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# Introduction

UNDP commissioned the evaluation of the“Strengthening capacities for the acceleration of EU accession of Montenegro II” project**.** The Project Strengthening capacities for the acceleration of EU accession of Montenegro II” is funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and implemented by UNDP in partnership with the Office for European Integration and the Secretariat General of the Government. The general objective of the project was to assist, advise and support EU accession negotiations through strengthening the capacities of the Government of Montenegro in responding to the demands of the new phases of accession process, including the areas of policy planning and coordination.

The Evaluation is an opportunity to benefit from an independent assessment of activities implemented within the project and its performance. The evaluation will assist UNDP, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Montenegrin Office for European Integration and the Secretariat General of the Government to be informed of project’s performance to date and to plan future interventions. The evaluation was designed following the evaluation criteria defined by OECD DAC[[1]](#footnote-2) and adhering to United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for evaluation[[2]](#footnote-3). In addition, the evaluation also followed UNEG Code of Conduct and Ethical Guideline for Evaluations[[3]](#footnote-4).

## 1.1 Context analysis

The project “Strengthening capacities of the Ministry of European Affairs”, funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and implemented by UNDP, started on October 1, 2017. The general objective of the project was to assist, advise and support EU accession negotiations through strengthening the capacities of the Government of Montenegro in responding to the demands of the new phases of accession process, including the areas of policy planning and coordination.

After seven months, the Ministry of European Affairs (MEA) ceased to exist following the Minister’s resignation. The activities related to the accession of Montenegro to the EU were taken over by the Office for the European Integrations (OEI), which was established within the Cabinet of the Prime Minister. The mandate of the Directorate for Coordination, Monitoring Alignment and Implementation of Strategies defining Public Policies fell under the Secretariat General of the Government (SGG), which is also under Prime Minister.

Montenegro submitted a request for EU membership in December 2008 and received the status of the candidate country in December 2010, while accession negotiations opened in June 2012. By the beginning of 2022, Montenegro opened all, and closed three negotiating chapters. For the purpose of EU accession process, Montenegro has established a negotiating structure in which the Office for European Integration (OEI) has a central role at the technical level. OEI was established in April 2018 and took over most of the responsibilities from the former Ministry of European Affairs (MEA). The establishment of a new structure led to the distribution of responsibilities between the newly established OEI and the Secretariat General of the Government (SGG), as well as the involvement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) in the administration related to the negotiation process.

The advanced stage in the EU negotiations imposed more challenging tasks to the Montenegrin administration, including work on better governance and strategic planning, in particular stricter rules for coherence and coordination of policy planning processes. Significant results have been achieved since the 2017 project began, as legal and institutional framework for policy coordination was established and is now in force. To avoid slowing down the pace of EU negotiations and affect policy planning, as well as programming and absorption rate of IPA funds, more focus should be put on outcome-oriented, evidence-based approach when drafting strategies, in synergy with researchers and academia at all stages of policy development.

Full compliance with the Acquis Communautaire is achieved through primary and secondary legislation. By joining the EU, regulations become legally binding for all citizens and business entities of the new member state, and therefore every state that joins the EU is obliged to translate the acquis into one of the official languages of the EU. Translation of the legal text into the Montenegrin language and its edits is extremely demanding and represent a significant effort for the candidate country. For the translation of the legal text into Montenegrin, it is necessary to continuously strengthen the capacities of the Department for the preparation of the Montenegrin version of the EU acquis.

In addition, informing the public about the negotiation process and the EU is one of the most important tasks of the institution that oversees coordinating and monitoring the negotiation process. Although the current support for Montenegro's entry into the EU is high, these activities are extremely important.

## 1.2 Subject of the Evaluation

The project is aimed to assist, advise and support Montenegrin EU accession negotiations through strengthening the capacities of the Government in responding to the demands of the new phases of accession process, including the areas of policy planning and coordination. The aim is to enhance compliance and implementation of policies, and to improve internal and external government coordination in relation to accession priorities, with specific focus on the negotiation Chapters 8, 23, 24 and 27. The project strengthens capacities of government institutions to coordinate and lead the overall EU accession process, as well as to ensure better coherence between a number of parallel processes relevant for the EU integration.

After two years of project implementation, the project was extended for another two years with modified outputs and outcomes and increased funding. On October 18, 2021 the project was extended for additional 9 months and the funding was increased once again. The project timeline is presented in diagram below, while main outputs and outcomes of both phases of the project are presented in Table below.
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*Table 1. Project's outputs and outcomes*

| **2017-2019** | **2019-2022** |
| --- | --- |
| Result 1: Internal (functional and technical) capacities of the MEA improved, resulting in more efficient performance of the Ministry | Result 1.2. Internal capacities of OEI and the EU negotiation structure strengthened to fulfil the remaining closing benchmarks |
| 1.1. Undertake strategic planning exercise with Ministry to help define priorities and goals in the Ministry Strategic Plan 2018-2020 and align staff set up and organization to achieve it.  1.2. Provide expert support to develop internal procedures within the Ministry  1.3 Engage 3 local consultants for supporting the negotiations, 2 local consultants for the policy alignment and coordination and 2 local consultants for strengthening of the Ministry’s capacities.  1.4. Support in development of specific briefing skills for ministry employees, writing reports, briefing from meetings, preparation of talking points and presentations.  1.5. Organise a conference at the end of the project to discuss way forward. | 1.2.1: Support provided through local junior experts for negotiation chapters on the long-term basis  1.2.2: Support provided by senior experts for purpose of implementation of CBMs in the negotiation chapters  1.2.3: Strengthened capacities of the OEI to improve the coordination of the negotiation process with all important stakeholders |
| Result 2: Capacities of MEA dealing with the EU accession negotiations improved | Result 2.2: Strengthened system for legal alignment with the EU acquis and preparation of the national version of the EU acquis |
| 2.1. Through technical assistance strengthen capacities of the MEA to coordinate the process of addressing the chapter benchmarks and adaptation of the action plans for a number of selected negotiation chapters.  2.2. Support to development of the relevant legal and other documents (e.g. manual, operational plan) for coordination of activities for the implementation of the EU assistance.  2.3. Provide technical assistance to MEA by establishing the model for the negotiations especially in terms of managing the Negotiations process through Norwegian experience – so called «Pipeline system»  2.4. Support in organizing trainings for civil servants from relevant ministries and other state agencies on topics in the fields under negotiation chapters. | 2.2.1: Alignment of the national legislation with the EU acquis supported  2.2.2: Preparation of the national version of the EU acquis supported |
| Result 3: Improved system for efficient coordination of the EU accession process | Result 3.1: Promoted EU values and results in the negotiation process in ensuring citizen’s support for the accession process |
| 3.1: Detailed analyses of the coordination and functioning of the EU accession process within government was developed | 3.1.1: Enhanced public speaking skills of the EU negotiation structure  3.1.2: Launching a promotional campaign on EU integration process |
| Result 4: Capacities for the Implementations of Acquis strengthened | Result 4.1: Enhanced evidence-based policy planning as a prerequisite for major quality of government strategies and better advancement of Montenegro in the EU negotiations. |
| 4.1: The existing framework of public policy planning was analyzed with the aim of enhancing policy coordination and streamlining sector strategies in function of a more efficient EU integration. Basic elements of the regulatory framework for improving the quality of strategic planning documents was developed, with a focus on the minimum quality criteria, that will enable MEA to issue opinions on their content  4.2: Technical assistance was provided in developing a legal act to support efficient strategic planning of public policies, with focus on enhancing the quality of strategic papers and quality check control of the strategic documents defining public policies, as well as their streamlining and alignment with key EU policies.  4.3: Support for harmonization of national legislation with the acquis provided  4.4: Guidelines to support the legislative act to enhance the coherence among the strategic planning documents, in line with the practice of analyzing the existing draft strategies were developed  4.5: Network of Strategic Planning Focal Points established, aimed at enhancing awareness across civil service of the importance of better strategic planning for reaching the goal of EU accession and improving inter-institutional cooperation  4.6: Support to the mandate of MEA was provided for coordinating strategies by the development/updating/ of the key strategic documents through organization of workshops/seminars/specific trainings on policy planning and policy planning cycle  A.4.7. Provide support for development/updating/platforms on the role of Parliament and other actors in the process of Accession Negotiations | 4.1.1: Promote evidence-informed and evidence-based policy making among decision-makers and to the citizens, in line with good EU practices  4.1.2: Potential policy areas to pilot enhanced evidence-informed policy development, with respect to the strategies in the pipeline for the EU negotiations explored  4.1.3: Possible systemic solutions explored in order for the Government and academia to work together on better policy making |

The project implementation started on October 1, 2017 and it will end on July 1, 2022. The total budget of the project is 9,822,090 NOK (954,497 EUR).

## 1.3 Objectives of the assignment

The objective of this assignment was to conduct the evaluation of the project “Strengthening capacities for the acceleration of EU accession of Montenegro”. The evaluation specifically aimed to:

* Assess project results achieved against planned objectives, targets and indicators, including the aspects of effectiveness and efficiency of the intervention and sustainability of project benefits beyond the lifetime of the project, based on the analysis of the documents produced by the project (reports, analysis, papers, etc.) and interviews with major stakeholders including project partners;
* Provide reflections on the state of play now and capacities of the main actors as compared to the beginning of the project implementation and in relation to that, provide recommendations and guidance for future programming in the EU Accession area;

• Identify and consolidate good practices, lessons learned and make recommendations on processes, management, partnerships and other aspects of project implementation that would benefit future engagement of UNDP in this area.

The evaluation looked at the entire Project within the broader Montenegrin EU accession negotiations and related national priorities. The evaluation covered the entire project implementation period (October 2017 – March 2022).

# Methodology

## 2.1 Evaluation design and approach

The evaluation was designed as utilization-focused and consultative, maximizing the value of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations for the intended users and supporting lessons learning for future interventions. The evaluation applied a mixed methods approach, combining the use of qualitative and quantitative data, while relying on both primary and secondary data sources throughout the evaluation process. During the inception phase, the evaluation consultant consulted with UNDP to develop a set of evaluation questions in line with the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and coherence as its basis. All the evaluation questions were then further elaborated through indicators within the evaluation matrix (Annex 1).

The main data collection methods included policy review (UNDP’s corporate policy and strategic documents, Project’s results framework, government policies and strategies), documentary analysis (general documentation review, review of secondary sources, reports, analyses, studies) and primary data (interviews and survey results). The evaluation consultant considers the data collection methods to be adequate given data needs, budget, and time constraints.

**Participation:** The evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner and participation of key stakeholders was ensured in all phases of the evaluation, including the planning, inception, fact-finding, and reporting. These elements are intertwined throughout the evaluation design and summarized in the evaluation workplan. Evaluation expert used key informant interviews with key stakeholders from the government, UNDP, and the donor as sounding board for the evaluation.

## 2.2 Data collection methods and tools

The evaluation used an evidence-based approach, combining a variety of quantitative and qualitative data collection tools, which helped to ensure that the limitations of one type of data were balanced by the strengths of another. The main quantitative data sources were secondary data and existing documentation, including UNDP’s reports and data sources. The evaluator generated qualitative data through key informant interviews and one group discussions. Triangulation was used to strengthen the reliability and robustness of all findings.

### Documentary analysis – inception and desk review phase

Within the inception and document review phase, evaluator liaised with UNDP to conduct the stakeholder mapping, resulting in a list of key informants to be consulted during the evaluation process. Besides, evaluator conducted an in-depth and structured documentary review. The document review established documentary evidence for most indicators and established preliminary hypotheses to be tested during primary data collection.

