system (National Open Data Portal).

The evaluator finds that the project was highly relevant in the Serbian context, with Open Data being high on the government’s agenda and supported directly from the Cabinet of the Prime Minister. The relevance of the project is reflected in the national strategic and policy framework, notably the e-Government Development Programme 2019 – 2021, as well as in several sector strategies, including justice, public procurement and open government. Further, the project contributed to the UNDAF as well as the Sustainable Development goals and the 2030 Agenda. The project was implemented efficiently and effectively and has achieved a strong foundation for sustainability, through developing national ownership as well as strengthening demand for open data. Further, UNDP was able to convene a wide mix of stakeholders and partners, bringing together state institutions with civil society, academia and representatives of the tech industry. All stakeholders recognise this as a key success of the project.

However, while the project has had significant achievements during its first phase, the second phase should be more structured to elevate the project to the next level. This should include further increasing awareness as well as demand at both the institutional and state level, and among the general public. UNDP should focus more on steering the process during the second phase in order to avoid capacity substitutions.

The evaluator was asked to rate the project in accordance with the rating scale as stipulated in the Terms of Reference. This is summerised below and a moe detailed narrative is provide in Chapter 3.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A: Assessment of Project Outcomes | Rating | **Weighting** |
| 1. **Project Effectiveness of achieving results**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) | 6/6 |
| 1. **Project Efficiency in achieving results**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) | 6/6 |
| 1. **Project Relevance**
 | Relevant or not relevant  | 6/6 |
| Output rating | **Averaged from above** | **30/30%** |
|  |  |  |
| B: Sustainability |  |  |
| 1. **Sustainability of Results**
 | Likely (4) to Unlikely (1) | 4/4 |
| 1. **Sustainability within the Socio-Political setting**
 | Likely (4) to Unlikely (1) | 2/4 |
| 1. **Sustainability of Institutional framework and governance**
 | Likely (4) to Unlikely (1) | 2/4 |
| Overall Likelihood of sustainability | **Averaged from above** | **13/20%** |
|  |  |  |
| C: Monitoring and evaluation |  |  |
| 1. **Project M&E design at entry**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) | 5/6 |
| 1. **M&E plan implementation**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) | 5/6 |
| M&E overall rating | **Averaged from above** | **17/20%** |
|  |  |  |
| D: Implementation |  |  |
| 1. **Quality of UNDP project implementation**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) | **6/6** |
| 1. **Inclusion of relevant crosscutting issues (gender, environmental safeguards, Human rights etc.**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) | 4/6 |
| **Overall Implementation rating** |  | **25/30%** |
|  |  |  |
| Overall project quality | **Based on weightings of above scores.**Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) | **85/100%****6 – highly satisfactory** |

## 1. Introduction

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.1 Background** The overall objective of the Open Data – Open Opportunities project was to support the development of an open data ecosystem in Serbia that will catalyze improved government delivery to citizens and generate economic growth. It followed the recommendations from the Open Data Action Plan set out in the Open Data Readiness Assessment (ODRA, conducted by UNDP and World Bank in 2015), which is in line with Serbia’s Action Plan for the Development of e-Government. On a wider scale, the project contributed to the implementation of the E-Government Development Strategy as well as the Public Administration Reform Strategy, considerably bridging the gap to European and global best practices in governance.Working on all three levels of the Open Data ecosystem (policy and regulation/top-down, support to individual agencies and generation of champions/middle-out, and demand for open data and innovative reuse/bottom-up), the project created new and firm linkages between all actors vital for ensuring sustainability.The project forms part of a larger UNDP portfolio aimed at increasing the competitiveness in Serbian economy, through digital transformation of the Serbian government, via support of the UK Good Governance Fund and the Serbian government.The poor availability of good data, data management and data exchange practices within Government have been recognized as significant challenges for transforming the Serbian state in line with the European administrative space. In 2015, Serbia has taken initial actions to change this picture, among other things through implementing an open data initiative. The initiative started with a small amount of funds, prior to donor support, with the idea to have several iterations as the context evolves, followed by adaption of activities and specific goals to that context over the course of time. *Open Data – Open Opportunities* project was aimed to tackle the following outputs:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Output 1 | Government effectively implements the Open Data Action Plan and Open Government Partnership Action Plan in a participatory manner, putting in place a coherent open data policy with adequate governance mechanisms and an enabling legislative framework |
| Output 2 | Relevant and high-impact data released in an open format |
| Output 3 | Reuse of data by both government and external stakeholders generates business opportunities, improves public service delivery and enhances government accountability |

 |

## 1.2 Objectives and scope of the Evaluation

This evaluation covers the entire project implementation period from September 2017 – March 2020. The overall objective of the evaluation is to provide information about the results of the *Open Data – Open Opportunities* project implementation. The specific objective is to assess if and how project outputs were achieved, the efficiency with which outputs were achieved, relevance for the national strategic framework and UNDP Country Programme outcome and sustainability of the results*,* and to provide recommendations for future engagement.

In terms of scope, the final evaluation assesses the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project*.* It assesses what works and why, highlights intended and unintended results, and provides strategic lessons to guide decision-makers and inform stakeholders.

## 2. Methodology

**2.1 Evaluation criteria and key questions**

In addition to the OECD/DAC key evaluation criteria listed above – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability - the ToR specified a number of specific review criteria and key review questions as detailed below. These were also incorporated and reflected in the evaluation matrix at Annex A.

The Evaluator reviewed, analyzed and provides conclusions and recommendations on the following:

* The contribution of the project to the implementation of relevant national strategic frameworks and UNDP’s Country Programme Document;
* Draw linkages to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated
* The degree to which the project activities listed in the Project Document have been successfully implemented and desired outputs achieved;
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness;
* The efficiency of the project approach in delivering outputs;
* Assessment of external factors affecting the project, and the extent to which the project has been able to adapt and/or mitigate the effects of such factors;
* The approach to project management, including the role of stakeholders and coordination with other development projects in the same area;
* The extent to which the target beneficiaries have benefited from the project activities, including women and vulnerable groups;
* The extent to which the project recognized changing context in which it operates (ICT in Serbia) and provided tailor-made activities in order to satisfy the new context and map opportunity spaces;
* The level of beneficiaries’ and partners satisfaction with programme implementation and results;
* The potential for continuation or up scaling of the initiative and its sustainability.

A detailed methodology is provided in the Inception Report and Evaluation Matrix. A large focus of the evaluation was on obtaining qualitative data through interviews and questionnaires with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries. While focus group discussions has initially been envisaged, due to the state of emergency (Covid-19), these were unable to be held. Two data gathering instruments in the form of questionnaires were developed, one for the Project Board members and one for a wider set of stakeholders –please see Annex B for the questionnaires. Once the questionnaires had been completed, the evaluator conducted a number of follow-up interviews with respondents for additional information and clarification. This allowed the evaluator to obtain as much qualitative data and information as possible. Wherever possible, data gathered, both qualitative and quantitative, was triangulated, through cross verification from more than two sources. For interviews and the questionnaires, this was done through posing a similar set of questions to the multiple interviewees and respondents. For the document review it was accomplished through crosschecking data and information from multiple sources to increase the credibility and validity of the material.

