UNDP Kosovo

REVISED FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Final External Evaluation of the "Cultural Heritage as a Driver for Inter-Community Dialogue and Social Cohesion" Project

Commissioned by UNDP Kosovo

Funded by the European Union through the Foreign Policy Instrument (FPI), the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports, the Municipality of Prishtinë/Pristina, and UNDP

Implemented by UNDP Kosovo

for an amount of EUR 2.376.386,00

By: Christian Bugnion de Moreta, Team Leader

Mytaher Haskuka, National Expert

Evaluation timeframe: 28 April to 31st May 2023

Draft report – field visit to Kosovo 14 to 20 May 2023

17 July 2023

Project/outcome Information	
Project/outcome title	Cultural Heritage as a Driver for Intercommunity Dialogue and Social Cohesion
Atlas ID	N/A
Corporate outcome and output	N/A
Country	N/A
Region	Kosovo as defined by the UN SC Resolution 1244
Date project document signed	N/A

	Start	Planned end
Project dates	1 December 2020	30 May 2023

Project budget	**2,376,386.00 EUR**
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	1.962.061 EUR out of 1.999.876 from EU FPI
Funding source	**MCYS: EUR 123,600.00** **EU Funds: EUR 1,999,876.00** **Municipality of Pristina: EUR 70,000** **UNDP funds: EUR 182,910.00**
Implementing party[1]	**UNDP Kosovo**

[1] It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

Evaluation information		
Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)	Project evaluation	
Final/midterm review/ other	Final	
Period under evaluation	Start	End
	1.12.2020	30.05.2023
Evaluators	Christian Bugnion de Moreta Mytaher Haskuka	
Evaluator email address	cbugnion@suburconsulting.es	mytaher.haskuka@uni-pr.edu
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion
	28 April 2023	30 May 2023

Table of contents

Content

Annex:

1 Mission agenda and list of people met.

2 Logical framework 20th February 2020

3 TOR

Acronyms and abbreviations

CH:	Cultural Heritage
DAC :	Development Assistance Committee
DOA:	Description of the Action
EU:	European Union
EUoK:	European Union Office in Kosovo
FGD:	Focus Group Discussion
FPI:	Foreign Policy Instrument
ICH:	Intangible Cultural Heritage
IMC:	Implementation and Monitoring Council
KFOR:	Kosovo Force (NATO)
KII:	Key Informant Interview
KP:	Kosovo Police
KS:	Kosovo
MCYS:	Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports
MSC:	Most Significant Change
M&E:	Monitoring and Evaluation
NATO:	National Atlantic Treaty Organisation
OECD:	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
RBM:	Results-Based Management
RCH:	Religious and Cultural Heritage
RCCH:	Regional Centre for Cultural Heritage Protection
RCHU:	Unit for Protection of Cultural and Religious Sites (KP)
SO:	Specific Objective
ToC:	Theory of Change
ToR :	Terms of Reference
UNDG:	United Nations Development Group
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG :	United Nations Evaluation Group

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

UNDP has implemented the project "Cultural Heritage as a Driver for Inter-Community Dialogue and Social Cohesion" from December 2020 until its deadline of 31st May 2023. This project is the third phase of an earlier project "Confidence-Building through Cultural Heritage Protection in Kosovo" that was implemented as a first phase from 17 February 2016 until 17 April 2017, and the project "Inter-Community Dialogue through Inclusive Cultural Heritage Preservation" as the second phase and implemented from 4 May 2018 until 31 January 2020. All three phases were evaluated by the same team leader. This current phase adds more complexity and includes a higher level of complexity as compared to the earlier two phases and more components than in the first phase. The total funding was EUR **2,376,386.00** funded by the European Union through its Foreign Policy Instrument with EUR 1,999,876.00, and co-funding from the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports (MCYS) with EUR 123,600.00, from the municipality of Prishtinë/Pristina with EUR 70.000,00, and from UNDP with USD 182,910.00 to offset the global price increase in the construction sector. The transition from one phase to the next was not seamless. For various reasons phase 3 of the project was started eleven months after the end of the phase 2. As a side effect this had an impact on the sustainability of some interventions that were undertaken with NGOs under the second specific objective and that would have required extended support into phase 3.[1]

This is the final external evaluation of the project commissioned by the UNDP, as foreseen in the agreement between the donor (EU) and the UNDP, undertaken by a team of two persons: an international team leader and a local expert. The evaluation followed a utilisation focused approach in line with good practice and was mostly qualitative, using a mix of methods that included documentary analysis, key informant interviews and on-site observation.

The project had three specific objectives:

1. Rehabilitate select cultural and religious sites through a participatory and consultative process with local communities, municipalities, and religious institutions;
2. Promote intangible cultural heritage as a source of economic empowerment and inter-ethnic dialogue with a focus on women and young people;
3. Strengthened capacities to protect and preserve cultural heritage through institutional mechanisms.

The first specific objective was fully achieved as the approach, systems in place to identify sites and undertake physical works, communications were already in place since phase two. Hence there was a high degree of efficiency in that many of the primary actors were the same and there was a common ground established over which the specific objective of the project was achieved. While communication with the main actors at the technical and civil service levels were all in place, it is noteworthy to indicate that there was a change in the political leadership and UNDP was required to establish cooperation with the new leadership in the Ministry but also with the municipalities. All outputs under this specific objective (SO) were achieved and their respective targets exceeded (see logframe results in the body of the report).

---

[1] Comment from UNDP: "Good to note that FPI funding is limited to usually two phases and that the third phase was an exception. The decision to fund a third phase was based on the results of the second phase but also the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic; FPI saw the pandemic as a potential threat to social cohesion but also as an opportunity to maintain the earlier achieved results."

For the second specific objective, the project put a different twist on some of the engagement with the civil society organisations, with greater focus on the women empowerment and youth participation, and greater focus on the economic benefits of using Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) to generate income for the vulnerable groups. Again, all outputs under this SO were achieved or exceeded as per the indicators in the logframe. At the intercommunity dialogue level, the evaluation noted that the NGOs were able to mobilize a diverse participation from the different communities in the activities undertaken (Gorani, Bosnian, Roma, Egyptian, Askhali) but there are few examples in which Serbian and Albanian participants come together to share the same activities. While in SO 1 and 3 the increase in the tourism sector indicate that all Religious Cultural Heritage (RCH) sites are visited by all communities, the dynamics to include participation in the same event of both Serbian and Albanian people remain a challenge for civil society, a challenge that is underpinned by the complex political environment.

For the third specific objective, the evaluation noted a higher interest and ownership from the institutions in general, starting at the highest level in the Ministry. This phase is the first to have received co-funding from both the MCYS and municipalities and UNDP, showing a higher degree of interaction, support and collaboration, while also indicating a greater institutional ownership and commitment towards CH and given the positive effects of the expanding CH tourism as a source of revenue for economic operators, benefitting indirectly the municipalities. As regards the Kosovo Police (KP), it gained a high visibility and recognition during the earlier phases of the project. The unit for the protection of CH sites is now being elevated to a directorate level, as part of the community police, and only one CH site in all of Kosovo remains secured by KFOR, all other sites being now under KP's responsibility. The first output of this SO could not be achieved (support to the Implementation and Monitoring Council or IMC) as the political situation did not allow the foreseen activities to take place due to the non-functionality of the IMC.

At the higher level of results, after having reviewed the evaluation of the first two phases, and looking at the effects from a longer-term perspective (e.g. from 2016 to 2023), there is evidence that CH, both RCH and ICH are playing a key role as agents of economic development, as an opportunity to empower women and youth, as a driver for the intercommunity dialogue particularly over the RCH sites, and that there is a general change of attitude that shows greater awareness and interest in CH as other more immediate post-conflict needs are being addressed.

Interviews show a clear interest and willingness from the Ministry to continue the collaboration with UNDP through co-funding partnerships in CH. Municipalities equally expressed an interest in co-funding CH interventions as these are seen as a driver for economic and social development. At the same time, some municipalities also indicated that receiving funding from the EU for CH was a very important support because they have a limited budget and there are many other priorities which require funding. Given budget limitations, it is sometimes difficult to justify investments in CH when other key needs (infrastructure and rehabilitation of public services and institutions) are still being addressed. Yet it is also a sign of normalisation to see increasing investments from the central and municipal authorities into CH.

The project received a very high rating regarding the level of satisfaction with an average of 4.56 out of a maximum of 5.0 was given by 24 stakeholders (excluding UNDP but including the donor, with two answers rated as N/A), with concrete explanations justifying the rating.

This phase proved to be even more responsive to the needs of the religious communities (higher number of religious groups involved and reported higher degree of satisfaction). All respondents unanimously commended UNDP for its communication, information, support and coordination

and the fact that many of the same people were involved made understanding easier and project implementation more efficient. UNDP project management was often mentioned in interviews as efficient, supportive, and ensuring good communication with the key stakeholders.

However intercommunity dialogue and social cohesion, and particularly between the Albanian majority and Serb minority population in Kosovo, remains a delicate and sensitive process which is influenced by the political agenda (e.g., events in 2022, Belgrade-Pristina dialogue, etc.) and require a long-term approach to create gradual benchmarks to achieve the objective. Using short-term funding instruments of 20 months is not the ideal mechanism for intercommunity dialogue and social cohesion. It is the view of the evaluation that UNDP should engage with Kosovo institutions and the EU to set the priorities for a five-year IPA funding period with two primary strategic objectives that are mutually contributing to intercommunity dialogue and social cohesion: 1) continued support to the restoration of the RCH and other CH sites of value, in line with the current approach. However, for public CH sites, a management plan is required so that use of the sites for other cultural events can be utilised as connector between communities (for example the Kino Rinia in Pristina). While RCH are being increasingly seen as a good resource for tourism which is gradually increasing, the use of public CH sites should similarly be linked to a management plan for their active use as connectors and contributors to social cohesion. 2) Using ICH as an empowerment and economic development mechanism for women and youth, but through a more comprehensive approach in the engagement with civil society from different communities in general and a cross-community joint programme where participation from both Serb and Albanian communities is structured around a common win/win revolving project (e.g. with Serbian participation in Albanian communities, and vice-versa) to take forward the interaction between the two communities which remains limited given the political considerations.

