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PREFACE

This Mid-term evaluation covers assistance to the Republic of Serbia’s youth employment and youth migration measures financed under the joint programme *Support to National Efforts for the Promotion of Youth Employment and Management of Migration*, a Government of Serbia programme implemented by the United Nations and financed by the Government of Spain under the Spanish MDG Achievement Fund for Youth, Employment and Migration.

This Evaluation Report has been prepared by Dietmar Aigner during the period February to March 2011 and reflects the situation at 03 March 2011, the cut-off date for the Report. The factual basis was provided by formal programme documentation, regular programme progress reports, other relevant sectoral and regional documents and materials, and interviews with the main parties, stakeholders and final beneficiaries.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**INTRODUCTION**

This mid-term evaluation covers technical assistance provided to the Government of Serbia through the UN Joint Programme *Support to National Efforts for the Promotion of Youth Employment and Management of Migration*. The joint programme is financed by the Government of Spain through the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund with a contribution of US$6.143 million. The intervention is co-financed by the Serbian Government, providing funds of US$1.900 million.

**THE INTERVENTION**

The long term goal of the Youth Employment and Migration joint programme (YEM JP) is to contribute to the fulfilment of key strategic objectives of Serbia such as the Poverty Reduction Strategy, the National Strategy for Economic Development, the National Sustainable Development Strategy, Strategy for Regional Development, and the National Employment Strategy and the National Action Plan on Employment. YEM JP is being implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development, which acts as the Serbian lead partner. Further national partners include the Ministry of Youth and Sports, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, the Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, the National Employment Service, the Centres for Social Work and the Republic Statistical Office. Under the formal leadership of IOM, four participating agencies – IOM, UNDP, ILO and UNICEF – are implementing the programme activities.Three interlinked outcomes were planned and the main activities and outputs produced so far are briefly summarised below:

* **Outcome 1. Youth Employment and Migration Policy Objectives are Included into National Development Strategy**

Work on the *Knowledge base on youth employment and migration improved to inform national development strategy and action plans* has progressed well for youth employment but less so for social protection and migration. The biggest achievement so far is the establishment of a framework for the systematization of labour market data and the beginning of time series. However, the use of this knowledge for the development of evidence-based policies has not been demonstrated yet in respect to social protection and migration indicators. The process of adoption is slow and full achievement is not secured. The online-survey on Diaspora initiated discussions within the inter-ministerial coordination body on migration.

Work on *Policy on management of labour migration, including returns of young Serbians, developed and linked to employment policy and strategies*has been slowly progressing towards its completion***.*** Assistance given to drafting the White Paper on labour migration strategy has resulted in a sound document to improve the strategic framework in respect to labour migration. There are currently moves to present the labour migration strategy as an annex to the new National Employment Strategy and the Commissariat for Refugees has incorporated certain parts of the into its Migration Management Action Plan. The drafting support given to the new Law on Work of Foreigners has not produced significant results yet.

Assistance to ensure that *Youth employment and migration targets are included in national development* strategy has been successful*.* The advocacy campaign has produced immediate political impacts and a formal commitment to the introduction of entrepreneurial learning. Six measurable youth employment targets have been included in the new Employment Strategy which will be regularly reviewed in the course of implementing the Strategy. The youth employment indicators are being used for the analysis of the labour market, problem identification, and the generation of policy options, which will become one of the key pillars of the Joint Inclusion Memorandum. Youth migration and social protection indicators are available, but not yet integrated into the national development strategy framework.

* **Outcome 2. National Institutions Develop Integrated Labour Market and Social Services that Meet Employment and Migration Policy Objectives Targeting Disadvantaged Young Women and Men.**

Progress towards *a system integrating labour market, migration and social services for youth established and functioning* has been good and is expected to be fully achieved*.* As a result of the assistance given, good practices of integrated and coordinated employment and social protection services have been explored. The inter-ministerial working group on integrated service delivery is guiding and overseeing implementation of seven pilot initiatives. There are indications from the field, however, that the purpose of the exercise is not always fully clear to local stakeholders. Here, the YEM training is likely to produce increased awareness. Local communication and coordination is at an early stage and rules are not yet agreed. The results and impacts should be boosted by funds from the EU Instrument for Pre-Accession which is envisaged to be utilised for further roll-out of the integrated service delivery established by this programme.

*The capacity of the National Employment Service, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and Ministry of Youth and Sport to deliver targeted youth employment and social services has been strengthened*. Capacity development for implementing schemes targeting disadvantaged youth has been significantly assisted and the introduction of a case management approach for local offices has helped to increase competencies. Youth offices have gained a better understanding of their role in mentoring young people, in providing user-friendly services and in helping vulnerable groups to get access to information about employment and social protection.

Work to progress a *long-term national financial mechanism to implement employment measures targeting disadvantaged youth established and implemented* is likely to be successfully completed this year. Financed by the Fund, a set of six intensive treatment measures has been designed to be combined and to complement each other. Ministerial commitments have been given for funding after the closure of the programme. Twelve social enterprises are receiving micro-grants for developing their business services. There is strong evidence that at the level of the individual social enterprise, support will generate employment for individuals suffering from disadvantaged living conditions. There is strong interest in this new approach both by NGOs and, increasingly, by government representatives.

* **Outcome 3. Integrated Employment Programmes and Social Services Targeting Young Returnees and Other Disadvantaged Young Women and Men Implemented in Three Target Districts.**

Work to achieve l*ocal partnerships for youth employment strengthened to coordinate implementation of employment programmes that are linked to social services* is being successfully concluded.Capacity building for local councils has strengthened capacities for actively tackling youth employment of vulnerable groups. Initially, six selected local policy councils in 2009 were selected to identify priority youth groups to be included into labour market programmes. The support was extended to additional local employment councils in 2010. Local action plans produced have been successful and, in February 2011, national co-financing had been approved. Selected youth offices have increased their capacity to better mentor young unemployed people, including help from the Info-Point system. Youth office projects funded by the programme in the selected municipalities are starting and are likely to achieve their respective project targets.

Work to implement *integrated packages of active labour market measures implemented through the financing of the Youth Employment Fund in the target districts* has been successful and most funding has been disbursed and the remainder earmarked for beneficiaries placed in the integrated service delivery pilot sites. Local labour market measures are now available to unemployed youth in five Serbian districts but comprising currently 1,899 final beneficiaries. The measures include a high proportion of young Roma (17%) and 6% of people with disabilities which is a remarkable achievement.

Information packages on *Youth awareness raising on existing local services as well as on risks of irregular migration* are being disseminated. A new chapter on migration issues will be included in the “Right to Know Guide”. The guide will be printed and disseminated in May/June. More sustainable results and awareness-raising can be expected from the online information campaign due to start in March/ April 2011. Upon completion, detailed assessments of this innovative promotion measure will be needed in order to systematically trace its effects and outreach.

**EVALUATION FINDINGS**

**Relevance:** Overall, the YEM JP is highly relevant and needed. It is firmly based on adequate and realistic needs assessments and good problem identification. It has a clear logic and documentation. The specific interests of women, minorities and ethnic groups have been taken account of. The monitoring framework has been improved in the life of the project and the guidance given by the MDG-F Secretariat has been particularly helpful. The three defined outcomes directly respond to national policies, systems and services, and national counterparts have been fully involved and strongly supportive of the programme and have made a substantial financial contribution.

**Efficiency**: Overall, programme implementation was characterised by initial delays in all components, but once sub-projects have started, efficiency has improved rapidly. Whilst the programme has been implemented efficiently by the professional agency managers, procedural rules relating to parallel management and contracting have reduced the true potential for efficiency, and some synergies may have been lost, although there is limited evidence to show the benefits of sharing work methodologies and tools. The pace of implementation means that programme outputs should be complete at the close of the project.

**Effectiveness:** The YEM JP is making substantial progress towards the effective achievement of programme objectives, Millennium Development and thematic window goals.Particular success is reported in the youth employment component. Performance of social protection and migration components is good but sometimes uneven. Serbian policy makers and administrators have been given a large number of innovative tools and models to actively fight youth unemployment and to a lesser extent migration. The data base on youth employment and migration is being significantly improved and should lead to the development and implementation of more effective and better targeted national and regional policies. All these activities need further systematic replication and dissemination to boost the effects being produced. The YEM JP mostly delivers high quality products and flexible management has regularly adapted to a constantly changing environment, Dissenting views exist on the quality of the draft Diaspora on-line survey. Despite limitations, the Diaspora survey can be considered as a first attempt to move towards a more systematic follow up of migration trends.

The work on migration data and trends initiated by YEM is being followed up by an EU pre-accession project implemented by IOM and Commissariat for Refugees. Implementation is adequately followed up by the Programme Management Committee. The target areas for regional activities have been mostly chosen well, taking into account the size and complexity of the underlying socio-economic problems. Concerns remain about the selection of Belgrade as a pilot area for the Fund. Overall, there appears to be a good mix of final beneficiaries among different social groups, comprising in particular low and unqualified youth, long term unemployed, minorities and women. However, relatively little funding have been earmarked for actively tackling migration problems despite these having been defined as one of the strategic priorities.