Questionnaires were received from project board members, donors and external partners, which were supplemented by follow-up interviews.

**2.2 Evaluation ranking scale**

Each evaluation criterion was scored using the evaluations rating scale:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)

Satisfactory (S)

Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

Unsatisfactory (U) and

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A: Assessment of Project Outcomes | Rating | **Weighting** |
| 1. **Project Effectiveness of achieving results**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) |  |
| 1. **Project Efficiency in achieving results**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) |  |
| 1. **Project Relevance**
 | Relevant or not relevant  |  |
| Output rating | **Averaged from above** | **30%** |
|  |  |  |
| B: Sustainability |  |  |
| 1. **Sustainability of Results**
 | Likely (4) to Unlikely (1) |  |
| 1. **Sustainability within the Socio-Political setting**
 | Likely (4) to Unlikely (1) |  |
| 1. **Sustainability of Institutional framework and governance**
 | Likely (4) to Unlikely (1) |  |
| Overall Likelihood of sustainability | **Averaged from above** | **20%** |
|  |  |  |
| C: Monitoring and evaluation |  |  |
| 1. **Project M&E design at entry**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) |  |
| 1. **M&E plan implementation**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) |  |
| M&E overall rating | **Averaged from above** | **20%** |
|  |  |  |
| D: Implementation |  |  |
| 1. **Quality of UNDP project implementation**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) |  |
| 1. **Inclusion of relevant crosscutting issues (gender, environmental safeguards, Human rights etc.**
 | Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) |  |
| **Overall Implementation rating** |  | **30%** |
|  |  |  |
| Overall project quality | **Based on weightings of above scores.**Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) |  |

**2.3 Limitations**

The evaluation faced some challenges and limitations, in large part due to the current state of emergency and restrictions that are in place related to Covid-19. These prevented the evaluator from meeting face to face with all stakeholders and from conducting any focus group discussions. To overcome this, the evaluator designed additional data gathering instruments in the form of questionnaires, and conducted a number of virtual interviews. However the responses gathered via the questionnaires were not as detailed as oral responses would have been. In addition, the data received from the project was from December 2019, so final end of project data is not included in the report.

**3. Evaluation Analysis**

The following section presents an analysis of the Open Data project by looking at the evaluation ranking matrix provided above and stipulated in the ToR. It contains a narrative section as well as key findings and an overall rating towards achievement of the evaluation criteria. The subsequent Chapter 4 will present broader, higher level findings and recommendations.

**3.A Assessment of project outputs (Highly satisfactory (6) to highly unsatisfactory (1))**

**3.A.1 Project effectiveness of achieving results**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that all three project outputs were effectively implemented to achieve a high level of results.** | **Highly satisfactory – 6** |

**Output 1: Government effectively implements the Open Data Action Plan and Open Government Partnership Action Plan in a participatory manner, putting in place a coherent open data policy with adequate governance mechanisms and an enabling legislative framework**

This output was focused around the provision of support to the Open Data Working Group; introducing open data into Serbia’s legislative framework; and initiating institutional reform for embedding open data in Government operations. In addition, it aimed to develop and track impact assessment criteria. This output contained 6 indicators all of which were achieved or anticipated to be achieved in full by the end of the project on 31 March 2020.

The evaluator finds that the project successfully supported the functioning and expansion of the Open Data Working Group (ODWG), which gathers and articulates all individual open data initiatives by institutions, along with stakeholders from other sectors, through regular plenary and bilateral meetings, workshops and discussions. Stakeholders informed the evaluator that the ODWG provides a valuable resource for peer learning among institutions, and a venue for valuable feedback from the community of users**.** During the project period, the membership of the ODWG expanded from 31 members in January 2018 to 64 as of December 2019. The ODWG currently includes 42 government institutions, 6 members from the tech community, 12 civil society organizations and 4 members from academia. The expansion of the ODWG is seen by many as one of the key successes of the project.

The evaluator finds that members of the WG as represented in the Project Board are highly satisfied with the functioning of the WG and believe that all relevant stakeholders are represented in it. They receive timely information and support from the project. Cooperation and communication between the Project Board and UNDP and the project is assessed as good. Some Project Board members commented on initial challenges with regards to joining meetings remotely, however these seem to have been largely overcome now. Both the Project Board and the ODWG were responsive to the changing context. For example, the Annual Work Plan 2019 was revised at the end of the year 2019, to extend the project until March 31st 2020 and to include additional funds from the UK GGF resulting from positive currency exchange rate differences.

With regards to Open Data related legislation, the evaluator finds that the project was highly successful in supporting the establishment of a legal framework for open data during the first year of the project implementation, through the adoption of the Law on e-Government and relevant secondary legislation and by-laws. The Law effectively makes it mandatory for public institutions to release data in open formats upon request, following a procedure similar to freedom of information (FOI) requests. Subsequent to the adoption of the Law, the project conducted a series of trainings for both state institutions and local self-governments to promote the benefits of open data. This resulted in new datasets being published at the National Open Data Portal.

With regards to the development of an Open Government Partnership Action Plan the third Plan for the period 2018-2020 was adopted in December 2018. The plan includes six commitments related to open data. Based on the report from the Ministry in charge (Ministry of Public Administration and Local self-government), shared with the OGP Working group members, 4 out of 6 commitments are implemented. UNDP and the Office for IT and e-Government were included in two commitments as providers of support to the responsible institution (the Office for cooperation with the Civil Society). The evaluator was informed that project provided the content and substance for the Action Plan and provided the framework for cooperation by including and connecting civil society, the state and media.

The evaluator was informed by stakeholders that key Impact Assessment Criteria were developed and shared with the members of the Open Data Working Group. The ODWG respondents to the questionnaire confirmed their level of satisfaction with the quality of the impact assessment criteria and the utility of the criteria in their work.

In addition, the evaluator was informed that an Open Data Guide is developed and published in print and online versions at the UNDP website and the National Open Data Portal. The Guide focuses on open data in theory and practice in different areas and covers the National Open Data Portal and legislative frameworks for open data in Serbia and the EU. It also features a review of resources, actors and tools relevant for the community. A number of respondents to the questionnaire and those interviewed commented on the quality and utility of the Guide.

**Output 2:** **Relevant and high-impact data released in an open format**

This output focused on upgrading the national open data portal; supporting pilot projects and institutions with opening data; and the development of open data knowledge products and capacity development. This output also had 6 indicators, all of which were met.