Institutional support can be further developed with co-funding from MCYS and aligned to the National CH Strategy 2017-2027. Also, additional support to the KP can be provided as some sites still require the installation of the CCTV security systems which was recommended at the end of the phase two of the project.

After a period of seven years of support to CH through three phases, it is time to take a more holistic, comprehensive, and integrated approach towards intercommunity dialogue and social cohesion. The next phase could be part of a wider programme, but should certainly address the components listed above, over a five-year period and with a clear higher-level objective (e.g. outcome level results entailing a change process at either the institutional performance level and/or in terms of behaviour change among communities) and a clear logical framework which allows to capture the higher level results (e.g. change processes at the outcome level as per Results Based Management principles). Key stakeholders are supportive of this process, but the challenge is to identify the mechanism that will support a long-term approach while providing uninterrupted funding during the five-year timeframe for the programme implementation.

Despite good progress the process of intercommunity dialogue is still in a frail situation and requires a stronger and more comprehensive involvement of the UNDP as a recognised neutral intermediary which is apolitical and has convening power and facilitation across both religious and ethnic communities, and which has gained the trust and support of the institutions in Kosovo. A more ambitious, better defined longer-term programme can be the next step towards greater social cohesion and intercommunity dialogue in Kosovo, using CH and ICH as valuable connectors to engage all programme stakeholders.

1. Introduction

The UNDP has hired a team of two consultants to undertake the Final Evaluation of the Project: "Inter-Community Dialogue through Inclusive Cultural Heritage Preservation". The project started in December 2020 and will finish on 31st May 2023. The total budget is EUR 2.634.316 primarily funded through the EU Foreign Policy Instrument (FPI), as detailed in the table hereunder:

Table 1: List of financial project contributors

Organisation	Amount in EUROS
EU FPI (European Union Foreign Policy Instrument)	1,999,876
MYCS (Ministry of Youth, Culture and Sports)	123,600
Prishtinë/Pristina municipality	70,000
UNDP (to offset global price increase in the construction sector)	182910
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET	**2,376,386**

This final evaluation has been contractually foreseen in the agreement between the funding agency and the UNDP. The team leader has worked on different occasions in Kosovo in 2007, 2012, 2017 and has carried out the evaluation of the first two phases of the project. He has extensive work experience in the Balkans and a track record of over 120 evaluations completed, many of them in confidence building and post-conflict peacebuilding contexts, including previous experience in evaluation of Cultural Heritage (CH) projects. The local expert has extensive subject matter knowledge and was directly involved in the phase two of the project. The report is structured according to the IEO evaluation guidelines: after the executive summary and the introduction (section 1), the report identifies the purpose, scope, objectives of the evaluation (section 2), as well as the audience (section 3). It brings information relating to the project background (object of the evaluation) in section 4 and discusses its evaluability in section 5. The approach and methodology are presented in section 6 and the risks and limitations in section 7. The findings are contained in section 8, following the evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions. Good practices and lessons learnt are covered in section 9, and the conclusions (section 10) and recommendations (section 11) complete the report.

2. Purpose, scope, and objective of the assessment

The objective of this final evaluation was to provide an assessment of the project performance and outputs. The criteria for the evaluation were standard evaluation criteria defined by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG): relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact. The evaluation was also requested to assess the following aspects: gender, theory of change, stakeholders, partnership strategy, human rights and Leave No One Behind (LNOB).

This final external evaluation had three purposes:

1) To provide a summative evaluation of the performance and results to date,

2) To identify good practices and lessons to be carried forward into potential future interventions with similar outcomes,
3) To provide recommendations, where relevant, on aspects which could be improved.

The scope of the final evaluation is the entire implementation period of the Project execution since its start in December 2020 until its end-date on 31st May 2023.

3. Audience

This final evaluation is meant to provide evidence of results and accountability to the UNDP and European Union Office in Kosovo (EUoK), the EU FPI, national stakeholders such as MCYS, participating municipalities, religious leaders, implementing partners, as well as other stakeholders. It may be published for dissemination and communication purposes. It is undertaken under the oversight of the UNDP Kosovo Office. The UNDP evaluation manager is also the UNDP Assistant Resident Representative (ARR). Her role is to ensure that the final evaluation remains on track with its work plan and submits the required deliverables.

4. Project background

The project was established over a 30 months' implementation period. It started its in December 2020 and will be operationally closed on 31st May 2023. The overall project budget is EUR 2.634.316 funded primarily by the EU FPI with co-funding from MYCS, Prishtinë/Pristina municipality and the UNDP as mentioned in table 1 in the introduction.

The **overall objective is to improve inter-community trust through cultural heritage protection, ultimately leading to social cohesion**.

The project has three **specific objectives (SO)**:

1. Rehabilitate select cultural and religious sites through a participatory and consultative process with local communities, municipalities, and religious institutions;
2. Promote intangible cultural heritage as a source of economic empowerment and inter-ethnic dialogue with a focus on women and young people;
3. Strengthened capacities to protect and preserve cultural heritage through institutional mechanisms.

To achieve the above-mentioned outcome, the project has identified the following **three Outputs**:

1. Restoration, rehabilitation, and beautification of cultural and religious sites;
2. Promotion of intangible cultural heritage as a bond for social cohesion;
3. Capacities to protect and preserve cultural heritage strengthened at the institutional and community level.

The outputs are each obtained through the following activities:

Output 1 activities:

1.1 Rehabilitation of cultural and religious sites and adjacent areas;

1.2 Implementation of "Restoration Camps/Creative Camps" under the guidance of the partner NGO "Cultural Heritage without Borders" (CHwB) Kosovo;

Output 2 activities:

2.1. Skills development for women and youth;
2.2. Promotion of social cohesion and cultural heritage through learning and awareness raising;
2.3. Developing innovative ideas on preserving and promoting CH through the Challenge Prize Competition;
2.4. Youth engagement as agent of social cohesion through different fora and the production of digital contents

Output 3 activities:

3.1. Supporting and cooperating with IMC as a tool to facilitate resolution of difficult cases;
3.2. Trust building between the community and the Kosovo Police;
3.3. Strengthened municipal capacities to engage in heritage protection.

5. Evaluability

UNDP Kosovo uses the EU template and the EU model logical framework. However, as mentioned in the evaluation of the sister project which ran from 2018 to 2020, there is a level of disconnect between the different terms that are used by the EU and the UNDP regarding the hierarchy of results and the terminology when applying Results Based Management.

The EU uses overall objective (e.g., goal level for the UNDG) for the higher-level results. That level is a longer-term objective and is not reached immediately by the end of the project.

The second level of results is the specific objective (e.g., outcome level for the UNDG) which are the changes that need to take place by the end of the project. According to Results Based Management (RBM) terminology, these changes deal with institutional performance and/or behaviour change. The UNDG RBM handbook also provides a definition of an outcome as "Changes in the institutional and behavioural capacities for development conditions that occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of goals"[2]. This is the level at which the project is expected to contribute to, but because there are multiple factors and actors involved, there cannot be a measure of attribution to the project. Hence, often non quantitative methods (outcome harvesting, contribution analysis, most significant change, etc.) that do not measure the attribution but determines a level of causality between the project outputs and the outcomes/specific objectives are used to evaluate this level of results.

The third level of result is the output level. This is where the project is mostly in control and responsible for the results achieved, hence attribution is possible. It relates to "changes in skills or abilities and capacities of individuals or institutions, or the availability of new products and services that result from the completion of activities within a development intervention within the control of the organization. They are achieved with the resources provided and within the time period specified."[3] Normally project management is mostly responsible for this level of result, and the completed activities lead to outputs.

---

[2] UNDG RBM handbook, October 2011, p. 7
[3] Ibid.

Finally, activities are not part of any result. They are simply "Actions taken or work performed through which inputs, such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources, are mobilized to produce specific outputs"[4].

Using the RBM terminology that has been defined by the United Nations Development Group agencies and the UN Staff college and taking into consideration the formulation of the project overall objective or goal, of the three specific objectives, of the three outputs, and of the nine activities identified under the three outputs, there is a disconnect between the definition of an outcome as institutional performance and/or behavioural change and the formulation of the three SO, which are worded as outputs and do not focus on the enabling change process. This is further evidenced in the wording of the outputs, which are almost the same as the SO. If the EU is using the SO as output level results, there is a level of result missing (the outcome level) to capture the changes the project is expected to contribute to at the institutional performance and/or behaviour change levels.

Another issue is the wording of the activities, worded as outputs, and not as activities, for output 3.

Providing support, raising awareness, promoting, developing capacities, knowledge, and skills, do not automatically ensure that capacities and capabilities will be used to generate higher level results. Outputs are contributing to specific objective/outcome statements that show changes in institutional performance and/or behaviour.

The project also has a logical framework (but no Resource and Results Framework, which is normally found in UNDP project documents) that is quite complicated and has been reviewed and simplified to present the logframe indicators and results achieved in this report.

The Action also contains a theory of change (ToC) which is described as "*when* stakeholders and beneficiaries are brought together and *if* institutional mechanisms and capabilities for the protection of cultural heritage are strengthened and *if* communities are offered opportunities to engage in preservation of cultural heritage which provides them with economic opportunities and *if* physical interventions in cultural and religious heritage sites significant for the community are undertaken *then* the sustainability of interventions will be improved which will *then* increase acceptance and trust between the communities which will *then* create more opportunities for inter-ethnic dialogue which will, ultimately, contribute to social cohesion"[5]. Six main assumptions are upholding the ToC which are mainly the willingness of the different partners to engage in and support the Action's interventions.