### Primary data collection

**Remote Key informant interviews (individual and group interviews)**- Most of the primary data were collected remotely using zoom online conferencing tool from prioritized key informants during the field phase. During the primary data collection phase, semi-structured key informant interviews (KII) were carried out with i) UNDP team; ii) key government interlocutors; iii) consultants; iv) donor; and v) Sigma. A total of 27 key informants (16 women, 11 men) were interviewed (Annex 2).

A Perception survey was distributed to all members of negotiation structure and the Commission for EU integration, i.e., to a total of 713 persons, out of which, a total of 237government officials participated in the survey (33% of total invited; 65.5% F, 34.6% M). Most respondents are members of working groups coming from public sector (73%) while 17% are members of working groups not representing public sector). Half of respondents have been directly involved in the negotiation process for over five years, while 29% were engaged for less than a year. 12% of respondents have been engaged for 3-4 years and the remaining 9% have been engaged 1-2 years. Due to relatively good response rate and coverage, the survey responses have been used as important data source for triangulation of findings for the evaluation.

## 2.3 Data analysis

Once the primary data collection was finalized, evaluator embarked on data analysis and synthesis of evidence and findings. Specific methods for analysis of quantitative and qualitative data collected through the document review and stakeholder interviews were applied as follows:

***Thematic narrative analysis*** through structured desk review to enable identification of key themes covered by the Joint Programme that are of relevance to the indicators outlined in the evaluation matrix. Specifically, analysis methods used included:

* 1. ***Descriptive quantitative analysis*** of quantitative data collected through document review of available monitoring data, reports and external sources with cross tabulation for evaluation indicators, but also criteria of interest (such as gender, equity or disability, or geographic location) where relevant.
  2. ***Qualitative iterative data analysis*** allowed to connect, and structure key thought units related to each evaluation question (EQ) deriving from stakeholder interviews into clusters and identifying the key themes within each cluster. These formed emergent themes from each category for further analysis. Triangulation of data was conducted determine if inputs were coming from multiple sources and stakeholder levels and multiple stakeholder categories. Observations or comments that only came from a single source or a single category of stakeholder were given less weight during the building of the analysis. Finding highlighted in the report are those emerging from multiple actors and across multiple stakeholder categories.

The evaluation utilized two types of **triangulation** that served to highlight any inconsistencies between document analysis and the feedback from key informants, i.e. how external parties perceive the results of the measures undertaken within the Joint Programme. These were: i) **Methods triangulation**, both qualitative and quantitative data was used to elucidate complementary aspects of the same subject; and ii) **Data sources triangulation**, which involves examining the consistency of different data sources within the same methods.

## 2.4 Limitations and mitigation measures

The evaluation was conducted remotely through virtual meetings, using Zoom as communication channel. The remote primary data collection was conducted during March 2022, with a slightly longer timeframe for primary data collection to allow wider participation taking into account remote data collection approach. One remaining limitation that the evaluation encountered related to the remote approach is a lack of opportunity to observe and gain insights from in-person interviews, as it would have been done in in-person evaluation.

# **Key findings**

This chapter presents the review of the overall performance of the project “Strengthening capacities for the acceleration of EU accession of Montenegro II” from different perspectives: project relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of project results, coherence, and efficiency. The evidence collected and presented as key findings in this report derive from thorough review of documents that were obtained from UNDP, secondary data sources gathered by the evaluator throughout the process, and interviews and a survey with key informants. Quantitative and qualitative data was analysed, and findings were triangulated to ensure balanced and evidence-based review of the project performance and its catalytic potential.

## 3.1 Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right thing?

**EQ 1. To what extent the intervention objectives and design respond to Government of Montenegro’s needs, policies, and priorities in its EU accession negotiations and continue to do so given evolving political circumstances?**

Finding 1: The design and development and implementation of the Project was informed by thorough analyses and experiences gathered through implementation of previous UNDP interventions in support to Government’s priorities to strengthen its institutional capacities for EU accession negotiations. The project adapted well to evolving political circumstances and evolving accession context in Montenegro.

Since receiving the candidate country status in December 2010 and opening accession negotiations in June 2012, Montenegro has successfully opened all 33 and closed 3 negotiating chapters. The success to open all negotiation chapters has resulted from intensive reforms across all sectors and readiness to create and maintain structures which would intensively work on negotiations. The negotiation structure’s technical work is led by the Office for European Integration (OEI), which took over most of these relevant responsibilities from the former Ministry of European Affairs (MEA) in 2018. Besides, the Secretariat General of the Government (SGG) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) have also been engaged in the process.

The negotiation process itself has imposed several complex tasks to the Montenegrin administration, including work on better governance and strategic planning, in particular stricter rules for coherence and coordination of policy planning processes. Considering the small Montenegrin public administration and large demands within the negotiation process, additional support has been crucial to ensuring that the process is running smoothly and to the benefit of the country and its citizens. Evidence collected through document review and stakeholder interviews, as well as responses to the survey show that the project Strengthening capacities for the acceleration of EU accession of Montenegro II” has provided stable and important support to the needs of the national negotiation structures when it comes to strengthening evidence base, capacity strengthening and supporting policy coordination across the reference period. Collected evidence confirms that the project’s combined intervention through supporting capacity strengthening of the OEI and of the EU negotiation structure in fulfilling remaining closing benchmarks and investing the evidence based policy and legal alignment with the EU acquis and preparation of the national version of the EU acquis has been extremely relevant to underpin Montenegro’s efforts in this area. The production of a number of comparative analytical studies relative to the national legislation and transposition of the EU acquis; investing in the [MONTERM English-Montenegrin terminology database](http://www.eiprevod.gov.me/) and relevant coordination and evidence base knowledge platforms; piloting evidence-informed policy development; and support to policy, integrity and transparency efforts, etc. have been viewed as important support interventions which responded to the needs of the national partners and underpinning EU’s efforts in this regards too.

The project was developed in close consultation with the national government counterparts and was informed by thorough assessment of Montenegro’s accession process and related needs as well as expertise and experience generated through implementation of previous UNDP assistance to the government. Throughout the project implementation, UNDP remained in continuous **close contact with the government counterparts**, who emphasised that they were **in the driving seat in project planning and implementation** (in particular Steering Committee meetings, observers during the selection of experts and procurement of services), which enhanced ownership and relevance of the project. In particular relevant in the view of all interviewed stakeholders has been the provision of **combined local and international expertise and flexibility to respond to arising needs**, measures that were seen as an added value of the project.

Interviewed stakeholders found that the project invested in identifying and selecting national consultants with expertise in relevant areas, which proved to be extremely relevant for two reasons: 1) ensuring that **outsources expertise comes with deep familiarity and understanding of the local context**, which helps provide relevant and efficient support; and 2) investing in **building local expertise**. The familiarity of local experts with local context, policies and institutional structures was seen as relevant primarily for the speed of provision of needed support services. National government counterparts noted that they did not have to invest time to familiarize experts with Montenegro’s context, which ensured efficiencies on both sides. Besides, experts’ full-time engagement in day-to-day work of respective institution was seen as crucial as it presented an opportunity for institutions to **have ‘extra pairs of hands’ to support their work** but also as an investment in capacity strengthening of national experts by engaging them in work streams and processes. This is important from the perspective of outstanding ban on employment across public administration in Montenegro and high turnover of staff across the structures, but also in light of limited human resource capacities in the public administration particularly in some thematic areas (such as environment and climate change). Interviewed national experts also confirmed **the dual relevance of such engagement for their own learning** and also for the contribution to the national structures.

The project also outsourced international experts for a number of support interventions in close coordination with beneficiaries. **Consultative processes in development of the ToRs and selection of international experts** were considered as important to ensure appropriate support. In response to beneficiaries’ requests to outsource experts from Slovenia and Croatia, the project to commission experts from these countries, which was praised as extremely relevant primarily for familiarity with context but also preventing the language barrier.

Additional relevance factor has been the fact that the project was funded by Norway, which has a special status in relation to the EU. As a member of EEA but not the Union, Norway is viewed by national stakeholders as important partner who provides support the Government of Montenegro in its accession process through its experience in negotiations with the EU but also **neutral but positive positioning when it comes to Montenegro’s EU accession**.

The project was agile to adapt to changing circumstances both when it comes to evolving needs and priorities relative to negotiations but also COVID-19. Document review and stakeholder interviews show that the project managed to promptly adapt to such changing circumstances, ensuring that the planned support is implemented as appropriately as possible given changing circumstances.

## 3.2 Efficiency - How well were resources being used?

**EQ 2. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?**

Finding 2: The Project ensured due diligence, efficiency and adaptive management of its portfolio. A challenge to efficiency related to the stretched human resources, due to the fact that the project was implemented by very small team, in some periods limited only to a nominally part time manager. The implementation of such comprehensive portfolio of activities was efficient but was found to spread human resources too thin. Ensuring that a bigger core team was put in place for implementation of such comprehensive project would have helped ensuring that the team did not have to work overtime to ensure that all implementation dimensions are covered appropriately.

The project has been rather ambitious and covered a comprehensive set horizontal interventions across the negotiation structure, with a large number of activities and themes. This demands significant coordination and management efforts for UNDP and main national counterparts, primarily the OEI and GSS. The review of Project implementation data, corroborated by stakeholder interviews, shows the project’s diligence to use available project funds efficiently, despite its broad scope and multitude of partners and target areas. UNDP’s efficiency driver has been the technical competence and personal dedication of the project manager, contributing to the efficient implementation of the interventions. The project structure envisaged engagement of a part-time Project Manager (50%) and a Project Finance and Administration Officer (part time 20%) during the period 2017-2019, with addition of the Project Coordinator (part time 70%) during the period 2020-2022. The Project Manager has had overall responsibility for the implementation of the project including operational and financial responsibility, with the support of Project Coordinator during last two years. The Project Finance and Administration Officer has dealt with day-to-day administrative activities related to procurement, project administration, payments and monitoring.

During the project implementation, there has been fluctuation of Project Coordinator with gaps in such position for some periods of time, whereby Project Manager was solely working on this project. The fact that the project was implemented by only one person for the most period of implementation of such a complex and demanding programme (both thematically and implementation wise), with one more staff member for some period of time (due to fluctuation of staff), points to challenges with overstretching of human resources and too high demand. This has been considered as a weakness despite high praise for the management efforts across the board of the project.

The evaluation found that the project secured strong and competent technical staff, through outsourced services where specific thematic expertise was needed. This structure of outsourced experts (national and international) appropriately addressed the personnel needs related to policy and system strengthening, and the technical support to negotiation processes. It is in particular important considering the fact that much of the reform interventions require highly specialized tasks, for many of which Montenegrin public administration may not be adequately prepared. **Project efforts to engage a mix of national and international experts assisted in efficiently building a critical mass of local expertise to be absorbed by national system in one way or another**. Besides, the interviewed stakeholders noted that engaging national experts proved useful in light of the COVID-19 restrictions which would have prevented international experts to travel. The Project was affected to some extent by COVID-19, primarily when it comes to restrictions on travel and in-person meetings. However, the project shifted online for those activities that could be implemented in such manner (e.g., trainings) and also respected health and safety measures.

Review of financial aspects of the project shows that a total of ﻿9,822,090 NOK (954,497 EUR) was provided by Norway with additional ﻿61,245.85 EUR contribution by UNDP. The utilization rate has been good, with the full funding expected to be used as planned. Some savings were made in light of travel restrictions, and these have been relocated to other budget lines to provide more opportunity for support. The project underwent four amendments across the period of implementation reflecting arising needs of the government institutions. ﻿Review of project documentation and stakeholder interviews showed that the **amendments contributed to efficiency of the project and indicated flexibility and agile management in light of changing dynamic negotiation process.**

## 3.3 Effectiveness: Was the intervention achieving its objectives?

The following section provides a review of project performance and its catalytic potential of delivered outputs to contribute to outcomes and impacts as envisaged in the intervention logic. The Project has drawn on the expertise and strategic positioning of UNDP in its support to the Government towards ensuring effective negotiation process within Montenegro’s EU accession. The support was delivered through a mix of capacity building, policy dialogue and technical assistance, aimed at building a coordinated, evidence based and expert policy making and negotiation process. at institutional, policy and programme/operational levels.