The evaluator finds that the project exceeded its target related to the number of open data resources on the National Data Open Portal, which it surpassed by 851, with 1851 data resources being available as of December 2019. This marked an substantial increase from when the Open Data Portal was launched in October 2017, when there were 45 datasets published by 8 institutions. Stakeholders agreed that some of the biggest achievements in the release of the new data sets, relate to the Serbian Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)releasing 20 near-real-time datasets on air quality, water quality, pollen concentration and sources of pollution, available on the National Open Data Portal and SEPA’s open data portal ([data.sepa.gov.rs](http://data.sepa.gov.rs/)); the project supporting four cities –Nis, Kragujevac, Subotica, and Uzice –to release open data on public transport in the General Transit Feed Specification format (GTFS). The support also included enrolling the cities in the Google Transit programme, enabling citizens and tourists to access public transport data via the Google Maps app on their phones. The evaluator finds that the release of these data sets, among others has already had a significant beneficial impact on the lives of the citizens of Serbia.

In addition, the project supported the upgrading of the portal by supporting a new design, which was primarily informed by feedback from the portal users. It also met its target of conductingone in-depth sector open data readiness assessment with the Ministry of Justice, which covers the work of the commercial courts, penal courts, general jurisdiction courts and implementation of the Law on Prevention of Domestic Violence.

**Output 3 Reuse of data by both government and external stakeholders generates business opportunities, improves public service delivery and enhances government accountability**

This output aimed to support the development and incubation of data-driven solutions; provide support for data literacy; support to community building; and the organisation of national data open days. This output had 6 indicators all of which were achieved or due to be achieved by the end of the project on 31 March 2020.

The evaluator finds that key highlights related to the effectiveness of the results achieved include conducting several competitions for civil society organisations, resulting in the implementation and completion of a number of open data projects. These included a portal for data visualization ([data.odi.rs](http://data.odi.rs/)), containing visualization and analysis of Serbian organizations that participate in Horizon 2020 and national scientific projects from 2011 onwards; a website [bor.sigurnestaze.com](https://bor.sigurnestaze.com/), containing a digital model of safe pedestrian paths for pupils of elementary and high schools in the city of Bor; a mobile application “SM Alarm”, developed by APEDAS, giving notice to the citizens of Sremska Mitrovica about electricity or water shutdown (available on [Google Play Store](https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.smalarm)); a project implemented by the Edtech Centre Western Balkans resulted in 170 high school computer science teachers trained for open data, **10,000 high-school students learning about open data** in schools, and 80 open data-based infographics were developed by high-school students (three of them awarded); and a project of Palgo Smart resulted in more than 100 open datasets from 4 LSGs – Nis, Kragujevac, Sabac and Priboj and two public transport open data files (GTFS)– Nis and Kragujevac. Thus, based on data available to the evaluator, the project achieved 11 data driven solutions. However, this does not reflect the new results that were achieved during Q1 2020, and an increase in this number is anticipated.

Participants informed the evaluator that the Second National Open Data Week held in April 2019 was highly regarded, informative and beneficial for their work. The event was organised in cooperation with 21 different partners with 17 events being held across 8 cities in Serbia, gathering a total of around 600 participants.

The evaluator was informed by stakeholders that the project successfully conducted Data Innovation Challenges, which produced six of the eleven new data-driven solutions; a Data Fellows Programme” whereby three students received a data internship at the Serbian Public Health Institute and Belgrade University Library; implemented a School of Data for 24 participants in total coming from the public sector, the civil society sector, media, academia, and startups; established a partnership with the Digital Serbia Initiative aimed at supporting cities in releasing public transportation data in GTFS format; and successfully organised a number of Open Data events.

Overall, the project established many valuable partnerships both at the national and international level, including those with: Digital Serbia Initiative, Data Science Serbia, Institute for Contemporary Sciences (organizers of the Data Science Conference), R Ladies Initiative, Startit, Microsoft Serbia, Friedrich Naumann Foundation, The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Open Contracting Partnership, as well as the Open Data Institute.

**3.A.2 Project efficiency in achieving results**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that the project was implemented efficiently. A non-cost extension of 3 months resulted from favourable exchange rates and not due to project inefficiencies.**  | **Highly Satisfactory - 6** |

The project was fully funded and had an initial total budget of US$1,002,696, of which $305,340 was from the World Bank, $23,500 from UNDP Serbia, $204,660 in parallel funding from SIDA (focused on open data in public finance), $92,640 in in-kind Government contributions; $300,396 from the DFID Good Governance Fund, and $75,560 from the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub. The annual budget was sufficient to deliver the planned results and the delivery rate at the end of December was 96,36%. The project was granted a no-cost extension for the UK GGF-funded activities until 31 March 2020 to include additional funds from the UK GGF resulting from positive currency exchange rate differences, in the amount of USD 19.783,00. This resulted in a revised project budget of $1,022,489, with a final DFID GGF contribution of $320,789.

The evaluator finds that the project was implemented with maximum efficiency resulting in “low-cost: high impact” results. With a relatively small budget but a strong vision, the project was able to achieve more with the available funds. The donors who were interviewed and who participated in the questionnaire consistently commented on their high level of satisfaction with the efficiency of the project.

Based on the document review, interviews conducted and questionnaires received, the evaluator is of the opinion that the project cooperated with all other stakeholders working in the same field, for example, the World Bank, and linked with other related projects such as the UK funded Digital Transformation project, to ensure that there was no duplication and to enable complementarities.

In terms of partnerships, the evaluator finds that UNDP was successfully able to convene partners and brought together a broad range of actors and partnerships that were new to UNDP and each other, including CSOs and the tech world with government stakeholders. The project was intentionally designed as a platform for a wide stakeholder community engagement, which brought together state institutions and a wide variety of partners. As one stakeholder commented, UNDP was able to utilise partnerships and expertise that were already embedded in structures without requiring heavy investment in additional expertise.

The project created a community of users, which included a number of CSOs and presented new types of partners for UNDP, including the tech community, as well as more traditional state institutions. UNDP adopted a coordination role and a holistic approach, through which it was able to articulate and widen the topics being discussed while engaging with both the supply and demand sides as well as the middle partners.

**3.A.3 Project relevance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that the project was highly relevant in the current Serbian context.**  | **Highly Satisfactory - 6** |

The evaluator finds that the project was aligned with the national strategic and policy framework, in particular the Strategy for e-Governance Development in the Republic of Serbia (2015-2018) and the subsequent e-Government Development Programme (2019-2021). The project was also relevant to sector strategic and policy frameworks including the Strategy on Development of the Justice Sector (2019-2024), the Strategy for Development of Public Procurements (open contracting) and the Serbian Action Plan for the Open Government Partnership Initiative (2018-2020).

During the project’s lifespan, open data was put high on the government’s agenda, supported directly from the Cabinet of the Prime Minister. The evaluator notes that the Prime Minister has been a keen driver of open data and a key facilitating factor in the achievement of the project’s objectives. She has frequently emphasized that digitalisation is one of the main priorities of the Government, primarily in the areas of public administration, economy and education.

