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**List of used abbreviations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Artificial intelligence** | **AI** |
| **Civil Society Organisation** | **CSO** |
| **Country Programme Document** | **CPD** |
| **European Union** | **EU** |
| **Geographic information system** | **GIS** |
| **Information technology** | **IT** |
| **Monitoring and evaluation** | **M&E** |
| **Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution** | **LRTAP** |
| **Local Self Government** | **LSG** |
| **Office for IT and e-Government** | **ITE** |
| **Sustainable Development Goals** | **SDGs** |
| **Serbian Environmental Protection Agency** | **SEPA** |
| **Open Data Working Group** | **ODWG** |
| **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Development Assistance Committee**  | **OECD/DAC** |
| **Terms of Reference** | **ToR** |
| **United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change** | **UNFCCC** |
| **United Nations Evaluation Group** | **UNEG** |
| **United Nations Development Programme** | **UNDP** |

**Executive summary**

Overall, the Open Data for Sustainable Development project is a partner that is highly in demand, mastering the promotion and usage of open data. It has showcased its value proposition to all relevant partners, both with the representatives of the Government and local self-governments, as well as with the civil society, setting high standards for taking action and engagement with open data planning and implementation processes. The evaluator is not recommending any major course corrections, but only some additional push and focus that will help steer the project going into the next programmatic phase.

The evaluator finds that in a nutshell the project has continued to foster greater transparency and use of Open Data in Serbia. Particular successes include the release of environmental and budgetary open data, where the latter has already showed some spillover effect. The project successfully established the Open Data Hub as a consultative and knowledge sharing platform with a continuously increasing number of users, both on the side of data providers and data users.

The evaluator finds that the project was highly relevant in the Serbian context, with Open Data continuing to be high on the government’s agenda, with a growing demand on the side of the general public in the context of Covid-19 pandemic. The relevance of the project is reflected in the national strategic and policy framework. Further, the project contributed to the Sustainable Development goals as well as the 2030 Agenda. The project was implemented efficiently and effectively and has achieved a strong foundation for sustainability, through targeted capacity building activities and strong national ownership.

This evaluation is an external, independent final evaluation of the Open Data for Sustainable Development Project (23 July 2021 – 31 March 2022). The evaluation was commissioned by the Project and covers the entire implementation period from 23 July 2021 – 31 March 2022.

The objective of the evaluation is to assess if and how project outcomes are achieved, the efficiency with which outputs are achieved and contribute to outcomes achievement, 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 should assess what works and why, highlight intended and unintended results, and provide strategic lessons to guide decision-makers and inform stakeholders.

The evaluation was based on data available at the time of the evaluation, including project documents and other relevant reports, as well as on 10 stakeholder consultations with 7 women and 8 men, conducted over a period of one month. The primary audience for the evaluation is the Project itself and UNDP, its donor and development partners. The methodology used a mixed-methods approach but was essentially qualitative.

The evaluator was asked to rate the Project in accordance with the rating scale as stipulated in the Terms of Reference. This is summarized below and a more detailed narrative is provided in Chapter 6.

Overall, the evaluator finds that the project was highly successful

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 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) | 3/4 |
| 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) | 3/4 |
| Overall Likelihood of sustainability | **Averaged from above** | **13.3/20%** |
|  |  |  |
| 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** | **16.7/20%** |
|  |  |  |
| 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) | 5/6 |
| **Overall Implementation rating** |  | **27.5/30%** |
|  |  |  |
| Overall project quality | **Based on weightings of above scores.**Highly satisfactory (6) to Highly Unsatisfactory (1) | **87.5/100%****6 – highly satisfactory** |

**1. Introduction: Background and context of the programme**

Digitalization and technology are crucial tools that guide the provision of more efficient and accessible services to citizens and businesses, and foster governance transformation. The recent COVID-19 pandemic further enhanced the importance of technologies in different sectors, as the demand for up to date and reliable data increased.

Publishing data is inherently linked with policymaking and decisions on specific policy instruments. Data analysis practically enables governments to define priorities and policies, monitor and adjust them. These decisions, through funding and legal provisions, invariably influence other stakeholders' behaviour. Open data is also a powerful tool to stimulate growth in the economy. Data analysis can be used to gear innovative practices, particularly among startups, small and medium-sized enterprises. Finally, advances in cloud infrastructure and big data analytics, on the global level, have supported the emergence of the new digital economy: the evidence shows that seven out of ten "giant" corporations by market capitalization are digital data-driven businesses.

The Republic of Serbia is on an accelerating path of digitalization. In the past several years, the authorities in Serbia are catching up with the global trend, by starting to enable access to raw data identified under the following key subjects: public safety, education, energy, sustainable development goals, administration and health and user-friendly visualizations. Digital transformation and open data initiatives in Government resulted in release of number of data sets available to the public. This has shown the value of open data, contributing to understanding the Government's measures, connecting stakeholders around specific topics and issues, and creating platforms for actions.

This Government approach is recognised both in the regulatory and institutional framework. The current Programme for Development of e-Government 2020-2022[[1]](#footnote-1), aiming to "develop efficient and user-oriented government in a digital environment", sets the overall framework for building an open data ecosystem. In 2019, the Government adopted the national Artificial Intelligence (AI) Development Strategy for 2020-2025, along with the Action Plan adopted in June 2020. The Strategy contains a specific measure focused on opening and reusing public sector data of significance for artificial intelligence[[2]](#footnote-2). Further, the Public Administration Reform Strategy 2021 - 2030[[3]](#footnote-3) prominently mentions open data and has one commitment which is devoted to the advancement of proactive publishing of data in public sector ownership. The Law on e-Government[[4]](#footnote-4) , adopted in 2018, introduces the right to re-use open data, along with definitions of "open data", "open format", "machine-readable form" and "National Open Data Portal". The Law binds public institutions to release data in open formats. In late 2021, changes of the Law on Free Access to Information of Public Importance in Serbia were adopted, introducing **new Information Directories – open data-based repository of basic information on the work of public administration** (data on the public procurement, budget plan and execution, organizational structure, etc). Article 39 of the changed Law prescribes that Information Directories are to be published in a machine-readable form, with support of the information system set by the Commissioner for Access to Information of Public Importance and Personal Data Protection.

The Office for Information Technology and Electronic Government (ITE) was established in 2017 to support devolvement and implementation of eGovernment, including infrastructure, registers and services. The ITE complements the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self Government's role as the central institution for e-government and open data legislation. On March 1, 2022, the World Economic Forum Centre for the Fourth Industrial Revolution became operational in Serbia. The centre works within the ITE, functioning as a non-profit organisation and a platform for public-private partnership and cooperation for the Fourth Industrial Revolution and focusing on artificial intelligence and bioengineering, thus further promoting the use of open data[[5]](#footnote-5) National Open Data Portal (www.data.gov.rs) was established in October 2017, which an upwards trend of open data sets, currently counting 1921 data sets (5943 data resources)[[6]](#footnote-6).The Serbian National Academy of Public Administration has adopted a training program in open data as a regular program for civil servants' professional development and has also developed a training program focusing on the Fourth industrial revolution and emerging technologies.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Over the past years, UNDP and other development partners have been working on developing the capacities of the ITE; these efforts included data owners for data release and catalysed open data mainstreaming in the Serbian government. The effort is recognized in the Public Administration Reform Strategy in the Republic of Serbia 2021-2030[[8]](#footnote-8), which is based on, inter alia, principles of openness and transparency, and underscores the importance of the Open Data Portal and the datasets made available therein. However, the quality and value of those datasets are still not on a satisfactory level. The main challenge has been with the release of high-value datasets and creating a data sharing culture and practices across different sectors; a particular challenge is the limited use of the potential of the open data in developing new products and services, improving the quality of public services and effecting saving in the public administration. Further, the need to ensure the sustainability of the open data initiative and ecosystem in Serbia has been noted. [[9]](#footnote-9) Open data in public administration is also one of the specific objectives of the E-Government Development Programme of the Republic of Serbia 2020−2022 and Action Plan for its implementation.[[10]](#footnote-10) It is set to improve generating, updating and publication of open data; improve open data portals (integration of “smart cities”); supporting the use of open data; and introducing the concept of "smart city"/e-city. The national Artificial Intelligence (AI) Development Strategy for 2020-2025, which was adopted at the end of 2019, along with the Action Plan adopted in June 2020, contains a specific measure focused on opening and reusing public sector data of significance for artificial intelligence.[[11]](#footnote-11) There is a common understanding that the value of open data was particularly highlighted during the Covid-19 pandemic, when its power of has been recognized more widely especially in the health sector, by both Government and citizens.