**EQ 3. To what extent has the project achieved its outputs and outcomes as stipulated in the project’s results framework?**

The Project has been expected to assist, advise and support EU accession negotiations and wider policy planning and coordination as the basis for stronger Montenegro’s EU accession efforts. Evaluation found that UNDP has been strategically positioned as a key partner of the government actors in these efforts, and managed to build and maintain strong partnerships with negotiation structures and the OEI and GSS. The main positive framework condition gearing the results of the project has been **strong willingness and ownership of the Government to progress in EU accession** and buy in for the project. On the other hand, negative conditions have related to the level of absorption capacity across public institutions, constraints limiting employment in the public administration, and the COVID-19 pandemic which created some resource limitations.

Within these framework conditions, UNDP invested in: i)Supporting the internal capacities of OEI and EU negotiation structure in fulfilling remaining closing benchmarks; ii) strengthening the system of Montenegro for legal alignment with the EU acquis and preparation of the national version of the EU acquis; iii) promotion of EU values and results achieved in the negotiation process; and iv) enhancing evidence-based policy planning as a prerequisite for major quality of government strategies and better advancement of Montenegro in the EU negotiations. The assessment of project’s contribution to each of related outcomes is presented below.

**Outcome 1. Strengthened internal capacities of OEI and the EU negotiation structure to fulfil remaining closing benchmarks**

Finding 3: The Project contributed to enhanced capacity of the OEI and relevant national institutions engaged in EU negotiations across Chapters 23, 24, 27 and 8. The Project support has resulted in the enhancement of the evidence base and better understanding of EU practices relative to these Chapters and stronger institutional capacity to deliver on priorities within negotiation processes and alignment with EU acquis in given areas.

The Project provided continuous technical assistance through a pool of national and international experts and capacity strengthening opportunities in support to enhancing the capacities of OEI and relevant institutions engaged in the EU negotiations. The document review and as corroborated by stakeholder interviews shows that the project engaged 16 national experts[[4]](#footnote-5) with an appropriate mix of junior and senior national experts. The experts provided support to internal capacity strengthening of the then Ministry of European Affairs (MoEA)/OEI and intensive administrative and professional support to OEI and institutions in charge of certain negotiation chapters (i.e. Rule of Law chapters (23 – Judiciary and Fundamental Rights and 24 – Justice, Freedom, and Security), Chapter 8 – Competition, and Chapter 27 – Environment and Climate Change).

Document review and stakeholder interviews point to effective expert support to the process of strategic planning for the then Ministry of European Affairs to help define priorities and goals in the Ministry Strategic Plan 2018-2020 and align staff set up and organization to achieve such goals. With expert support, the Strategic plan was drafted during the internal process including the strategic planning workshop facilitated by the expert. However, the MoEA ceased to exist following the restructuring of the government, but the Strategic plan remained relevant for the OEI, which was successor of main EU related tasks of the Ministry.

Finding 4: Project’s support to the Chapter 8 contributed to better understanding of European state aid practices, leading to better state aid case solutions and wider alignment of national structures to EU acquis. The Chapter 8 is wide and Project’s decision to focus on specific sections helped target realistic results areas.

Evaluation found evidence of cohesive and valuable support of the project to the negotiation process through integration of national experts into the national institutions included in the negotiation process. The national experts were recruited through a highly competitive process using UNDP procedures but with hands-on engagement of relevant national institutions in selection, which helped ensure adequate expertise was provided to the institutions. The project hired experts on longer term full-time contracts and placed them within the institutions, to ensure that the experts can provide day-to-day support to respective institutions. Stakeholder interviews with beneficiary institutions and experts noted that **effective support was provided in terms of expanding evidence base for institutions in their processes to draft legal acts, strategic documents/action plans**, and similar as well as support in establishing and maintenance of the system for implementation of certain EU standards. The experts also provided ongoing support to organization of trainings, conferences and other events as well as other day-to-day activities of the relevant line ministries and institutions.

For instance, comprehensive support to Chapter 8: Competition policy included a comprehensive set of support measures to all relevant institutions, in particular focusing on state aid and clearer basis for the Negotiating Position for Chapter 8 and enhanced capacities of the Agency for Protection of Competition. Specifically, a bulk of support was provided to enhancing the institutional and evidence base structure to reform the state aid in Montenegro through extensive advisory and analytical support[[5]](#footnote-6) which helped to address issues in the implementation of the state aid legislation and preparation of required changes and amendments of state aid legislation and administrative practices. Besides, support to the Ministry of Capital Investments resulted in a set of proposals of possible measures for improving the functioning of the state-owned enterprises (SOEs), which are aligned with the State Aid rules, based on the functional analysis of the SOEs in the field of transport. Finally, the support also resulted in enhanced preparedness of the national institutions when it comes to issues such as: proceedings for infringement of competition, as well as proceedings against decisions of the Agency for Protection of Competition (APC); transferring the EU and regional countries practices and taking evidence to establish a violation of competition.

Finding 5: Project’s support to the Chapter 27 contributed to greater government understanding of the needs to align national regulatory and institutional structures in light of the respective Chapter negotiations as leading to evidence base for the development of a costed institutional design. The Project efforts also lead to adoption of relevant legislative package, which has helped bring Montenegro closer to opening the negotiation chapter.

Document review and stakeholder interviews provide ample evidence of project’s effective support to strengthening capacities under **Negotiation Chapter 27** – **Environment and Climate Change**. The ongoing support by national experts was considered as crucial to enhance capacity of relevant national institutions (in particular continuous hands-on support) but also expert support focused on enhancing evidence base and legislation within the wider Chapter 27. Stakeholders noted effective support to enhance understanding of the financial needs within Chapter 27 through expert analytical support. In particular crucial, in opinion of the stakeholders, was the fact that this Assessment of Financial Needs within Chapter 27 provided clear overview of needs which helped the government to prioritise their work and better understand the full scope of such wide and comprehensive Chapter. The assessment was adopted by the Government and serves as evidence base for their planning purposes. Interviewed stakeholders also noted the usefulness of such methodology which can serve as foundation for similar assessments in other chapters.

The Project also provided effective support to drafting of the Law on Establishment of Framework for the Protection of the Marine Environment line with the EU acquis, which resulted in its adoption by the Parliament in December 2019 (Official Gazette of Montenegro 73/19). Expert support to drafting the relevant bylaws also resulted in their adoption in April 2021, leading to direct results in terms of the transposition of Marine Framework Directive into the national legislation. Interviewed stakeholders noted that the project’s support leading to this result was very effective. On the other side, the planned support to the capacity strengthening of relevant government institutions on eco-crime and liability for damage and noise were canceled due to the fact that the selected international expert from Croatia could not provide hands-on support due to travel restrictions in light of COVID-19. Feedback from interviewed stakeholders shows that this was a missed opportunity, with understanding that the cancelation reasons were beyond project’s control.

Finding 6: Project’s support to the Chapter 23 contributed to enhancing national capacity and framework for integrity and prevention of corruption. The support to upgrading integrity plan methodology and corruption risk assessment contributes to good governance and institutional integrity.

Project’s support to the Negotiation Chapter 23 - Judiciary and Fundamental Rights focused on provision of targeted technical assistance to the Agency for Prevention of Corruption and the National Council for the Fight against High-Level Corruption. The institutional support to these two bodies resulted in adoption of the Guidebook for Procedures of the work of the National Council and the draft Memorandum of Understanding for cooperation with Revenue and Customs Administration, and Ministry of Finance and Social Welfare with the Council. Besides, the project helped produce a Strategic plan of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption 2022-2024 with an Action Plan for 2022. Interviewed stakeholders shared appreciation of this support, resulting in more institutionalized strategic framework for further work of the two bodies.

Wider support in this area targeted concrete priorities linked to fight against corruption, notably support to legislative solutions and upgrading the corruption risk assessments and related integrity plans as well as strategic frameworks for the work of the two above mentioned main bodies in charge of fight against of corruption. The analysis on corruption proofing of legislation included recommendations for the improvement of the Methodology on anti-corruption assessment of laws, especially in parts related to the identification of priority legislation for the special risk of corruption. The support resulted in checklist for draft laws to eliminate the risk of corruption.

Within the framework of this support, an analysis of assessment of integrity plans was conducted as a basis for upgrading respective methodologies and approaches. The methodology was also piloted for state authorities and social and child protection institutions, in assessing whether public authorities conduct anti-corruption measures and whether their implementation has led to any changes.

The work on this area was boosted by the support from Korea, which helped enhance the methodology based on Korean experiences in development and application of Korea’s Anti-Corruption Initiative Assessment. Stakeholder interviews noted that the Methodology, once adopted, will assist to enhance planning and application of anti-corruption measures. However, all interviewed stakeholders noted that the **Agency does not have sufficient financial and human resource capacity to scale up the methodology across the government institutions, despite its quality which was praised**. The methodology requires strong engagement and deep-dive into sector-specific measures, which require strong sector expertise and devoted human resources which were provided by the project in the pilot phase. Institutional solutions to scale up the methodology are still not fully feasible at the time of finalization of this report.

**Outcome 2. Strengthened system for legal alignment with the EU acquis and preparation of the national version of the EU acquis**

Finding 7: Support to the upgrading the terminology database (MONTERM), the coordination platforms and investment in sector-specific capacity strengthening helps enhancing national capacity and framework to facilitate transposition of the EU acquis into national legislation. The project provided effective support, though further needs remain to ensure full transposition.

Closely inter-related to the specific negotiation chapters’ support interventions analysed within Outcome 1 above was UNDP’s support to strengthening of the system for legal alignment with the EU acquis and preparation of the national version of the EU acquis. The technical assistance (in the form of advisory, trainings, workshops and facilitated coordination activities) was provided by the project to strengthen capacities of the OEI to coordinate the process of addressing the chapter benchmarks and adaptation of the action plans for a number of selected negotiation chapters. Document review shows that a number of capacity building activities, including trainings, workshops, discussions and advisory support was provided to wider pool of representatives of national institutions across the implementation of the project. As corroborated by stakeholder interviews, these events helped bring sector experts together to analyse, discuss and agree on steps in alignment of national structures to respective EU negotiation chapters, but also to raise awareness and expertise relative to sector/negotiation chapter requirements. Interviewed stakeholders noted that bringing international experts helped national actors to strengthen their capacity and institutional framework to respond to the needs in terms of legal alignment with the EU acquis.

Stakeholder interviews also pointed to outstanding needs across different negotiation chapters, which require continued expert support, which is not readily available without external support. Within the efforts to strengthen the legal alignment, the Project also assisted the process of upgrading the MONTERM English-Montenegrin terminology database (including the multilingual terminology database (Monterm), the bilingual English-Montenegrin corpus of translations (Montekorpus) and monolingual and bilingual terminology analyser (Terminator)). Document review and stakeholder interviews show that investment in upgrading this database provides direct contribution to enhancement of structures for translation of the EU acquis to Montenegrin, ensuring that the terminology is clear and terms used consistently across legislative documents.

Evidence collected across evaluation process shows that the Project contributed significantly to the enhancement of internal (cross-government) and external (government – other sectors) coordination within the wider framework of EU accession negotiations. Across all areas of intervention, the project has invested significant efforts into strengthening coordination systems for each of the targeted negotiation structures. The role of national experts was critical in this regard, particularly the support to elaboration of efficient coordination, planning and monitoring mechanisms for the most demanding individual chapters, primarily in the area of rule of law. Besides, continuous efforts were invested in advisory and capacity building support to improving the working procedures and IT systems for the overall coordination of EU Accession process. The support resulted in upgrades of the respective IT system which, once finalised, will allow for efficient sharing and oversight of all relevant documents entailing all EU Acquis policies and topics as well as related inter-institutional and intra-institutional processes.