As one stakeholder commented, the National priority of every country is to have efficient public administration in which citizens can trust. In order to make public administration more transparent and efficient, institutions need to cooperate and open their data, which can provide better services to citizens and to reduce space for corruption. This project accelerated reaching that national goal. Other than that, the constitutional right of Serbian citizens is to have accurate, timely and reliable data on environmental quality. This project also contributed to that. The project has provided members of open data communities with enough data so they could make valuable and relevant analysis and visualisation that helps the national priorities that are connected to better transparency and openness of data that is relevant for general public. Project contributed to implementation of the Public Administration Reform Strategy of the Republic of Serbia by opening of the data owned by public institutions and enabling improved public services for citizens and others.

More broadly, the evaluator finds that the project was grounded in the UNDP Strategic Plan, the global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Data Revolution Report and UNDP’s on-going work in Serbia in response to national and regional challenges. In particular, the evaluator finds that the project contributed to SDG 16 *Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels*, and its target 16.10 *Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements*. The project also contributed to the achievement of the UNDAF Outcome *By 2020, governance institutions at all levels have enhanced accountability and representation to provide better quality services to the people and the economy*.

**B. Sustainability (Likely (4) to unlikely (1))**

**3.B.4 Sustainability of results**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that the results that have been achieved are likely to be sustainable.**  | **Very Likely – 4**  |

With regards to the sustainability of the project results, the evaluator finds significant sustainability elements. For example, the staff of the Office for IT and e-Government have migrated the National Open Data Portal to their infrastructure and implemented localization for the Serbian language. While they continued to receive technical support and mentoring from the UNDP Techcell unit, the Portal is now fully hosted by the Government and institutional ownership is secured.

The evaluator finds that open data has been successfully included into the legislative and policy framework both at the national level and within specific sectors and the project has successfully strengthened the enabling environment for increasing access to and availability of open data. Many organizations of civil society have recognized the importance of open data. They have increased capacity to collaborate in this area. In the future, they will have better proposals and impact will be more likely.

**3.B.5 Sustainability within the socio-political setting**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that sustainability within the socio-political context is less certain due to the potential change in government and the continued low level of awareness among both institutions and the public.**  | **Somewhat likely – 2**  |

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, one of the key facilitating factors for the project was the strong buy-in from the Prime Minister and the commitment of the current Government in terms of e-governance and open data. Parliamentary elections in Serbia were slated for April 2020, however these have been postponed until after the current state of emergency. It could reasonably be anticipated that elections will be held within the next 6-12 months, which could lead to a change in Government. This poses the risk of a turnover in government and institutional personnel, who may either not be aware of the potentials of open data or may simply not be interested in pursuing this agenda.

Furthermore, the evaluator finds that one of the key constraints within the project is the low level of knowledge regarding open data among both the relevant institutions and stakeholders, as well as among the general public. Without an increased demand for open data, data stewards are less likely to release new open data sets and the project’s interventions could stall, thus impacting the sustainability of the project interventions.

**3.B.6 Sustainability of institutional framework and governance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that sustainability of the institutional framework and governance has gained some traction, however it is too early to assess the long-term sustainability aspects in this context.**  | **Somewhat likely – 2**  |

The evaluator finds that institutional ownership has been secured in the Office for IT and e-Government, which is fully capacitated for the coordination of the ODWG, fully capacitated for the National Open Data Portal management, and fully capacitated for sustaining the open data policy in government. The project has conducted significant capacity building activities, in particular with regards to the Open Data Working Group. In addition to expanding its membership, the ODWG holds regular meetings, including an annual retreat. The project also conducted numerous trainings and workshops for government agencies, CSOs, media, private sector and entrepreneurs delivered. Interviewees and questionnaire respondents regarded capacity development as a key area where the project had achieved significant results.

Open data is still a relatively new and innovative concept for most institutions in Serbia and personnel turnover always remains one of the constraining factors in terms of sustainability. Additionally, there are still institutions with a low level of interest and understanding of open data, although once exposed to the benefits of open data, institutions tend to demonstrate greater interest and support for the initiative. Further, the parliamentary elections could also impact on the sustainability of the institutional framework and governance. Some of the stakeholders interviewed and those that responded to the questionnaire commented about concerns regarding competing priorities, especially given the current context. While they believe that sustainability has been ensured on the supply side with the current Government of Serbia committed to taking open data further, they are less certain about sustainability on the demand side once donor funding has ended.

The Action Plan for e-governance envisages the systematisation of IT positions in the official system of government together with the requisite budget requirements. However, at present there are no budget allocations for these position and they still need to be systematised. This situation could also impact on the long-term sustainability of the project’s interventions.

**C. Monitoring and evaluation (Highly satisfactory (6) to highly unsatisfactory (1))**

**3.C.1 Project M&E design at entry**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that the project document contained a solid monitoring and evaluation framework.**  | **Satisfactory – 5** |

Based on the document review and interviews with key project staff, Project Board members and UNDP, the evaluator finds that the project design incorporated a comprehensive M&E plan. This included tracking results progress on a quarterly basis; monitoring and managing risks on a quarterly basis; learning, on an annual basis; annual project quality assurance; annually reviewing and making course corrections; annual project reports; and annual project reviews by the project board.

The evaluator notes that the system of indicators developed in the project document, which were used to track progress were exclusively quantitative indicators at the output/activity level. This means that results are measured against the achievement of activities and that the indicators were unable to capture any progress that the project made towards the outcome and impact. The lack of qualitative indicators excludes the possibility to measure any changes in attitude or perceptions or capture the voices of people.

**3.C.2 M&E plan implementation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that the M&E systems utilised were able to ensure effective and efficient project management.**  | **Satisfactory – 5** |

The project document envisaged the developed of a comprehensive M&E plan that would be followed throughout the project implementation period. While this did not materialise as such, significant data was collected by the project, and two additional columns were added to the results framework, stipulating who would collect data and when. The evaluator finds that both the project document and its M&E plan and RRF were well drafted with logical and inter-connected outputs. Progress reports were well developed and submitted in a timely fashion, on a quarterly basis, which was more frequent than envisaged in the project document, with lessons learned and risks tracked on a semi-annual basis.

They included lessons learned as well as updated risks and challenges and mitigation efforts. They were informative and included significant data as to the project implementation and results achieved. Furthermore, the role of the project board in overseeing the project was successful.

Monitoring of the project was implemented through the following mechanisms:

1. *Monitoring of indicators in the results framework*

Indicators from the results framework were monitored regularly, noted in the quarterly reports, and discussed with the Project Board members quarterly. The Project Manager assessed the progress against indicators. During the project period, the Project Manager informed the Project Board that one of the indicators[[1]](#footnote-1) would not be achieved and proposed budget revision, which was approved by the Project Board members. All the other indicators are achieved.

1. *Monitoring of the risks*

The risk was monitored regularly, and noted in semi-annual reports, together with the mitigation strategy for each risk. Recognized potential risks didn’t influence the project implementation, the project is finished smoothly in the agreed timeline with the donor (extension until 31st March approved by the donor), and the agreed outputs are achieved.

1. *Capturing of lessons learned*

The Project Manager captured lessons learned on a semi-annual basis in the project reports. All the lessons learned are input for the new project proposal currently being developed for the next cycle of the open data initiative in Serbia. The project improved and scaled many activities during the project implementation based on the previous lessons learned.