**Sustainability:** There is strong national commitment to the sustainability of YEM employment components, with funding available for 2011. The sustainability prospects of some predicted outcomes from the social protection and migration components still deserve more attention. The rapid adoption of the new Law on Labour Protection is essential for the durability of results being achieved. Additional resources will be needed to cope with an increased workload at Centres for Social Works and it remains to be seen how far case management approach and integrated service delivery can be further developed and disseminated under such conditions. There is still room to increase the durability of the results being achieved by parts of the migration component. In particular adoption and integration of outputs into national policy frameworks is slow. Taking into account very small resources dedicated to labour migration policy, the opportunity for capacity building might be missed. Sustainability of the municipal youth offices in Serbia is still weak. The establishment of youth offices by decree has been a pragmatic step forward and in fact has facilitated the quick set-up of local service centres. National discussions about a revised framework for education and vocational training, including the related accreditation and certification measures are moving slowly.Entrepreneurial learning has been established in the educational system and the creation of an institutional framework for it is an important prerequisite for addressing youth unemployment.

**CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

**Conclusions**

Overall, the YEM JP is highly relevant and addresses key issues in respect of Serbia’s socio-economic development. The programme design has been ambitious in scope and coverage relative to its timeframe and resources. Targeting disadvantaged young men and women, especially those most at risk of social exclusion and prime candidates for emigration has been a crucial success factor for this well designed intervention. The programme also focuses well on developing evidence-based policies on youth employment, on strengthening the capacity of national institutions to design integrated labour market and social services aligned with policy objectives and on supporting local institutions in piloting innovative employment programmes and social services.

Implementation was characterised by initial delays, but once projects started, efficiency has improved rapidly. Individual components and sub-projects appear to be innovative in tackling youth employment and social protection and have made good use of the technical experience and good practice existing at the various agencies involved. National partners’ commitment is good within the youth employment component but variable in social protection and labour migration components. The programme has made very good use of existing inter-ministerial working groups and has also stimulated the establishment of further overall coordination mechanisms. The implementation and cooperation structures have encouraged the participation of many national stakeholders, in particular, some not highly involved in the programme implementation.

The YEM JP currently presents the best performing joint programme in Serbia. The YEM JP is expected to achieve most of its defined outcomes within the timeframe for implementation. Results and impacts could be even stronger if the programme were given an extension. Adoption of strategic outputs and thus transferring them into intermediate and wider impacts is lagging behind schedule in some cases, such as parts of the social protection and labour migration components. This somehow reflects a limited interest of the government particularly in dealing with migration management and labour migration. The likelihood for replication of successful pilot initiatives is good in general but since many initiatives, especially the integrated service delivery, have just started immediate impacts have not yet materialised. The outcome of the integrated service delivery piloting will be a finalised model, but more difficult to predict are the wider consequences of this model. Much will depend on the revised social protection legislation being put in place soon and the pro-active engagement of local branches in making the integrated service model a success.

For some activities, follow-up actions are already being considered or have started by means of the EU pre-accession instrument and other support mechanisms. Nevertheless, an extension would deepen the impacts, notably legislative and administrative improvements and strengthen immediate and longer term sustainability. Despite its success, implementation has suffered from the prevailing implementation approach, namely the absence of a strong and integrated programme management, coordination and reporting structure. Impressions remain that the management of individual agencies’ components is clearly superior to joint overall coordination. Joint programming is still too much based on a segregated approach based on individual agency considerations which are later harmonised under a unified umbrella. Strong overall leadership and guidance is unlikely to be achieved on the basis of independent parallel budgeting and agency-specific implementation provisions. Overall cost effectiveness, above individual agencies’ parts, is difficult to predict in respect to value-for money and synergetic effects from the prevailing approach.

**Lessons learned**

Joint programming and joint programmes

The evaluation findings raise wider questions about joint programming. Joint programming should not be an end in itself and it would be useful to develop criteria to determine when joint programming is the most appropriate approach. Clear expectations of joint programming and indicators for measuring its efficiency and effectiveness in terms of process and outcomes are welcome. Adherence to mandates, while a good idea in principle, creates challenges for joint programming and can potentially reduce efficiency.

Management and coordination mechanisms for joint programmes need to be explored and agreed by the UN agencies involved prior to implementation. Efficient programme implementation by means of independent parallel streams raises questions on overall efficiency and cost-effectiveness. A way forward could be to give the UN Resident Coordinator a supervisory role in managing joint programmes. This would require inter-agency agreement.

Youth employment and migration

Feedback from field visits confirms that local institutions involved in piloting can be greatly encouraged and motivated by clear guidance and information dissemination from the respective central state institution. Good examples have been found in the areas of the National Employment Service and Youth Offices. Centres for Social Works often complained about a lack of information and guidance from the sponsoring ministry when it came to their role and expectations as regards piloting innovative concepts at local levels.

Social enterprise has been one of the innovative elements in the programme. The allocation given for this is clearly insufficient to achieve broader impacts outside of these immediately assisted companies. The thematic context is receiving great attention in Serbia and many NGOs are actively facilitating the development of social enterprises as a means to provide employment possibilities for vulnerable groups. Future UN assistance in this area could greatly enhance the successful introduction of this measure. In particular, piloting and outreach could immediately provide socio-economic improvements.

Migration has not received sufficient attention by the national stakeholders, despite increased awareness on the prevailing adverse socio-economic trends. It is apparent that the external migration agenda is driven entirely by those countries concerned with illegal and unregulated migration. The responsible national institutions still have a low profile and very limited competencies and funds. The issue of internal migration should receive stronger consideration once the Serbian regional and rural development policies move towards the adoption of the aims and requirements of the EU social and economic cohesion agenda.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

* ***MDG-F Secretariat***

Extension of programme duration

Together with other institutions and partners involved, the Secretariat should consider granting a time extension to this programme. Despite the fact that the achievement of objectives within the current timeline is considered very good and partly excellent, more time would be beneficial to allow the YEM programme’s immediate impacts to appear more visibly. In this event, programme success and the good practice character of YEM Serbia could be much better explored and disseminated. A no additional cost extension of six months would allow the follow up of sustainability actions being taken by the national partners. The benefits from an extension could be further strengthened by seeking additional donor funds in order to allow a limited number of extra activities to take place.

* ***YEM JP Project Management Committee***

Extension of programme duration

The Committee should take a favourable view on extending the programme lifetime. In order to identify financial means for an extension, an enlarged Committee meeting should be organised in the form of a “sustainability conference”. The purpose would be to present the achievements today and the detailed prospects for sustainability, as well as further activities needed for the immediate strengthening of impacts and sustainability. The donor community should be invited as the main target group of such conference, and their ideas for providing funding for covering an extended programme period should be explored.

The remaining programme time, in particular if an extension is granted, should be utilised to incorporate education and vocational training elements into the remaining programme activities. The Ministry of Education, including its regional centres, and institutions dealing with vocational training, should be invited to take a stronger interest in the programme, its outcomes and perspectives.

Communication and advocacy

There is still a need to further strengthen the joint communication and advocacy campaign. The Joint Programme Manager should be requested to further increase efforts for promoting programme achievements under the unified umbrella of the joint programme.

In line with launching the Campaign on Migration, the Joint Programme Manager should consider using this activity as a basis for promoting all other outputs produced by the migration component and to call for immediate adoption and absorption by the national authorities. Commissariat for Refugees and Ministry of Diaspora should ensure greater involvement and quicker decision-making as concerns the output of the labour migration component.

Government partners have to continue with providing training particular in respect to the integrated service model and case management, preferably by further developing and using sustainable training systems.

Design of future joint programmes

Future joint programmes in the area of YEM should take account of the need to be fully inclusive by actively involving the education and vocational training sector at the programming stage. In the event of a future programme having a migration component, it is recommended that migration activities are designed as an important cross-cutting issue, complementing all other programme activities accordingly. Special attention should be given to the identification and inclusion of returnees, a particular vulnerable group that does not receive sufficient consideration in the current intervention.

Future support to social protection should deeply explore ways for increasing employment perspectives for young social benefit receivers benefiting from the integrated service model. Pilot interventions targeting the most vulnerable groups should preferably take place in socio-economically disadvantaged locations.

Design of future JPs should put clear emphasis on exploring coordination and management mechanisms and should actively promote the identification of synergy effects. A revised implementation approach giving the UN Resident Coordinator a supervisory role could effectively improve the quality of joint programmes.

**MAIN REPORT**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1. **Background**

Since May 2009 the International Organization for Migration (IOM) as the leading agency, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the International Labour Office (ILO) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) have been providing technical assistance to the Government of Serbia through the UN Joint Programme *Support to National Efforts for the Promotion of Youth Employment and Management of Migration*. This Joint Programme supports national and local institutions to implement measures that will increase youth employment in Serbia, while also reducing the negative impact of return and irregular migration.

The joint programme (JP), financed by the Government of Spain through the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) with a contribution of US$6.143 million, is being implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development (MERD), acting as the Serbian lead partner. Further national partners include the Ministry of Youth and Sports (MYS), the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MLSP), the Ministry of Human and Minority Rights (MHMR), the National Employment Service (NES), the Centres for Social Work (CSW) and the Republic Statistical Office (RSO). The intervention is co-financed by the Serbian Government, providing funds in the amount of US$1.900 million.