At the EU level, the Open data and Public Sector Information Directive[[12]](#footnote-12), introduced the concept of high value datasets into the regulatory framework, defined as documents whose reuse is associated with important benefits for the society and economy. The high-value datasets are: 1) Geospatial; 2) Earth observation and environment; 3) Meteorological; 4) Statistics; 5) Companies and company ownership; and 6) Mobility. This Directive provides a focused context for the future course of intervention in Serbia.

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Description of the programme** Against this backdrop, in July 2021, the Office for IT and eGovernment (ITE) and UNDP, with support of the UK Good Governance Fund, began the project “Open Data for Sustainable Development”. The overall objective of the Project was to improve the level of accountability and transparency at all levels of government. The progress towards improved transparency and accountability was to be measured through the European Commission Progress Reports and its assessment on progress in Accountability and the SIGMA’s indicator on access to information of public importance.The Open Data for Sustainable Development 2021-2022 Project builds on the success of the previous intervention, namely the "Open Data-Open Opportunities" project that focused interventions and support to big data publishers at the national level, while one Open Data Innovation Challenge focused specifically on local datasets. The gap in skills and capacities among Local self-governments (LSGs) affected data opening; thus, a need was identified to address root causes and build their capacities in a systematic manner and triggered the need to focus on interventions and support towards the LSGs to a much greater extent.The Open Data for Sustainable Development Project was designed to build and sustain a dynamic, open data environment and support further the work of public administration and the quality of policymaking following the European Principles of Public Administration. Addressing the need for more high-value datasets at the national and local level in Serbia, the Project was set to focus on national-level interventions in public finance and the environment. The main challenge identified has been with the release of high-value datasets and creating a data-sharing culture and practices across different sectors. Most notably, the necessity for an intervention focused on open data in the domain of public finance was found to exist and responding to it could have profound impact on government transparency and accountability, private sector growth and citizen trust, as well as creating further momentum for opening other categories of high-value datasets.[[13]](#footnote-13) With regards to the environment, it was ascertained that data related to agriculture, emissions, forests, and waste management, among others, could be invaluable for incorporating environmental protection fully into the open data ecosystem. This requires both mapping all the relevant data sources and data sets, establishing closer collaboration with SEPA, improving the data collection and dissemination systems on existing pollutants (air, water, waste), opening new data and incentivizing use cases that raise awareness, inform policymaking, and enable better engagement of citizens, CSOs, media and the private sector in issues related to environmental protection in the countryAt the local level, the Project scope was expected to be broader and include e.g. transport and mobility data public utility data. It was planned that the open data will be used by various stakeholders for different purposes: 1) for policy and evidence-based decision making by the government 2) for public services development by the government 3) for business development by the business sector 4) for policy advocacy by CSOs 5) for media reporting by media outlets and 6) for research by the academic community. The Project forms part of a larger UNDP portfolio aimed at increasing the competitiveness in the Serbian economy, through digital transformation of the Serbian government, via support of the UK Good Governance Fund and the Serbian government. The national counterpart for the project remained the same as in the previous intervention – the ITE, with a new beneficiary of a significant project component, the Serbian Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA).The Project adopted a twofold approach to developing the open data ecosystem, specifically, supporting data owners and open data release, and simultaneously assisting with open data reuse and capacity development of users. The intervention revolved around two aspects of the open data ecosystem - open data release and support to data owners on one hand, and open data re-use and capacity building on the other. The project takes the initiative on the local level, with deeper intervention with 10 selected local self-governments, for open data release and reuse.*Open Data for Sustainable Development* project was aimed to tackle three interlinked outcomes with associated outputs:**Outcome 1: Enabling environment for implementation and coordination of open data initiatives created**Output 1.1. The capacities of the Office for IT and eGovernance and the Open Data Working Group (ODWG) enhanced to coordinate and monitor implementation of open-data policies and plans Output 1.2. Monitoring of the status of open data legal framework delivered and inputs for improvements provided**Outcome 2: Increased effectiveness of the governance systems and institutions in planning and implementing open-data policies and priorities**Output 2.1. Interventions for open data release implemented in the public finance, health, business environment and environment sectors Output 2.2. Green open data: Support to Serbian Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) through improvement of existing monitoring, reporting and data dissemination systemOutput 2.3. The Open Data Hub, established and operational**Outcome 3: Increased public participation in local government decision-making and oversight**Output 3.1. Raised capacities on the local level for open data release and support |
| The Project is linked to the Country Programme Document for Serbia (2021-2025)[[14]](#footnote-14) outcome: All people benefit from effective governance and meaningful civic engagement and related CPDOutput 1.3: Digital transformation of public administration accelerated. Further, it has linkages with Output 2.2.1. Use of digital technologies and big data enabled for improved public services and other government functions from the UNDP Strategic Plan (2018 - 2021)[[15]](#footnote-15). |

**3. Purpose of the evaluation**

This evaluation covers the entire project implementation period from 23 July 2021 – 31 March 2022.

The objective of the evaluation is to assess if and how project outcomes are achieved, the efficiency with which outputs are achieved and contribute to outcomes achievement, relevance for the national strategic framework and UNDP Country Programme outcome and sustainability of the results, and to provide recommendations for future engagement.

**4. Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations**

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

To this end, the evaluator has reviewed, analyzed and provided 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.

The evaluation matrix sets out the relevant evaluation criteria, key questions and sub-questions, data sources, data collection methods/tools, indicators and methods for data analysis. The evaluation matrix has been divided into each of the 4 evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (see Annex I). In addition to the evaluation matrix, the Questions for interview partners (adjusted to the level of partnership/engagement) were developed (see Annex II).

**Limitations**

There were several challenges and limitations confronting the evaluation. The first relates to the challenges of conducting the evaluation remotely using virtual tools. While this is generally a satisfactory substitution for data gathering, it does not allow for building up a rapport with participants, for more informal communication which often takes place before and after formal meetings, or for conducting site visits. In order to mitigate this, the evaluator tried to “warm-up” the participants at the beginning of each interview with some general questions, and also assured all participants that their responses were confidential and anonymous.

Another challenge, which is frequently faced during evaluations relates to biases. Each bias and the corresponding mitigation efforts are described below.

● Recall bias: The Project, building on the previous phase of implementation, conducted many activities to date, and it is quite possible that key informants may not accurately remember particular specific project intervention activities. A similar problem is that participants in multiple UN/DP activities –may have blended their experiences into a composite memory or response and, subsequently, did not distinguish between them as separate activities in their responses.

The consultant mitigated this bias primarily through a semi-structured interview protocol that called for questioning about specific activities; through gentle reminders and nudging about the activities of the Project. Triangulation of data also mitigated this bias.

● Response bias: Informants may have given the consultant positive remarks about the project because they would like to stay involved with the intervention in the future and they think that a negative evaluation could mean the end of project opportunities.

The evaluator adopted two main strategies for mitigating this bias. First, it reiterated for each informant the maintenance of confidentiality and anonymity and then explained the evaluation’s independence from both UNDP and the Project. Second, as with recall bias, questions designed to elicit specific examples helped to identify response bias.