Besides, the Project also facilitated coordination between respective government institutions in charge of specific chapters and academia. However, the coordination with academia is still in embryonic stage and will need further support to be strengthened to ensure full utility of academic research and knowledge to underpin evidence-based policy making (See also Outcome 4 below).

**Outcome 3. Promoted EU values and results in the negotiation process in order to ensure citizen’s support to the accession process**

Finding 8: The project provided some, albeit limited support to the promotion of EU values and negotiation process results. Implemented activities were creative but not sufficient to ensues citizens’ support to the accession process overall.

The negotiation process is a very technical, sector specific process which is quite often very hard to explain and promote to the wider public. The extensive technical efforts are hence often not seen by citizens, who do not understand the benefits, commitments and responsibilities arising from membership and government’s efforts to respond to them. This lack of understanding of the needs, requirements and invested efforts affects citizens’ support to the accession process overall. To respond to the need for better promotion of results of Montenegrin negotiation structures, the project included some, albeit limited, support efforts to strengthen capacities of the members of the negotiation structure to better present achieved results. Within the framework of support, trainings were organised on public speaking and crisis communication for the representatives of the negotiating structure. Evaluation could not find evidence of improved communication of EU process resulting from this support, due to the fact that the capacity strengthening support was limited to the junior public servants and public relations officers in the ministries.

Besides, a promotional campaign was organised to share concrete results of the EU accession process. Within this framework, two short videos about the benefits were produced along with promotional materials such as notebooks, cups, USBs, pens and T-shirts that were distributed. Besides, the project organised online consultations with the youth and workshops with high school students in nine municipalities across Montenegro[[6]](#footnote-7) as space to exchange with young people on EU accession process in Montenegro. However, evaluation could not establish strong evidence of utility of such promotional activities due to time and resource constraints.

**Outcome 4. Enhanced evidence-based policy planning as a prerequisite for major quality of government strategies and better advancement of Montenegro in the EU negotiations**

Finding 9: The project’s contribution to government’s effort to strengthen its procedures and systems for evidence based policy making included the upgrades of the existing or development of new guidelines and manuals, as well as direct support to strategic planning processes. The resulting strengthened system is in place and is utilised for policy making, despite the fact that stronger engagement with academia is still not taking place despite project’s efforts.

Evidence based policy planning has been an area of continuous advocacy and technical support by UNDP across various policy areas, including the EU negotiation process. Within the framework of the project, continued expert support was provided to upgrading national methodological and institutional procedures and structures for enhancing evidence based policy making, efforts which were seen as critical contribution to government’s efforts in this area. Specifically, investment in upgrading the ***Methodology for Policy Development, Development and Monitoring of the Implementation of Strategic Documents*** was considered as effective contribution to further strengthening of such processes across the government. To ensure that the guidelines are in place for each step of the policy cycle, the Project also provided support to strengthening the system for evaluation of public policies. The support in this area will culminate in the ***Manual on evaluation of public policies***. The manual provides detailed overview of monitoring and evaluation processes, methods and techniques for evaluation, data collection and analysis, various types of evaluations (internal, external, mixed; ex-ante, formative, ex-post), gives practical examples for each of these elements to bring closer the vocabulary and terms used in the manual. This manual, once finalized, is considered by interviewed stakeholders as a welcome addition to formalizing policy cycle milestones and related guidelines on how to address them, through clear checklists that can lead line institutions across the policy cycle.

As mentioned in Outcome 2 above, within wider efforts to enhance evidence based consultative policy making processes, the project invested in strengthening links between academia and policy makers. This was deemed as crucial to ensure that externally conducted research and academic expertise informs policy making processes. Within these efforts, the project supported the SGG in the preparation of the Analysis on putting evidence and research in function of smart policy solutions, as well as the research on Innovative Policy Labs. Besides, the project facilitated policy makers-academia consultations in the development of the Tourism Development Strategy 2021-2025, Forestry Development Strategy 2021-2026 and Regional Development Strategy 2021-2025, National Program for Attracting Digital Nomads and Encouraging Foreign Investments in Montenegro by 2025. These efforts were considered by interviewed stakeholders as needed and welcome, albeit limited to externally facilitated efforts. All interviewed stakeholders considered the coordination and consultations between policy makers and academia as extremely needed, yet no systemic solutions or venues for such exchange were established thus far, despite project’s advocacy and piloting efforts.

The project also provided comprehensive support to the development of the Mid Term Workplan of the Government 2022-2024 and the Annual Workplan of the Government for 2022 including indicators. The support included efforts of outsourced experts to engage with line ministries to help them develop their proposals with reference to key national priorities and goals, budget planning and European integration process. Besides, the project engaged with citizens and business community in 10 sector-specific thematic focus groups to discuss key challenges and related recommendations for the government to focus on in the period between 2022-2024. Once the consultations with line ministries and external stakeholders were conducted, the project team supporting the government in defining the Workplan priorities, goals, indicators and activities. Stakeholder interviews noted the added value of project support to government efforts in this area, which contributed to more efficient and effective planning process which would not have been so smooth without external expert support.

**EQ 4. How effectively has the project built necessary and sustainable capacity of people and institutions?**

Finding 10: The project’s contribution to government’s effort to strengthen its capacity to respond to EU accession requirements has been effective overall. Continuous in-house expert and advisory support and investment in capacity strengthening has helped strengthening the system overall and ensuring smooth negotiation process.

Evidence collected through document review and stakeholder interviews shows that the project has contributed to the enhancement of sustainable capacities of targeted institutions to engage in the negotiation processes and wider evidence-based policy planning. All stakeholders agreed that continued, hands-on expert support provided by the project helped raise capacities and solve more efficiently arising issues and priorities within the negotiation process. The project also contributed to better understanding and capacity of government institutions to prepare quality government strategies, which bring transformative effects when it comes to advancement of Montenegro in the EU negotiations. In support of this, comparative analysis of survey results shows high satisfaction of survey respondents with the coordination of negotiation process. The survey results show that over half of survey respondents are extremely or very satisfied with the coordination of the negotiation process by OEI, while additional 30% of respondents are satisfied with OEI’s work in this area (See Figure below). The survey respondents also noted high level of satisfaction with negotiation structures established in 2021 (See Annex 3 with Survey responses).

Figure 1. Satisfaction with OEI's coordination of the negotiation process
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However, all interviewed stakeholders noted outstanding needs and human resource limitations across the national government institutions across all sectors. Montenegrin public administration is small and, in some areas, such as environment and climate change (Chapter 27) has very limited sector expertise, which makes it very challenging to respond to all EU accession requirements. In light of those limitations, placing experts within their institutions was crucial support interventions which helped them to advance a bit faster in terms of negotiations but also day-to-day work. Some institutions managed to integrate such outsourced expertise by hiring these experts to be full time staff, but not all institutions (and experts) managed to do so. This means that expertise and hands-on support was not sustained, which is a challenge to these institutions, as emphasised by relevant interlocutors.

## 3.4 Sustainability - The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue

**EQ 5. How do Project interventions generate sustainable change at the organisational level of relevant government institutions to continue to work on responding to the demands of the new phases of accession process, including the areas of policy planning and coordination after the end of the projects?**

UNDP has succeeded in ensuring the partnership and ownership by the government, which presents a strong foundation for sustainability. The evaluation found that the project was based on a joint understanding about where the reform and in particular the negotiation process should be going and the commitment to contribute to these reforms. The Project’s engagement at multiple levels: at system level (investment in the governments strategic planning and policy cycle; legislation and institutional and IT structures relative to transposition EU acquis), at institution level (expert support and piloting models), as well as investing in promotional activities has contributed to sustainability prospects of project interventions. This combination contributed to building durable partnerships and enhanced individual and institutional capacity. The following section presents an overview of the sustainability of the results achieved by the project and the contribution to the ownership by the Government and other stakeholders.

Finding 11: The Project supported important changes to legislation and policy planning mechanisms as well as an enhancement of institutional mechanisms to address the needs stemming from the EU negotiation process. However, the sustainability of these efforts will depend on the capacity of the government and national actors to implement the drafted and/or adopted policy and institutional solutions.

The Project worked in close partnership with the key national institutions engaged in the negotiation process to address the recognized bottlenecks and reform priorities. The support interventions benefited from strong ownership and commitment of the government counterparts. This translated into joint efforts and readiness to maximize the programme potential, as elaborated in Section 3.3 – Effectiveness.

Within these efforts, and in fulfilling its key role of policy advisory and technical assistance, the project succeeded in bringing legislative and policy contributions, resulting in adoption of several regulatory acts, a set of guidelines and manuals as well as increased institutional capacities across institutions in charge of priority negotiation Chapters The adopted legislation, manuals and guidelines and institutional processes once fully adopted, will create strong regulatory and institutional foundations for improved performance in addressing issues arising from the negotiation process.

However, interviewees from all stakeholder groups emphasized the fact that the full operationalization of such enhanced regulatory and institutional package will depend to a large extent on the competing priorities and resource limitations, which may threaten government’s ability to maintain reform and EU negotiation process focus.

The reform also requires significant financial and human resource allocations, which are more difficult to ensure given the employment freeze and the economic downturn caused by COVID-19. Some stakeholders raised concerns about the capacity of some government institutions to technically maintain and respond to the negotiation requirements. There is still limited capacity and human resources in some sectors, notably environment and climate change, which present obstacle to ensuring quality and timely response to negotiation milestones. In particular, despite project’s efforts and the desire of national institutions to integrate experts within their ranks, this was not possible in majority of cases. Only three out of 16 experts were employed by their respective host institutions. Stakeholders noted the main obstacle to the recruitments in the civil service relate to the recruitment freeze stipulated by the Optimization Plan of Public Administration 2018-2020. After the new Government was established, the adoption of the Budget for 2021 was part of the political negotiations, therefore it was adopted only on June 17, 2021. The final obstacle for new recruitments in the Office for European Integration (OEI) is pending adoption of Internal Procedures on Systematization of Job Positions in the Office of Prime Minister, since the OEI is part of it. Upon adoption of the Internal Procedures, the Personnel Plan (Kadrovski plan) needs to be adopted for the whole Government and only then new job positions can be advertised. Such challenges affected the sustainability of the project as well.

## 3.5 Coherence

**EQ 6. To what extent have the interventions of different actors been harmonised?**

Finding 12: The Project has been implemented in coherence with other relevant interventions in the targeted areas of support.

Evidence collected through document review and stakeholder interviews points to a high level of coherence and complementarity of the project support with other donor and government’s efforts within the EU accession negotiation process. The Project team and outsourced experts undertook careful and extensive efforts to actively participate and promote coordination and cooperation with the Government of Montenegro and other development partners. Such efforts helped avoid overlaps and ensure coherent project contributions to the negotiation process. Interviewed stakeholders noted project’s added value to the process by openness in communication, flexibility and readiness to engage and discuss with all partners, which contributed to the success of the project. The Project promoted effective partnerships and strategic alliances with government institutions and active EU projects around its main output areas. Such engagement has been considered as an example of best practice for Montenegro.

# Conclusions

This section provides a set of conclusions derived from the evaluation process, relating to the relevance of the Project interventions to national EU accession negotiation priorities; assessment of efficiency, effectiveness sustainability and coherence of the project.

### Relevance

**C1: The programme has underpinned and stirred important government efforts within the EU accession negotiations.**

The Projects strategic direction to providing direct support to the negation and wider government’s policy making processes was highly appropriate to the context and the needs of the negotiation structures, the OEI and the GSS in Montenegro. UNDP is strategically positioned as one of the key actors in delivering technical assistance to institutional capacity strengthening that is well aligned with government priorities, and responsive to priority needs. The Project also has helped fill a gap in human resources and technical expertise to respond to the EU accession needs, which helped bring more systematic response to the negotiation requirements and process overall.