Programme coordination arrangements have been established in accordance with the Operational Guidance Note for the Participating UN Organisations. Overall, the National Steering Committee (NSC) oversees and coordinates the operation of all JPs in Serbia. Furthermore, a Programme Management Committee (PMC) coordinates and oversees immediate programme implementation. It acts as the principal coordinating and supervisory body for the implementation of the JP and provides policy guidance and recommendations regarding programme strategy and objectives. The Programme Implementation Unit (PIU), headed by the JP Manager, is located at the NES and provides technical inputs, implementation management and backstopping for the JP.

National partners include MERD, MYS, MLSP, MHMR, NES, CSW and the RSO; as well as involved local state institutions, NGOs and private business organisations.

The MDG-F Secretariat is essential to ensure the operationalisation of the MDG-F framework and all country programmes. The Secretariat plays an important role in guaranteeing transparent processes and improving the quality of JP formulation. As one of its Secretariat functions, the MDG-F has developed a Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy for the Fund which is gradually being implemented.

1. **Purpose of the evaluation**

The MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes stipulate that all JPs lasting longer than two years will be subject to a mid-term evaluation.

Mid-term evaluations are to be formative in nature and seek to generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned and to improve implementation of the programmes during their remaining life. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation are addressed to its main users: the PMC, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund (MDG-F Secretariat).

The MDG-F mid-term evaluation has the following specific objectives:

* *To know about the quality of the design and the internal coherence of the joint programme (the needs it seeks to fulfil and the problems that intends to solve), the external coherence to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and National Development Strategies and up to what extent national ownership is present in the implementation of joint programmes according to the terms defined by the Paris Declaration and Accra Action Agenda.*
* *To know about the implementation of the joint programme, the efficiency of the management system with regards to planning, coordination, and use of the designated resources for its implementation. The evaluator should start by analyzing the processes and institutional mechanisms that allow identifying success factors and limitations of inter-agency work within the frame of One UN.*
* *To know about the degree of effectiveness of the programme in terms of; beneficiaries, contribution to the thematic window as well as to the Millennium Development Objectives at local level and/or in the country.*
* *Preliminary assessment of the sustainability context including the joint programme outcomes as well as barriers and counter-measures in order to ensure sustainability.*

1. **Methodology used in the evaluation**

This mid-term evaluation focuses on the actual performance of the JP, mainly on the outputs being produced. It assesses the efficacy and sustainability of these outputs. It also assesses the relevance and efficiency of the intervention taking into account international and EU standards as benchmarks where relevant.

Evaluation Questions, divided into sub-questions were established in the generic Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation. Annex 1 provides a detailed evaluation matrix, linking evaluation issues and questions to evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection.

The methodology for preparing this evaluation report comprised initial data collection, document research and literature survey, and interviews (see Annex 5 and Annex 6). Following an initial desk analysis undertaken by the Evaluator, primary data has been gathered through structured and in-depth interviews with all the relevant stakeholders in Serbia. The field visit to Serbia enabled direct contact with implementing bodies, programme partners, stakeholders, beneficiaries and end-users and constitutes an important source of information.

This mid-term evaluation strictly adheres to the transparency norms and ethical principles set by the United Nations Evaluation Group.

1. **DESCRIPTION OF INTERVENTION CARRIED OUT**
2. **Initial concept**

This inception report includes an initial draft of the Theory of Change of the programme under review as a benchmark for comparison during the evaluation and as common start point of agreement between the consultant and the managers of the evaluation. Overall, a Theory of Change is the product of a series of critical-thinking exercises that provides a comprehensive picture of the early- and intermediate-term changes in a given intervention that are needed to reach a long-term goal articulated by the intervention. A Theory of Change model for the evaluated YEM JP, based on a simplified re-construction of the underlying intervention logic, is presented below:

**Strategy**

* Enhance youth employment and migration management through better alignment of the national strategies on youth employment and migration

**Problems**

* Growing problem of access of young people to employment
* Increasing incidence of (self) employment in the informal economy
* Continuous migration flows
* Regional disparities in Serbia large and still increasing
* Limited access to social protection services

**Needs**

* Capacity building of labour market institutions to better tackle youth employment, migration and informal economy
* Strategies for minimizing migration risks of disadvantaged youth
* State of the art integrated employment and social services targeting disadvantaged young people

**Influental Factors**

* Serbia’s economic growth does not provide sufficient employment creation, notably in the formal economy and for young, particularly marginalised, people
* Under-employment and informal employment of young workers
* Better educated young Serbian generation is more willing to work abroad

**Assumptions**

* Strong ownership by Government, no major institutional changes
* Active cooperation of local institutions and private sector
* Young people and marginalised groups are interested in and willing to take advantage of the services offered
* No significant slowdown of economic growth

**Desired results**

* Youth Employment and Migration Policy Objectives Included into National Development Strategy
* National Institutions Develop Integrated Labour Market and Social Services that Meet Employment and Migration Policy Objectives Targeting Disadvantaged Young Women and Men
* Integrated Employment Programmes and Social Services Targeting Young Returnees and Other Disadvantaged Young Women and Men Implemented in Three Target Districts

The long term goal of the YEM JP is to contribute to the fulfilment of objectives in key Serbian strategic documents such as the 2003 Poverty Reduction Strategy, the National Strategy for Economic Development (2006-2012), the National Sustainable Development Strategy (2008-2013), Strategy for Regional Development (2007-2012) and the National Employment Strategy and the National Action Plan on Employment. The YEM JP is aligned to UNDAF Outcome 3.1 (*Sustainable development plans that effectively respond to the need of people, communities and promote rural development*) and Outcome 3.7 (*Improved network of employment services and strengthened employment promotion policies*). It builds also on past and current activities implemented by all partner organizations (UNICEF for youth and social protection, UNDP for youth and employment, ILO on employment and youth employment, IOM on migration, returnees and youth). In drawing up the programme, lessons learned from previous programme experience have been built into the design. Annex 1 presents the hierarchy of outcomes for the YEM JP.

The YEM JP aims to contribute to the achievement of the targets set in the Millennium Development Goals in the Republic of Serbia, adopted by the Government in 2006. These targets envisage a reduction of the youth unemployment rate by at least one third by the year 2015 as well as substantial reduction of unemployed among people with disabilities, Roma people, refugees and internally displaced persons.

The YEM JPs implementation approach is based on a set of coordinated interventions that draw on the mandate, expertise and added value of the national and local partners, as well as of the four participating agencies – IOM, UNDP, ILO and UNICEF. It builds on three interlinked outcomes:

* Mainstreaming youth employment and migration policy objectives into national development strategies,
* Strengthening the capacity of national institutions to develop integrated labour market and social services, and
* Implementing a package of programmes on employment and social services.

The expected results by the end of the YEM JP include:

* Improved knowledge and understanding of integrated policies and measures to tackle youth employment and migration,
* more prominent focus on youth employment within national development frameworks,
* A national policy on management of labour migration and an improved capacity in the Serbian government to tackle youth migration,
* An inter-institutional system combining employment and social services for disadvantaged youth,
* A comprehensive package of gender-sensitive programmes in the realm of youth employment and social protection available at local level,
* A system for replicating and scaling-up pilot programmes country-wide.

Programme interventions target disadvantaged youth in the 35 municipalities that make up the districts of South Backa, Belgrade and Pcinjski. Those districts have been targeted because they have high rates of youth unemployment and poverty and because they are the expected re-settlement destination of many returnees. Local institutions are being supported in pilot innovative employment programmes and social services.

1. **Detailed description of its development: description of the hypothesis of change of the programme**

In Serbia, three joint programmes have been approved. YEM JP started in May 2009, the other two joint programmes by December 2009. The YEM PIU is located at the National Employment Service of Serbia (NES) building. The termination of YEM JP is envisaged in November 2011.Based on the documentation provided, the main activities and outputs produced so far by the YEM JP are summarised below. The structure of presentation follows the desired programme objectives and outcomes:

**Outcome of YEM JP: 1. Youth Employment and Migration Policy Objectives are Included into National Development Strategy**

Overall, work under Outcome 1 has so far resulted in improved knowledge on youth employment, migration and social protection, and a better informed national strategy on employment, which highlights youth and migration. The YEM advocacy campaign promoted the inclusion of key issues in youth employment and migration into national policies and action plans.

* **Outcome 1.1 (joint outcome: ILO/ IOM/ UNICEF) – Knowledge base on youth employment and migration improved to inform national development strategy and action plans.**

YEM JP provides assistance to the Republic Statistical Office (RSO) of Serbia to improve the quality of the data obtained from its labour force survey (LFS). A list of 15 youth labour market indicators was completed and is used in the annual LFS. The survey module on youth employment and mobility was developed and is attached to the annual LFS. An *ad hoc* survey module on the impact of the financial crisis was included in the April 2009 LFS. In October 2009 the LFS was included 2,596 youth.

A survey on Diaspora was completed and presented to the inter-ministerial coordination body on migration. The survey discusses the profile of those living abroad (predominantly young, predominantly male and largely highly educated) and examines remitting behaviour, seeking to determine what opportunities there may be for engaging the Serbian Diaspora in development activities in Serbia.