6. Approach and methodology

The evaluation followed the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation norms and standards (2017 revision), and the UNDP "PME Handbook" established by the UNDP in 2009 and revised in 2011, the UNDP Outcome-level evaluation, a companion guide to the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and evaluation for development results for programme units and evaluators, December 2011, the UNDG, Results-Based Management Handbook, Harmonizing RBM concepts and approaches for improved development results at country level, October 2011, as well as the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP, New

---

[4] Ibid., p. 8
[5] Annex 1, Action for Social Cohesion UNDP, p. 16

York, June 2021.[6] It was conducted under the provisions of the revised UNDP Evaluation Policy of 2019[7] . The final evaluation also adheres to and is a signatory of the UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation and the UNEG Code of Conduct both of 2008. The approach follows a "utilization-focused evaluation" approach that is described by M. Q. Patton in his book of the same name that continues to be a good practice reference material for the conduct of evaluations[8].

The five criteria for undertaking the assessment are mentioned in the Terms of Reference (ToR) and are the standard criteria used for project evaluations: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

The definition of each of the evaluation criteria has been given by the OECD/DAC revised evaluation criteria as follows[9] :

"Relevance: The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries´ global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

Efficiency: The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

Effectiveness: The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

Impact: The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

Sustainability: The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue."

In addition, and to the extent possible, the evaluation will also assess the gender responsiveness of the project, and its stakeholders and partnership strategy. Gender analysis will include content analysis of the data collected from different sources as well as ensuring sex disaggregated data collection and analysis.

Tools and methodology

The evaluation used a combination of methods, but was mainly qualitative, including the following:

   a) Documentary review of project outputs and reports submitted by the project, giving rise to the preparation of the inception report and key questions addressed by the evaluation;
   b) Individual Key Informant Interviews (KII) with all stakeholders: Project Board members, donor, UNDP project team and governance and peacebuilding programme staff, KP, municipalities, religious leaders, NGOs, and grantees, as well as a sample of contractors;

---

[6] http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml
[7] http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2019/DP_2019_29_E.pdf
[8] "Utilization-focused Evaluation", Michael Quinn Patton, 3rd Edition, Sage publications, 1998, also see https://www.utilization-focusedevaluation.org/
[9] Better Criteria for Better Evaluation, Revised Evaluation Criteria, Definitions and Principles for Use, OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2019 which completes and updates the traditional OECD/DAC, glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management, Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness series, 2002

a total of 25 interviews were undertaken with key informants as per the table hereunder. The total interview time was 1,095 minutes or over 18 hours and a total of 42 people (25 men and 17 women) were interviewed, 16 through KII and 9 through group interviews. Interview time ranged from 30 minutes to 75 minutes, with an average of 44 minutes per interview. All primary stakeholders were interviewed, with the exception of one meeting with a Serbian Orthodox Church Representative. The evaluation used a questionnaire to ensure consistency and comparability across the range of respondents.

Table 2. Interview statistics (Source: evaluators' interview notes)

Nr.	Date	location	Organisation	Name	Surname	Sex	min.	Men	Wome	total	min.
						Individual		Group			
1	15.5.23	Pristina	UNDP Kosovo					1	3	4	55
			Project Manager	Sehadin	Shok						
			RR	Maria	Suokko						
			ARR	Valbona	Bogujevci						
			Gov. PM	Marta	Gazizeda						
2	15.2.23	Zoom	EU (vienna FPI, Brussels)						2		60
			FPI Project manager	Lea	Tries	F					
			Wester Balkan PM	Biancha	Anechitei	F					
3	15.2.23	Pristina	EUoK	Stefano	Gnocchi	M	75				
4	15.5.23	Pristina	MYCS Senior Advisor	Nora	Arapi Krasniqi	F	60				
5	15.5.23	Pristina	MYC CH Department	Rezarta	Loxha Vitaku	F	40				
6	15.5.23	Zoom	NGO Fondacioni 17	Dir. Ajete	Kerqeli	F	30				
7	15.5.23	Zoom	Former FPI PM	Asier Santillan	Santillan Luizira	M	55				
8	16.5.23	Pristina	Islamic Community					3			60
			Grand Imam	Vedat	Sahiti						
			architect	Sami	Isufi						
			architect	Esad	Ramadani						
9	16.5.23	Pristina	Arch. Institute Dir.	Enver	Rexha	M	45				
10	16.5.23	Pristina	Kosovo Police	Mayor Drazo	Bozovic	M	50				
11	16.5.23	Pristina	NGO CHwB					2			55
			Director	Sali	Shoshi						
			Deputy Director	Nol	Binakaj						
12	17.5.23	Zoom	NGO Ec Me Dryshe	Dir. Valon	Xhabali		40				
13	17.5.23	Zoom	NGO Anibar					2		2	45
			Director	Vullnet	Senaja						
			project staff	Andrea	Anadolli						
14	17.5.23	Zoom	CASA+YA Graçaniça					2		2	60
			NGO Director	Miodrag	Markinkovic						
			Youth Leader	Petar	Djordjevic						
15	17.5.23	Zoom	NGO Avenija						2		45
			Director	Gordana	Djoric						
			Secretary	Ivana	Vujovic						
16	17.5.23	Pristina	Catholic Church	don Shan	Zefi	F	50				
17	17.5.23	Pristina	Union of KS Tarikats	Shejh Luzlim	Shehu	M	45				
18	18.5.23	Pristina	RCCH Director	Edona	Gashi Durguti	F	25				
19	18.5.23	Novo Brdo	RCCH Director	Artan	Hoxha	M	45				
20	18.5.23	Novo Brdo	Deputy Mayor	Svetislav	Ivanovic	M	35				
21	18.5.23	Draganaç	Monastery					3	1		70
			SOC members	Father Hristofor							
			contractor MA-ING	Milovac	Maljinkovic						
				Marko	Maljinkovic						
			SOC Archaeologist	Svetlana	Hodzic						
22	19.5.23	Dakova	RCCH	Durim	Olloni	M	30				
23	19.5.23	Peje	RCCH and Museum					4	1		60
			Director	Shpresa	Xhonbalaj						
			RCCH architect	Arsim	Mullhaxha						
			RCCH architect	Prentim	Kastrati						
			technical advisor	Shkelzen	Shala						
			Museum Archeaolog.	Sefder	Lajqi						
24	22.5.23	Zoom	Gj/DJakova Mayor	Ardian	Gjini	M	35				
25	23.5.23	Zoom	Roma community Rep	Urma	Menekshe	F	40				

c) Field work in five municipalities and on-site observation

The evaluation worked from the perspective of the Most Significant Change (MSC) approach, in order to obtain feedback from all the stakeholder groups, using appreciative inquiry.

Contribution analysis was used to infer the causality between the observed and analysed effects and the factors that led to such outcomes to the extent possible, taking into consideration that confidence building is a long-term process.

7. Risks and limitations

The logical framework does not capture higher level results and therefore the focus on results is primarily at the output level.

All meetings that were not held in English had to be translated though interpretation services provided by the UNDP through a contracted interpreter.

8. Key evaluation findings

The findings section is structured according to the terms of reference to ensure ease of reading and coherence in the presentation. For the ratings, a five-point scale was used to appraise the level of satisfaction from the different project stakeholders (from 1,0 – minimum to 5,0 – maximum, mathematical average = 3,0). Each rating was also supported by a qualitative explanation.

8.1. Relevance

The project is fully relevant with the needs of the primary donor, the EU, through the FPI funds allocated to the project. Inter-community dialogue was and remains a key objective of the presence of the international community and of the EU in particular. For the national priorities, the government through the MCYS is showing greater interest and ownership in CH as both a tool for intercommunity dialogue but also as an opportunity to provide further economic development. Both the MCYS and a municipality invested funds for this phase of the project, something that was lacking in earlier phases. Furthermore, there is an indication at the political level that CH is among the priorities in the Ministry and that the Ministry is now better equipped to take ownership and lead the process of CH development.

UNDP has been and still is working on issues of intercommunity dialogue and social cohesion. The CH projects have been one, but not the exclusive, entry point that UNDP was using as a connector to bring communities together around a win-win situation, working both in physical CH and ICH. UNDP has been recognised as a key facilitator, is a technical and not a political agency, has shown capacity and commitment to play a convening role between the various stakeholders, and offers a neutral forum at which the different stakeholders can come to discuss the issues and look for solutions.

In this sense, this project is an important contribution to the wider process, because it is using cultural heritage (CH) as an entry point to bring communities together across issues of common interest and as part of the historical inheritance process which makes Kosovo what it is today. The value-added of this project is the way in which it combined the different elements (restoration of CH sites, working with civil society organisations to create linkages and groups

across various communities interested in CH and willing to support efforts to promote their CH, including intangible CH), and the collaboration with MCYS and municipalities in order to show how support to the CH is not only conducive to inter-community dialogue (e.g. social cohesion), but is also a potential pole of growth if it is linked to economic development opportunities, in particular tourism and the production of handicrafts. In a country with a high youth migration and limited work opportunities, the development of creative industries linked to CH in municipalities can significantly contribute to the process of social cohesion through economic development and result in a win-win situation for the people of Kosovo, especially women and youth who have difficulties to access formal employment opportunities, while creating new relationships amongst communities that have kept a certain degree of isolation in the recent past.

A single project cannot change the overall social dynamics overnight or substitute the necessary political negotiations, but the project provides interesting paths that offer a range of benefits across the different components: the restoration component is inclusive of both religious and public sites, so that all the population of Kosovo is able to benefit from the specific site interventions. In addition, the soft skills through the work of the civil society and in partnership with municipalities to develop income-generation and employment through tourism-and related CH crafts can be further established as pilot entry points for wider programmes. As already mentioned in the previous evaluation, the project has the potential to be a unique reference in Kosovo, providing immediate gains for the communities through the visible restoration as well as longer-term dialogue and economic development through CH. When a project can bring together the different communities on issues of common interest, it has a good chance of becoming sustainable. This is the recommended approach from the evaluation of the previous phase but it was not followed. The previous phase ended in January 2020 and the current phase started ten months later in December 2020. The gaps in the timeline between the first two phases have caused a negative effect on the project dynamics as initially promising results that could have been consolidated further were simply placed on hold or discontinued. The project today still covers needs at the different levels explained above: visible physical restoration of sites (religious and public) that are used by the various communities, dialogue across the communities through cultural events and CH related trainings and activities, such as youth camps, and supporting both ministerial and municipal priorities not only around physical CH but looking at the linkages with tourism, employment, and local economic development.