● Selection bias: Stakeholders provided by UNDP and its partners could mean that the consultant hears only from people who had positive experiences. As with the other forms of bias, multiple sources of data and questions eliciting specific examples helped to mitigate the risk of this bias.

**5. Evaluation approach and methodology**

The Final evaluation was guided by the basic methodology as set out in the ToR, in line with the UNEG and OECD-DAC evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, keeping in mind the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. The ToR specified the steps to be taken in conducting the evaluation, as follows:

* Review of project documentation, monitoring records and progress and other relevant reports;
* Initial meeting with Project Team to agree the specific design and methods for the evaluation, what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives. Agree on the evaluation questions that will need to be answered, given limitations of time and extant data;
* Organization of interviews with key staff involved in the project implementation;
* Preparing inception report with evaluation matrix;
* Discussions with members of the project team and members of the open data ecosystem (project beneficiaries) to assess project's relevance and effectiveness of project implementation take note of their perceptions of accomplishments and potentials for further development and provide suggestions for management response to evaluation findings. Objectively verifiable data should be collected whenever available, to supplement evidences obtained through interviews and focus group discussions;
* Preparing a Draft Report and presenting it to the Project Team, Implementing Partner and beneficiaries;
* Addressing comments received through the Audit Trail
* Preparing the Final Report with the Executive Summary;
* Each evaluation criterion should be scored using the evaluations rating scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 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) |  |

Given the relatively short time period of the project from July 2021 to March 2022, and cognizant of the long-term nature of IT and open data reform assistance, the evaluator has also analysed the potential for further outcomes to which the project may contribute in the longer term.

The evaluation was multi-faceted and the methodological approach used a mixed (qualitative and quantitative) methods; however the focus of the evaluation will be on obtaining qualitative data through interviews with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries, as per the stakeholder list provided below. The consultant ensured that the evaluation is conducted through a participatory and consultative process. Wherever possible, data gathered, both qualitative and quantitative, was triangulated, through cross verification from more than two sources. For interviews, this was done through posing a similar set of questions to the multiple interviewees and respondents. For the document review, it was accomplished by crosschecking data and information from multiple sources to increase the credibility and validity of the material.

The methodological approach has been synthesized into an Evaluation Matrix (see Annex I), which has guided the consultant and provided an analytical framework for conducting the evaluation. The evaluation matrix sets out the relevant evaluation criteria, key questions and sub-questions, data sources, data collection methods/tools, indicators and methods for data analysis. The evaluation matrix has been divided into each of the 4 evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

The evaluation’s principal guide was the project document for the Open Data for Sustainable Development project and in particular the Results Framework containing its logframe which contains indicators, targets and “means of verification” (i.e. data source) for the project’s outputs, as well as through the M&E plans.

To this end, including the project team, a total of 15 stakeholders and beneficiaries were consulted during the course of the evaluation in 10 meetings. Participants included representatives of government and local self-government institutions, civil society organisations, representatives of the open data community, donors and UNDP. A total of 7 women and 8 men were consulted. A full list of stakeholders who were consulted is provided at Annex III including the organisation or institution that they represented.

Questions for interview partners (adjusted to the level of partnership/engagement) are provided at Annex II

As stipulated in the ToR, gender, environmental safeguards and the human rights based approach aspects have been integrated into the evaluation methodology and incorporated into the evaluation matrix. In addition to being participatory and inclusive, the consultant’s approach was based on the principles of gender equality. All data gathered were disaggregated to the largest extent possible and efforts will be made for positive sampling in terms of aiming at a 50 per cent gender balance during informant interviews with project beneficiaries.

**Data analysis**

In order to analyse the collected data, the following analytical methods were applied:

• Political economy analysis;

• Quantitative and qualitative data analysis;

• Data synthesis;

• Triangulation; and

• Verification and validation.

Political Economy Analysis

A political economy analysis helped the evaluator to understand who seeks to gain and lose from the project’s interventions, as well as to identify who has vested interests and the social and cultural norms that need to be taken into account.

Quantitative and Qualitative Data Analysis

The Primary data collection method used (interviews) collected qualitative data. These were analysed using a code structure, which was aligned to the key evaluation questions, sub-questions and indicators. The qualitative data from the primary data collection methods was cross-referenced with other sources such as documents. The quantitative data produced descriptive analysis (rather than more complex regressions).

Triangulation

Triangulation is the process of using multiple data sources, data collection methods, and/or theories to validate research findings. The evaluator used more than one approach (data collection method) to address the evaluation questions in order to reduce the risk of bias and increase the chances of detecting errors or anomalies. The evaluator applied three approaches to triangulation: methods triangulation (checking the consistency of findings generated by different data collection methods); interrogating data where diverging results arise; and analyst triangulation (discussion and validation of findings, allowing for a consistent approach to interpretive analysis).

Data Synthesis

The process of bringing all the evidence together to synthesise the data and formulate findings and conclusions took place in two ways. The first was the process of articulating the key findings and cross-checking the strength of the evidence for each. Based on this, the conclusions were then developed and cross-checked for their relevance to the findings.

Verification and Validation

The above steps incorporate verification and validation of evidence during the data collection and data analysis processes. In addition, the evaluator presented the preliminary findings and recommendations to the Project team, allowing for review and comments. These processes provided an opportunity to share key findings, offer mutual challenges, and discuss the feasibility of and receptiveness to draft recommendations. It also provided an important opportunity to foster buy-in to the evaluation process particularly for the stakeholders who will have responsibility for implementing recommendations.

**6. Findings**

***6.1. 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.

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

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

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

**Outcome 1: Enabling environment for implementation and coordination of open data initiatives created**

The evaluator finds that the project successfully supported the creation of an enabling environment and coordination of open data initiatives. The project managed to advance the environment for implementation and coordination of open data initiatives, at the central and local level of governance, but also across the main beneficiary institutions – namely the Office for IT and eGovernment and SEPA. The evaluator also finds that Office for IT and eGovernment is well positioned to lead the open data initiative and push for a more enabling environment for growth of the open data ecosystem. The project also improved the legal and institutional setup, and was successful in engaging local actors, while also increasing the share of female users of open data initiatives and the users coming from vulnerable groups. Out of six indicators for this outcome, five were achieved, while one was discontinued.

**Output 1.1. The capacities of the Office for IT and eGovernance and the Open Data Working Group (ODWG) enhanced to coordinate and monitor implementation of open-data policies and plans**

This output was focused on providing capacity support to the ODWG in the priority areas of work and to the Office of IT and eGovernance related to open data. This was done through the organisation of a specialized training programme for ITE sta which started in September 2021, helping employees of the Office for IT to acquire additional knowledge needed for working with open data and AI. Further focus was put on addressing coordination challenges and monitoring capacities of the ITE. Finally, the output focused on organising National Open Data Week in order to bring together different actors, and upgrading the National Open Data Portal. The output had 10 indicators, nine of which were fully achieved, and one was partially met.[[16]](#footnote-16)

The evaluator finds that the Project successfully carried out capacity building activities. This is particularly visible through the exceeded target of the total number of participants in the capacity building activities, all of whom successfully passed the test on open data at the end of the capacity building programme.

When it comes to the support provided to the ODWG, the evaluator finds that within the project period, only one meetup instead of the planned two was held with the ODWG members. This was due to the fact that its new members were not appointed by the ITE, as reported by UNDP. In that regard, the evaluator finds that this did not affect the Project implementation.

The evaluator finds that the Project successfully contributed to the advancement of the implementation of the open data legal framework, which is visible from the increased demand for open data, as at least 202 data requests were filed to public administration institutions. National Open Data Week was also organised, consisting of seven events (workshops, meetups, seminars, panel discussions) by 6 partners, with a total of 977 participants (percentage of participants who are female or from vulnerable groups was 43%). This constitutes an impressive increase compared to the 2019 event, which attracted some 600 participants. Further, five out of six partners engaged in the organisation of the National Open Data Week were new partners, which testifies to the Project’s ability to attract and convene stakeholders. Particular value added in terms of the achievement of cross-cutting issues is the partnership with the association Zeleni mir which works with persons with disability and is a valuable partner when approaching this vulnerable group.