A comparative analysis of youth module data in the LFS, comparing April and October 2009 was done. Recalculation of LFS data collected prior to 2008 with corrected methodology in order to create time-series was made and youth employment indicators comparing 2009 and 2008 were established.

The framework for indicators on Social Protection and Labour Migration has been agreed with the Government partners. Ten social protection indicators for youth have been defined and collection methods established. The guide for collection and reporting of national and local data is being developed. Instruments for data collection are being revised within the social protection system and, on the basis of the report on social protection indicators, with the aim of being used from January 2011.

* **Outcome 1.2 (IOM) – Policy on management of labour migration, including returns of young Serbians, developed and linked to employment policy and strategies.**

Consultations with Ministry for Economy and Regional Development (MERD), Ministry for Diaspora and Commissariat for Refugees were completed and priorities for labour migration policy have been agreed. Regular collection and analysis of data on youth labour supply and labour demand, as well as internal and international migration patters and social protection, was improved to inform the policy making process. This set of data has proven instrumental in the development of the new Employment Strategy, where SMART[[1]](#footnote-1) targets on youth employment and migration are now envisaged. The White Paper on a labour migration strategy for Serbia has been completed.

* **Outcome 1.3 (joint outcome: UNDP/ IOM/ ILO) – Youth employment and migration targets included in national development strategy.**

The aim of this component is to embed employment and migration targets in the national development policy and budgetary planning frameworks of Serbia. This work will be accompanied by an advocacy campaign run by organizations representing the interests of young people which had lobbied for such an inclusion. The advocacy campaign was initiated and issues to be advocated were identified. In partnership with a national NGO, the national advocacy campaign on youth and employment has been completed, resulting, *inter alia*, in the signing of a Memorandum between MERD and Ministry of Education as the foundation for introducing entrepreneurial learning into the Serbian education system. Another outcome of the advocacy campaign was the establishment of “advocacy base” - interested NGOs and institutions, which will continue advocating as a group.

Additional capacity in selected youth regional NGOs to address youth related issues was built through provision of grants. Two selected NGOs organised round tables tackling issues of employment opportunities and youth unemployment at the local level, organized extensive regional media campaigns and supported youth in selection of occupations through the organization of professional orientation and carrier guidance fairs. Six professional orientation fairs were organised and attended by 1,300 youth.

Furthermore, MERD staff has been assisted to proceed with EU *acquis communautaire* employment law approximation as concerns third-country nationals. In this respect, a comparative study on the employment of foreign nationals in a number of selected countries was prepared in November 2010.

YEM has supported the Government in the drafting of the new National Employment Strategy, providing technical support with a focus on youth employment and labour migration. Employment (including youth employment) targets have been developed to be embedded in national employment strategy 2011 2020 and budgetary planning frameworks. Technical assistance has been provided continuously to MERD in the development of the new national employment strategy 2011-2020 and budgetary planning framework.

**Outcome of YEM JP: 2. National Institutions Develop Integrated Labour Market and Social Services that Meet Employment and Migration Policy Objectives Targeting Disadvantaged Young Women and Men.**

Overall, in terms of achievements, Outcome 2 has so far resulted in public institutions being able to provide more efficient and individualized services to disadvantaged youth, to better understand their problems and needs, to integrate youth employment in municipal targets, and to build consensus and a solid base for piloting integrated service delivery. Groundwork for implementing integrated service delivery pilots in seven municipalities is completed. YEM has also secured firm cooperation between CSW and the NES as regards the proposed new law on Social Protection. The Law, approved by the Government, is currently awaiting adoption by the Parliament.

* **Outcome 2.1 (ILO) – A system integrating labour market, migration and social services for youth established and functioning.**

For this purpose an inter-ministerial coordination mechanism was established and meets on a monthly basis. Two surveys on integrated service delivery focusing on employment and social services have been completed. The review of the type and sequence of employment services offered to disadvantaged youth in Serbia, with a view of improving their effectiveness was completed in July 2010. A UK study tour for the inter-ministerial working group was conducted with the aim of viewing best practice in integrated service delivery.

Basic elements of the models for integrated service delivery among different institutions at local level to be piloted in Serbia have been jointly defined by the working group. Integrated service delivery pilots were started in February 2011. The integrated service delivery working group provided input to the new draft Law on Social Protection.

* **Outcome 2.2 (joint outcome: ILO/ UNICEF) – The capacity of the National Employment Service, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and Ministry of Youth and Sport to deliver targeted youth employment and social services strengthened.**

Development of a comprehensive training module for the NES staff to manage youth clients took place. Moreover, a functional assessment of the NES was carried out by the YEM in order to identify areas for the improvement of NES client services and a set of recommendations has been presented to the NES and MERD top management. These recommendations are guiding the NES capacity development activities.

The training in case management for supervisors of all CSWs in the regions of Belgrade, South Backa and Pcinski was delivered. All CSWs in the YEM target districts (377 case managers and 75 supervisors) were trained to introduce case management. Training of trainers for producing Annual Operational Plans (AOP) for CSWs, comprised 15 trainers. The training package was submitted for accreditation and the AOP handbook was developed and printed in 2010. The YEM also ensured a facilitated input from youth NGOs for drafting the new Law on Social Protection.

Capacity was built in six Youth Offices for developing project proposals addressing the needs of disadvantaged youth recommendations, for the improvement of youth employability of and NES functioning. The youth-friendly guide through national legislation - rights and obligations "Right to Know" has been upgraded. The components on migration, labour and health have been finalised, while social welfare and education are under final development.

* **Outcome 2.3 (joint outcome: ILO/ UNDP) – A long-term national financial mechanism to implement employment measures targeting disadvantaged youth established and implemented.**

A skills needs survey covering 2,500 enterprises was completed in July 2009 under the leadership of the RSO. The survey identifies the occupations and skills most demanded by the local labour market and these will feed into implementation of the active labour market programme measures (ALMP) under the Youth Employment Fund (YEF). Research on existing public-private partnerships (PPP) and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) practices in Serbia and internationally was completed in 2010. An analysis of the existing legal framework for the establishment of social enterprises in Serbia was conducted. A Call for Applications for social enterprises to receive business development services was published and 12 organisations are being provided with micro-grants.

A management framework, guidelines and internal training for the YEF were completed. Codification of all ALMP offered by the YEF was completed. The Information Technology module allowing precise bookkeeping of expenditure per beneficiary of YEF/NES ALMP has been completed and is operating. A comprehensive training module plan for NES staff to manage youth clients has been developed.

An assessment of possible models for the sustainability of the YEF was conducted and models have been proposed to MERD and other ministries and agencies in order to explore future possibilities and developments of the YEF. The primary eligibility criteria for end-beneficiaries are young men and women (15 to 30 years old), residing in the JP target districts, with a low skills level, no prior (or not relevant) work experience, and an unemployment spell of at least three months at the start of the programme. An agreement was reached with the Ministry of Education to take a role in the assessment and certification of competency based training offered through the YEF, with a view of transferring the Regional Training Centres into national assessment centres responsible for the recognition of prior learning and informal education. Improvements to the occupations and skills survey methodology and administration in Nis and Jagodina districts have been delivered.

**Outcome of YEM JP: 3. Integrated Employment Programmes and Social Services Targeting Young Returnees and Other Disadvantaged Young Women and Men Implemented in Three Target Districts.**

Overall for Outcome 3, the main achievement so far has been the fact that the Youth Employment Fund (YEF) has fully operational since the beginning of 2010. Currently, the Fund supports 1,899 beneficiaries, thus contributing also to improved social inclusion. Improved local partnership for actively tackling youth employment has started to function in a number of target municipalities.

* **Outcome 3.1 (joint outcome: UNDP/ UNICEF/ IOM) – Local partnerships for youth employment strengthened to coordinate implementation of employment programmes that are linked to social services.**

An assessment of capacity of all local councils in the three target regions was completed. Results include recommendations that six municipal councils should get further support through the YEM JP in order to identify priorities for inclusion of vulnerable youth and implementation of ALMP at the municipality level. This support was extended to additional number of local employment councils in 2010 upon request made by the MERD. Capacities of local employment councils to develop local employment action plans were strengthened through a series of training events. Development of the "Guide for Development of Local Employment Action Plan" has been supported which is now widely used by local employment councils. Mentoring support to local policy councils has been completed, resulting in identification of priority categories of vulnerable young unemployed persons to be supported through the YEF. Subsequently, 22 local employment councils applied to Governments Call for Application for co-funding of active labour market programmes identified in municipal employment strategies. The total amount disbursed by the Government for co-funding of local employment action plans in 22 municipalities that undergone training organised by the JP was approximately 2 million USD.

The first coordination workshop on Youth Offices’ capacity building, with representatives of six Youth Offices from the three target regions was organized; capacity building seminars for Youth Offices in all three target regions started in December 2009 and continued until July 2010. The seminars aimed at raising awareness, understanding the context, both wider and local, in respect of the unemployment and migration issues, learning concepts of psychosocial approach and developing specific skills. The Youth Offices apply their improved knowledge when working with the most vulnerable youth. In July 2010 each participating Youth Office coordinator presented a project proposal prepared by his/her municipality and, after the presentations workshop, participants were able to give their comments and discuss the topic. Detailed discussion with UNICEF representatives followed (since UNICEF will fund within the framework of YEM) the implementation of projects in the local communities. Support to Youth Offices for defining locally based project proposals for receiving grants was given. Four out of five project proposals from selected Youth Offices were developed and initiated before the end of 2010. The projects focus on vulnerable young people with respective desegregation to young men and young women, Roma, young people with disabilities, beneficiaries of family allowance, and young people with first and second levels of education. It is expected that the four projects will encompass cumulatively some 700 young people from their respective communities.