8.2.   Efficiency

The project is small in terms of funding, with a budget of EUR 2.6 million over 30 months, and has a small but committed project team. Project management was generally found to be of very high quality, ensuring responsiveness, good communication and coordination, and being overall highly efficient. There were no complaints or negative comments about UNDP project management. One enabling factor that supported good project management was that many of the actors involved in the Action were the same as in phase two of the project. This means that there was no time lost in terms of establishing trust, communication, mutual understanding, especially regarding the complex procedures involved for procurement and restoration works. UNDP was commended by stakeholders the way project management was undertaken, although the project started during the COVID-19 pandemic. In terms of achievements, the project results systematically exceeded the target indicators for all three outputs, apart from output 3.1. which had to be cancelled (support to the IMC) and output 2.3. for which it achieved 67% of the target.

For the first output the project completed or is in the process of completing 21 CH sites as compared to a target of 14. CH restoration requires specific skills and the project developed in previous phases an efficient procedure that allowed all the works to be undertaken efficiently while obtaining all required documentation, permits, and materials efficiently. The larger challenge for this component, which represents half of the project budget, is the important increase in prices fuelled by the war in Ukraine. As a result of the price increase of the materials, UNDP allocated USD 195.000 from its own resources to offset the global price increase in the construction sector.

The complexity of the project in terms of the first component, physical restoration of CH sites, was very high given the requirements of the task: specific technical guidance for protected CH objects, coordination and communication in order to obtain the necessary permits to undertake the restoration/works, ensuring all the authorities at municipal and central levels facilitate the process and have the relevant information, compliance with the legislative requirements including for the tendering processes for contractors, the implementation of the works and the adequate completion of those, etc. Despite taking place during the COVID-19 pandemic, the project is on track to complete 21 sites versus a target of 14 sites.

Interviews indicate the technical work from the contractors under this phase was completed as planned despite the COVID-19 pandemic and the global increase in the price of construction materials. Beneficiaries (religious sites and public sites) interviewed indicated a very fluid and strong coordination and communication with UNDP, and a high staff commitment and responsiveness, which was a key element of success in achieving the results. One religious representative that had some criticism in the last phase indicated that this third phase was "perfect" because all their wishes were considered in the realisation of the works. Similarly, the procurement procedures from UNDP seem to be quicker than public tenders, hence given UNDP an edge in efficiency. Other religious leaders indicated also that UNDP's support did not have any strings attached, as some of the funding received from international organisations have had some concessions. In one case the interviewee indicated that two CH sites were joined into one site because the budget was too small and UNDP agreed to this request, with additional funding for the other site being allocated by the MCYS. The respondents for RCH that provided ratings regarding their level of satisfaction gave a 5 out of 5 appraisal (maximum).

The evaluation team noted that while both RCH and public CH sites were selected under the first output, RCH now has been mainstreamed into the tourism sector and anecdotal evidence suggests that the rising cultural tourism covers all RCH sites, as all monuments are listed in the tour guide packages and the bus routes, regardless of ownership. Interviews confirm high level of interest from all communities living in Kosovo with the RCH sites from Serbian Orthodox Church, the Islamic Community, the Catholic Church, the Union of Tarikats, and there is growing evidence that CH tourism is gaining ground among both national and international tourists.

For the public CH sites, the evaluation noted that some of the sites are only used on specific occasions. However, it is important to have a management plan to be able to actively use CH sites as a key connector, especially those places that can be used for other cultural events (e.g. such as the Kino Rinia in Pristina that can host many different cultural events). Management plans facilitate use and maintenance issues since they foresee the frequency and use of the site, something that is already ensured for the RCH sites in Kosovo as access is granted to all RCH sites.

Generally religious leaders see the funding from the EU to CH as very positive as it signals that Kosovo is close to Europe and is not supported only by other eastern donor countries.

Under the second output, the project involved many NGOs from different ethnic communities. It worked on a wide range of initiatives related to intangible CH, with very concrete and tangible results in most cases. While all planned results were achieved, again through very close collaboration and communication and support from the UNDP staff, some of the initiatives were innovative in the sense that they used an approach to motivate creative initiatives, and to some extent these were going into unchartered waters – not knowing beforehand the results it would achieve. At the same time initiatives that included women empowerment and economic development, and which supported training in business management and income generation through ICH, were highly appreciated by the beneficiaries. Activities related to youth camps and restoration camps were also considered as attractive for participants.

The evaluation interviewed six NGOs from different communities that participated in the output two[10] to promote ICH as a tool for economic empowerment and intercommunity dialogue. All had examples of how they were able to implement their activities, and despite working during the COVID-19 pandemic, each was able to join different communities together in their activities and events. There is evidence that the output two does contribute to both economic empowerment and intercommunity dialogue through ICH, but the evaluation also found that the communities that came together in the civil society sector rarely were inclusive of the majority and largest minority communities in Kosovo. Many examples of women participation including majority Albanian, Gorani, Roma, Ashkali, Egyptian, Bosnian, Turkish and other minorities was reported, but few cases where Albanian participants came together with Serbian participants. This indicates that more efforts are needed and perhaps conditional funding to have a joint programme between one Albanian and one Serbian NGO to ensure reciprocal attendance of women and youth from their communities in the same event. If RCH appears to be able to bring people together despite the political divide, it does not appear to be so easily done when working with civil society institutions. Hence the need for UNDP to consider a joint pilot programme with an Albanian and Serb NGO that do subscribe to alternating activities in each other's communities to facilitate physical closeness and interaction during the events held and develop closer ties between the communities. Some of the partner NGOs felt they deserved a higher degree of recognition as partners and wished for less direct oversight from UNDP. The limitation of the output 2 is that when the funding comes to an end there is no mechanism to ensure sustainability even if positive dynamics are created, and this undermines a process that should be accompanied over the long-term (intercommunity dialogue and social cohesion) rather than as a project activity.

The third output was the strengthening of the capacities to preserve and protect CH at institutional and community level. While the first activity was cancelled (support to IMC), the Kosovo Police is now in charge of the protection of all CH sites save one that remains under Kosovo Force (NATO's KFOR). Through the project the KP´s unit for the protection of the cultural monuments has gained great visibility and recognition. So much so that it is now elevated to a directorate, as part of the community police. This is a very positive development and shows that the project provided a win/win situation for all stakeholders. While the recommendation from the previous evaluation to complete the installation of the CCTV security systems was not followed, since it was expected to be done by the OSCE, it remains an important support that

---

[10] From a total of 7 NGOs interviewed, one of which was involved in output 1 and not output 2

UNDP could provide to keep its contacts with the KP and further contribute to its professional development, possibility also supporting its community police (outside of the scope of this project if UNDP has other projects of this type in its governance portfolio).

According to the financial report from the UNDP, and which is not yet final, the project has a delivery rate of 98.1% as of 29 May 2023 regarding the funding received by the EU. In terms of monetary value, UNDP reports to date a level of commitment and expenditures of EUR 1.962.061 versus a total accepted cost of the Action amounting to EUR 1.999.874. However, this is not yet the final financial report and the financial report may indicate a delivery of 100% by the end of final transaction.

This means that the activities and outputs have been fully implemented (apart from activity 3.1 that was cancelled), as mentioned in the enclosed updated log frame which contains the latest results indicators at the end of the project.

Table 3. Extract of the logical framework for the project (data source. UNDP)

extracted from logframe	Impact level	Specific objective 1	Contributing to output 1.1.	Contributing to output 1.2.	output 2.1.	output 2.2.	output 2.3	output 2.4	contributing to output 3.	output 3.1	Output 3.2.	output 3.3.
indicator statement	Perceptions of communities on the level of social cohesion in Kosovo	Number of initatives which promote cultural heritage (tangible and intangible) and engage with communities to support community dialogue and acceptance of "the others"	Number of physical interventions in cultural and religious heritage sites	Number of initiatives which engage with communities, with a focus on youth and women	Number of women and youth participating in skills development interventions	Number of young people with a positive attitude towards inter-ethnic trust and cooperation	Number of innovative ideas	Number of participating youth who agree to address divisive narratives	Perception about capacities of public institutions to address community needs	Number of interventions as identified/selected by IMC	Number of youth participating in two youth camps	Number of people who have trust in public institutions
initial value (without baseline)	25,30%	0	0	0	0	20,30%	0	0	0	0	0	19,70%
target	22%	30	14	12	65	24%	6	150	24%	8	70	22%
final indicator value (current)	26,20%	38	21	15	420	24%	4	343	27,10%	cancelled	86	45,70%
gender disaggregation		50/50 (originally planned)		n/a	50/50 (originally planned)	50/50 (originally planned)		(w/m; originally planned)	50/50			
male	28%	33%	n/a	31%	10%		0%	53%	26,30%		57%	46,10%
female	26,40%	67%	n/a	69%	90%		100%	47%	27,20%		43%	41,40%
Ethic community												
Majority	28,30%	n/a	n/a	n/a	48%	45%	15%	45%	46,20%		73%	46,10%
Minorities	28,60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	52%	55%	85%	55%	53,80%		27%	53,90%

Note regarding output 2.4: No surveys conducted. The target was revised to use the number of participants. It was decided that participants were too young to respond to potentially sensitive questions. The current numbers reflect the changed indicator.

As shown according to the indicator values in the table above, the project exceeded all targets except for output 2.3 where the target reached 67% (4 of 6 innovative ideas) and Output 3.1. which was cancelled.

While project management efficiency was high, the evaluation notes that reporting for results needs to be improved and reflect better the analytical aspects to weave a consistent narrative that brings the mutually supportive efforts undertaken under the three outputs into strong results-based management report that informs about changes in the communities and how they contribute to the wider results.