**Lesson 1: Investing efforts to design a programme based in close consultation with main national counterparts assists relevance of intervention, ownership by government and strategic positioning. This in turn helps enhanced delivery of results**. UNDP’s Project experience in Montenegro showcases the importance of a clear intervention logic of how direct technical assistance can be combined with networking efforts with a realistic strategy to achieve results in complex and dynamic setting. Such approach is critical in supporting efforts for multisectoral and highly political coordination, particularly within demanding EU accession framework.

### Effectiveness and sustainability

**C2: Output level results ensuing from advisory and capacity strengthening interventions have been positive and confirm the strength and value added of such targeted technical assistance project. Yet, the challenge is to ensure that investments across the targeted negotiation areas transform into more sustainable outcome level results.**

The Project has engaged with relevant national actors leading negotiations across Chapters 8, 23, 24 and 27, investing in capacity strengthening, direct provision of expertise, modelling, investment in platforms and wider promotional activities. This engagement brought important output level results, through which the Project contributed to strengthened capacity of national institutions to respond to EU accession requirements. The project assisted the government to quicken the pace of negotiations, bringing important results in terms of increased regulatory and institutional capacity and faster negotiation and strategic planning pace.

Investment in capacity strengthening and modelling of innovative approaches and systems has resulted in scaled or scalable solutions and models which, once scaled up and implemented, will bring significant changes in terms of addressing the EU accession reform needs. **In some areas, such as corruption risk assessments, engaging with academia and innovative consultation approaches within sectors have marked important entry points for further engagement and deepening the support.** However, there are array of bottlenecks and barriers that limit the implementation of regulations and models, including the government’s absorption capacity and the socio-economic challenges exacerbated also by COVID-19. Due to lack of further funding, the project is not in position to offer further sustained systematic, concerted efforts targeting multiple institutional bottlenecks and incremental system changes simultaneously. The project delivered planned outputs, however, there are outstanding needs to allow some of the outputs to be fully institutionalised across all targeted chapters, which is a prerequisite for sustainability. For instance, the project provided effective support to the State aid, competitiveness, environment and climate change, integrity and fight against corruption, etc. but outstanding needs to further strengthen all these thematic areas are noted.

**Lesson 2. Achieving longer-term strategic (outcome level) objectives requires the timely adoption by the Government of an appropriate set of policies, legislative and institutional reforms through a sequenced approach in response to the EU acquis demands.** The experience in Montenegro suggests that investment in a policy area brings transformative potential when it involves (i) engaged and proactive government institutions; ii) clear definition of core policy reform steps needed for the achievement of higher level of strategic objectives as set out in the EU acquis, and/or when (ii) such investment comes with multisectoral engagement of government institutions that brings immediate benefit with potential to ultimately contribute to the realization of strategic objectives.

### Efficiency

**C3: Project efficiency was very good, uplifted by positive and constructive partnership between the Norwegian Government, UNDP and national institutions, sound results framework and efficient project management. However, the constructive and extensive project management efforts caused significant spreading of human resources which was not necessary given the availability of funding**.

Strategic positioning of UNDP and joining forces with the government actors and outsourcing technical expertise, worked well to secure partnerships with the government and responsiveness to priorities. The Project’s management efforts and dedication of core staff boosted the efficiency and effectiveness of the programme, albeit causing unnecessary spreading of these resources too thin. The programme did not encounter significant delays in implementation, aside from interruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, which determined the postponement or shift of several actions or changing the approach. Still, the COVID-19 disruptions did not negatively affect the project to a major extent. The project was implemented with due diligence in allocation of resources, and its pool of outsourced experts worked diligently to provide efficient and effective support to the government.

**Lesson 3. Ensuring adequate staffing for management of multi-sectoral and highly politically delicate programmes ensures that the human resources do not spread too thin.** Experience from the project shows the risks of spreading resources too thin if interventions that target top senior government institutions and officials engaging on a number of sectors and themes suffer from limited core management team. Adequate staffing assures that the politically sensitive roles are underpinned by management support positions which can relieve administrative burden from the project management.

### Coherence

**C4: The collaborative and flexible approach helped to maximize the project’s potential.**

The project is a positive example of collaborative and proactive partnership between the Norwegian Government, UNDP and key government institutions. The project brought in and combined where possible/relevant national and international expertise, which helped efficient and effective delivery of results. UNDP has been proactive, flexible and positive partner of the government, civil society and development partners. The open and proactive partnership approaches have been a driver of implementation of the project and enhanced the profile and prominence of UNDP as a partner in the EU accession negotiation process.

**Lesson 4: Investment in partnerships, quality technical assistance, consultative processes and flexibility in operations, while keeping the strategic direction, pays off.** The experience in Montenegro demonstrates the importance and value of investing in the development of strong links with the government, academia and CSOs in joint preparation and monitoring of the reform priorities. It demonstrates the importance of engaging with and facilitating dialogue between these partners in selection of policy choices and collecting independent views, even if (and perhaps especially when) these are not consonant with the government’s views of how to organize and implement policy and reform interventions.

# Recommendations

The recommendations for the project derive from extensive consultations with key stakeholders across the evaluation process, analysis of documentation, and the findings and conclusions of this evaluation. The Evaluator used interviews to generate ideas for future potential UNDP’s strategic directions in support to the EU accession process. The recommendations are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Recommendations

| # | Recommendation | Timeframe |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | **Continue to support government efforts to fight against corruption**  Follow up on the positive results of the Project’s support to capacity strengthening and upgrading the corruption assessments and Integrity plans as well as wider institutional support to the Agency for fight against corruption should be continued. Future UNDP support should build upon the conducted pilot analyses of the two sectors and established cooperation with South Korea, to expand the analytical and methodological reach. Such efforts should be closely linked to fulfilment of requirements coming out from the Chapters 23 and 24. | 2022 and beyond |
| 2. | **Continue and intensify support to building institutional capacity for coordination of EU Accession process**  Building on UNDP’s strategic positioning, well established relations and positive cooperation practices, support to building institutional capacity for coordination of EU accession process should be continued and intensified. Such investment is seen as critical at time when Montenegro intensifies its EU accession pace, requiring all support to stronger coordination to move reforms forward in more unified manner. | 2022 and beyond |
| 3. | **Continue investing in building institutional capacity for state aid.**  Ongoing support to State aid should build on achieved changes in policy and institutional mechanisms and models and could be operationalized through the provision of expertise and international best practices in this area. | 2022 and beyond |
| 4. | **Support further institutional capacity building of sector institutions relative to Chapter 27.**  Continue supporting government efforts to build institutional capacity within the sector of Environment and climate change. This support should be hands-on by provision of technical expertise (in the form of placing experts within the institutions) and sharing international and regional best practices and experiences. | 2022 and beyond |
| 5. | **Build on the efforts invested on evidence based policy development by intensifying cooperation with academic community**  The established links and networks between academia and policy makers on specific subjects should be capitalised on by further intensifying such venues for consultations and common work. The efforts should include a) advocacy on the value added in engaging with academia in efforts to establish sound evidence base for policies; b) facilitating dialogue and links; and c) promoting joint efforts of policy makers and academia | 2022 and beyond |
| **Operational recommendations** | | |
| 6. | **Continue strengthening strategic and operational partnerships with key government institutions within the framework of thematic UNDP support (outlined in recommendations 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 above).**  To maintain strategic positioning and delivery of results, UNDP should continue to invest in and nurturing key partnerships with Government, development partners and donors. | 2022 and beyond |

# **Annex 1. Evaluation matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation questions** | **Indicators** | **Data sources** | **Data collection techniques** | | **Data analysis** |
| **Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right thing?** | | | | | |
| EQ 1. The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to Government of Montenegro’s needs, policies, and priorities in its EU accession negotiations and continue to do so given evolving political circumstances? | * Degree of matching between the Project objectives and the objectives outlined in Government of Montenegro’s, UNDP’s and strategies of the Norwegian government * Beneficiaries needs and priorities considered * Perception of stakeholders on the degree of alignment of the Project objectives and interventions with Montenegro’s strategies and plans for EU accession * Objectives of project are adapted to the key government institutions’ needs (e.g. in terms of selection of priorities to be supported and outreach to institutions, TA approaches, etc.) based in comprehensive analysis of context and needs in specific area | * Government of Montenegro; Norway, UNDP policy documents and progress reports * Project planning documents, reports and other materials * External sources * Qualitative data from KIIs from   + Norway   + UNDP   + Government of Montenegro   + Other relevant Government stakeholders   + EU * Survey results   + Other Development partners | Document review  Semi-structured interviews | | Document review  Qualitative iterative data analysis of the KIIs with key stakeholders  Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques, and data types according to principles of iterative analysis |
| **Efficiency - How well are resources being used?** | | | | | |
| EQ 2. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? | * Degree of adequacy of:   + - Budgets     - Material     - Human resources   vis-à-vis the volume of tasks carried out   * Disbursement rates (expenditure vs. planned) per component and activity, per year * Proportion of Project interventions that demonstrate implementation on schedule and per planned budget * Factors hindering or facilitating timely delivery of results (including special focus on COVID) | * Government of Montenegro; Norway, UNDP policy documents and progress reports * Project planning documents, reports and other materials * Monitoring data * External sources * Qualitative data from KIIs from   + Norway   + UNDP   + Government of Montenegro   + Other relevant Government stakeholders   + EU | Document review  Semi-structured interviews | | Document review  Qualitative iterative data analysis of the KIIs with key stakeholders  Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques, and data types according to principles of iterative analysis |
| **Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?** | | | | | |
| EQ 3. To what extent has the project achieved its outputs and outcomes as stipulated in the project’s results framework? | * Evidence that delivery of capacity building activities (trainings, learning sessions, advisory support, etc.) contributed internal capacities of OEI and of the EU negotiation structure to fulfil remaining closing benchmarks (Component 1) * Evidence of improved capacity and existence of a system for legal alignment with the EU acquis and preparation of the national version of the EU acquis (Component 2) * Evidence of achieved outputs and their potential for promoting EU values and results achieved in the negotiation process (Component 3) * Evidence of improved capacity for evidence-based policy planning (Component 4) | * Government of Montenegro; Norway, UNDP policy documents and progress reports * Project planning documents, reports and other materials * External sources * Qualitative data from KIIs from   + Norway   + UNDP   + Government of Montenegro   + Other relevant Government stakeholders   + EU * Survey results | Document review  Semi-structured interviews | | Document review  Qualitative iterative data analysis of the KIIs with key stakeholders  Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques, and data types according to principles of iterative analysis |
| EQ 4. How effectively has the project built necessary and sustainable capacity of people and institutions?  What are outstanding needs? | * Comparative evidence from pre-existing and current data on sufficient achievement of intended capacity building outputs * Evidence of project contributions towards improved capacity for evidence-based policy planning bringing transformative results in terms of quality of government strategies and better advancement of Montenegro in the EU negotiations. * Evidence of improved capacity of the Government of Montenegro to responding to the demands of the new phases of accession process * Evidence of improved policy planning and coordination capacity and mechanisms across the Government of Montenegro’s institutions * Evidence that capacity strengthening interventions create observable changes in terms of Government of Montenegro’s capacity to engage in negotiations * Stakeholder perceptions regarding likelihood for the Government of Montenegro to be able to institutionalise outcome level changes by the end of the project * Evidence of outstanding needs and areas for further support to inform recommendations of the evaluation. * Stakeholder perceptions regarding each project result as having been achieved and contributing to overall positive change in terms of overall capacity of the Government of Montenegro to continue negotiation process * Degree and type of drivers that promoted project implementation * Degree and type of hindering factors affecting project implementation | * Government of Montenegro; Norway, UNDP policy documents and progress reports * Project planning documents, reports and other materials * External sources * Qualitative data from KIIs from   + Norway   + UNDP   + Government of Montenegro   + Other relevant Government stakeholders   + EU * Survey results | Document review  Semi-structured interviews | | Document review  Qualitative iterative data analysis of the KIIs with key stakeholders  Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques, and data types according to principles of iterative analysis |
| Sustainability - The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue | | | | | |
| EQ 5. How do Project interventions generate sustainable change at the organisational level of relevant government institutions to continue to work on responding to the demands of the new phases of accession process, including the areas of policy planning and coordination after the end of the projects? | Evidence of:   * Concrete changes in Government of Montenegro’s policies, regulations, and plans that can sustain achieved project results * Institutional capacity in place to sustain levels of achievement or a strategy/plan exists and funded * Perceptions on sustainability by national stakeholders | * Government of Montenegro; Norway, UNDP policy documents and progress reports * Project planning documents, reports and other materials * Monitoring data * External sources * Qualitative data from KIIs from   + Norway   + UNDP   + Government of Montenegro   + Other relevant Government stakeholders   + EU * Survey | Document review  Semi-structured interviews | | Document review  Qualitative iterative data analysis of the KIIs with key stakeholders  Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques, and data types according to principles of iterative analysis |
| Coherence | | | | | |
| EQ 6. To what extent have the interventions of different actors been harmonised? | * Degree to which the Project partners actively participate and promote coordination mechanisms with the Government of Montenegro and other development partners to avoid overlaps, leverage contributions and catalyse joint work * Evidence that the Project promoted effective partnerships and strategic alliances around its main output areas | * Government of Montenegro; Norway, UNDP policy documents and progress reports * Project planning documents, reports and other materials * Monitoring data * External sources * Qualitative data from KIIs from   + Norway   + UNDP   + Government of Montenegro   + Other relevant Government stakeholders   + EU   + Survey | Document review  Semi-structured interviews | Document review  Qualitative iterative data analysis of the KIIs with key stakeholders  Triangulation between data sources, data collection techniques, and data types according to principles of iterative analysis | | |