A survey on international best practices and models of Info-Point systems for youth offices was completed. Based on the research of Info-point models and the recommendations provided, an info-point model was selected in agreement with the MYS. The purpose of the info-points is to raise youth awareness in Serbia, including data on available services, events, scholarships, job programmes and other key information. Info-points are fully established and operational in 17 municipality youth offices.

* **Outcome 3.2 (joint outcome: ILO/ UNDP) – Integrated packages of active labour market measures implemented through the financing of the Youth Employment Fund in the target districts.**

Two rounds of training for NES counsellors for implementation of ALMP have been completed. Guidelines to administer ALMP targeting disadvantaged youth were produced together with guidelines for conducting competency-based assessments. Consultants were hired to present and promote YEF to employers. To inform the public about the YEF, close liaison with the media took place. The Fund was featured eight times in 2010 on TV, Radio, and newspaper. Presentations of the Fund to employers associations, at round tables with employers and employment fairs, at four events to Roma associations, and to associations of people with disabilities, took place.

The YEF was successfully launched with first contracts awarded in January 2010. The general Call for Applications was published in January 2010, and an additional Call for Applications was designed to further encourage employment of young people with disabilities. As an additional measure to increase absorption, it was proposed to expand the YEF into two more districts, Nis and Jagodina. This proposal was agreed with MERD and NES, approved by the YEM PMC and endorsed by the NSC.

YEF is the first employment programme which specifies the aim of having 10% of beneficiaries who are persons with disabilities. As of 31 December 2010, the fund supported 1,899 beneficiaries (936 funded by the programme, 963 funded by the government), of which an estimated 45% are women, 17% Roma, 6% young people with disabilities. Out of the total of 1,899, 1,337 beneficiaries are undergoing vocational training, and 477 are in employment (138 self-employment, and 339 placed in companies). The first annual YEF implementation report was completed and presented.

* **Outcome 3.3 (IOM) – Youth awareness raised on existing local services as well as on risks of irregular migration.**

The mapping of information material and campaigns about local services and risks of irregular migration has been completed. An online campaign that informs and points people to relevant information was conceptualised. The concept for the online info campaign has been completed and a contractor hired. Three major components of the “Right to Know” guide through the national legislation (migration, labour and health) have been developed, while social welfare and education have been under development, expected to be finished by the end of March 2011.

1. **LEVEL OF ANALYSIS: EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

This chapter examines the performance of the YEM JP, based on considerations of needs assessment and design, inputs, outputs, ownership, results and sustainability, set against the Evaluation Questions detailed in Annex 1.

**3.1 Design level**

**Relevance: Overall, the YEM JP is highly relevant and needed. It is ambitious in scope and coverage relative to its timeframe and resources. Flexibility in respect to changing needs and programme environments has been well demonstrated.**

***The Serbia YEM programme is strongly based on adequate needs assessments and problem identifications.*** Overall, the programme is designed to reflect the corresponding MDG-F thematic window, identified as youth employment and migration. Serbia was hit hard by the global economic crisis and young people were particularly hard hit. Over a third are unemployed, and for those who have found work, one in three is in temporary or informal, unprotected jobs.Youth unemployment and under-employment impose heavy costs on the Serbian society. Long unemployment spells early in life affect the prospects of young people to secure a career job and a decent wage. High percentages of unemployed youth mean that investments in education and training are wasted, that there is a reduced taxation base and higher welfare costs. High unemployment levels among young people can also be a source of social instability.In the area of social protection, decentralisation of reforms for improving efficiency and active participation of the beneficiaries are main key challenges for the near future in Serbia. Prerequisite for any reform process is establishment of the relevant database and simplification of administrative processes. At present the social protection public sector has a similar image to other public sectors which overpower beneficiaries by its formal and restrictive behaviour. Demographic trends reveal a constant decrease of the population size (see also Box 1). The migration problem in Serbia has still not been analysed sufficiently in depth and, therefore, some important limitations exist to a comprehensive insight into the current situation and into the perspectives regarding future trends in the movement of the labour force. The lack of adequate statistical resources imposes a need to use the incomplete sources of national services, immigration countries and the international organisations.

**Box 1: Rationale for the migration component**

About 500,000 young people left Serbia between 1991 and 2001 in search of better livelihoods. In the Serbian districts of Pcinjski, South Backa and Belgrade where the programme is being carried out preferably, it is estimated that in the last five years, 96,500 young people, or more than 35 per cent of the current youth population, have left their communities and migrated abroad.

Against this underlying position, the intervention basis the YEM JP demonstrates clear programme logic. The programme document is sound and coherent, based on a realistic needs assessment. The three defined priorities (outcomes) directly respond to national policies, systems and services. The targets set are challenging but realistic and can be achieved within the given budget and time. However, it is apparent that individual activities have been developed independent from each other, reflecting a programming approach of separation according to individual agencies tasks and agendas. The synergy effects and cross-fertilisation expected from a joint programming approach could have been more strongly incorporated. In particular the Migration component, characterised by a small allocation compared with the programme budget, could have been better anchored by defining it as a cross-cutting issue in each of the various programme components.

***Where relevant, particularities and specific interests of women, minorities and ethnic groups have been taken into account by the YEM JP***. The review of gender balance on the YEM programme indicates that the programme maintains a participatory and gender sensitive approach. The project team includes males and females and the pilot sites are managed in collaboration with regional offices, which includes male and female officers. Females, minorities and ethnic groups are an integrated part of the programme activities.

***The intervention strategy has been sufficiently adaptive to address where relevant changing needs of intervention areas.*** Flexibility was built into programme design and this has helped the YEM JP to adapt to the rapidly changing political environment and to cope with initial delays. In fact the high degree of flexibility can be regarded as one of the positive key features of the JP design. It appears to be much more responsive to changing needs than for instance EU programmes in the same area. The programme was initially delayed but when it finally came to implementation its relevance can be considered as even higher than before. YEM JP was launched at the time when the financial crisis seriously affected the Serbian economy, leading to immediate increased trends in unemployment and migration, particular in respect of young people. Therefore, the opportunities offered by the YEM JP, particularly aiming at the fight against youth employment were highly welcome and found broad support among national partners and stakeholders.

***Revised monitoring indicators allow for a better follow-up of programme achievements.*** The monitoring and evaluation framework has improved. ILO recognized the need for this revision at the beginning of JP implementation and conducted it as agency in charge of administering JP monitoring. Also, the first external monitoring exercise has contributed to an improved monitoring framework. Clear indicators, baselines and targets are given for many activities. Quantified outputs have been defined wherever possible but due to planning uncertainties in a few cases not all of these expected quantifications correspond to the achievements actually being made. There are, however, some outputs expected to over-achieve their initial definition. Where possible, programme indicators have been followed up and the results are summarised in Annex 3.

***Guidance given by the MDG-F Secretariat in properly programming the YEM intervention has been greatly appreciated.*** The Secretariat has, in particular, ensured that the intervention under evaluation has been prepared in line with the respective thematic window, thus ensuring overall consistency with the MDG-F strategic approach. Monitoring missions of the Secretariat were well received and have helped to strengthen, in particular, the monitoring and evaluation framework, the communication and advocacy strategy and the follow-up of implementation.

***There appears to be a strong coherence between YEM JP objectives and related national and sectoral strategies.*** Individual programme outcomes and components reflect well the expressed needs of the Serbian Government. The programme activities directly respond to relevant national legislative and strategic documents. Additionally, many programme outputs directly target the further refinement and development of the current legal and strategic framework, as concerns data and evidence-based policy making and implementation of sectoral action plans.

***Strong involvement of many national and local authorities has well supported the development of a highly relevant programme design and intervention approach.*** Without doubt, MERD has been delivering an excellent performance in the national lead partner role. The individual programme components were prepared by the respective UN agencies and all relevant national and local stakeholders were consulted during the programming. Their views and suggestions were incorporated where applicable. Furthermore, Serbian NGOs and social partners were involved in order make sure that their later involvement in implementation would be successful. Involvement of young people has been ensured via youth NGOs and youth associations. MERD co-financing towards the YEF measures has been clearly beneficial in boosting the results and impacts expected from this activity.

**3.2 Process level**

**Efficiency: Overall, programme implementation is characterised by initial delays in all components, but once sub-projects have started, efficiency improves rapidly. Added value from implementing JPs does not automatically appear in implementation but needs to be built in systematically from the design stage onwards.**

**The JP management model is delivering the expected outcomes but synergy effects are often difficult to trace.** Overall, the YEM JP management model still needs to be seen as having an experimental nature***.*** Despite the fact that some previous programmes had been conducted as joint efforts, the nature of the YEM JP has clearly exceeded the scope of previous experience. There has been an additional administrative burden experienced by some participating agencies and not all agencies have sufficient operational capacity to cover the additional administrative and reporting needs from own sources.