1. *Quality assurance*

The quality of the project was assured through regular monitoring and consultations with the senior management of the Competitiveness and Digital Governance portfolio and the Good Governance cluster. The management attended the most important events, followed many core activities attended Project Board meetings where core decisions are being made. Also, the quality of the project has been assessed initially and once again in Q1 2020, against UNDP’s quality standards to identify project strengths and weaknesses.

1. *Project Board*

Project Board held regular meetings, on a quarterly level, and reviewed the latest reports and results against indicators. Core decisions are made in consultations with the Project Board members, and the most important documentation was approved on the Project Board meetings (Grant implementers, Data Innovation Award winners, Annual Work Plan, Budget revisions, etc.). Also, the last meeting held in February 2020 was used to discuss opportunities for scaling up and development of the next phase of the project.

**D. Implementation (Highly satisfactory (6) to highly unsatisfactory (1))**

**3.D.1 Quality of UNDP project implementation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that the quality of UNDP project implementation was highly satisfactory.**  | **Highly satisfactory – 6** |

The evaluator finds that the project was innovative and catalytic and ahead of the curve in terms of the impact achieved as a result of the high quality project implementation. For example, the evaluator was informed that Data Innovation Challenges provided the first opportunity for institutions to organise such events and seek out data-driven solutions from the community of users. Having in mind that Serbian institutions did not previously have the opportunity to organize similar activities, this was new and innovative by nature. Many of the supported projects introduced innovative approaches to familiar issues, such as air pollution and the "citizens' science" concept. For example, the project implemented by the Belgrade Open School, Internet Society of Serbia and All things talk, uses Internet of Things technology and open data to engage the citizens in burning issues in our society, creating value data in addition to the official data produced by the Serbian Environmental Protection Agency. Project board members and donors informed the evaluator that the biggest achievements were in terms of open data being released with respect to air pollution and the transport networks.

**3.D.2 Inclusion of relevant cross-cutting issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that the project satisfactorily addressed aspects related to gender, environmental standards and human rights.** | **4 – Satisfactory**  |

The evaluator finds that while the project was not focused on human development issues *per se*, it did address gender, environmental standards and human rights, as well as the core principles of good governance. The project promoted the relevance of open data in its direct connection with the fundamental principles of democracy.

The evaluator finds that while gender concerns were not a focus of the project, the needs of both women and men were taken into consideration when modelling new approaches and developing tools. To the extent that project activities led to new data collection or reforms in data processing in institutions, the availability of gender-disaggregated data was prioritized, however stakeholders informed that this was an area which could be further strengthened.

The evaluator finds that the project sought to ensure equal participation of men and women in project interventions. Activities organized during the project implantation period gathered both male and female participants. The total number of participants at all public events organised through the project was 1445 participants attended all events, with 55% of male participants and 45% of female participants. In the scope of the support provided for releasing open data by the Ministry of Justice, the project conducted analysis on opening data related to monitoring the implementation of the Law on Domestic Violence Prevention.

The evaluator finds that project incorporated a human rights based approach through working on top down, middle out and bottom-up solutions. The beneficiaries of the project were all citizens of Serbia, without specific geographical or social group restrictions. However, as the vulnerable groups, poor and youth, predominantly rely on quality and accessibility of public services, which have the potential to become more accountable and transparent through the publishing of open data, the benefits of the project may have a greater effect on these groups, although the impact on such groups was not monitored by the project or assessed by the evaluator.

**4. Findings and Recommendations**

**4.1 Findings**

**4.1.1 Low-cost: high impact**

The evaluator finds that the project was able to do more with less. This was confirmed by all donors, who expressed their satisfaction as to the amount the project achieved in relation to the amount of funds invested. The value for money coefficient was high. The project cast a wide net and worked with many new partners in order to work with what already existed and what was possible in the given context in Serbia. The project created new knowledge through opening access to new data, which will be a key resource for the future development of Serbia, across all sectors.

**4.1.2 Innovative and catalytic**

The evaluator finds that the project was innovative in its approach and achieved some catalytic results. The project was ahead of its time and UNDP was able to drive the discussion and open it up to new partners and stakeholders. A key facilitating factor was the buy-in of the Prime Minister, herself a keen believer in the value of open data, however, the evaluator finds that even without this support, or if the Prime Minister changes during the second phase of the project, UNDP has already started the dialogue and the government has already committed to furthering the availability of open data, so this process is unlikely to stop, even if it is slowed down.

**4.1.3 Partnerships**

The evaluator finds that the project and UNDP were able to initiate a wide range of partnerships through introducing broad categories of stakeholders to each other. Key to this was building trust between government and civil society through joint experiences, competitions and increasing knowledge. This is particularly important in Serbia, where there is diminishing capacities within the public sector, in particular with regards to identifying and publishing open data, which can be bolstered through partnerships with civil society, academia and the tech community. As one stakeholder mentioned, through the project, there are many people in government, public institutions and local self-governance who have realised how much people from civil society can help them. UNDP was perceived as an excellent mediator in this process, which has led to increased trust and better communication between the public institutions and civil society, media and the tech community.

**4.1.4 Tangible results**

The evaluator finds that one of the key successes of the project was the tangible impact that some of the results have had on the every day lives of citizens, in particular the examples mentioned elsewhere in the report of open data related to air pollution levels and transport data. Citizens are coming to rely more and more on the accessibility of open data and as awareness rises as to its utility, so should the demand for even more data. Increased open data will enable citizens of Serbia to demand greater transparency and a higher level of consumption of democratic freedoms, social and environmental education, as well as opportunities for the development of innovation and entrepreneurship.

**4.1.5 National ownership**

The evaluator finds that there is a high degree of national ownership with regards to the project activities, and in particular this is evidenced through the expansion and capacity building of the Open Data Working Group. The ODWG is now coordinated by the Office for IT and e-Government and is fully functional, with an ever-expanding membership. In addition, national ownership of the National Open Data Portal has been secured by the staff of the Office for IT and e-Government having migrated the National Open Data Portal to their infrastructure and implemented localization for the Serbian language. All stakeholders interviewed and respondents to the questionnaire reflected on the success of the ODWG. The evaluator notes that it is difficult to capture the full range of results related to national ownership and other key areas, due to the exclusively quantitative nature of the indicators included in the RRF.