8.3.   Effectiveness

The project was successful in reaching the targets and completing the outputs as shown on the indicators list on table 3 above with one exception. The first component of physical restoration was both time-consuming and management intensive. The fact that the project worked largely

with the same stakeholders as in phase 2 means that implementation was much more efficient and that there was a common understanding on the approach and regarding the expected results. The beneficiaries of this first component (output 1) expressed a high level of satisfaction with the results of the interventions. This applies not only to the actual quality of the restoration works but also to the level of coordination, communication, and information across the range of actors involved. A high number of community initiatives focusing on women and youth were supported (15 versus a target of 12). The process regarding the selection of the sites was generally smooth, although a comprehensive list was established at the end of the phase 2 of the project. Nonetheless this project phase had to review the selected sites and accepted additional recommendations to consider other CH sites for an intervention. While almost all sites were identified according to criteria that satisfied all project stakeholders, one of the sites initially chosen in Mitrovica had to be abandoned as it created additional problems instead of contributing to intercommunity dialogue. This shows that, while there is a common understanding and respect for RCH sites, there remains some high level of sensitivity when considering private or publicly owned sites with controverted historical narratives. The very adamant position shown by both Albanian and Serbian respondents regarding this particular site is a lesson learnt. UNDP has to pay more attention to the historical significance of the CH site's owner if it is likely to be politicised, and therefore it is too early to select such sites for restoration and preservation.

The second component (output 2) was achieved through the collaboration from a wide range on NGOs, working on different aspects of the rich intangible cultural heritage that is found in Kosovo. These NGOs represented a wide and varied range of actions related to intangible cultural heritage. The actual results obtained by each NGO show that the products were useful and valuable, and that the right approach was used to generate these results. There is ample evidence across the involvement of civil society organisations about the high value of ICH in empowering women and youth (both in handicraft related work and in business management and development) with several NGOs focusing on women and youth empowerment through ICH. There is equally ample evidence that the NGOs obtained participation from numerous and diverse communities, in an inclusive manner to contribute to the intercommunity dialogue and contributing to social cohesion. Some actors even used the language commonality between Serbian and Albanian to publish a dictionary of common words used in both languages (reportedly 560) through the involvement of youth. Several of the NGO initiatives have shown early results, but some are at an early phase require further support to be sustainable, while others have already completed their objectives. Because of the short nature of the project and the fact that the NGOs answered UNDP's calls for proposals which are short-term in nature, it is difficult to establish a continuous dynamic as activities depend on the funding available and the funding period. Obviously, some of the income generating activities for women and youth will continue after the end of the project. Similarly, projects that resulted in tangible outputs such as books, video, or e-materials published in internet will continue to impact after the end of the project. However, some of the initiatives have not fully blossomed and should be taken through different graduation stages if the ambition is to strengthen social cohesion more effectively than just by putting people together and sharing their common CH. This also means that there should be a clearer strategy to involve the NGO partners over the longer-term, within a clearer framework that allows to write the story of how each initiative contributes to the wider objective of intercommunity dialogue and social cohesion. At present it is easy to identify what the individual micro-projects have achieved, but it is much more difficult to tie them into a

coherent narrative in support of a shared outcome. Higher-level results for output 2.4. on the production of digital contents are unclear.

Many of the NGO partners had already worked with UNDP in the previous phase, something that also made the process and project implementation more effective as NGOs already knew UNDP's requirements and approach. There remains a need to consolidate these individual efforts into a collective framework that shows contribution to the project overall objective.

The project also used the small grants given under the Challenge Prize Competition, as the creativity in the proposals were matched by ingenious use and approaches regarding CH, something that was replicated from the second phase of the project given the positive results obtained.

The third component of the project (output 3) was working with municipalities and institutions to preserve and protect CH at community and local levels. The MCYS has taken a much greater ownership of CH and has co-funded this project, along with the municipality of Pristina. It is equally now launching calls for proposals for NGOs working in CH. There is a clear desire and drive to take more fully the CH on board as one of the priorities of the Ministry, particularly given the positive effects on tourism and economic development, something that was echoed by various municipalities interviewed. At the institutional level, the Regional Centres for Cultural Heritage (RCCH) have also been much more closely involved with the work of the UNDP and see UNDP as an important and trusted partner. Furthermore, the EU funding channelled through UNDP for CH is highly valuable for the municipalities, as it remains difficult for them to allocate funds for CH when some of the basic public services and reconstruction projects are still in the process of implementation. At municipal level the UNDP project is adding value to the municipal development plans and the funding from the EU is equally recognised and appreciated.

For the Kosovo Police, Unit for Protection of Cultural and Religious sites (RCHU), the project was key in providing greater visibility and awareness of their role as protectors of RCH sites. The KP is now under a restructuring of the unit into a directorate under the division of community police and prevention. There remains a need to further support the installation of the CCTV in protected areas that has been shown to increase not only the protection of the RCH sites, but also the security of the inhabitants living in that area.

For the 24 KII undertaken respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with UNDP under this project. The table hereafter reflects the ratings from the different types of respondents and covers all the of the project components. The scale is a five-point scale, where 1= minimum, 2= low, 3= average, 4= high, 5= excellent. The mathematical average is 3.0 and each rating was further supported by qualitative explanations to justify the rating. From the range of respondents interviewed, the lowest rating received was a 3 and the highest was a five, with the following distribution:

Table 4– Ratings distribution from 1 (minimum) to 5 (maximum) (Source: notes from KII)

No of responses	Rating given
1	3
1	3,75
6	4
1	4,5
13	5
2	N/A

Total	24	Mean	4.56

Overall, the level of satisfaction from the UNDP project is perceived to be quite high, with an **overall average of 4,56 out of a maximum of 5,0**. This is quite a high mark coming from **24 respondents including all stakeholder categories** (except of course UNDP). As compared to the phase 2 evaluation this rating includes a higher number of respondents (24 versus 17 in phase 2) as the evaluation was undertaken by a team of two consultants, versus a single consultant who was recruited for the evaluation of phase 1 as well as for the evaluation of the phase 2 of the project.

Table 5 – Ratings obtained from 24 respondents representing the different project stakeholders (Source: interview notes)

No of responses	Respondent category	Average
7	NGOs	**4,57**
2	municipality	**4,50**
8	institution	**4,66**
4	religious community	**5,00**
3	donor	**3,50**
24	**overall average**	**4,56**

If the ratings are compared with the evaluation of the phase two, in which the donor ratings were not included, the current phase has an even higher rating of 4,68 out of five versus 4,59 in phase two – and this from a higher number of respondents.

Table 6 : ratings from the evaluation of phase 2 (source: evaluator's notes and evaluation report) and ratings from the evaluation of phase 3 excluding donor ratings (to allow for comparison) – (Source: evaluation team's notes from KII)

Phase 2 of the project

No of responses	Respondent category Phase 2	average	No of responses	Respondent category Phase 3	average
6	NGOs	**4,58**	7	NGOs	**4,57**
6	municipality	**4,5**	2	municipality	**4,50**
2	institutions	**4**	8	institutions	**4,66**
3	religious community	**5**	4	religious community	**5,00**
17	**overall average**	**4,59**	**21**	**overall average**	**4,68**

The findings that were valid for phase two remain applicable in this phase and support the positive ratings obtained. On the one hand the commitment, coordination, and communication

capacity of the UNDP with its partners facilitated interaction across the various communities and contributed to smooth and efficient project management. The project was able to engage all stakeholders around the issue of CH and raise awareness and knowledge about the value of CH. Through the project components many activities were undertaken that allowed to bring diverse communities together to learn from one another. This was particularly highlighted by interviewees for the RCH sites, although some of the public CH sites are also gaining greater interest from the communities that come to enjoy the events held at those sites. The most challenging aspect of the project is however to ensure that civil society partners are able to engage at the same time both Albanian and Serbian women in projects of common interest (e.g. for women economic empowerment). While there is evidence that NGOs were able to include a large participation of minority groups in all activities, there is limited evidence that Serbian and Albanian participants are willing to engage in an intensification of their interaction. This indicates that although the actions of civil society cannot offset the tense political climate between Serbs and Albanians and the difficulties around the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue, there is a need to foment greater interaction between the two groups, as the division between these two communities is wider than that of any of the other minorities as a result of the armed conflict. A small number of Serbian participants joined restoration camps and youth camps, and some NGOs that had foreseen a greater participation by both groups did not obtain the desired level of participation. A good practice which may have a longer impact on perceptions of Albanian children toward Serbian community was reported by NGO which organized primary school student visits to SOC sites. A specific recommendation is made to address this and support more openly the intercommunity dialogue from the civil society side for Serbs and Albanians alike.

The good practices and benchmarks that were used in the second phase remained in place during the third phase. All the procedures for the review and selection of sites, with an increased level of participation and collaboration by the Ministry (MCYS) and related institutions both at national and at regional and municipal level. UNDP has developed a good partnership strategy with its primary stakeholders, although for the civil society sector the relationship remains mainly driven by small projects that answer the calls for proposal (with the notable exception of the partnership with CHwB which is a full-fledged strategic partnership that enables an efficient and effective implementation of the physical restoration component of the project). There is a need to upscale partnerships with the NGO sector to increase intercommunity dialogue and collaboration, possibly through more women empowerment initiatives with a revolving participation from Serb and Albanian beneficiaries, in addition to the other minority groups. One aspect mentioned by an NGO partner is that they did not believe that such close scrutiny by UNDP was needed, as it tended to indicate a lack of trust in their capacity. Because NGO partnerships were project driven, some of the potentially very constructive results have not been upscaled or given the visibility they would have deserved. More visibility on some of the results obtained by the NGOs, particularly those that are obvious connectors through ICH, should be given to sustain the dynamics created through the project beyond its funding period.

8.4. Perceived changes and emerging outcomes

As mentioned in the inception report, it is not possible to carry out a rigorous impact evaluation of the project's contribution to the overall project objective for a 30-month project. Therefore, the evaluation team has sought to mend this using a range of different methods that can inform about the contribution of the various project components to the project's overall objective. At

the same time, since the team leader was also the evaluator for phases 1 and 2 of the project, the analysis of the Most Significant Change, and the contribution analysis when identifying the outcomes generated through the project, do not only cover the last 30 months (unlike the ratings which are specific for this third phase of the project). It is important to take into consideration that, although the project has been expanding its scope from phases one to three and has increased its level of complexity by also widening the components and their individual objectives, the actual period under review when considering the outcome-level changes goes back from 2016 to 2023, over a seven-year period.