The YEM JP is implemented by a high quality team of professionals. The various agency staffs are highly motivated and dedicated to the programme, often working beyond the call of duty. There has often been close cooperation in the field as concerns pilot regions and in particular UNDP and ILO have established excellent local joint work. Overall results indicate that cooperation and coordination has been good in all areas where cooperation actually adds value, such as ILO and UNDP on integrated services, social enterprises and YEF, ILO cooperation with IOM on labour migration data, UNICEF and IOM on youth offices, or all partners on the “Right to Know Guide”.

Efficient management of the YEM JP has, to some extent, suffered from the situation that whilst individual components are managed well by the respective agency, the competencies and responsibilities of the overall JP Manager remain weak and are often limited to advice and collegial guidance. Effective suppervision of the entire JP resources and experts is not sufficiently ensured due to limited insight into other agencies’ work. Also in case of effective representation and communication and other appreciated unified programme elements the development of a harmonised overall approach is limited by prevailing agency-specific procedures and guidelines. As witnessed in other MDG-F JPs, Serbia YEM reveals that the leading agency and its JP Manager should have had greater managerial powers in order to ensure better efficiency and cost-effective delivery. Despite being given an overall coordination role by the JP Manager of the lead agency there are apparent limitations in effectively managing project components of other agencies as the JP Manager does not possess sufficient legal authority to, for example, sign or approve contracts on behalf of other agencies and/or commit their funds.

JP management matters became even more complicated because insufficient funding for the JP Manager position was initially granted. Only in July 2010, after lengthy and difficult discussions between the agencies involved, including reviews and assessments of the JP Manager performance, inter-agency agreement was finally reached to secure further JP Manager funding for the remaining programme period (year 3 of implementation). JP management was also strengthened when two additional Deputy Programme Managers from ILO and UNDP were appointed from July 2010 onwards based on an initiative by MERD.

Insufficient funding of programme management functions has been revealed in other JPs[[2]](#footnote-2). After an increase was agreed, the overall budget for management is 4.6% of the total JP budget. The JP Programme Manager has no legal authority over any area of the programme, budget or human resources. This leads to the question to what extent overall JP management and coordination is actually perceived by the implementing agencies as being important and crucial for the programme success. Impressions remain that the management of individual agencies’ components is more important than joint overall coordination.

***Programme coordination has improved with the PMC providing a sound platform for inter-agency and national partners’ coordination.*** Over time, the YEM JP has developed steadily, and inter-agency coordination at the time of this evaluation has been largely well established. The PMC, as the programme’s coordination platform, suffered from initial uncertainties but has stabilised and closely guides the implementation process. The PMC performs well as the main coordination body and link to the government. Despite the limitations mentioned above, the JP Programme Manager and his Deputies have largely ensured good coordination of participating agencies. Cooperation between the agencies and the most important national partners works well. Civil society and private sector organisations are closely involved in implementing certain activities and they are coordinating well with their respective UN agency.

***The approach for implementing programme outputs ensures coherence and completeness of the YEM JP outputs.*** There is hardly any duplication or overlapping of individual components and activities. Where inter-agency collaboration in the field has been essential this has been usually managed well.

***There is limited evidence to substantiate some potential benefits of the joint programmes, such as sharing work methodologies or financial tools among agencies***. Individual agencies do not always view their work as a joint effort at both national and regional levels, and reducing regional transaction costs through approaching the regions as a joint UN team has been hardly visible. Over time, the UN agencies involved have managed to clarify mandates and determine roles based on their respective comparative advantage, improved communication between agencies and strengthened joint planning. Mostly good working relations have been established between technical staff. Depending on the individual agency, some participating agencies also view the JP as an opportunity to work together more closely at district level.

***The YEM JP has shown a good degree of flexibility in order to respond to the relevant political and social-cultural context.*** For instance, the absence of a functioning Public Private Partnership (PPP) system in Serbia together with a significantly reduced CSR due to the prevailing economic crisis has resulted in a successful re-orientation of originally earmarked activities towards support to social enterprises. The inclusion of two more target regions into the geographical YEF operation field was pragmatic and resulted in a very strong interest for participation, clearly exceeding the scope of funds available.

***Ownership of the target population and programme participants is positive.*** There is in general a good degree of ownership demonstrated by national stakeholders but commitments sometimes still need to materialise in the YEM social protection and migration activities. Overall, the involvement of the Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Unit (SIPRU) is much appreciated. SIPRU, an overall coordinating body within the government, despite not being formally part of the YEM JP, collaborates with the national institutions involved and assists with the development of evidence-based policies and integrated service delivery design, thus facilitating increased overall coordination and cooperation, directly benefiting the programme realisation. The regional and local authorities take a strong interest in the programme activities and local ownership is only limited by the lack of funds and resources.

In some areas, capacities of partners are a challenging matter of concern. For example youth offices show very weak capacities in project management but also a weak understanding of vulnerable groups so more time in preparing the relevant programme activities was needed in order to cope with the deficiencies of the benefiting youth offices.

Moreover, in respect to the migration component it is apparent that the migration management agenda is largely driven by the requirements of Serbia’s EU integration process. There appears still to be a lack of common understanding on the on-going return process and multiplicity of actions and national stakeholders involved in reintegration, together with a varying scope of and different types of returnees make a coherent management approach difficult to trace.

***National co-financing means has been instrumental in making the YEM JP a success.*** Resource contributions from the national public authorities for co-financing the YEF have been very useful in boosting the success of this particular initiative. After some initial hesitation local employers have been encouraged to contribute to the youth employment measures being financed by the YEF, through active cooperation and provision of temporary work stations and training opportunities.

**3.3 Results level**

**Effectiveness: The YEM JP is making substantial progress towards effective achievement of programme objectives, Millennium Development and thematic window goals.Particular success is reported in the youth employment component. Performance of social protection and migration components is good but varying.**

***Overall, YEM JP has progressed well and will significantly support the Millennium Development Goals of Serbia within the given thematic window.*** YEM JP is directly aligned and tackling essential issues related to the socio-economic problems of Serbia in line with national priorities and strategies. Particular reference can be made to the MDGs addressing the eradication of extreme poverty through full and productive employment and decent work for all and the promotion of gender equality. In the course of the YEM implementation Serbian policy makers and administrators are being confronted with a large number of innovative tools and models to actively fight youth unemployment and to a lesser extent migration. The data base on youth employment and migration is being significantly improved and should, in the long run, lead to the development and implementation of more effective and better targeted national and regional policies. Improved professional mentoring and guidance in career planning and employment qualifications should help to make young people more responsible for their own future and more realistic and pro-active in approaching the labour market. The wider younger population is being better informed about the potential drawbacks of migration. All these activities need further systematic replication and dissemination by the national and local authorities involved in order to boost the effects being produced and thus to significantly contribute the timely achievement of Serbia’s Millennium Development Goals. Details on the extent to which the individual outcomes and outputs are expected to be effectively achieved are given below:

**Outcome of YEM JP: 1. Youth Employment and Migration Policy Objectives are Included into National Development Strategy**

* **Outcome 1.1 (joint outcome: ILO/ IOM/ UNICEF) – Knowledge base on youth employment and migration improved to inform national development strategy and action plans.**

***Outcome 1.1 has been well progressed for youth employment but less for social protection and migration.*** Capacities of the RSO have been increased and youth employment and mobility indicators are being used in the LFS, thus, in the longer term facilitating improved policy and decision making in respect to youth employment. The greatest achievement so far is the establishment of a framework for the systematisation of labour market data and the beginning of time series. Moreover, indicators for labour migration and social protection are ready to be adopted by the national partner institutions. However, the use of this knowledge for the development of evidence-based policies has not been demonstrated yet for social protection indicators. The process of adoption of new social protection legislation is lagging behind in government and parliament and thus full achievement of the related objectives is not yet ensured. Institutionalisation of the social protection indicators and data collection methods is linked to by-laws still to be defined.The online-survey on Diaspora initiated discussions within the inter-ministerial coordination body on migration. Some of these discussions however, dispute findings and methodologies applied. A revised version is under preparation. This survey can be considered as a first attempt to move towards a more systematic follow up of migration trends for Serbian people living in the Diaspora. The RSO has now a basic system in place and can repeat and fine-tune Diaspora surveys in the future.

* **Outcome 1.2 (IOM) – Policy on management of labour migration, including returns of young Serbians, developed and linked to employment policy and strategies.**

***So far, outcome 1.2 has been moderately progressing towards its achievement.*** The White Paper on labour migration strategy presents a sound basis to improve the strategic framework in respect to labour migration. However, immediate integration of the White Paper findings and recommendations into political priorities and actions is not yet fully visible. Incorporation of the White Paper provisions is still subject to consideration by the national partners. The original idea, to have a labour migration strategy incorporated into the wider Migration Management Strategy, produced in 2009, did not find sufficient support. There are currently moves to present a labour migration strategy as a part, most likely as an annex, of the new National Employment Strategy. The Commissariat for Refugees has incorporated certain parts of the White Paper into its Migration Management Action Plan for 2011/2012. This Plan however is still under preparation. The discussion on what to do with the White Paper findings also reflects to a certain extent the overall discussion on who will be responsible at national level for the labour migration agenda. The formal adoption of the White Paper within the current lifetime of YEM JP presents a challenge. Also drafting support given to the new Law on Work of Foreigners has not produced significant results yet. The strategic importance of this Law is obvious since it is a part of Serbia’s EU pre-accession package. Final drafting of the Law had still not been completed at the time of this evaluation, due to ongoing governmental consultations.