# Annex 2. List of interviewed persons

| **Stakeholder** | **Interest/role in implementation of the project** |
| --- | --- |
| Jelena Mrdak | UNDP Programme Manager |
| Tomica Paović | UNDP Team Leader |
| Zorka Kordić | Office for European Integration (OEI), Chief Negotiator |
| Dragana Marković | Office for European Integration (OEI), Deputy Chief Negotiator |
| Marko Mrdak | Office for European Integration (OEI), Advisor to the Chief Negotiator |
| Andrej Orlandić | Office for European Integration (OEI), Head of EU Sector Policy Department |
| Almedina Vukić Martinović | Secretariat General of the Government (SGG), Assistant to the General Secretary of the Government |
| Nada Vojvodić | Secretariat General of the Government (SGG), Head of the Sector for Public Information on the EU and the EU Accession Process |
| Boris Vukašinović | Agency for Prevention of Corruption, Deputy Director |
| Marko Škerović | Agency for Prevention of Corruption, Integrity and Lobbying Department |
| Jovana Tosković | Member of the Council of the Agency for Protection of Competition |
| Jelena Samardžić Kotri | Office for European Integration, Head of the Group for Planning and Coordination of the Process of Translating the Acquis Communautaire |
| Jelena Kovacevic  Dragana Raonic  Olivera Kujundzic Brankica Cmiljanovic | Ministry of Ecology, Spatial Planning and Urbanism |
| **Ivan Kuzminović** | Royal Norwegian Embassy in Belgrade |
| Marija Tripunović | Local Consultant for Negotiation Chapter 27 – Environment and Climate Change |
| Marko Savić | Consultant for Evidence-Based Policy Development |
| Jelena Zvizdojević | Consultant for Facilitating Cooperation with Academia in Development of the Tourism Development Strategy 2021-2025  Senior Consultant to Support Development of the Mid-term Government Working Programme  Consultant to Support Development of Guidelines for Preparation of Strategic Documents |
| Marko Sošić | Local Consultant for Integrity Plans  Senior Consultant to Support Development of the Mid-term Government Working Programme |
| Prof Gordana Đurović | National Consultant for Assessment of Financial Needs within Chapter 27  Consultant for Facilitating Cooperation with Academia in Development of the Regional Development Strategy 2021-2025  Senior International Consultant for European Integration |
| Jovana Bulatovic | [Local Consultant for Monitoring of Implementation of Strategies defining Public Policies](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=75062) ;  [Expert for Evaluation of Strategic Documents](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=103089), |
| Aleksandar Maskovic | [Local Consultant for Negotiating Chapter 8 (Competition)](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=75399) |
| Martins Krievins | SIGMA |

# 

# Annex 3. Responses to the Survey on coordination of negotiation process in Montenegro

Following up on the Survey on coordination of the negotiation process in Montenegro that was conducted in 2018, a survey based on same questions with added questions relating to the evaluation was launched. This survey was distributed to the same ‘universe’ of those institutions and officials engaged in the negotiation process, though the very respondent pool might have been different due to staff rotation or turnover. The comparative results of the two surveys are presented below.

The original survey collected a total of 184 respondents, while a total of 237 responded the follow up 2022 survey, with slightly more women than men responding to the survey in both cases (56% in the 2018 to 65.4% in the 2022 survey). Most respondents in both surveys were members of working group (representatives of the public sector) or Working group members not coming from the public sector (See figures below). In both surveys, over half of the respondents were in their positions for more than five years.
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Comparative analysis of surveys shows similar level with satisfaction with the way in which negotiation process has been coordinated by the Office for EU integration. With very small increase of those extremely satisfied with the coordination (from 25% in 2018 to 25.3% in 2022 – which is still an improvement taking into account that more respondents participated in the 2022 survey). There was a slight decrease of those who were totally satisfied or satisfied from 63,5% in 2018 to 60.4% in 2022 (which is also very small difference having in mind with larger respondent pool in the 2022 survey). On the other side, there has been an increase of those that are satisfied despite a number of shortcomings (from 8.2% in 2018 to 10.5% in 2022) and those who were not satisfied (from 3.3% in 2018 to 3.8% in 2022).
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The 2022 survey respondents were generally satisfied with the new negotiation structure that was established in 2021, though the level of satisfaction varied with 9.7% not satisfied and 11/4% extremely satisfied (See figure below).
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Comparative analysis of 2018 and 2022 data shows that around half respondents have been satisfied with structure and level of information that was made available to successfully perform the negotiation role. There has been an increase in 2% of those who were not satisfied over the period as shown in two figures below.
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The 2022 survey respondents see that more frequent meetings, timely communication, more clear division of responsibility among structures would be areas for improvement in the coordination (See figures below)/
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Finally, both surveys included an open question to collect suggestions for ways in which coordination could be improved. Responses from the 2022 survey are included below (in Montenegrin language):