One key informant underlined:

*“Coordination is a challenging job – finding consensus among different actors with different views, perspectives and experiences – the Project masters it.”*

**Output 1.2. Monitoring of the status of open data legal framework delivered and inputs for improvements provided**

This output was focused on the preparation of a by-law supporting the full implementation of open data activities on national and local levels, as guided by the EU PSI Directive and other Government of Serbia commitments, and providing technical support to the national partners to prepare the initial review of the legal framework relevant to open data, and the status of its implementation. The output had two indicators, and both were met.

The evaluator finds that the Project successfully provided a review of the Open Data legal framework, showing options provided by the current legislative framework, and developing recommendations for change in the Law on eGovernment, which could significantly contribute to the advancement of the second instance proceedings for data requests.

As reported, one of the key achievements the Project contributed to was the introduction of Article 39 of the Law on Access to Information, which prescribes that Information Directories are to be published in a machine-readable form (currently PDF/Word repositories of basic information on the work of public administration – data on the public procurement, budget plan and execution, organizational structure, etc). This change is set to unroll by November 2023 for 11.000 public administration bodies. As reported, the Project has further produced a SEPA by-law, which is ready to be adopted[[17]](#footnote-17).

**Outcome 2: Increased effectiveness of the governance systems and institutions in planning and implementing open-data policies and priorities**

The evaluator finds that the Project has successfully increased the effectiveness of the governance systems and institutions in planning and implementing open-data policies and priorities.

The evaluator finds that the Project recognised with the enabling environment, institutions and the Government as a whole need to be effective in planning and implementing the open data policies and priorities. Further to this, the Project supported the development of two roadmaps which offer a clear picture of the complex data system in the areas of public finance and environmental protection. The roadmaps were developed in a highly participatory manner, which included a number of institutions at the central and local level. The Project supported the creation of a substantive space for civic engagement with open data through establishment of the Open Data Hub. There are two indicators for this outcome; however, data relevant for the indicator’s achievement, namely the UN e-Government survey is yet to be published, so the evaluator is unable to assess the progress towards this output.

**Output 2.1. Interventions for open data release implemented in the public finance, health, business environment and environment sectors**

This output was focused on a system review on the comparability in performance of analysed functions across different institutions. In particular, a system review of open data functions in the targeted sectors sought to determine the extent to which the open data within different institutions is implemented and comparable. The focus of the intervention was on the environmental and public finance sector (public spending data on national and local level). Following the analysis, the Project was set to prepare roadmaps for prioritizing the release of high-value datasets and their reuse. The output had four indicators, all of which were met.

The evaluator finds that the Project was successful in conducting the analysis and producing two roadmaps which offer a picture of the complex data systems in these two sectors, best practise examples, mapping against policy goals of the key institutions and mapping of innovation opportunities around (open) data. The Project achieved this through continuous cooperation with key national and local level stakeholders (for environment - Ministry of Environmental Protection, Serbian Agency for Environmental Protection, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Mining and Energy, Institute for Nature Conservation of Serbia, State Enterprise for Forests Management Srbijasume, and two municipalities – Kragujevac and Priboj, and for public finance - Ministry of Finance, State Audit Institution, Public Procurement Office, Tax Administration, Public Debt Administration, Treasury Administration, Serbian Business Registers Agency, Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Serbia and National Bank of Serbia). Overall, the intervention was completed in three areas: public finance, environment, and health, and an open data set on diabetes was released.

**Output 2.2. Green open data: Support to Serbian Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) through improvement of existing monitoring, reporting and data dissemination system**

This output was focused on supporting the reconfiguration of the National Register of Pollution Sources within SEPA, in terms of providing an adequate information system for collecting and processing the data prescribed by local registers, based on the feedback from the pilot programme of capacity building also conducted under the Project. Further, the output set to establish an air emission inventory and data dissemination system/portal with a Geographic Information System (GIS) component within the existing SEPA IT platform, and use it for dissemination of data on air emissions at national and international levels, coupled with the promotion of the activities and the results of this intervention. The output had a total of twelve indicators, all of which were achieved.

The evaluator finds that the Project has successfully contributed to the establishment of grid data module and implementation of LRTAP and UNFCCC conventions.

As reported by the Project, the open data release in the area of environment went steps ahead with multiple new valuable data being published, namely updated data from the National Register of Pollution Sources, data from the [Local Registers of Pollutions Sources](http://data.sepa.gov.rs/group/lriz) (to be populated until March 2023), data on [wild dumpsites](http://data.sepa.gov.rs/dataset/divlje-deponije) from 2017 until 2021 (dataset generated by citizens and public utility companies), and [data on air emissions](http://data.sepa.gov.rs/group/vazduh). With the Project support, SEPA improved their data management mechanisms and strengthened coordination and data exchange practises among local and central level of governance. More importantly, SEPA included all local self-governments (LSGs) into this process, tailoring new modules and IT support to the local register of pollution sources, according to their needs and recognized challenges at the local level. All LSGs (145) were included in the comprehensive capacity building programme, consisting of concrete steps for identification of local polluters, methodology for the development of the local registers and data collection, as well as guidance for usage of new IT modules for local registers. Fifteen LSGs provided valuable information from the local level, on concrete problems with the local registers, and their vision for possible solutions. The main result is that data on levels of pollution of air, water, land and waste generation across the Serbia will now be part of the unique information system, administrated on the central level by SEPA, used by all relevant stakeholders from a single point of access, enabling easier data analysis and collection. SEPA staff (11) have in parallel also attended dedicated trainings.

**Output 2.3. The Open Data Hub, established and operational**

This output was focused on establishing the Open Data Hub as an ITE-led initiative, as a cooperation mechanism to connect data owners and data users and increase the visibility of open data importance and benefits among a wider stakeholder group. This included the proposal of the Open Data Hub design as an online space, and a network of stakeholders, services and community events. The Open Data Hub was set to play an important role in supporting data literacy. There were a total of eight indicators for this output, seven of which were achieved, and one even overachieved.[[18]](#footnote-18)

The evaluator finds that the project has successfully established the Open Data Hub to a good standard. The Open Data Hub is a virtual space for the open data community. Building on the results of the previous project, it is also a platform for knowledge sharing and promotion of open data.

The evaluator finds that the Project has exceeded its goals, as the Open Data Hub has managed to gather a total of 72 stakeholders (37% female stakeholders) compared to the projected 50. Consequently, the Hub now gathers prominent open data experts (with expertise in data science, data visualization, cleaning, mining, data journalism, R/Python), offering support to those who wish to use or publish open data. Moreover, the evaluator was informed that the Hub hosted the Data Innovation Challenge with two lots, one focusing on the diabetes data, released prior to the Challenge launch, and the other focusing on the local level, with new local datasets in various fields. The Challenge resulted in three winning solutions (two for diabetes and one for public transport air emission in the city of Kragujevac), all three offering valuable insights into the data while also responding to topical real-life problems in public and media focus.. The diabetes related solutions (DADOS and Diabetes in Serbia) offer guidance for improvement of the condition of the diabetes patients. More specifically, they promote smart planning of procurement of medicines and medical aids, coupled with a geographic and demographic analysis, indicate the rate of diabetes patients at the municipal level, and through interpolation with other data, enable a better understanding of the impact of diabetes on the healthcare system. The solution for the city of Kragujevac (Ekobus) shows a low correlation of public transport air emissions with air emissions measured by the stations showing that the public transport is environment, thus promoting the adoption of smart and sustainable urban development planning.