**4.2 Recommendations**

**4.2.1 Incubating and seeding**

In the first phase of the project the approach taken was to try to work with what already existed while increasing capacities, knowledge and demand on both the supply and demand sides. During the second phase of the project, the evaluator recommends that the project should be looking more at incubating and seeding. This means that the project is investing resources in multiple, concurrent small level pilots that may be based on successful approaches from within Serbia, or from external sources with similar contexts, and then to see which are able to be adapted to work in Serbia and within its political system. For this, the project could work closely with the UNDP Accelerator Lab.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**4.2.2 Continue to identify innovative and catalytic interventions**

The project should continue its approach of identifying innovative and catalytic interventions. Indirectly, the project contributed to other priorities related to the innovation infrastructure and human capital by supporting transparent and digital governance and by assisting relevant national bodies in the data opening process. The evaluator recommends that this should be continued. UNDP should play a more strategic approach (as discussed below) to further guide the process. Institutions are quite slow in opening their data and this could be improved, for example, by signing an MOU between UNDP and the Government of Serbia that could be used by civil society when approaching institutions. The entire partnership building process should be more closely monitored and mentored by UNDP during the second phase of the project.

**4.2.3 Further expansion of partnership base**

The evaluator recommends that the partnership base should be continually expanded, but that in the second phase of the project implementation, the project should find a balance between the local and central level. While the local level tends to be more responsive to opening data and is often able to respond in a more timely and efficient manner, the project should not overlook the importance of the central level institutions, and this should be better balanced by the project. An additional focus during the second phase should also be to engage more with academia and in particular research and development units, which although intended during the first phase, did not particularly materialise.

**4.2.4 Increase demand on both supply and demand side**

The project should continue to increase demand for open data through raising awareness and visibility and to generate a bottom-up demand for more data. There should be a more strategic focus on high value data and the project should work on both sides of the human development paradigm to aim for a greater release of high value data. In order to do this, the project should develop criteria for the identification and selection of data that needs to be open and that which would have the greatest impact in different sectors. The second phase of the project could also identify new ways of involving even more citizens in the activities so they can directly participate either in collecting or operating with open data.During the first phase, the data that was opened had a bigger impact on society and the environment than on the economy. In the future, data that is open could have more influence on the economy. The possibility of developing user applications on an increasing number of open data sets will enable citizens to be better informed for different needs. Thus it is recommended that UNDP consider the following for the second phase:

* Better communication with all stakeholders (public sector, academia, civil society, companies, citizens, IT) in order to define the necessary data sets to be opened based on objective criteria as mentioned above - organizing focus groups, conducting research, etc.;
* Define an Advisory Board of the project, which should consist of a maximum of 10 persons with expertise in one of the open data fields (representatives of state bodies, academia, civil society, IT community) to steer and guide the process in a more strategic manner;
* Monitoring and reporting regularly on the use of open data sets available on the National Portal.

**4.2.5 Indicators to capture behavioural change**

As noted by the evaluator above, the first phase of the project relied on measuring success against quantitative indicators at the output/activity level, which did not sufficiently capture behavioural change. A greater use of qualitative indicators that measure perceptions and behaviours at the outcome level, as opposed to quantitative indicators that measure activities at the output level, will likely better capture project progress and results, as well as contributions towards the outcomes and impact. These will also allow for capturing the voices of people, which cannot be captured through quantitative indicators, and behavioural changes among institutions and the public related to the release and usage of open data.

**ANNEX 1 Evaluation Matri****x**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria/Sub-criteria**  | **Questions to be addressed by evaluation**  | **What to look for**  | **Data sources**  | **Data collection methods**  |
| **Relevance** | To what extent were the objectives of the project consistent with the national priorities of Serbia with the needs and interests of citizens? | Alignment with national strategies/policiesDegree of participatory consultation in design stageThe level of acceptance for and support to the Project by relevant stakeholders? | \*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans\*EU Acquis\*UN/DP Strategic Documents\*Open Data Project Document\*Open Data Progress Reports\*Open Data Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports\*Responsible partners’ progress reports \*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviewsFocus group discussions  |
| What is the degree to which the project activities were overlapping with and/or complementing other interventions in the domain? | Other initiatives and projects in the fieldDonor complementarity and overlap |
| To what extent was the project appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in Serbia throughout the project period?  | Degree of context analysis in design stage and throughout projectDesign and implementation of M&E frameworkIdentification of risks and update of risk log throughout project  |
| **Effectiveness**  | To what extent did the Project contribute to the attainment of outputs and outcomes initially expected in project Document? | The direct and indirect results (at outcome and impact level) of the project implementation and their sustainabilityLevel of progress against indicators | \*Open Data Project Document and RRF \*Open Data Progress Reports\*Open Data Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports\*Responsible partners’ progress reports \*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviewsFocus group discussions Observation visits |
| To what extent were the Project’s outputs and outcomes synergetic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached? | Expected and unexpected results of the project – any additional results achieved or any results not met – why/why not?In what way have the project activities contributed to achievement of the outcomes? |
| What were the constraining and facilitating factors and the influence of the context on the achievement of results? | Was the project modified during the course of the implementation – why?In what way did the Project come up with innovative measures for problem solving?What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples were identified? |
| **Efficiency**  | Were the implementation modalities appropriate and cost-effective?  | Were project resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to provide significant results?Was the project implemented within deadline and cost estimates?Were the resources allocated sufficient/too much? | \*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans\*EU Acquis\*UN/DP Strategic Documents\*Open Data Project Document\*Open Data Progress Reports\*Open Data Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports\*Responsible partners’ progress reports \*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviewsFocus group discussions Observation visits |
| Did the staffing structure and management arrangements ensure cost-efficiency, value-for-money, and effectiveness of implementation strategies and overall delivery of results? | Was the project fully staffed and were the staffing/management arrangements efficient?Were procurements processed in a timely manner? |
| Was there good coordination and communication between partners in the project? | Did UNDP choose the best implementing partners? Were there any institutions that should have been included in the project but weren’t?How often did the project board meet? Were there any issues raised regarding implementation? If so, how and to what extent were these addressed by UNDP?Did UNDP and its partners solve any implementation issues promptly? |
| **Sustainability**  | Was the Project supported by national institutions? | What is the level of national ownership of the project interventions? Did the project provide for the handover of any activities? | \*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans\*EU Acquis\*UN/DP Strategic Documents\*Open Data Project Document\*Open Data Progress Reports\*Open Data Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports\*Responsible partners’ progress reports \*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviewsFocus group discussions Observation visits |
| Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the Project? | Did the project manage to procure Gov. co-financing for any of the deliverables?Were initiatives designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks? |
| Did Project design take into account strategies to ensure sustainability? Were strategies used in from the beginning of Project implementation? Was there an adequate strategy for capacity building?  | Was there an exit strategy for the Project? Did it take into account political, financial, technical and environmental factors?How did UNDP address the challenge of building national capacities? What are the perceived capacities of the relevant institutions for taking the initiatives forward? |
| **PROMOTION OF UN VALUES FROM A HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE** |
| **Criteria/Sub-criteria**  | **Questions to be addressed by evaluation**  | **What to look for**  | **Data sources**  | **Data collection methods**  |
| **Supporting policy dialogue on human development issues**  | To what extent does the project contribute to human development?  | Did the project address inequalities in opportunities and outcomes | \*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans\*EU Acquis\*UN/DP Strategic Documents\*Open Data Project Document\*Open Data Progress Reports\*Open Data Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports\*Responsible partners’ progress reports \*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviewsFocus group discussions Observation visits |
| How did the project address the human development needs of intended beneficiaries? | Did the project expand citizen’s opportunities and choice?Did the project increase citizen’s access to quality services? |
| To what extent did the project mainstream a human rights based approach?  | Did the project include interventions that addressed top down and bottom up approaches?Were activities sufficiently balanced between raising capacities of service providers and awareness of rights holders? |
| **Contribution to gender equality**  | How well were gender aspects taken into account into project design and concretely and effectively implemented? | Were the needs of both men and women taken into consideration in the project design and project implementation?Did the project ensure equal participation of men and women in the project activities – how?Did the project disaggregate all data by gender? | \*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans\*EU Acquis\*UN/DP Strategic Documents\*Open Data Project Document\*Open Data Progress Reports\*Open Data Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports\*Responsible partners’ progress reports \*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviewsFocus group discussions Observation visits |
| **Addressing equity issues (social inclusion)**  | How did the project address the need to “leave no one behind” and advance the 2030 Agenda? | Were the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups addressed in the project? If so, how? | \*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans\*EU Acquis\*UN/DP Strategic Documents\*Open Data Project Document\*Open Data Progress Reports\*Open Data Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports\*Responsible partners’ progress reports \*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviewsFocus group discussions Observation visits |
| How did the project contribute to social inclusion of marginalized groups | Did the project ensure participation of marginalized and vulnerable groups in the project implementation?How do the project results benefit vulnerable and marginalized groups? |