* Progressive approach
* Češći sastanci radne grupe (mogu biti i za manji broj članova grupe iz istog resora)
* Jasno postavljenim zadacima sa jasnim indikatorima uspjeha realizacije
* "Prije svega, članovi pregovaračke strukture koji su zaposleni u javnoj uoravi ne dolaze redovno na sastanke, sa druge strane ti ljudi vec imaju puno posla, a na sve to dodatno im se dodaje obina posao vezan za pregovaračke grupe. Potrebno je bolje birati te predstavnike i od njih tražiti intezivnije učešće. Pored svega, ovaj dodatni posao bi im trebao biti plaćen
* "
* Za početak da postoji, da je aktivna i funkcionalna. Radna grupa koja se sastala samo jednom kako bi se konstituisala - ne postoji.
* Češći sastanci.
* Kroz cescu razmjenu informacija, vise sastanaka i kroz redovno upoznavanje sa razlozima zbog kojih se neke aktivnosti ne realizuju. Neophodno je uvidjeti problem i dati konkretna rjesenja u cilju prevazilazenja istoga. Moramo shvatiti da su svi clanovi radnih grupa na istom zadatku tako da moramo dijeliti vise informacija i dati svoj maksimum da se sve aktivnosti realizuju blagovrmeno. Radna grupa mora ostrije da reaguje ukoliko se uoci da neko ne obavlja svoje zadatke.
* U okviru pregovaračkog poglavlja u kom sam imenovan za člana smatram da brojnost članstva usporava aktivnosti, pogotovo kada se ima u vidu kompetentnost pojedinih članova. Aktivnosti se periodično odvijaju u određenim ciklusima, uz pripremu informacija i podataka koji se samo osvježavaju i teško omogućavaju promjenu strukture same informacije i prezentovanje bitnih aktivnosti koje su završene. Takođe, smatram potrebnim češću organizaciju sastanaka, i po mogućnosti sa tačno utvrđenom tematikom na kojima bi odgovorne institucije prezentovale svoje aktivnosti i napredak koji je u nekoj oblasti ostvaren u proteklom određenom periodu.
* Jačanjem administrativnih kapaciteta
* Radovniji sastanci
* Imenovanjem strucnih ljudi koji imaju dovoljno vremena da se bave zadacima koji su im povjereni u procesu pristupanja
* Jasna podjela duznosti u skladu sa opisaom radnog mjesta. Materijalna odgovornost na nepostovanje radnih zadataka. Manje radne grupe sa jasnim ciljem i cesci kratki izvjestaji o napretku. Ministarstvo poljoprivrede, šumarstva i vodoprivrede nije imalo ni jedan sastanak vezano za 11icu. Neodgovaranje na e-mail koji je uputila EK nije bilo rijetko tj.da nas kolege sa kojima smo imali komunikaciju "zamole" da se odgovori....
* Jasne obaveze i redovno izvjestavanje
* Imam utisak da se cijelom procesu pristupa neobavezno, fakultativno, reda radi. Treba uvesti princip odgovornosti za ucinjeno i/ili neucinjeno.
* Nije bilo sastanaka RG.
* Jača politička volja/podrška, uključenost osoba sa većeg nivoa odlučivanja, konstantna komunikacija o zaostalim obavezama uz jasne indikatore i priprema akcionog plana za implementaciju preporuka iz izvještaja EU
* Češći tematski sastanci i obuke
* Nemam predlog
* Organizovanje seminara,radionica, workshopova
* Uvodjenjem redovnih zoom sastanaka uz davanje konkretnih imputa na postavljene prioritete
* Smatram da bi redovnije trebalo komunicirati u okviru timova, brže raditi na rješavanju problema koje moramo da eliminšemo kako bi smo bili dio EU, bolja koordinicija i u timovima, podjela zadataka.
* Koordinacija unutar radne grupe je dobra. Ali za veliki broj nerealizovanih obaveza od strane i minstitucija u okviru pregovaračkog procesa potrebno je utvrditi uzroke i personalnu odgovornost.
* Rad u manjim timovima i bolja informisanost.
* razmjena informacija
* Vecom posvecenoscu
* /
* Da se prestanu baviti koordinacijom, i krenu nešto konkretno raditi. Sastajati. Izvještavati javnost.
* "Strucna pomoc u odredjenim djelovima, obuke/treninzi za nove clanove kako bi se upoznali sa process.
* "
* Vise sastanaka
* Više sastanaka, i razmjene informacija putem email ili sajtova na kojima se objašnjava trenutno stanje i buduće aktivnosti.
* Definisanjem pojedinačnih odgovornosti učesnika u procesu i definisanjem jasnih rokova koji će se poštovati.
* Aktivnijim ucescem rukovodioca grupe sa jacom kontrolom ostvarenih zadataka od strane clanova grupe.
* Jacanje kadrovskih kapaciteta/zaposlenih koji su zaduzeni za sprovodjenje potrebnih aktivnosti vezanih za EU integracije.
* Davanjem jasnih zaduženja avim članovima radne grupe
* Jasna koordinacija nadleNih Ministarstva kad clqnovima radnih grupu. Iako sam clan radne grupe ni jedan sastanak s Edo sada nije odrzao
* Direktni i definisani okviri za razgovor kompetentnih i profesionalnih osoba a ne predstavnika koji nemaji iskustvo i znsnje.
* Na čelo radnih grupa bi trebalo postaviti motivisane ljude, koji će efikasnije koordinisati rad u radnoj grupi.
* češći sastanci članova RG, kao i češća koordinacija između članova podgrupa
* Promjenom organizacione strukture
* Formiranjem projektnih timova koje ce predvoditi clanovi RG u institucijama u cilju ukljucivanja I podjele zadataka na veci broj sluzbenika.
* Organizovanjem rada u manjim grupama, po oblastima.
* Povećanjem preglednosti ciljeva, zaduženja i rezultata
* "da se obezbedi dovoljan broj obučenih ljudi i adekvatna politika zadržavanja kadrova u strukturama koje će upravljati programima.
  + pregovari o iznosu novca koji će biti na raspolaganju..."
* Potpuna izmjena načina funkcionisanja saradnje u Radnoj grupi
* Davanjem konkretnih zaduzenja pojedicima.
* Jačanje edukacije svih članova radne grupe i koncizno i precizno rješavanje problema gdje bi svaki član grupe odgovarao za svoj zadatak.
* Davanjem jasnih instrukcija članovima radnih grupa,tj. preciznijom podjelom zadataka.
* Vise sastanaka i zadataka u okviru radne grupe
* Potrebna je bolja povezanost i razmjena informacija između nadležnih institucija koje se bave bezbjednošću hrane (zakonska regulativa, kontrola i inspekcija, laboratorijska ispitivanja, istraživanja, donošenje programa i planova), zaštitom životne sredine, proizvodnjom energije, kao i bolja povezanost nadležnih institucija sa ostalim važnim faktorima u društvu, a to su primarni proizvođači, prerađivači, potrošači i dr.
* Upravo na način predložen prethodno postavljenim pitanjima.
* Maling lista za djeljenje informacija i tacka za djelejenje dokumentacije (sharing point)
* .
* Nemam ideju.
* Kroz primjerjere uspješnih aplikacija zemalja iz okruženja
* Ozbiljnoscu
* Imenovanje šefa i zamjenika šefa RG, organizaciju češćih sastanaka na nivou klastera, kao i podgrupa u okviru poglavlja/RG na kojima bi se upravo razmatrale dobre prakse iz regiona/EU i rješenja za konkretne probleme; veći angažman u pogledu iskorištenosti dostupnih programa podrške prilikom izrade zakona i podzakonskih akata (bilateralna podrška, Tajeks, itd); jačanje postojećih kapaciteta kroz obuke i dodatna zapošljavanja (ili preraspodjele zaposlenih unutar organa).
* -
* Češća organizacija sastanaka, strogo poštovanje rokova za dokumenta koja se šalju EK.
* Oslanjanjem na tematske sjednice nasuprot plenarnim sjednicama. Na plenumu se često vrijeme osipa na sporedne stvari, pa bi se na tematskim sjednicma brže došlo do suštine pojedinih specifičnih pitanja. Dalju usaglašenost sa ostalim članovima radne grupe mogi bi popstići kroz rad sekretara i šefova radnih grupa.
* u okviru pregovaracke grupe za odredjeno poglavlje vise radnih tijela ili podgrupa
* Da nadlezne institucije u procesu EU pristupanja implementiraju Zakone koji su na snazi.
* Organizovanje radnih sastanka, sa jasnom podjelom nadležnosti i zadataka, pružanjem/dijeljenjem info o svim oblastima projekta u cilju napretka istog, ekspertska podrška
* Brzim i jednostavnijim dijeljenjem podataka medju clanovima RG
* /
* \*
* da se sastane češće...
* Posvećenijim pristupom Vlade Crne Gore evropskim integracijama.
* U okviru radne grupe za proces pregovora u Crnoj Gori, sam veoma zadovoljna koordinacijom, i nemam predloga za unapređenje.
* Jasne podjele obaveza i zadataka
* Češća komunikacija
* Brza razmjena informacija, podsjetnici
* Češći sastanci i bolja organizacija radnih grupa i njenih aktivnosti.
* Nemam konkretnih ideja
* Veca odgovornost i ucesce svih clanova radne grupe
* Jasnim postavljanjem ciljeva, rokova za završetak aktivnosti, motivacijom članova
* Vise sastanaka grupe i komunikacija između clanova grupe van sastanaka.
* direktan kontakt sa predstavnicima EU
* Novčana naknada za članove/ice Radne grupe
* Organizovanjem obuka.
* Vjerujem da članovi Pregovaračke grupe, odnosno pregovarači, na zadovoljavajući način koordiniraju rad radnih grupa za pripremu pregovora po pojedinim poglavljima.
* Za početak, da članovi Radne grupe koji ne dolaze iz ministarstva koji je resorno za odnosnu politiku, imaju bilo kakvu ulogu osim posmatračke, koju do sada imaju.
* veća uključenost svih učesnika u procesu
* češći sastanci, dijeljenje relevantnih informaija, i sl.
* češće organizovanje sastanka sa jasnom podjelom zadataka uz neophodno obezbjeđivanje edukacija za članove radnih grupa u cilju napređenja znanja i vještina. Otovorena komunikacija, prihvatanje kritičkih stavova i stvarna, a ne deklarativna uključenost svih aktera u proces integracija
* jasnim definisanjem nadleynosti
* xxx
* kada bi se konkretne obaveze iz pregovaračkih poglavlja riješavala u praksi, a ne samo praznim izjavama na papiru
* Češći sastanci radnih grupa i bolja motivacija članova kroz izdvajanje određene manje naknade za rad u tim tijelima
* Boljim i odgovornijim pristupom u radu radnih grupa.
* generalno sam zadovoljna, organizovanje vise tematskih sastanaka i veća posvećenost otvorenim pitanjima
* jedinstveni repozitorijum (portal) sa svim informacijama i dokumentima vezanim za proces, više koordinacionih sastanaka, jasni zadaci šefova pregovarača (i njohovoh sekretarijata, ako postoje) da aktivno komuniciraju sa ostalim članovima, učesniima u pregovorima, djeljenje informacija, tematski sastanci sa ciljnim grupama, članovima, jasna podjela zadataka, smanjivanje broja članova radnih grupa (manje članova, ali sa jasnim zadacima i podjelom zadataka), itd.
* raditi na jačanju autoriteta KEI u ovom procesu
* Ukljuciti vise "esnaf" ,struku i objasniti sustinu pregovora.
* podjelom na podgrupe
* Boljom kominikacijom
* Pružanje tematskih obuka po pregovaračkim poglavljima, sprovođenje analiza najbolje pregovaračke prakse i češće organizovanje sastanaka radne grupe
* kroz intezivniju komunikaciju svih članova rg
* Boljom komunikacijom o svim relevantnim pitanjima uz dijeljenje informacija o napretku u svim oblastima poglavlja.
* imenovanjem novog glavnog pregovarača koji će "pokrenuti mašineriju" svom snagom i znanjem
* definisanjem preciznijih i mjerljivih rezultata sa realnim rokovima
* "Češće organizovanje sastanaka, dijeljenje informacija, kriterijum odabira članova radnih gru ­
* pa, jer od njihove kompetentnosti i stručnosti zavisi kvalitet pregovaračke Formiranje tijela čija će se uloga odnositi na pružanje podrške pregovaračkim strukturama koja neće biti sastavni dio niti jednog ministarstva, međusobna usklađenost i razmjena iskustva i znanja između pregovaračkih poglavlja, usvojiti dokument koji će regulisati sve aspekte saradnje
* između Vlade i Parlamenta, i time formalizovati njihov odnos i uloge u pregovaračkom procesu, uspostaviti kontinuiranu saradnju i komunikaciju sa Evropskom komisijom , itd."
* Jačanjem znanja i vještina administrativnog kadra i predstavnika civilnog sektora na poslovima koji se tiču evropske integracije.
* Obukom kadrova
* Više uključivanje stručnjaka iz privrede koji poznaju javni sektor.
* Bolje upoznavanje pregovaračke strukture sa ulogom svih formiranih tijela u pregovaračkom procesu, uz finansijski podsticaj.
* Otvorenom komunikacijom
* INFORMISANJE
* n/a
* Potrebni su češći sastanci šefova i koordinatora radnih grupa sa KEI i Glavnim pregovaračem.
* ekspertska podrška
* praviti više bilateralnih sastanaka.
* Izostankom čestih kadrovskih promjena.
* Koordinacija je uglavnom dobra.
* -
* N/a
* Rješavati postepeno zahtjev po zahtjev i čekati da se isti riješi, a ne započeti svaki i ni jedan ne ispratiti do kraja.
* Jačanjem proaktivnosti predstavnika resora u radnim tijelima
* Ne znam
* NA
* češći sastanci užih timova po oblastima
* Redovnija komunikacija, bolja i jasnija raspojdjela dužnosti i obaveza
* neposrednom komunikacijom o svim relevantnim pitanjima
* Redovna i blagovremena komunikacija o svim relevantnim pitanjima uz dijeljenje informacija o napretku u svim oblastima poglavlja
* Česti sastanci, proaktivnije mapiranje problema na kojima se treba poraditi..
* Azuriranjem podataka bez preklapanja perioda
* Jasnijom, bržom i efikasnijom komunikacijom.