The major change that is observable is how, among the population in Kosovo across the different communities, and including from the international visitor's perspective, CH is attracting much more attention. A significant increase in tourism was reported by municipalities (although no data was available) both from national and international tourists. In some municipalities this has already exerted a very positive influence in economic development, as the rise in tourism generates additional revenues (tour operators, guides, restaurants, cafés, hotels, and accommodation) which in turn increase the amount of taxes collected. It is a win/win situation for all actors, and the inclusion of reportedly all RCH sites in the tourist routes and packages reflects the willingness to provide visibility to all potentially interested parties. As time passes and more urgent needs have been and are being addressed, the interest in CH is rising. Also support to ICH related to traditional handicrafts is having impact in increasing the number of people engaged in these traditional manufacturing activities and creation of networks for promotion and trade which go beyond different communities and increases social cohesion.

Another key change is the high level of ownership and commitment from the MCYS which is taking a clear leading role in the support and preservation of CH. Not only did the ministry co-fund this phase of the project, but it has shown to be taking clear steps to lead a committed drive to support CH, with a particular interest in its potential for economic development. This was echoed by the municipalities, and another significant change is that, for this phase of the project, both the MCYS and the municipality of Pristina provided co-funding. It has also been officially confirmed that the MCYS will also launch calls for proposals for NGOS in the field of CH for five sites that are state-owned and with the focus on income generation and education al programme for youth, among other activities. Partnership with the Ministry and other institutions was very strong based on solid communication and synergies across the actions undertaken under the project. The MCYS is also interested in formalising the restoration camps (two undertaken by CHwB in this project) but this requires a change in legislation. There is a strong interest to pursue and develop further CH in the MCYS and the support of the UNDP is seen as a valuable element. The major change has been that the project has provided a platform for different communities including religious communities. That platform is operational, trustworthy and in the words of one respondent "still important because of the political situation". This phase of the project was seen as a joint project between MCYS/EU/UNDP, and not as an EU/UNDP project. The role of UNDP as a neutral platform is still seen as necessary given the political situation and the ability of the UNDP to engage with all stakeholders. It would be important also to consider developing an exit strategy technically prepared for the next phase of the project if funding is available. In this case again the MCYS would be willing to co-finance the activities particularly with the religious communities as the main target.

Another important development has been how the Kosovo Police through the RCHU has gained visibility and recognition. At the time of this report only one religious site remains under the protection of the KFOR, all other sites have been placed under the responsibility of the KP. A

change is taking place and the RCHU is being promoted to a directorate level, under the division of community policing, which indicates that it is taking greater role and responsibility. Placing the directorate under the division of community policing will enable an even greater knowledge of the events that are taking place in the communities. The KP is also interested and willing to cooperate further with UNDP should there be a continuation of the project.

Intercommunity dialogue is taking place, particularly in and around RCH sites. While there is also a large interaction between most minority groups and the Albanian population, the evaluation team noted that Serb representation is lower than expected in many events (restoration camps, youth camps, NGO projects) and requires the development of a specific strategy to include both Serb and Albanian participants to enhance interaction and dialogue between these communities. Obviously, the political situation is not providing an enabling environment, but that is why the use of civil society organisations across both sides working together and sharing participants may be a bold and interesting approach that should be explored. At present, the intercommunity dialogue between Serbs and Albanians is not at its highest and particularly since the violent incidents in 2022 and now those taking place in 2023.

The outcome with the NGOs is not yet there, except with CHwB which is playing a key partnership role for the first project component. All other NGOs have been implementing short-term activities as a result of the calls for proposals and low-value grants. In some cases, the same NGOs had collaborated in earlier phases with UNDP, but on different small projects. This means there was no continuity or any important change process taking place because the NGO partnership is focused on small scale projects and not on the wider objective. Even in this phase, some NGOs reported important empowerment process and income generating for women and youth, but they are ad hoc interventions that do not easily lend themselves to an analytical review because they are not mutually supportive or do not appear to have a clear strategy that evolves in support of the overall objective. Even though the participation of Serb beneficiaries was lower than expected, it must also be said that one NGO that had a large number of minorities participating in their project did not succeed in obtaining the participation of majority Albanian beneficiaries despite having received assurance that they would participate. UNDP was not able to provide an explanation for this lack of participation from the majority Albanian group.

While the strategy and objectives of the physical CH are clear, the strategy surrounding the support to ICH is not as clear: some important results were achieved in women empowerment, youth participation and income generation/employment by some NGOs, but it tells a story that does not seem to have a longer-term projection. In view of the evaluation team, it should on the contrary show its linkages to a longer-term strategy to support women empowerment and youth participation in a more consistent and coherent manner than through the support of short-term small projects as a mechanism to increase intercommunity dialogue and contribute to social cohesion over the long term. It should be noted that NGO activities related to ICH which produce materials that will continue to exert an impact in the future should be prioritised for future projects. Good examples are the production of books, videos and e-materials that provide evidence of shared cultural heritage and contribute to decreasing prejudices. The change process at the Civil Society level seems to be quite small compared to what could expected from a strategic engagement of NGOs into partnerships for intercommunity dialogue and their contribution to social cohesion. The evaluation of the previous phase had already made a recommendation to create a platform for NGOs working on CH in support of a common strategy. In the absence of a clear strategy the efforts undertaken seem few and of limited value when

considering the needs that need to be addressed, both in terms of the numbers and in terms of the benefits that are being generated by short-term projects which do not evolve into a common narrative.

8.5. Sustainability

The sustainability of the projects' results depends on the nature of the component. For the first component, the physical restoration of the sites, all the RCH sites are maintained by their respective religious communities and communities have access to their religious sites. RCH restoration is therefore sustainable, as the communities ensure the care and maintenance required. For the sustainability of public monuments or other forms of CH that must be maintained by the respective municipality where it is located, the issue is somewhat different. A key factor of sustainability is to have a management plan for the public site, something that is not always readily available or something for which it is sometimes difficult for municipalities to allocate funding for. A management plan that uses the CH site for multicultural events and other public and/or private functions can include income generating and the maintenance aspects in their management plan.

For the second component of raising awareness of intangible CH "as a bond for social cohesion", the interventions all have contributed to raise awareness about the knowledge, promotion and protection of CH in Kosovo, with some having further potential to develop other critical aspects of the intervention (such as tourism, local economic development, employment) further. However, the strategy to engage with the civil society remains unclear and the component is essentially a continuation of the efforts undertaken under component two of the phase two of this project. Women empowerment with NGO support was shown to provide some good results, as well as those involved youth participation. It is however unclear that benefits will be continued after the end of the funding. Evidence indicates that some very promising examples from the phase two, such as the filigree handicrafts that provided employment and income generation through the sales to tourists travelling to Prizren, did not continue after the end of the project because there was no further funding available. The short-term projects undertaken under the calls for proposal are not of a sustainable nature because they gravitate on the launch of new and creative and innovative projects. This approach is good, but a single round of funding is insufficient to ensure the sustainability of the activities or of the benefits leveraged through the projects. In essence, the activities designed under this component are not focused on sustainability, but rather on showing the potential value even though the project ends before the businesses developed or initiatives or innovative interventions in ICH have reached a critical mass to ensure their sustainability. The number of participants are reported as the key results in the indicators contained in the logframe, to the detriment of the significance of the results and their potential contribution to intercommunity dialogue. In the current difficult political context, it is not realistic to expect a large joint Serb/Albanian participation in NGO projects unless it is tailored as a revolving joint venture with the commitment of the NGOs to provide participants from their communities. In relation to the dialogue with other minority communities, the project has clearly offered venues and events in which a range of other minority communities have participated as indicated in the activities undertaken by the NGOs (namely Gorani, Turkish, Ashkali, Egyptian, Roma, Bosnian). Sustainability of this component would require a much longer timeframe for partnering with the NGOs and a larger funding and longer implementation period, working in a complementary mode with the efforts of the physical restoration of the CH sites (e.g. holding ICH events in CH sites and more interaction

between the two components). Also, the sustainability of traditional handicraft businesses require the establishment of networks for promotion and trade in cooperation with central and local government institutions. A comprehensive support to the NGOs in ICH which contributes to the intercommunity dialogue needs to be grounded on a clear strategy linking the different intervention components around a common overall goal that can be captured through an analytical narrative rather than a description of activities.

Recognising social cohesion to be a long-term goal, the project needs to be planned over a five-year period to achieve outcome level results (e.g. institutional performance and/or behaviour change), instead of focusing on outputs (e.g. increase in awareness, knowledge, skills, and capabilities) with larger funding to make a lasting effect instead of focusing on small demonstrative projects that are not always sustainable. The evaluation of phase two had recommended a 36-month timeframe with an increased budget of EUR 3 million but this was recommendation was not followed.

The third component of strengthening institutional capacity to promote and protect cultural heritage at institutional and community level has been largely completed in relation to the partnership with the KP, although there is a dearth of funding for the remaining 16 CH sites that required CCTV, and which were supposed to be provided by the OSCE[11]. The RCHU is now elevated to the level of a directorate under the community policing division, which is an important institutional improvement. In relation to the MCYS there has been very close collaboration and the decision-making and partnership was very satisfactory underlined by the increased commitment of the MCYS to take the lead role in ensuring CH preservation and restoration. The co-funding from the ministry, the CH strategy up to 2027, the allocation of funding for NGOs on CH linked with economic development, the active participation and oversight of the regional centres, are all indications that an important institutional change is taking place and that it should be supported by the UNDP. Technical capacities are not the main cause of the continued support required by UNDP. Rather, its role as an impartial facilitator and convenor in a complex and sensitive environment indicates that it still has an important role to play at least over the next five-years if it wants to be able to have outcome level results in intercommunity dialogue and contribute to social cohesion.