One stakeholder acknowledged:

*“The responsiveness of the Project team was continuously at a high level.”*

**Outcome 3: Increased public participation in local government decision-making and oversight**

The evaluator finds that the Project successfully brought the initiative closer to the citizens and contributed to increased public participation in local government decision-making and oversight, working with around 30 LSGs on open data release and promotion. There were two indicators for this output. With regard to one indicator (On-line services index) data relevant for the indicator’s achievement, namely the UN e-Government survey is yet to be published. With regard to the second indicator, it is only partially achieved. Namely, instead of the targeted LTI score of 50 for all municipalities, the 2022 LTI average score for all municipalities is 49. However, disaggregated data for targeted municipalities shows the following scores: Knjaževac 50, Gornji Milanovac 48, Topola 55, Priboj 49, Veliko Gradište 76, Raška 62, Subotica 70, Kragujevac 65, Niš 64 and Zrenjanin 53, meaning that the target was achieved/overachieved in eight out of ten targeted municipalities.

**Output 3.1. Raised capacities on the local level for open data release and support**

This output was focused on increasing the capacities of local governments in public participation through establishing a network of information and knowledge sharing. Following an open data conference, the Project was set to select municipalities, identify the current situation with an application of open data in the respective municipalities and identify needs for improvement and further advancement and simultaneously increase the supply and demand side, ensuring availability of data in priority areas. This were a total of nine indicators for this output, all of which are achieved, where one was overachieved.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The evaluator finds that the project was successful in going local, working with around 30 LSGs on open data release and promotion. As reported by the Project, LSGs went through two phases: **on-site training in four regional centres** – Kragujevac (held on 22nd of September), Niš (held on 30th September), Gornji Milanovac (held on 7th October), and Zrenjanin (held on 14th October) and **tailor-made support** (development of open data action plans, and release of high-value local open data sets - public finance, geodata, urban mobility) to ten selected LSGs: Knjaževac, Gornji Milanovac, Topola, Priboj, Veliko Gradište, Raška, Subotica, Kragujevac, Zrenjanin, and Niš.

The evaluator acknowledges that the support for the intervention was provided by the top level of management in LSGs and that overall, the LSGs showed a considerable level of understanding on how open data can support creation of better local services and boost innovation, raise transparency, and attract tourists and investors.

The evaluator finds that the Project was successful in establishing a horizontal network for knowledge sharing, as it has been reported that some municipalities help others to publish their budget as well, following the guidance and template provided by the Office for IT and eGovernment.

The project was particularly successful and on target through a deeper intervention with 10 selected LSGs; the evaluator acknowledges that a spill-over effect is already visible, as there are LSGs outside of this cohort publishing data on their own.

While the final evaluation is criteria-based and is not a theory-based evaluation, the consultant also reviewed the Project theory of change as a part of the analytical process. The evaluator finds that the Project theory of change underpins that “if governance structures and public institutions at different levels are provided with the necessary tools to plan and implement open data policies, data-users across different sectors would be offered opportunities to benefit from data”. The theory of change as a main purpose thus identifies the strengthening of capacities of key governance actors and stakeholders to release and use open data, hence increasing government transparency and accountability at the national and local levels. Based on the main purpose to be achieved, the theory of change also identifies the key issues and challenges to be considered as well as planned activities and strategies that need to be implemented for achievement of Project outputs and outcomes and ultimately, impact. (Improved level of accountability and transparency at all levels of government). The Project theory of change appropriately recognises the interconnectivity and co-dependency between the issues and challenges and the planned activities and strategies and thus provides a realistic framework for programming and implementation, including sufficient follow-up even for “soft aspects of programming”. The clear articulation of the theory of change is accompanied with a visualisation, which provides additional clarity and ease of understanding. The evaluator finds that the Project theory of change was a useful analytical instrument during the project implementation for both the Project team and partners.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that the project was implemented efficiently**  | **Highly Satisfactory - 6** |

The Project had a total budget $ 816,848.00, provided from the UK GGF. The project had one budget revision, which included harmonization of the adopted budget and actual available funds upon receiving all traches, since the project has received less funds in USD than originally budgeted, due to the currency exchange rate. Total budget from the Project Document was $ 852,569.28 (project costs $ 844,128.00 and coordination levy $ 8,441.28), and the project received $ 816,848.00. That made a deficit of $ 27,280.00, which had no influence on the quality and scope of the project activities and results, which were delivered as planned. The Project achieved a delivery rate of 100%.

The evaluator finds that the Project budget was driven by the 4Es (equity, economy, efficiency, and effectiveness). The project was implemented with maximum efficiency resulting in “low-cost: high impact” results. The Project value for money coefficient remained high. With a relatively small budget, and within a short implementation timeframe, but with a strong vision, the project was able to achieve more with the available funds. Furthermore, the Project managed to deliver outputs in a timely manner and in line with the expected targets and effectively contributed to the achievement of the Project outcomes. The donor who was interviewed consistently commented on their high level of satisfaction with the efficiency of the project.

The evaluator finds that the Project performed on a substantive level, both at the national and local level, ensuring long-lasting impact. All of the implemented activities are part of a wider programmatic concept constructed to create engagement of all relevant stakeholders, using a tailor-made approach in accordance with their needs. In addition to the implementing partners, the Project addressed the needs of two main groups of beneficiaries – data owners and data users. Thus, in terms of partnerships, the evaluator finds that UNDP was successfully able to convene partners and bring together a broad range of actors and partners 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 evaluator finds that the Project team has proven to be highly instrumental to all project partners, providing both technical expertise and organizational support. As commented by one stakeholder:

*“Working with the Project has been a huge learning experience thanks to Sanja and the team”*

However, another stakeholder pointed out:

*“Open data requires a more systemic approach and more synergies among all stakeholders”*

**6.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 Serbian Artificial Intelligence (AI) Development Strategy for 2020-2025, along with the Action Plan for its implementation, the Public Administration Reform Strategy 2021 – 2030 and the E-Government Development Programme of the Republic of Serbia 2020−2022 and Action Plan for its implementation.

During the project’s lifespan, open data remained on the government’s agenda, supported directly from the Cabinet of the Prime Minister. The evaluator notes that the Covid-19 pandemic has influenced greatly the digital transformation process of Serbia (mostly pushing it forward with greater velocity), which had a tremendous influence on ITE and their priorities. Power of data for decision-making process has been recognized more widely, across the Government and the general public, and especially in the health sector.

More broadly, the evaluator finds that the project was grounded in the UNDP Strategic Plan, the global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and UNDP’s ongoing 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 intended Outcome as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resource Framework - All people benefit from effective governance and meaningful civic engagement.

As one stakeholder put it:

*“Open data concept is here to stay, the Project recognised the momentum”*

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

**6. B.4 Sustainability of results**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that the results that have been achieved are likely to be sustainable.**  | **Likely – 3** |

With regards to the sustainability of the project results, the evaluator finds significant sustainability elements, considering the dynamic and complex implementation environment.

The evaluator finds that the open data concept has been successfully included into the legislative and policy framework. Further, the Project has successfully strengthened the enabling environment for increasing access to and availability of open data at the national level, local level and within specific sectors.

While the establishment of the Open Data Hub has created a community, which includes start-ups, media, SMEs, academia, and individual open data enthusiasts, it seems that the life of the community outside of the project is still not vibrant as expected. It will be of critical importance for the Open Data Hub to actively pursue its role in establishment of strong open data community, including through implementation of more digital literacy activities (School of Data primarily).