**ANNEX 2 – QUESTIONNAIRES**



**OPEN DATA- OPEN OPPORTUNITIES**

**PROJECT EVALUATION**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT BOARD MEMBERS**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

In order to assist the evaluation, please complete all answers in English.

**All participants** – please complete sections A and B

**If you are a donor** – please also complete section C

If you would like to discuss further or have any additional comments or suggestions, please contact Olivera Puric via:

Email: puriceva10@gmail.com

Tel: +381 (0) 63 439 403

**A.  PROFILE**

**1. What is your professional position?**

**2. For how long have you been a Project Board member for the Open Data – Open Opportunities project?**

1. 0-1 years
2. 1-2 years
3. 2-3 years
4. 3+ years

**B. FUNCIONING OF THE PROJECT BOARD**

**3. How do you rate the functioning of the Project Board?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**4. Are all relevant stakeholders represented in the Project Board?**

 Yes/No

If no, please provide details of which stakeholder you feel should be included

**5. Are the meetings held on an adequate basis?**

Yes/No

If no – do you think the meetings to be held more or less frequently?

**6. How frequently has the Project Board been asked by the project management to conduct a project review?**

Please explain the outcome(s)

**7. How frequently has the Project Board been asked by the project management to consider project plans and revisions?**

Please explain the outcome(s)

**8. How do you rate cooperation between the project management and the Project Board?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**9. How do you rate communication between the project management and the Project Board?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**10. How familiar are you with UNDP rules and procedures?** *(1=very familiar, 2=familiar, 3=neutral, 4=unfamiliar, 5=very unfamiliar)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**11. Are the Project Board meetings well prepared?**

Yes/No

If no – what could be done to improve the preparation?

**13. Is relevant information shared with you in a timely manner?**

 Yes/No

If no – please explain

**14. Do you receive all financial data in a timely manner?**

Yes/No

If no – please explain

**15. Do you have any other comments/suggestions for improving the functioning of the Project Board – please explain**

**C. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR PROJECT DONORS ONLY**

**16. To what extent were the objectives of the project consistent with the national priorities of Serbia with the needs and interests of citizens?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

*Please elaborate*

**17. What is the degree to which the project activities were overlapping with and/or complementing other interventions in the domain?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

*Please elaborate*

**18. To what extent was the project appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in Serbia throughout the project period?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

*Please elaborate*

**19. To what extent did the Project contribute to the attainment of outputs and outcomes initially expected in Project Document?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

*Please elaborate*

**20. To what extent were the Project’s outputs and outcomes synergetic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

*Please elaborate*

**21. What were the constraining and facilitating factors and the influence of the context on the achievement of results?**

*Please elaborate*

**22. Were the implementation modalities appropriate and cost-effective?**

Yes/No

*Please elaborate*

**23. Did the staffing structure and management arrangements ensure cost-efficiency, value-for-money, and effectiveness of implementation strategies and overall delivery of results?**

Yes/No

*Please elaborate*

**24. Was there good coordination and communication between partners in the project?**

Yes/No

*Please elaborate*

**25. Was the Project supported by national institutions?**

 Yes/No

*Please elaborate*

**26. Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the Project?**

Yes/No

*Please elaborate*

**27. Did Project design take into account strategies to ensure sustainability from the beginning of Project implementation?**

Yes/No

*Please elaborate*

**28. Was there an adequate strategy for capacity building?**

Yes/No

*Please elaborate*

**29. To what extent does the project contribute to human development?**

*Please elaborate*

**30. How did the project address the human development needs of intended beneficiaries?**

*Please elaborate*

**31. To what extent did the project mainstream a human rights based approach?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

*Please elaborate*

**32. How well were gender aspects taken into account into project design and concretely and effectively implemented?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

*Please elaborate*

**33. How did the project address the need to “leave no one behind” and advance the 2030 Agenda?**

*Please elaborate*

**34. How did the project contribute to social inclusion of marginalized groups?**

*Please elaborate*

**Thank-you for your participation!**

****

**OPEN DATA- OPEN OPPORTUNITIES**

**PROJECT EVALUATION**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT PARTNERS**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

In order to assist the evaluation, please complete all answers in English. If you are unable to complete the answers fully in English, please use Serbian.

**ALL PARTICIPANTS** – please complete sections A, B and H

**PUBLIC SECTOR INSTITUTIONS** – please also complete section C

**CIVIL SOCIETY, MEDIA, TECHNOLOGY COMMUNITY** – please also complete section D

**ACADEMIA** – please also complete section E

**BUSINESS AND STARTUPS** – please also complete section G

If you would like to discuss further or have any additional comments or suggestions, please contact **Olivera Puric** via:

**Email**: puriceva10@gmail.com

**Tel**: +381 (0) 63 439 403

**A.  PROFILE**

**1. Which institution/organisation do you work for and what is your position?**

**2. How long have you been working for this institution/organisation?**

1. 0-1 years
2. 1-2 years
3. 2-3 years
4. 3+ years

**B. ALL PARTNERS**

**3. How would rate the relevance of the project to the national priorities of the Republic of Serbia?** (1=highly relevant, 2=relevant, 3=neutral, 4= not very relevant, 5=irrelevant)

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**4. How would you rate the relevance of the project to the priorities of your institution / organization?** (1=highly relevant, 2=relevant, 3=neutral, 4= not very relevant, 5=irrelevant)

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**5. In what ways has the project contributed to the national priorities of the Republic of Serbia? Please explain:**

**6. In what ways has the project contributed to the achievement of the goals of your institution / organization and your day-to-day work? Please explain:**