* **Outcome 1.3 (joint outcome: UNDP/ IOM/ ILO) – Youth employment and migration targets included in national development strategy.**

***Outcome 1.3 has been already mostly achieved.*** The advocacy campaign has produced immediate political impacts. The public hearing, roundtables, street actions, conference, media appearances and individual meetings with relevant stakeholders and decision makers has led to the formal commitment of the Serbian Government Ministries to the introduction of entrepreneurial learning. With signing the ‘*Memorandum of Understanding regarding the development and implementation of policies of lifelong entrepreneurial education'*, by the Ministry of Education and MERD in November 2010, the two ministries have pledged to work together on the introduction of entrepreneurial learning in the Serbian education and training system (see also Box 2). Six measurable youth employment targets have been included in the new Employment Strategy and will be regularly reviewed in the course of implementing the Strategy. The youth employment indicators developed with the assistance of YEM JP are being used by MERD for the analysis of the labour market, problem identification and generation of policy options that will become part of the new Employment Policy. This policy document, in turn, will become one of the key pillars of the Joint Inclusion Memorandum. Youth migration and social protection indicators are available, but not yet integrated into the national development strategy framework due to ongoing substantial legislative or pending institutional adjustments.

**Box 2: Protocol on cooperation of partners in the development of lifelong entrepreneurial education**

Signed in December 2010, this Protocol establishes a national partnership of private, public and civil society to work together to promote the introduction of entrepreneurial learning in the educational system of Serbia. This type of learning will enable young people to acquire knowledge and skills for entrepreneurship, which can facilitate searching and finding a job. The signing of the Protocol has been part of the ‘Memorandum of Understanding regarding the development and implementation of policies of lifelong entrepreneurial education'.

**Outcome of YEM JP: 2. National Institutions Develop Integrated Labour Market and Social Services that Meet Employment and Migration Policy Objectives Targeting Disadvantaged Young Women and Men.**

* **Outcome 2.1 (ILO) – A system integrating labour market, migration and social services for youth established and functioning.**

***Outcome 2.1 is expected to be fully achieved.*** Good practices of integrated and coordinated employment and social protection services have been explored with support of the YEM JP. The inter-ministerial working group on integrated service delivery guides and oversees implementation of seven pilot initiatives. Piloting has just started. Experience from the pilot initiatives will be utilised to define the final model for integrated service delivery. There are indications from the field that the purpose of the exercise is not always fully clear to local stakeholders and that the benefits of having a true integrated service delivery have not been always explained enough to those who are participating in the local pilots. Communication and coordination between local NES branches and CSWs is at an early stage and formally established cooperation mechanisms at the local level could not be observed in the pilot municipalities visited. It will be a task of the programme to ensure that local protocols on cooperation are agreed and in force. The basic training on integrated services was launched in February 2010 (40 professionals from CSW and NES) and first reactions from participants were clearly positive.Different working procedures among the different services (CSW, NES and Youth Offices) need still to be harmonized. Whilst NES is quite advanced in the use of ITC and electronic data processing, this is not the case for CSWs. CSWs are increasingly applying case management approaches, while this practice in not adopted yet at the NES. JP has managed is to create a foundation for introducing case management properly at the NES. The main outcome of this sub-component will be the lessons learned from the piloting. Overall, results and impacts should be boosted due to the availability of funds from the EU Instrument for Pre-Accession which will be utilised for further roll-out of the integrated service delivery.

* **Outcome 2.2 (joint outcome: ILO/ UNICEF) – The capacity of the National Employment Service, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and Ministry of Youth and Sport to deliver targeted youth employment and social services strengthened.**

***Outcome 2.2 is expected to be fully achieved***. NES capacity development for implementing ALMPs targeting disadvantaged youth has been significantly assisted by the YEM programme. The introduction of the case management approach both for local CSWs and NES branch offices has helped to increase competencies, understanding and acceptance as concerns newly reformed organizational and operational structures, including the management structure, roles of supervisors, case managers and coordination with other service providers. Implementation of the new case management approach in CSW services has been strengthened by the programme and the skills of CSW staff responsible for annual AOPs. The CSW branch offices visited use the AOP now in a routine manner. Youth Offices have gained a better understanding of their role in mentoring young people, in providing user-friendly services and particularly in helping vulnerable groups in getting access to information about employment, career guidance, education and social protection.

* **Outcome 2.3 (joint outcome: ILO/ UNDP) – A long-term national financial mechanism to implement employment measures targeting disadvantaged youth established and implemented.**

***Outcome 2.3 is expected to be effectively realised.*** A set of six intensive treatment measures has been designed to be combined and complement each other and are being financed by the YEF. Successful deployment of the YEF is ongoing and commitments are being given by MERD and NES that the YEF model will continue once the YEM funding has finished. To allow the monitoring of the cost-effectiveness of the ALMPs, YEM JP supported the NES to link the IT platform that records individual data and programme participation history to the software system used to record expenditure. It will allow the comparison of the performance of different programmes across individuals and regions. This system is envisaged to be extended to all the measures provided by the NES. Twelve selected social enterprises are receiving until September 2011 micro-grants for developing their business services. The concept of social enterprises as such is new to Serbia and currently the legislation only recognizes the operations of social cooperatives. There is strong evidence at the micro-level of the individual social enterprises that YEM support will help to generate employment for individuals suffering from disadvantaged living conditions. Due to the very small size of the individual grants no wider effects can be expected however. There is, however strong interest in this new approach both by NGOs and, increasingly, by government representatives. In the long term an extension or follow up of YEM JP might put particular emphasis on developing social enterprises and their funding concepts in Serbia.

**Box 3: Palilula Youth Office – Project “I am actively looking for a job”**

***General goal:*** Increase employability of youth from vulnerable groups in Palilua

***Specific goals:***

* Promote social inclusion of youth from vulnerable groups through greater understanding and better access to relevant services (for education, employment, etc);
* Increase the Youth Office capacities for providing information services, through connecting relevant local stakeholders for the purpose of better youth awareness of the possibilities at the local level;
* Increase availability of the Youth Office services to the target group of beneficiaries;
* Increase motivation and capacities/skills of youth from vulnerable groups for employment;
* Increase interest of employers in accepting youth from vulnerable groups for internship;
* Strengthen the capacities of the Youth Office Volunteer Service by sensitizing volunteers for work with vulnerable groups.

**Outcome of YEM JP: 3. Integrated Employment Programmes and Social Services Targeting Young Returnees and Other Disadvantaged Young Women and Men Implemented in Three Target Districts.**

* **Outcome 3.1 (joint outcome: UNDP/ UNICEF/ IOM) – Local partnerships for youth employment strengthened to coordinate implementation of employment programmes that are linked to social services.**

***Outcome 3.1 is expected to be fully achieved.***Capacity building for local councils has strengthened local capacities for actively tackling youth employment of vulnerable groups. YEM support for developing professional local action plans in six communities has been successful. Overall, in February 2011 MERD approved 122 proposed local action plans for co-financing. Selected Youth Offices have increased their capacity to better mentor young unemployed people and with the help of the Info-Point system, to pro-actively connect them to NES and other services in order to inform them about ALMPs and social rights. Youth Office projects in the selected municipalities are starting (see also Box 3). They are likely to achieve their respective project targets at the micro-level. The ongoing revision of the DevInfo database for the local level should produce some benefits since it will be used for capacity building of selected municipalities.

* **Outcome 3.2 (joint outcome: ILO/ UNDP) – Integrated packages of active labour market measures implemented through the financing of the Youth Employment Fund in the target districts.**

***Outcome 3.2 has been already mostly achieved***. ALMPs financed by the YEF are available to unemployed youth in five Serbian districts, comprising currently 1,899 young people (see also Box 4 and Annex 3). It will be a challenge to achieve the originally planned total figure of 3,000 final beneficiaries. During the piloting it emerged that the most expensive measures received the highest interest. The benefits of participating in on-the-job training etc., are clearly obvious, leading to hands-on experience and direct employability. Meanwhile, most of the YEF funding has been already spent and the remaining funds are now earmarked for beneficiaries placed in the integrated service delivery pilot sites. YEF includes, besides a high rate of young Roma, so far 6% of people with disabilities (PWD) which is a rather remarkable achievement. Existence of the new law on professional rehabilitation and employment of PWD has partly contributed to an increased interest of both target group and employers as concerns employment training and job opportunities.