One stakeholder commented:

*“The technical capacity of open data users as well as their motivation needs to be strengthened further”*

Another key informant pointed out:

*“Usage of open data is key for their improvement – UNDP should focus on the education of the citizens and business ”*

**6. 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 (technical) Government in terms of e-governance and open data. Parliamentary elections in Serbia were organized in April 2022, but due to a number of appeals and ensuing repeated elections, the final results are yet to be announced and a new Government to be formed. 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 still insufficient level of knowledge regarding open data among the relevant institutions and stakeholders, as well as among the general public.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key finding** | **Rating** |
| **The evaluator finds that sustainability of the institutional framework and governance has gained recognizable traction with a high potential for long-term sustainability aspects in this context.**  | **Likely – 3** |

The evaluator finds that institutional ownership has been secured in the Office for IT and e-Government. The Office for IT and eGovernment now has a dedicated team for open data, with an Open Data Coordinator ready to provide leadership and support within the project, but also with activities to be carried out regardless of the project

Further to this, the Project also contributed to the capacity building of the key governmental stakeholders, namely the Office for IT and e-Government, LSGs and SEPA, through numerous trainings and workshops for government agencies. Interviewees regarded capacity development as an 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.

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

**6.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 against outcome and output indicators, project reporting and 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 largely quantitative indicators at the output level. This means that results are measured against the achievement of activities. Qualitative indicators that measure changes in attitude and perceptions would have provided more in-depth information and if they were adequately measured would have better captured the project’s progress and results. The Project could benefit from taking into account the following view of one key informant:

*“Open data is a powerful story telling tool – we need more promotions , more creative contents and visualizations”*

Furthermore, in some instances outputs were measured against the achievement of a large number of indicators. Reporting against an excessive set of indicators could result in fragmented understanding of the progress in implementation.

**6.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 is accompanied by an M&E plan that was followed throughout the project implementation period.

The evaluator finds that both the project document and its M&E plan and RRF were well drafted with logical and inter-connected outcomes and outputs. Progress reports were well developed and submitted in a timely fashion, with identified lessons learned and challenges and risks tracked.

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 reports, and discussed with the Project Board members. The Project Manager assessed the progress against indicators.

1. *Monitoring of the risks*

The risk was monitored regularly, 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, which was a particular challenge given the short implementation timeframe and the complexity of the results to be achieved.

1. *Capturing of lessons learned*

The Project Manager captured lessons learned in the project reports. All the lessons learned could be seen as input for the new 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.

1. *Project Board*

The Project Board met on a regular basis. Core decisions were made in consultations with the Project Board members, and the most important documentation was approved at the Project Board meetings.

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

**6.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.

The evaluator find that the Project recognized that effective planning and implementation of the open data policies and priorities should be backed up by the feedback of the open data community. The Project thus designed and launched the Open Data Hub as a one-stop shop for all data enthusiasts. The Hub hosted a Data Innovation Challenge and the National Open Data Week as its signature activities. The Data Innovation Challenge organized in 2022, resulted in three winning solutions (two for diabetes and one for public transport air emission in the city of Kragujevac), all three offering valuable insights into the data. The National Open Data Week further promoted innovative solutions and practices.

One key informant commented:

*“The Project is always testing new approaches and trying to reach new audiences through innovation – this is a reminder of how things can and should be done differently.”*

**6.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.** | **Satisfactory - 5** |

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 the needs of both women and men were taken into consideration when modelling new approaches and developing tools.

The evaluator finds that the project sought to ensure equal participation of men and women in project interventions and to increase the participation of women and representatives of vulnerable groups (including people with disabilities). For example, the Project reported 15,973 female users of the Open Data Portal, which exceeds the target of 20% (20% increase would equal to 5,124). The Project also reported a considerable increase in percentage of users using the open data-based services who are from vulnerable groups (including people with disabilities), exceeding the targeted 10%, which would be equal to 572, by achieving a total of 6,648 single users.

The evaluator finds that project incorporated a human rights-based approach through working on top down, middle out and bottom-up solutions. All citizens of Serbia will benefit from the project results. As the vulnerable groups predominantly rely on the 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.

***6.2. General findings***

**1.The project design reflects UNDP positioning**

UNDP has a strong comparative advantage within the open data sector and is recognised by the national partner as the viable partner in the e-governance sector. That position should be leveraged and capitalized on in the next programming cycle.

The understanding of the importance of the mainstreaming of the position of the UNDP as the key partner of the Government of the Republic of Serbia in the open data sector for the next programmatic cycle should inform the investment of CORE funds.

In addition to a clearly defined thematic focus, UNDP should strategically use the existing momentum to elevate from a stand-alone project to a programmatic platform.

**2. The project flexibility contributes to the promotion and implementation of the open data concept**

The evaluator finds that the Project is a flexible instrument that sets Open Data promotion and implementation in the right direction, though some concepts need more clarity and time to evolve and take shape.

The evaluator recognises that all project partners are satisfied with the flexibility and responsiveness of the Project to their needs. However, the downside of this approach is that the assistance provided can be perceived as fragmented and developed on an ad hoc basis. It is perceived among some partners that the Project has not fully maximised strategic cooperation and partnerships. This can potentially dilute UNDP’s positioning as a policy partner since it prevents the adequate strategic profiling of the organisation, meaning that the Project is sometimes perceived as an organiser of events and/or initiatives while it is striving to be recognised as a leader in the field.

While the Project has already taken steps towards developing an even more partner-orientated focus, in the next phase the project should move this a step beyond. This should include building a higher degree of trust, adequately communicating and managing expectations and limitations, seizing opportunities and creating solutions for all stakeholders.

**3. Project expertise is highly valued.**

National partners highly valued the project staff’s capacity, expertise, experience as well as commitment. The technical knowledge and skills of the project staff are assessed as excellent and fit for the task at hand. The project staff is also recognized as the ones that encourages innovative thinking and provide space for creative input and that value input from stakeholders and partners across the sector.

In addition to the support provided in implementation of the project activities the national partners find that the project staff were always ready to assist above and beyond in the development of policies, leadership skills, partnering abilities and institutional absorption capabilities in order to achieve and sustain development results. Further, the Project successfully managed the interaction between external expertise engaged by the Project and the key stakeholders, in order to provide appropriate response to the specific needs of the national partners and their buy-in for possible future steps.

At the same time as per the national partners’ view the team did not always have sufficient understanding of the specifics of the partners institutional mandate. Consequently, this created a situation where some of the requirements and recommendations provided by the Project team were too generic and not fully implementable.

**4. Internal communication and communication of results can be improved**

The evaluator finds that internal vertical and horizontal communication mechanisms could be strengthened, through improving dialogue and the exchange of information, to ensure the quality assurance of the project results. UNDP needs to be continuously involved in dialogue with the project partners while avoiding the trap of capacity substitution for horizontal coordination. The evaluator finds that UNDP has successfully integrated the project into its wider portfolio, however it should go beyond communication of results and develop a strategic communication plan to raise the partnership profile.

**5. The project successfully maintained and scaled-up partnerships and both central and local level**

While the Office for IT and e-government remained the national counterpart, a new beneficiary of a significant project component was welcomed, namely the Serbian Environmental Protection Agency. Additionally, as local self-governments have been recognized as holders of valuable data, one project outcome was focused on support to open data release and reuse on the local level. This resulted in cities and municipalities competing in a number of open data sets available. Public awareness and interest in open data remained high, especially in the area of public finance and environment, which present two main areas of the project intervention. With establishment of the Open Data Hub, Office for IT and eGovernment and UNDP are newly promoted as relevant addresses and resource centres for open data in Serbia.

**7. Recommendations**

**1. Explore linkages and synergies with other projects so that this project can be elevated as a programmatic platform.**

The evaluator recommends that in future programming, UNDP improve the strategic linkages between the project components and partners through designing it in an innovative manner as a “platform project“ where UNDP is gathering strategic partners around the same goal, without being at the centre of the project design. This project design is particularly applicable in complex thematic areas, such as open data and e-governance, which has multiple stakeholders and multiple development challenges. This offers on the one hand the possibility for donors to access and cover more partners within the same framework and on the other hand facilitates horizontal cooperation among national partners. However, the complexity of partnerships requires both individual tailor-made approaches towards certain project components but also a strategic overview of the entire intervention. There is a risk that although the projects are within the same framework they operate as silos.