**7. How would you rate your communication and collaboration with UNDP and the project team?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**8. Was the project inclusive of all relevant partners? (public institutions, media, civil society, tech community, business community, startups, etc.)**

Yes/No

If no, please explain:

**9. How would you rate the visibility and communication of the project?** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

Please explain your rating:

**10. In your opinion, what were the most significant results of the project?**

**11. In your opinion, what impact has the project had on citizens' lives in Serbia?**

**12. In your opinion, what impact has the project had on the economy?**

**13. In what ways are the activities of the project sustainable in the future? How could this be improved? Please explain.**

**14. What could be done to improve the project in the second phase? Were there any gaps? - Please explain.**

**C. QUESTIONS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR INSTITUTIONS**

**15. How has the project contributed to the creation of the institution's internal policy on open data / open administration? – Please explain.**

**16. How is your institution using its own open data and open data of other institutions? – Please explain.**

**17. What changes have there been in the number of requests for access to information of public importance (given the data that were opened during the project)? - Please explain.**

**18. Did the project contribute to increasing the quality of data?**

 Yes/No

Please explain:

**19. Please describe the level of interaction of your institution with other relevant actors within the open data ecosystem.**

**D. QUESTIONS FOR CIVIL SOCIETY, MEDIA AND THE TECHNOLOGY COMMUNITY**

**20. What is the level and nature of the interaction between your organization and institutions that publish open data? Please explain.**

**21. How many activities within your organisation either directly or indirectly involve open data? (e.g. event visitors, training participants, project activities) Please explain.**

**22. How many open data events has your organisation organised in the last 2 years wholly or partly dedicated to the topic?**

**23. Please provide details of the number and diversity of open data events organised by UNDP and the project in the last 2 years that you have visited. Please also provide your general impression of the visited events.**

**I have visited the following numbers of events:**

1. **1-2**
2. **2-4**
3. **4-6**
4. **6-8**
5. **8-10**
6. **More than 10**

**Please describe the diversity of visited events (in terms of the structure, participants, speakers, content, and similar):**

**Please rate your general experience with visited events:** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**24.** **Please provide details of the number and diversity of open data events NOT organised by UNDP and the project in the last 2 years that you have visited. Please also provide your general impression of the visited events.**

**I have visited the following numbers of events:**

1. **1-2**
2. **2-4**
3. **4-6**
4. **6-8**
5. **8-10**
6. **More than 10**

**Please describe who the event was organized by, the diversity of visited events (in terms of the structure, participants, speakers, content, and similar):**

**Please rate your general experience with visited events:** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**E. QUESTIONS FOR ACADEMIA**

**25. Please describe the presence and use of open data in academia.**

**26. In your opinion what is the potential of open data for the academic sector? – Please explain.**

**27. Please provide details of the number and diversity of open data events organised by UNDP and the project in the last 2 years that you have visited. Please also provide your general impression of the visited events.**

**I have visited the following numbers of events:**

1. **1-2**
2. **2-4**
3. **4-6**
4. **6-8**
5. **8-10**
6. **More than 10**

**Please describe the diversity of visited events (in terms of the structure, participants, speakers, content, and similar):**

**Please rate your general experience with visited events:** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**F. QUESTIONS FOR BUSINESS AND STARTUPS**

**28. Please describe the number of products / projects developed by your organisation that use open data.**

**29. What is the impact of open data on new private sector jobs / opportunities for new products? – Please explain.**

**30. What is the level and nature of the interaction between your organization and institutions that publish open data? Please explain:**

**31. Please provide details of the number and diversity of open data events organised by UNDP and the project in the last 2 years that you have visited. Please also provide your general impression of the visited events.**

**I have visited the following numbers of events:**

1. **1-2**
2. **2-4**
3. **4-6**
4. **6-8**
5. **8-10**
6. **More than 10**

**Please describe the diversity of visited events (in terms of the structure, participants, speakers, content, and similar):**

**Please rate your general experience with visited events:** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**32. Please provide details of the number and diversity of open data events NOT organised by UNDP and the project in the last 2 years that you have visited. Please also provide your general impression of the visited events.**

**I have visited the following numbers of events:**

1. **1-2**
2. **2-4**
3. **4-6**
4. **6-8**
5. **8-10**
6. **More than 10**

**Please describe who organized the event, the diversity of visited events (in terms of the structure, participants, speakers, content, and similar):**

**Please rate your general experience with visited events:** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**G. QUESTIONS FOR EXPERTS/ACTIVISTS**

**33. What is the level and nature of the interaction between your organization and institutions that publish open data? Please explain.**

**34. In your opinion what is the potential created by the project (economic growth, improving the effectiveness of public administration, increasing transparency, etc.)? Please explain.**

**35. Please provide details of the number and diversity of open data events organised by UNDP and the project in the last 2 years that you have visited. Please also provide your general impression of the visited events.**

**I have visited the following numbers of events:**

1. **1-2**
2. **2-4**
3. **4-6**
4. **6-8**
5. **8-10**
6. **More than 10**

**Please describe the diversity of visited events (in terms of the structure, participants, speakers, content, and similar):**

**Please rate your general experience with visited events:** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**36.** **Please provide details of the number and diversity of open data events NOT organised by UNDP and the project in the last 2 years that you have visited. Please also provide your general impression of the visited events.**

**I have visited the following numbers of events:**

1. **1-2**
2. **2-4**
3. **4-6**
4. **6-8**
5. **8-10**
6. **More than 10**

**Please describe who organized the event, the diversity of visited events (in terms of the structure, participants, speakers, content, and similar):**

**Please rate your general experience with visited events:** *(1=very good, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=poor, 5=very poor)*

If 4 or 5, please explain the reasons why:

**SECTION H – ALL PARTICIPANTS**

**37. Please provide any other comments, suggestions or feedback that has not been covered above.**

**ANNEX 3 - LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED**

* **Nataša Radović, British Embassy Belgrade Good Governance Programme Manager**
* **Daniel Varga, UNDP Programme Analyst - Assurance, M&E and Reporting**
* **Željka Topalović, UNDP Programme Analyst, Good Governance**
* **Jelena Marinković Macura, UNDP Programme Associate, Good Governance**

**Sanja Arizanović, UNDP Project Coordinator**

* **Irena Cerović, UNDP Head of Solutions Mapping, Accelerator Lab**
* **Katarina Kosmina, UNDP Junior Project Coordinator**
* **Jelena Ružičić, UNDP Portfolio Manager, Competitiveness and Digital Governance**
* **Slobodan Marković, UNDP Technical Advisor -Digital Governance**
* **Dragana Bečić, Office for Information Technologies and eGovernment**
* **Assistant Director (a.i.)**
* **Marija Kujačić, Office for Information Technologies and eGovernment**
* **Senior Advisor**

1. 2 feasibility studies completed for opening high impact data [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See, for example, UNDP Accelerator Labs: <https://acceleratorlabs.undp.org/#why> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)