8.6. Cross-cutting issues

8.6.1. Gender Equality: The project was marked as GEN2, indicating a strong component in gender equality and women empowerment. Under the project a special effort was made to include women and youth as key resource persons to benefit from UNDP's support through grants and contribute to women and youth empowerment. Several NGOs were women-led and targeted women marketing ICH products through networks that even exported their goods outside of Kosovo. Data obtained from UNDP is gender disaggregated and the logframe shows a good percentage of women participation in all activities undertaken. Inclusion of women from all the different ethnic communities was a key part of the project strategy.

8.6.2. Human Rights: the project is dealing directly through CH with intercommunal dialogue and social cohesion, in a very clear application of the respect for human rights which is apparent in the inclusion of all different communities and stakeholders groups identified under the project. The project is strategically aligned on the Human Rights

---

[11] Comment from UNDP: "It is good to clarify that CCTVs were not part of this phase"

Based Approach on all its components including all religious groups as well as ethnic groups.

8.6.3. LNOB: The project has made great efforts for inclusiveness of all religious and ethnic groups in Kosovo. Compared to the phase 2, additional religious groups (e.g. Union of Kosovo Tarikats) and all identified ethnic groups (Albanians, Serbs, Bosnian, Turks, Gorani, Egyptian, Ashkali, Roma, etc.) living in Kosovo have been included in the project activities, showing a clear commitment to LNOB.

8.6.4. Disability: It is not clear whether there were disability provisions in the physical works undertaken under the first specific objective of the project. Anecdotal evidence from on-site observation did not identify specific physical infrastructure to accommodate participation from disabled persons in the CH sites (such as ramps instead of stairs, etc.).

9. Good practices and lessons learnt

The evaluation team was able to identify the following good practices in this phase of the project:

- Communication, information, and coordination from the UNDP staff to the project stakeholders. Stakeholders unanimously commended UNDP for its capacity to be available, responsive, open and communicate clearly all the relevant information regarding the implementation of the project.
- The fact that many of the same people who were involved in phase two participated in phase three means the understanding, trust and communication were already well established, resulting in the smoothest implementation of the physical CH restoration component to date.
- There is a large pool of success stories in bringing communities together and supporting intercommunity dialogue, but they do so at a relatively small level. However, evidence of attitudinal change amongst project beneficiaries after participating in the various events (either through the NGO implemented projects, through participating in the youth camps, through visits of Albanian children to SOC sites or simply through the increase of CH tourism in the municipalities) abounds and is an indicator that CH and in particular RCH can be a connector across the communities. Some of the production from women associations is exported to other countries through networks created with the support of the project.
- Focus on shared (common) cultural heritage which transcend ethnic boundaries, such us traditional handicrafts, language similarities, oral histories and other ICH that show commonalities instead of differences and which are good examples that support inter-community dialogue and social cohesion.
- Youth engagement in camps is an important connector and contributes to attitudinal change, but it needs to be part of a strategic approach to youth engagement that goes beyond the holding of camps.
- UNDP's impartiality and neutrality, and its ability to convene and cooperate with all different actors in a very sensitive political environment gives it a unique advantage that adds value to the process of intercommunity dialogue and can contribute to social cohesion.

- Good administrative and financial procedures that are also more efficient as compared to public procurement processes.
- Challenge prize competitions are very useful mechanisms to identify great young talents that find useful and innovative approaches to support intercommunal dialogue and social cohesion through CH.

The following lessons were also identified for learning as there are still some aspects to improve further the positive results generated through the project:

- Civil society needs to be more engaged in order to ensure greater participation of both Serb and Albanian beneficiaries in all activities organised by the project. At present the level of joint participation by Serbs and Albanians is below expectations and the number of participants that join the same events from both communities is limited. This does not apply to the other minority communities in Kosovo who have no problem participating in the project events and activities. Some undertaking from Serb and Albanian NGOs is necessary to push more vigorously for joint participation at events. This could be done through joint projects across Serb/Albanian NGOs that share the same target groups and exchange their beneficiaries through a revolving process to complement each other's efforts towards intercommunity dialogue and changing mindsets. As long as the political situation remains so sensitive it is difficult to change attitudes but a more ambitious approach to involving civil society as partners to better engage both communities in joint events is warranted and possible if done properly.
- While there is growing evidence that CH can be used as a connector between communities, it is difficult to assess how much more this phase has brought communities together as compared to the second phase, since this aspect is not being monitored nor reported upon.
- Short-term funding is not ensuring a good transition across the different phases and impacts negatively on the results obtained as the initial dynamics are not sustained and some of the activities and small projects are abandoned despite having started with promising results. The time gaps between the different project phases and their timeline of initially 20 months for phase one and two, and 30 months for phase three, remain too short for an approach that seeks to generate long-term results in intercommunity dialogue and support to social cohesion. A short-term funding instrument should not be the preferred option for obtaining future funding linked to CH for UNDP.
- Intercommunity dialogue and social cohesion require integrated efforts that go beyond what a small project focused on CH can accomplish. If UNDP wants to upscale its results, it needs to take a broader and more ambitious approach based on a clear strategy to show how CH and economic empowerment contribute to creating win/win situations, breaking negative mindsets, changing attitudes, and contributing to social cohesion. A framework for a five-year integrated programme would be the most valuable option for the UNDP.

10. Conclusions

The project obtained good results at the activity and output levels, except for the output 3.1. which was cancelled and output 2.3. for which 67% of the target was achieved. It plays an important role in raising awareness about CH and about the importance of CH as a connector between communities. Despite a complex situation where the COVID-19 pandemic, increase of

prices due to the war in Ukraine and the political events made project implementation more challenging, all output results were largely reached or even exceeded the targets. However, it is more difficult to show how higher-level results are also benefitting from the project's contribution. The short-term funding instrument is not well adapted to the needs of the overall objective which is the improvement of intercommunity trust through CH protection, ultimately leading to social cohesion. UNDP has now enough experience to know it needs longer-term and more ambitious integrated programme based on an integrated strategy in which CH and economic empowerment go hand in hand. The lack of a strong Results-Based Management design in the project means the focus was largely on the output level results, but it still needs to weave a coherent narrative to explain how the different components are mutually supportive of the expected outcomes the project wants to achieve.

There is a willingness and interest from the MCYS to work on a longer-term partnership basis including co-funding for the future, as UNDP is seen as a neutral facilitator, convener and mediator which remains an important value addition over the medium term considering the convoluted political situation. More efforts need to be placed both on the logical framework and the strategy to involve the NGO sector in a way that shows more clearly civil society as a force for change through intercommunity dialogue based on a win/win situation provided by the different projects and events. Based on the learning from the past phases and the current project, it would be preferable for UNDP to move to a five-year larger integrated programme through mechanisms that provide such a longer-term support (such as IPA). The continuation of EU funding is also an important signal to both the Serb communities, that feel they are not being abandoned by Europe, but also for the Albanian communities, which are feeling more aligned with the European countries and standards.

The key challenge will be for UNDP to develop a comprehensive integrated programme in which the different components are mutually supportive and based on a narrative where CH and ICH (through its economic empowerment dimension) provide a win/win situation for all communities in Kosovo, supporting the necessary social cohesion that should develop across communities in time. The current project has obviously been able to successfully complete the different outputs, but it still struggles to tell the story of its successes at the higher outcome level. The difficulty in analytic reporting of the results with the civil society sector means that narrative reporting only provides one level of results but fails to capture the wider dimension and it seems to be opening the door, although more efforts are warranted to keep the door open. The gaps experienced between the different phases, particularly the ten months between phase 2 and 3 of the project, means some of the positive dynamics were not sustained and this negatively affected some of the project's early gains including in the use of ICH for economic empowerment, tourism, and job creation.

The potential is certainly there but it is time for UNDP to be more ambitious and upscale the project into an integrated programme that will leverage not only output results but also higher-level outcome results and being able to report on those outcomes of institutional performance and behaviour change in a more analytical matter through reviewing the approach used for report towards the RBM reporting for results approach.

The project is complex and covers a wide range of components. It was undertaken during a difficult period both given COVID-19 pandemic, global increase in prices and the latest political events including 2022 and 2023 events which obviously undermine confidence building across the Serb and Albanian communities. Starting from the premise that a return to open conflict is not an option and will not grant any side any significant advantage, it becomes then a question

of political negotiations that the different views and positions of the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue be finally resolved peacefully in order to find a compromise solution that is acceptable to all parties. In the meantime CH is an important connector as it shows that all religious groups are mindful and committed to sharing their sites with other communities as part of the recognition of the value of the RCH sites, many of which are tourist destinations for both national and international tourists. Similarly, some of the public CH sites have a good potential for further use as connectors for the different communities. ICH on the other hand is both a connector for intercommunity dialogue and a powerful tool for economic empowerment, especially for women networks and youth. These two complementary starting points need to be cohesively developed into an integrated programme so that the UNDP can look for additional funding to continue its support to both preservation and conservation of CH sites, economic empowerment through ICH, promotion of shared inter-community ICH, capacity development and partnership support to the MCYS and other institutions, including municipalities, through co-funding arrangements, for an integrated phase that will set the stage for a gradual withdrawal of UNDP (developing an exit strategy and enabling the MCYS to gradually assume leadership for all CH sites) after five years. This of course will depend on the progress made in the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue. While this kind of project cannot resolve existing conflicts or disagreements, it does have the capacity to create win/win conditions for all stakeholder and certainly to contribute to the intercommunity dialogue, supporting the longer-term objective of social cohesion.

Not all the results are sufficiently known or analysed in UNDP's reports. Greater visibility of outcomes is also warranted, and this could be done through a wider regional approach to CH and ICH as connectors for intercommunity dialogue and as building blocks towards the construction of social cohesion.