**2. Systemic Proactivity in Participatory Planning**

The Project needs to be continuously and systematically involved in dialogue with the project partners proactively addressing the challenges and limitations. A regular and active exchange with partners, with transparent communication of both positive and negative experiences will lead to sustainable partnership relations. This particularly relates to the full understanding of the partners institutional mandates and limitations within the current national setting.

The Project should emphasise inclusive and participatory planning and implementation that in return will result in more successful addressing of deeply rooted needs and priorities. The participatory planning will also enhance national ownership, increasing the potential of catalysing results.

Strategic planning informed by comprehensive feedback received from a variety of stakeholders supports the strategic relevance of interventions and enhances ownership and buy-in for the open data promotion and implementation

**3. Calibration of the programmatic support**

In the future, special attention should be given to the specifics of the institutional mandates of the national partners at both central and local level in calibrating the programmatic support. The Project/UNDP also needs to enhance its strategic approach in future programming in addressing partners needs and institutional priorities starting from the planning phase.

**4. Continue to expand support to local governments**

The Project should continue to expand its support to local governments to help them embrace and implement reforms and build their capacities to fulfil their mandates related to open data and e-governance. Particular attention should be placed on institutional capacity development of local authorities to promote and benefit from reforms, but also to enable them to implement new regulatory and institutional mechanisms put in place through national reforms. Convening partnerships at local and regional level should also be an underlying support stream of UNDP.

**4. The project should continue supporting government efforts to upgrade public services and engage with citizens**.

UNDP’s results in e-governance and open data should be used as a foundation for deeper engagement, particularly in access to services and increased competitiveness through development of innovative services utilizing open data. These areas have proved to be of common relevance and priority, and they have Government buy-in and commitment. This has been an area of comparative advantage for UNDP, and it continues to be the partner of choice in supporting e-governance reforms in the Republic of Serbia.

**8. Conclusions**

1. The Project has positioned itself as a strategic resource for national partners in the Republic of Serbia in the area of open data. While room for improvement exists, the Project/UNDP’s expertise, transparent procedures and approaches, and support modalities are valued for tackling the development needs of partners at the national and local level within their reform processes. The Project tackled the multidimensional needs of the national partners by investing in efforts to connect cross-thematic programme interventions and provide synergies. This in turn helped the application of multidimensional solutions for open data promotion and usage, resulting in empowered citizens and better services.

2. The Project upstream policy and capacity-building work has made important contributions. The Project has made a considerable contribution in supporting national partners with the institutional and policy reform process, a necessary precondition for creating the enabling environment to facilitate change. The Project’s multi-pronged approach has brought some significant results in open data promotion and implementation. The Project downstream work, has also brought positive output results, but institutionalization of results remains limited.

3. The Project model which relies on a combination of national and local-level support and focus on targeted thematic areas for intervention has proven to be highly successful and conducive of a comprehensive buy-in on the part of national partners. This approach should be carefully tailored and up-scaled in the future, in order to avoid tunnel vision and islands of achievement instead of overall engaging environment.

**9. Lessons Learnt**

**Capacity Building**

The project partners recognise and appreciate the capacity development related comprehensive assistance received during the project implementation.

The project conducted a number of workshops, on-site trainings and on the job support. It also created a substantive space for civic engagement with open data.

The fast-changing institutional environment requires that once potential implementing partners have been identified during the planning phase, a capacity assessment of each partner should be undertaken to assess their respective strengths and weaknesses and activities should then be tailored accordingly. This will result in each partner implementing activities based on their expertise and will maximise resources.

**Lesson Learnt:**

The capacity development of national partners at the systemic, organisational and individual levels should be seen as an investment in both future programming and as a means of maximising partnerships. The capacity development should be seen as a long‐term effort that needs to be embedded in broader change processes that are owned and driven by those involved, that are context‐specific and that are as much about changing values and mindsets through incentives, as they are about acquiring new skills and knowledge. Also, the Project should make a distinction between functional and technical capacities and support the development of both. The exact mixture of capacities to be addressed through a capacity development response will depend on the outcome of a capacity assessment. This will further contribute towards the long-term sustainability of the project results.

**Monitoring, evaluation and learning**

The evaluator finds that the project gathers considerable data, which is presented in an easy to use manner in the progress reports.

However, despite a sound approach to monitoring and evaluation the evaluator finds that there is no systematic mechanism to capture lessons learned and incorporate them into the project implementation, especially with regards to risk assessment, political economy and context analysis.

The project is being implemented iteratively and having to constantly react to challenges on the ground and the complexities of the political and social reality, meaning that there is limited time to reflect, to conduct background analysis, consultations and/or to dedicate time to risk management.

**Lesson Learnt:**

The project requires standardised mechanisms for learning, in particular from its monitoring and evaluation efforts that can be reflected both in the project implementation, as well as feed into the CPD programmatic cycle. The next project cycle should factor in a midterm evaluation as a way to (re)adjust the course of action during the project implementation towards transformative results. The project should develop a systematic mechanism to capture lessons learned and preserve the project results to the extent possible. This includes preparation of analysis, case studies, lessons learned reports, document gathering etc.

**Robust analysis and assessment**

The evaluator finds that while preliminary consultations were undertaken at the project design and development phase with national partners, the consultation phase could have been more extensive.

Had it been, the information and data gained through consultations would have fed into the design, which would have made it more context specific and tailored to the realities on the ground, and in particular regarding the support to the optimisation at the local level more realistic and achievable.

In designing the future project, UNDP should ensure that robust analysis and assessment are undertaken to feed into the project design process. This should include thorough contextual and political analysis, which is regularly updated throughout the lifespan of the project, and which addresses political economy considerations. In addition, a detailed stakeholder analysis should be undertaken to assess stakeholder levels of power and interest with regards to the proposed project in order to best identify engagement strategies.

**Lesson learnt:**

As a result of the analysis and assessments undertaken a more informed project can be designed, which is realistic and attainable given the operational realities, the opportunities, and constraints on the ground. A small set of high quality, measurable indicators should be developed and reviewed to ensure that the indicators are not only clearly defined but are also representative, reliable, and feasible. 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. This could include indicators such as ex-ante and ex-post training, capacity-building and workshop evalutions by the participants (changes in knowledge and attitudes), positive results of feedback (level of satisfaction) related to the feasibility and use of the supported open data solutions and of networking events.

**ANNEXES**

***Annex I Evaluation criteria matrix***

The evaluation matrix was developed as per the Evaluation Matrix Template provided in Annex IV of the TOR, and reads as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria/Sub-criteria**  | **Questions to be addressed by evaluation**  | **What to look for**  | **Data sources**  | **Data collection methods**  |
| **Relevance** | To what extent was the project in line with country programme outputs and outcomes, UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?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\*Minutes of the Project Board meetings\*Project stakeholders | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviews |
| 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\*Minutes of the Project Board meetings\*Project stakeholders | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviews |
| 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? |
| In which areas has the project had greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?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\*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviews |
| 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?To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of country programme outputs? | 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?To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits for men and women in the future? | 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\*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviews |
| To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?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? To what extent will targeted men, women and vulnerable people benefit from the project interventions in the long term?To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits for men and women in the future? | 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\*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviews |
| 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 gender, environmental safeguards, and 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?To what extent were the resources used to address inequalities in general, and gender issues in particular | 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\*Responsible partners’ progress reports \*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviews |
| **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\*Responsible partners’ progress reports \*Minutes of the Project Board meetings | Desk research and document reviewKey informant interviews |
| 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 II – QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW PARTNERS (ADJUSTED TO THE LEVEL OF PARTNERSHIP/ENGAGEMENT)***

 

**1. QUESTIONS FOR PROJECT BOARD MEMBERS**

1. How do you rate the functioning of the Project Board? Please provide the reasoning.

2. Are all relevant stakeholders represented in the Project Board? Please provide details.

3. Are the meetings held on an adequate basis?

4. How frequently has the Project Board been asked by the project management to consider project plans and revisions? Please elaborate.