* Unaprjeđivanjem internih procedura u dijelu usaglašavanja sa EU propisima (redaktura i izrada TT), kako bi se omogućila komunikacija sa EU u kraćem roku, bez ponavljanja proceduralnih koraka. Obezbjeđivanjem adekvatnih resursa na nivou releventnih ministarstava, koji bi se faktički bavili redakturom direktiva i izradom TT, i bili u kapacitetu da razumiju EU acquis - unaprjeđenje koordinacije ne znači puno ako koordinatora ima više od onih kojima se koordiniše. Unaprjeđenje internih kapaciteta za prenošenje acquis-a u svim fazama (od izrade propisa, preko usaglašavanja sa Eu pa do donošenja propisa) po relevantnim institucijama nužan je korak za efikasniji postupak usklađivanja sa EU.
* /
* Dobre prakse zemalja čklanica EU (npr. Hrvatska) i ekspertska pomoć u dijelu ispunjena preporuka mi usmjerenja za efikasniji tok pregovora.
* Nemam predlog
* Češći sastanci radne grupe.
* Mišljenja sam da bi češći susreti članova radnih grupa značajno doprinijeli koordinaciji cjelokupnog pregovaračkog procesa.
* Češćim sastancima radne grupe i neometanim protokom informacija između članova grupe.
* Veća novčana satisfakcija članova pregovaračke strukture.
* Unapredjenjem rada, edukacijom i vecom ukljucenoscu kompetetnih zaposlenih u KEI
* Bolja međuinstitucionalna komunikacija i saradnja.
* Smanjiti radnu grupu i fokusirati je na ljude koji rade najvažnije poslove za proces pregovora. Davati precizne zadatke članovima radne grupe i pratiti učinak svih članova. Moraju se organizovati češći sastanci, sjednice koje kraće traju i fokusirati se na goruće probleme uz konstantan pritisak da se nađe rješenje za iste.
* Potpunom transparentnosću svih aktivnosti
* -
* Intenzivnija međuresorna komunikacija
* Duzim rokovima za dostavljanje trazenih informacija, agilnijem pristupu svih clanova radne grupe (posto je slucaj da ih vecina ne radi adekvatno), preciznijim upustvima i informacijama, otklanjanjem bespotrebnih zahtjeva koji se preklapaju- za izvjestaje, informacije u tabelama i slicno.
* cešće organizovanje sastanaka radne grupe
* Pregovaračka struktura je glomazna i ima preveli broj tijela sa sličnim nadležnostima.
* bolja koordinacija
* Češćim sastancima i razmjenom relevantnih informacija.
* Gore pomenuto, znači kroz redovnije organizovanje sastanaka
* Potrebno je češće organizovati sastanke radnih grupa za pregovaračka poglavlja. Složićemo se da sastajanje jednom u pola godine ili duže nije dovoljno.
* Statističko Izvještavanje na polugodišnjem i godišnjem nivou, u ostalim oblastima na mjesečnom nivou ili po potrebi
* U skladu sa mogućnostima obezbijediti zajedničke rasprava u vezi sa postignutim usaglašavanjem i ažuriranjem PPCG kako bi se obezbijedila potpuna primjena i sprovođenje pravne tekovine.
* /
* U skladu sa mogućnostima obezbijediti zajednicke rasprave u vezi sa usaglašavanjem i ažuriranjem PPCG kako bi se obezbijedila potpuna primjena i sprovođenje pravne tekovine.
* Koordinacija je na sasvim zadovoljavajucem nivou.
* Češćom direktnom komunikacijom između uključenih institucija.
* Ne znam.
* Jasnom podjelom uloga i zadataka cijelog tima.
* Redovna i blagovremena komunikacija o svim relevantnim pitanjima uz dijeljenje informacija o napretku u svim oblastima poglavlja.
* češći sastanci
* Redovna i blagovremena komunikacija o svim relevantnim pitanjima
* jasnija pravila, bolje organizovane tematske sjednice, češće raditi detaljne analize i bolje planiranje budućih aktivnosti. neophodno je tačno analizirati privremena mjerila i jasno definisati oblasti gdje je potrebno uraditi dodatni napor i definisati dalje aktivnosti na ispunjavanju.
* češćim organizovanjem sastanaka i pružanjem ekspertske podrške
* Češće organizovanje sastanaka radne grupe i jasnija podjela nadležnosti i zadataka,
* Na odabiru šefova radne grupe koji svojim kvalifikacijama ispunjavaju uslove za rad na tom radnom mjestu.
* Da se unaprijedi horizontalna saradnja
* jasnom podjelom duznosti i tacno definisanim rokovima za izvrsenje
* Često se dešava da pojedinci iz radne grupe se stalno menjaju kada se menja i vlast, što je i logićno. Međutim, ti članovi radnih grupa bi trebalo imati posebne obuke o procesu pregovaranja kako bi bili uspješniji, a ne da bi samo politički djelovali već da bi se došlo do konkretnih rezultata, a za rezultate ponovo zavisi od političke volje. Dosta puta na neke promjene ne mogu uticati članovi radnih grupa, več donosioci odluka, što znači da i donosioci odluka moraju biti edukovani.
* organizovati sastanke radnih grupa u većoj mjeri
* Možda sa organizovanjem tematskih sastanaka, npr. vezanih za dobru praksu, naročito zemalja iz bližeg okruženja i sl.
* Imenovanjem koordinatora za pregovore u svakoj instituciji - jedno lice.
* Više koordinacije i komunikacije u okviru pregovaračke strukture
* "Potrebno je da u kancelariji svako poglavlje a u nekim sloyenijim poglavljima i po oblastima ima lice koje ce u potpunostiti biti posveceno iskljucivo toj oblasti i obavjestavati organ odmah po donosenju bilo kakvih pravila smjernica odluka koje treba transponovati i dodatno stvoriti mogucnost i direktne komunikacije sa odjeljenjima EK organa i kancelarije.
* Dosadasnje iskustvo nam daje za pravo konstatujemo da nas ljudi u Briselu , rade vjerovatno mnogo poslova i ne prate nas i ne poznaju oblasti dublje i potpuno. Zbog toga smatram da bi trebalo sto prije u Brisel slati predstavnike koji ce biti iz oblasti -pregovaračkog poglavlja."
* ne znam
* Postojanje softvera za razmjenu infomacija; izbjegavanje nekoordinisane komunikacije sa EU stranom od strane pojedinacnih resora /institucija i njihovih predstavnika;
* Uspostavljanje intezivnije komunikacije sa članovima radnih grupa i češće održavanje sastanaka
* Smatram da je neophodno da imamo više obuke i komunikacije.
* češće organizovanje sastanaka radne grupe
* Analizom potreba i problema sa kojima se susrijeću institucije koje su neposredno uključene u proces pregovora, a na osnovu koje bi se planirale i realizovale konkretne mjere i radnje.
* manji broj članova pregovaračkih grupa, veći nivo iskustva i obučenosti za pregovore
* Uključivanjem svih aktera u komunikaciju na dnevnom nivou jer nedostatak informacija i komunikacije šteti samom procesu, takođe veći stepen uključivanja Misije CG pri EU u čitav proces koji (uključivanje od strane KEI) po mom mišljenju nije na zadovoljavajućem nivou.
* Angažovanoj kao članici Radne grupe za pregovaračko poglavlje 26 - Obrazovanje i kultura, koja još uvijek nije počela sa radom, nisam u mogućnosti da dam odgovore na postavljena pitanja. Kako je forma morala biti popunjena svi odgovori su broj 3.
* efikasnija komunikacija, vise lateralno
* Potrebna je intenzivnija komunikacija medju clanovima radne grupe u okviru odredjenog pregovarackog poglavlja.
* Direktnim kontaktom i sastancima šefa radne grupe i članova.
* Jačanjem kapaciteta KEI i infrastrukture za razmjenu informacija
* /
* nemam ideju
* češće online sastanci
* Imajuci u vidu da se pojedina pitanja za razlicita pregovaracka podrucja preklapaju, pojacati koordinaciju i komunikaciju rukovodilaca predmetnih radnih grupa
* Većim stepenom koordinacije sa Kancelarijom za evropske integracije
* /
* Dugoročnim ulaganjem u razvijanje menadžerskih sposobnosti kod osoba koje su raspoređene na rukovodeće pozicije na svi nivoima, kao i kontinuirano ulaganje u razvijanja znanja i sposobnosti kod mladih službenika koji će vremenom preuzimati rukovodeća mjesta.
* Od važnosti za rad pregovaračke strukture i koordinacije unutar sistema je da se očuva institucionalna memorija, odnosno da se već uspostavljeni mehanizmi samo nadograđuju i ne trpe stalne izmjene, kako bi se očuvao kontinuitet rada i postigla nadgradnja dosadašnjih rezultata u procesu pregovora.
* /
* Redovni sastanci sa jasnim zadacima i rokovima izvršenja, neophodna pomoć stranih eksperata koji će prisustvovati radnim grupama, prenoseći svoja iskustva (hrvatske ) . Takođe, neophodna jasna uloga visoko rukovodnog kadra, koji će obaveze prenijeti na svoje zapošljenje i insistirati na izvršavanju obaveza, preuzetih sa radne grupe, svako za svoju oblast. Takođe, neophodno prisustvo i Ministra na nekim od sastanaka radne grupe za pregovoračka poglavlja, čemu će se dati veći značaj i lično insistiranje na izvršavanju obaveza i uspostavljanju odgovornosti ukoliko se ne izvršava zadata obaveza npr.zamena sa nekim drugim licem koje može dati veći doprinos .
* Kroz uspostavljanje jasnih protokola, definisanje obaveza i odgovornosti.
* Organizacijom sastanaka na nivou makar jedan put mjesečno
* Koordinacija u okviru pregovaračke strukture najbolje bi se mogla unaprijediti kroz češće organizovanje sastanaka Radne grupe.
* Posredstvom portala na kojem bi se sabirali materijali i informacije.
* Aktivno učešće svih članova RG, uz jasna ovlašćenja i odgovornosti, a naročito da starješine organa budu posebno upoznate o značaju učešća u RG i aktivnostima, odnosno da u RG imenuje kompetentna lica koja bi bila aktivni koordinator aktivnost unutar organa. Predlog je i da se aktivnim članovima RG, odlukom o fromiranju RG obezbjedi neka finansijska nagrada, varijabila ili sl.
* n/a
* Aktivnim angažovanjem članova radne grupe i ispunjavanjem obaveza iz završnih mjerila
* Češće organizovanje sastanaka radnih grupa na kojem bi se pratilo napredovanje u pregovorima i bili definisani dalji koraci za realizaciju postavljenih ciljeva. Takođe, potrebna je bolja komunikacija sa EK kako bi brže dobijali povratne informacije vezano za npr. usklađenost propisa i sl.
* Unapredjivanjem koordinacije u radu i jasnom podjelom obaveza i duznosti članova radne grupe.
* /
* češća komunikacija
* fokusirati se samo na one koji daju doprinos radu Radne grupe.
* Razmatranje razloga za kašnjenje u realizaciji obaveza i davanje preporuka u cilju realizacije istih.
* Promtno djelovanje sa vizijom da se prepoznaju izazovi i uloži maksimalna trud u iznalaženju rješenja
* koordinacija je prihvatljiva trenutno pregovaračka struktura funkcioniše optimalno sa obzirom na okolnosti u državi
* Proaktivni pristup.
* Koordinacija u okviru pregovaračke strukture bi bila značajno unaprijeđena upravo kroz kombinaciju nekih od aktivnosti koje su predmet konkretnih postavljenih pitanja u ovom Upitniku - kroz češće organizovanje sastanaka radne grupe, jasniju podjelu nadležnosti i zadataka u okviru radne grupe, sa nosiocima konkretnih podaktivnosti i rokovima za realizaciju tih podaktivnosti, kroz unapređenje znanja i vještina članova radnih grupa. Uz sve to, potrebna je, naravno, efikasnija i brža komunikacija sa Evropskom komisijom.
* Obezbijediti bolju koordinaciju aktivnosti na svim nivoima
* Aktivno uključenje svih članova RG nezavisno od institucionalne i tematske nadležnosti, predlaganje ideja i iniciranje aktivnosti u skladu sa oblastima pregovaračkog poglavlja, pravovremena razmjena informacija o svim temama relevantnim za poglavlje i kreiranje zajedničkih programskih inicijativa svih uključenih stejkholdera koje mogu doprinijeti sveukupnom napretku na nivou poglavlja.
* Koordinacija je u potpunosti zadovaljavajuća
* Nisam siguran kako bi trebalo.
* intenzivna komunikacija i kolaborativni alati
* More proactive approach.
* rad sa ekspertima
* Blagovremeno obavještavanje i najave aktivnosti. Transparentan i proaktivan pristup, posebno prema članovima van javnog sektora, manje hladne birokratske forme u komunikaciji ( evo i ova anketa je korak naprijed). Razgovor o konkretnim ciljevima i zadacima. ........
* /
* Koordinacija je na zavidnom nivou
* Organizovanjem većeg broja sastanaka na kojima bi svako imao mogućnost da iznese svoja zapažanja i komentare.
* Dijeljenje informacija i jasna podjela aktivosti
* brži odgovor EK na zahtjev za mišljenje
* -
* Koordinacija je dobra i ona nije prepreka pregovaraćkom procesu
* Jasnije definisati obaveze i nadležnosti
* Nemam komentar
* Nastaviti istim tempom i dobrom organizacijom, kao do sada.
* Intenzivnijom komunikacijom
* Odrzavanjem cescih sastanaka
* Međurosorna saradnja
* No comment.
* Frekvantnijom razmjenom informacija
* /
* Neophodno je dalje raditi na jacanju administrativnih kapaciteta, periodicno organizovati sastanke RG kako bi se razmijenile neophodne informacije neophodne za dalji proces pregovora....
* Bolja razmjena informacija i češća komunikacija. Konkretan rad na zacrtanom planu
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   6. [Local Consultant for Human Resources management](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=752)
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