11. Recommendations

This section envisages a number of options that stakeholders may want to explore if there is to be continued support to CH linked to increased intercommunity dialogue.

a) UNDP positioning and EUoK

1. UNDP should undertake an outcome evaluation across all its governance portfolio to identify the different entry points that are useful connectors towards intercommunity dialogue and social cohesion[12]. Based on these results it could develop a comprehensive and integrated strategic framework over a five-year time frame that articulates how the positive entry points identified in the outcome evaluation can be used to structure a strategic and inclusive framework for a five-year integrated programme in which both CH and ICH are included.
2. Develop the corresponding civil society partnership strategy for the five-year programme and its articulation into programmatic terms.
3. Short-term funding mechanisms are not the preferred option because they do not allow to track changes in time and do not focus enough on higher-level outcome results. Ideally a full

---

[12] Comment from UNDP "The integrated CB/IRH mission on 'sustaining peace' looked into this - and provides recommendations on how to move forward with a more coherent approach in this area. Also, important to note the CO's efforts to move towards portfolio approach - away from silos to a core comprehensive approach".

five-year programme should be developed with multiple components if the funding can be found from the adequate instrument. Depending on the number and complexity of its component the programme should be in the range of EUR 10 million over five years.

4. Because CH is increasingly showing its value as connector and driver for intercommunity dialogue (not only in Kosovo, but in many other post conflict situations), it is important to provide more visibility on the good results obtained, something which could be done through an international conference (see recommendations to the EU) hereunder.

5. Review and develop RBM informed logical framework and analytical reports that convey the results in a manner that weaves the different efforts into a coherent narrative, rather than as a description of the various outputs.

6. Develop an exit strategy built into the next phase to ensure sustainability of the process.

b) **European Union (FPI, Brussels, EUoK)**

1. Consider holding an international conference on the use of CH as a connector in post conflict societies. Since the EU is funding CH interventions in various countries, take the examples and case studies with UNDP, selected NGOs and civil society, academia to a regional conference where the results can be shown, discussed and used to further inform strategic programmes that address post-conflict situations and contribute to win/win situations across community lines.

2. Review if the IPA is not a mechanism better suited to the longer-term objectives and undertake the negotiation with UNDP for a comprehensive and integrated five-year programme based on the strategic framework resulting from the outcome evaluation of its governance portfolio.

3. Define together with UNDP a logical framework that follows Results Based Management principles, particularly for the higher-level results (specific objective/outcome level) and ensure analytical reporting of the results.

c) **MCYS and institutions and municipalities**

1. Engage on a discussion with UNDP regarding the value of a five-year integrated programme and discuss the strategy regarding the use of CH and consider the areas where technical support may be necessary (e.g. including policy formulation or review of law/by-laws)

2. Engage with the EU on the priorities for IPA funding considering a five-year programme to support CH in which UNDP could be a key implementing partner, in transition of MCYS taking over the leadership for the longer-term CH preservation and conservation.

3. Engage with UNDP on the level of potential co-funding for the sites that could be leveraged for future programming.

4. Discuss how the exit strategy for year five could link into the institutional needs of the MYCS.

5. Work on the legislation/ regulations for the management of public CH sites that enables engagement of civil society or private sector in income generating activities that ensure maintenance and utilisation of these sites for public good.

Annexes:

Annex 1: evaluation agenda and list of people met

Date: Monday, 15 May 2023 – Friday 19 May 2023 Venue: throughout Kosovo. Arrival of team leader Sunday 14.5.23.

Nr	Date	Location	Organisation	Name	Surname	Title	Sex	time
1	Monday 15.5.23	UNDP Office	UNDP Management and project	Sehadin Maria Valbona Marta	Shok Suokko Bogujevci Gazideda	Project Mang. RR ARR Gov. Mang.	M F F F	55 min.
2	Monday 15.5.23	Remote (Zoom)	EU FPI Vienna EU Brussels	Lea Biancha	Tries Anachitei	Proj. Mang. FPI West. Balkan PM	F F	60
3	Monday 15.5.23	EU office in Kosovo	EUoK	Stefano	Gnocchi	Head of non-majority community CH and North	M	75
4	Monday 15.5.23	Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports	MYCS	Nora	Arapi Krasniqi	Senior Advisor	F	60
5	Monday 15.5.23	MYCS CH Department	CH Department	Rrezarta	Loxha Vitaku	Director	F	40
6	Monday 15.5.23	Remote (Zoom)	Fondacioni 17	Ajete	Kerqeli	Director	F	30
7	Monday 15.5.23	Remote (Zoom)	EU FPI	Asier	Santillan Luiziraga	Former FPI project manager	M	55

Nr	Date	Location	Organisation	Name	Surname	Title	Sex	time
8	Tuesday 16.5.23	Pristina	Islamic community	Vedat Sami Esad	Sahiti Isufi Ramadani	Grand Imam Architect Architect	M M M	60
9	Tuesday 16.5.23	Pristina	Archaeological Institute	Enver	Rexha	Director	M	45
10	Tuesday 16.5.23	Pristina	Kosovo Police	Drazo	Bozovic	Major, head of RCCHU	M	50
11	Tuesday 16.5.23	Pristina	NGO CHwB	Sali Nol	Shoshi Binakaj	Director Deputy	M M	55

Nr	Date	Location	Organisation	Name	Surname	Title	Sex	time
12	Wedn. 17.5.23	Remote (Zoom)	NGO Ec Me Dryshe	Valon	Xhabali	Director	M	40
13	Wedn. 17.5.23	Remote (Zoom)	NGO Anibar	Vullnet Andrea	Sanaja Anadolli	Director Project staff	F F	45
14	Wedn. 17.5.23	Remote (Zoom)	NGO CASA + YA Gracanica	Miodrag Petar	Marinkovic Djordjevic	Director Youth Leader	M M	60
15	Wedn. 17.5.23	Remote (Zoom)	NGO Avenija	Gordana Ivana	Djoric Vujovic	Director Secretary	F F	45
16	Wedn. 17.5.23	UNDP office	Catholic Church	Don Shan	Zefi	Representative	M	50
17	Wedn. 17.5.23	UNDP office	Union of Kosov Tarikats	Sheh Luzlim	Shehu	Secretary General	M	45

Nr	Date	Location	Organisation	Name	Surname	Title	Sex	time
	Thursday 18.5.23	*Visit to the Sahat Kulla in Pristina, on-site observation*						
18	Thursday 18.5.23	Pristina	RCCH	Edona	Gashi Durguti	Director	F	25
	Thursday 18.5.23	*Visit to the Osman Efendi Mosque and Tyrbe of Mehmed the Elder, on-site observation*						
19	Thursday 18.5.23	Novo Brdo	RCCH	Artan	Hoxha	Director	M	45
20	Thursday 18.5.23	Novo Brdo	Municipality	Svetislav	Ivanovic	Deputy Mayor	M	35
	Thursday 18.5.23	*Visit to the Draganac Monastery, on-site observation*						
21	Thursday 18.5.23	Draganac Mon.	SOC SOC archaeologist MA-ING contractors	Father Hristofor Svetlana Milorad Marko	Hodzic Marinkovic Marinkovic	Father (Monk) Archaeologist CEO Deputy	M F M M	70

Nr	Date	Location	Organisation	Name	Surname	Title	Sex	time
	Friday 19.5.23	*Visit to the Dakovica Bazar, on-site observation*						
22	Friday 19.5.23	Dakovica	RCCH	Durim	Olloni	Archaeologist	M	30
	Friday 19.5.23	*Visit to the Drenoc Mosque and the Tahir Beu Museum, on-site observation*						
23	Friday 19.5.23	Peje	RCCH	Shpresa Arsim Prentim Shkelzen Sefder	Xhonbalaj Mullhaxha Lajqi	Director Architect Architect Technical advisor Museum archaeol.	F M M M M	60
	Friday 19.5.23	UNDP office	UNDP Management debrief	Maria Marta Sehadin	Suokko Gazideda Shok	RR Gov. PM Project manager	F F M	75

Saturday 20.5.23 departure of the evaluation team leader

Additional interviews held by remote means:

Nr	Date	Location	Organisation	Name	Surname	Title	Sex	time
24	Monday 22.5.23	Remote (Zoom)	Municipality	Ardian	Gjini	Dakovica Mayor	M	35
25	Tuesday 23.5.23	Remote (Zoom)	Roma community	Urma	Menekshe	Teacher	F	4

One additional interview with Father Ilarion from the SOC was planned but could not take place.

Annex 2: Logical framework indicators extracted from the UNDP for the "Cultural Heritage as a Driver for Inter-Community Dialogue and Social Cohesion" Project

extracted from logframe	Impact level	Specific objective 1	Contributing to output 1.1.	Contributing to output 1.2.	output 2.1.	output 2.2.	output 2.3	output 2.4	contributing to output 3.	output 3.1	Output 3.2.	output 3.3.
indicator statement	Perceptions of communities on the level of social cohesion in Kosovo	Number of initatives which promote cultural heritage (tangible and intangible) and engage with communities to support community dialogue and acceptance of "the others"	Number of physical interventions in cultural and religious heritage sites	Number of initiatives which engage with communities, with a focus on youth and women	Number of women and youth participating in skills development interventions	Number of young people with a positive attitude towards inter-ethnic trust and cooperation	Number of innovative ideas	Number of participating youth who agree to address divisive narratives	Perception about capacities of public institutions to address community needs	Number of interventions as identified/ selected by IMC	Number of youth participating in two youth camps	Number of people who have trust in public institutions
initial value (without baseline)	25.30%	0	0	0	0	20.30%	0	0	0	0	0	19.70%
target	22%	30	14	12	65	24%	6	150	24%	8	70	22%

final indicator value (current)	26.20%	38	21	15	420	24%	4	343	27.10%	cancelled	86	45.70%
gender disaggregation		50/50 (originally planned)	n/a	50/50 (originally planned)	50/50 (originally planned)		70/30 (w/m; originally planned)	50/50				
male	28%	33%	n/a	31%	10%		0%	53%	26.30%		57%	46.10%
female	26.40%	67%	n/a	69%	90%		100%	47%	27.20%		43%	41.40%
Ethic community												
Majority	28.30%	n/a	n/a	n/a	48%	45%	15%	45%	46.20%		73%	46.10%
Minorities	28.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	52%	55%	85%	55%	53.80%		27%	53.90%

Notes:

Output 2.4:	No surveys conducted. The target revised to use the number of participants. It was decided that participants were too young to respond to potential sensitive questions. The current numbers reflect the changed indicator
Ethnic disaggregation:	data are provided only for activities where the the information is accurate. Extrapolation is possibble althuogh not recommende by the statistician.