5 How do you rate the cooperation between the project management and the Project Board? Please elaborate.

6. How familiar are you with UNDP rules and procedures?

7. Are the Project Board meetings well prepared? If no – what could be done to improve the preparation?

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

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

10. Did the project mainstream gender, environmental safeguards, and human rights based approach? To what extent?

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

**QUESTIONS FOR THE PROJECT DONOR**

1. To what extent were the objectives of the project consistent with the national priorities of Serbia and with the needs and interests of citizens? Please elaborate

2. What is the degree to which the project activities were overlapping with and/or complementing other interventions in the domain? Please elaborate

3. To what extent was the project appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in Serbia throughout the project period?

4. To what extent did the Project contribute to the attainment of outputs and outcomes initially expected in Project Document?

5. To what extent were the Project’s outputs and outcomes synergetic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached?

6. What were the constraining and facilitating factors and the influence of the context on the achievement of results? Please elaborate

7. Were the implementation modalities appropriate and cost-effective?

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

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

10. Was the Project supported by national institutions? Please elaborate

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

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

14. Was there an adequate strategy for capacity building for partners at national and local level?

15. To what extent did the project mainstream a gender, environmental safeguards, and human rights based approach?

16. How well were gender aspects taken into account into project design and concretely and effectively implemented?

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



**2. QUESTIONS FOR PROJECT PARTNERS (ADJUSTED TO THE TYPE OF PARTNER, LEVEL OF PARTNERSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT)**

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

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

3. How would you rate the relevance of the project to the priorities of your institution / organization? Please elaborate.

4. Institution/Organization which you represent has participated in the project, but was not fully engaged (e.g., in the programme of advanced support to 10 LSGs). What are the reasons for that?

5. 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:

6. How would you rate your communication and collaboration with UNDP and the project team?

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

8. How would you rate the visibility and communication of the project?

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

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

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

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

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

14. Did the project contribute to increasing the quality of data?

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

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

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

18. To what extent did the project mainstream a gender, environmental safeguards, and human rights based approach

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

***ANNEX III – LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Contact Name(s)** | **Title** | **Organization Name** | **Male** | **Female** |
| **1.** | **Dragana Bečić,** **Andreja Glušcević** | **Assistant Director** **Open Data Coordinator** | **Office for Information Technologies and Electronic Government** |  | **X****X** |
| **2.** | **Tamara Perunović Čulić** **Nebojša Redzić**  | **Assistant Director** **Head of Department** | **Serbian Agency for Environmental Protection** | **X** | **X** |
| **3.** | **Branko Kovač** | **Logikka company, Founder, Open Data Hub expert** | **Open Hub** | **X** |  |
| **4.** | **Tatjana Kecojević** | **Sister Analyst, Founder, Open Data Hub expert (TBC)** | **Open Hub** |  | **X** |
| **5.** | **Vojislav Jović** | **Sigurne staze NGO, GIS specialist, Open Data Hub expert (TBC)** | **Open Hub** | **X** |  |
| **6.** | **Aleksandar Linc Djordjević,**  | **Data Science Serbia, Member of the Management Board**  | **Open Hub** | **X** |  |
| **7.** | **Ivan Jokić**  | **Software Engineer** | **City of Šabac** | **X** |  |
| **8.** | **Zoran Djorović** | **CEO** | **City of Kragyjevac, eKG Infodata** | **X** |  |
| **9.** | **Thomas Wright** **Nataša Radović** | **Head of Good Governance Fund – Serbia** **GGF Programme Manager** | **British Embassy to Serbia** | **X** | **X** |
| **10.** | **Sanja Arizanović****Daniel Varga** **Irena Cerović** | **Project Coordinator,****Competitiveness and Digital Governance****Programme Analyst****Team Leader, Governance**  | **UNDP**  | **X** | **X****X** |

***ANNEX IV - LIST OF KEY SOURCES***

**Policy documents and laws**

1. Serbian Programme for Development of e-Government 2020-2022, http://mduls.gov.rs/wp-content/uploads/Program-razvoja-eUprave-u-RS-2020-2022.pdf?script=lat

2. Artificial Intelligence Development Strategy in the Republic of Serbia for 2020-2050, https://www.srbija.gov.rs/tekst/437277

 3. Serbian Public Administration Reform Strategy 2021 – 2030, http://www.pravno-informacioni-sistem.rs/SlGlasnikPortal/eli/rep/sgrs/vlada/strategija/2021/42/1/reg

4. Law on e-Government, Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia, number 27/2018

5. Directive (EU) 2019/1024 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on open data and the re-use of public sector information

**News, articles and websites**

1. https://www.srbija.gov.rs/vest/en/184771/belgrade-to-get-centre-for-fourth-industrial-revolution.php

2. https://data.gov.rs/sr/dashboard/, accessed on 25.5.2022.

3. https://nasamesta.com/naju-zapocela-realizaciju-programa-obuka-za-2022-godinu/

4. Financial Times, June 2020: Belgrade’s fast-growing tech start-ups show Serbia’s ‘hunger for success’ <https://www.ft.com/content/03f995f0-9c12-11ea-871b-edeb99a20c6e>

5. https://www.transparentnost.org.rs/LTI2022/

**UN and UNDP documents**

1. UNDP Open Data for Sustainable Development Project Document, Project Number: 00122982, 29 June 2021

2. UNDP Country Programme Document for Serbia (2021-2025)

3. UNDP Strategic Plan

1. Programme for Development of e-Government 2020-2022, <http://mduls.gov.rs/wp-content/uploads/Program-razvoja-eUprave-u-RS-2020-2022.pdf?script=lat> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Artificial Intelligence Development Strategy in the Republic of Serbia for 2020-2050, https://www.srbija.gov.rs/tekst/437277 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Public Administration Reform Strategy 2021 – 2030, <http://www.pravno-informacioni-sistem.rs/SlGlasnikPortal/eli/rep/sgrs/vlada/strategija/2021/42/1/reg> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Law on e-Government, Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia, number 27/2018 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.srbija.gov.rs/vest/en/184771/belgrade-to-get-centre-for-fourth-industrial-revolution.php [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://data.gov.rs/sr/dashboard/, accessed on 25.5.2022. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. https://nasamesta.com/naju-zapocela-realizaciju-programa-obuka-za-2022-godinu/ [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.paragraf.rs/propisi/strategija-reforme-javne-uprave-republika-srbija.html [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Financial Times, June 2020: Belgrade’s fast-growing tech start-ups show Serbia’s ‘hunger for success’ <https://www.ft.com/content/03f995f0-9c12-11ea-871b-edeb99a20c6e> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. http://mduls.gov.rs/wp-content/uploads/e-Government-Development-Programme-2020-2022-FINAL-2.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. https://www.pravno-informacioni-sistem.rs/SlGlasnikPortal/eli/rep/sgrs/vlada/strategija/2019/96/1/reg [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Directive (EU) 2019/1024 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on open data and the re-use of public sector information [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. UNDP Open Data for Sustainable Development Project Document, Project Number: 00122982, 29 June 2021 [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. <https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/migration/rs/undp_rs-CPD-For-Serbia-2021-2025.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1318769> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Number of meetings of the Open Data Working Group held per period with participation from all key institutions and with senior stakeholders from each [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The Rulebook on the methodology for the development of the national and local register of pollution sources, as well as the methodology for the types, methods and deadlines for data collection [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Number of stakeholders using the Open Data Hub [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Number of participants at trainings, workshops and networking events organized at the local level. The targeted number of participants was 120, while the project reported the participation of 250 participants. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)