**Box 4: YEF beneficiaries**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **No beneficiaries** |
| Training | 1337 |
| Self employment | 138 |
| Job creation PWDs | 94 |
| Work placement | 330 |
| **Total** | **1899** |

* **Outcome 3.3 (IOM) – Youth awareness raised on existing local services as well as on risks of irregular migration.**

***Outcome 3.3 should be largely achieved.*** Information packages are being disseminated, including a revised version of the Right to Know guide. 6,000 copies will be distributed in the first run. More copies will be produced dependent on the further need and interest demonstrated. More sustainable results and awareness raising can be expected from the online information campaign. The campaign is due to start in March or April 2011. Consequently, no direct results have materialized yet. Upon completion detailed assessments of this innovative promotion measure will be needed in order to systematically trace its effects and outreach.

**Overall, the stipulated timeline of outputs should largely be addressed but more time would allow better absorption by national partners and more visible sustainability.** Implementation has been greatly accelerated, following an initial slow start and the vast majority of outputs are expected to be delivered within the current lifetime of the programme, planned to terminate in November 2011. On the other hand however, adoption and absorption of some YEM outputs is proceeding slowly, since these depend mostly on national administrations or government/ parliament decisions whose timescales are sometimes difficult to predict. This is evidently the case for some migration outputs. Also the quality of the final evaluations of the various pilot activities could greatly benefit from more time being made available.

***YEM JP mostly delivers high quality products.*** Flexible management has regularly adapted to a constantly changing environment, particularly to commit programme resources when activities need it and not just to meet a disbursement schedule. As a result, the products delivered are of good quality and each assignment is conducted on an as needed basis. Controversial views exist on the draft Diaspora survey. Some national stakeholders have contested the approach and findings of the survey. The RSO together with YEM is still trying to deal with the concerns expressed and to present a revised study taking account of the comments received.

***Programme implementation is adequately followed up by the PMC.*** The PMC meets regularly. Based on the progress report by the JP Manager the status of implementation is presented and jointly discussed. Attendance of the government counterparts is helpful and, in particular, the pro-active leadership of MERD is very much appreciated.

***The programme largely provides coverage to the government counterparts and beneficiaries as expected.*** All relevant central state institutions dealing with youth employment and migration are involved in the programme. The target areas for regional activities have been mostly chosen well, taking into account the size and complexity of the underlying socio-economic problems. Concerns remain however, for having selected Belgrade as a pilot area of the YEF. The very special situation of Belgrade, in terms of economic prosperity and attractive labour conditions, has been demonstrated by the limited interest of the local target group in participating in YEF-funded measures. Overall, there appears to be a good mix of final beneficiaries among different social groups, comprising in particular low and unqualified youth, long term unemployed, minorities and women. The YEF also provides support to returnees, one of the defined vulnerable groups of the programme. There are however, no data available since these groups usually do not register at NES (or CSW) as returnees.

***YEM JP offers valuable innovative measures for problem solving.*** For instance, the early presentation and discussion of possible models for the sustainability of the YEF have streamlined and accelerated considerations on the future of the Fund once MDG-F funding is finished. There is widespread agreement among stakeholders that at the national level the use of inter-institutional working groups has greatly facilitated cooperation and communication among key institutions. YEM JP has flexibly made use of the existing working groups and has also initiated new ones where required. The involvement of institutions not directly involved has often improved the quality of discussions and solutions.

***Effective delivery of ALMP to disadvantaged youth through the YEF demonstrates the key success of YEM JP.***  There is general agreement that the practical outcomes of the YEF represent the most important, practical and visible achievement of the programme. The successful introduction of this measure certainly improves the quality of the services being delivered by MERD and NES in respect to young unemployed people. The YEF in particular has managed to attract a large number of young Roma and has demonstrated well the interest of young disabled people in job training and employment. As shown by YEF implementation, concrete local actions that immediately stimulate employment, economy and social conditions are often superior to higher level policy interventions when it comes to producing direct and visible effects, thus bringing rapid return on investment of donor funds.

***Fair youth employment has been a main feature of the programme.*** There is widespread agreement that YEM, in particular, through the YEF, has for the first time delivered ALMP’s tailor-made to the needs for low and unqualified young people in Serbia. Traditional ALMPs often concentrate on better educated and experienced young job seekers, or on ones with high potential.

***Relatively little funds have been earmarked for actively tackling migration problems.*** Despite having been defined as one of the strategic priorities of the YEM JP overall only five percent of the programme budget has been earmarked for migration. Employment, in particular in respect to young people from vulnerable groups, has been the clear focus of the overall intervention. Implementation of the migration component has lagged behind because the national authorities required a long period to discuss and agree the principles of the proposed activities. Since the National Migration Management Strategy was already in place at the time when the programme finally got operational, parts of the migration component had to be-directed towards other national needs. This has been largely successful but it cannot conceal the fact that migration as such still receives relatively little attention by the Government. Despite the awareness on adverse demographic trends and increasing brain drain, pro-active management of migration is still lagging behind, and the discussion of issues and problems is mostly driven by EU countries. Within its small scope the IOM activities will, however, clearly contribute to fair and open information on migration.

***YEM JP reflects the disparities between pilot regions.*** The programme matches horizontal measures with potential significant political impact at national levels with hands-on direct support ensuring maximum outreach in the target regions. Disadvantaged and marginalized youth are the main target groups for education, employment and awareness. The counseling of these young people also provides for a change in mentality and behavior as concerns job seeking, qualification and participation in the labour market. Young people are made aware that they have to plan their future and need to be more active and more independent job seekers. The programme also reveals the disparities within the economic situation of Serbia. Strong interest and commitment of young people has been found in all pilot regions apart from Belgrade. The very specific, sometimes superior economic situation of Belgrade and the high mobility of its labour market, even in respect to low qualified labour force, has been confirmed by the relatively low interest in ALMPs financed by the YEF. Moreover, Belgrade is also special as concerns the piloting of integrated service delivery. Here the individual district CSWs are strongly coordinated by the CSW City as concerns the piloting. The CSW City is however, lagging behind in establishing overall formal cooperation with the related NES district offices and communication to individual district CSWs is poorly developed.

**3.4 Sustainability**

**Sustainability: Most achievements of YEM JP put great emphasis on follow up and sustainability. Sustainability prospects of some predicted outcomes from the social protection and migration components still deserve attention.**

***Strong national commitment facilitates sustainability of YEM employment components.*** There is clear evidence about excellent leadership and commitment demonstrated by MERD, NES and the RSO. Database upgrades and capacity building clearly helped to strengthen their institutional sustainability and the professional approach for further developing services in respect to disadvantaged young unemployed citizens. There is a clear commitment given by MERD and NES for sustaining the YEF. The YEF is likely to become part of the services being provided by the NES, in line with original provisions on vulnerable and disadvantaged young people. Continuation of operations is expected once the final evaluation of the individual ALMPs and their cost-effectiveness has been completed and a selection of future priority measures has been made. For 2011 the NES has so far allocated SRD15 mil. as a special budget earmarked for YEF continuation.

Sustainability of the assistance given to the RSO is being secured by follow-up activities funded from the EU pre-accession instrument. UNICEF is again a main partner in this EU project and thus continuity and expansion of the work done under YEM JP is being largely ensured.

***Sustainability prospects of YEM social protection and migration components are mixed.*** Sustainability of the YEM social protection support depends largely on the MLSP. In particular, the rapid adoption and coming into force of the new Law on Labour Protection is essential for the durability of results being achieved. There is a need to proceed quickly with all necessary by-laws (estimated at about 40 secondary legislative documents). These new legal provisions altogether will also influence the future role and competencies of the IoSP. In terms of related capacity building as concerns the further development of social welfare indicators, the IoSP is already benefiting from a 2008 EU pre-accession project.

Based on the new legislation it is expected that the CSWs will be confronted by a significant increase of the number of clients. Additional resources will be needed to cope with this new situation; internal estimations plan for an increase of at least 130 CSW staffs. It remains to be seen how far case management approach and integrated service delivery can be further developed and disseminated under such conditions. Without further external support immediate outreach of these new performance concepts might be limited for some time. The Government of Serbia has included the roll-out of the integrated model on national level in its IPA planning. Concerns regarding the by-in of the model are raised occasionally. On the other hand there are strong indications that the national partners involved fully intend to pursue the model and institutionalise it on a national level, provided of course the model currently being piloted proves to be successful.

There is still room to increase the durability of the results being achieved by parts of the migration component. In particular, the adoption and integration of outputs into national policy frameworks is slow, suggesting a limited interest in enhancing the knowledge-based evidence for policy making in the area of migration. Overall, there is also uncertainty about the future administrative structure of institutions dealing with migration, particularly labour migration. The Commissariat for Refugees, a main stakeholder in this area, may transfer into an Agency for Migration Management, serving as focal point for EU-related migration affairs. Some concern remains also with MERD’s Department for Labour Migration. The Department consists of only one staff who is about to retire. IOM has made a commitment to train any new incoming officer and thus to build up administrative capacity in respect to labour migration. However, recruitment is still not complete and it might be increasingly challenging to educate new staff within the currently given deadline for programme termination. Taking into account the evident need to strengthen the already very small national resources dedicated to labour migration policy, there is a risk that this opportunity for capacity building might be missed.

Sustainability of the municipal youth offices in Serbia is still weak. The establishment of Youth Offices by decree has been a pragmatic step forward and in fact has facilitated the quick set-up of local service centres. Establishing of youth services, youth offices and also the YEM support being given to these issues are based on a governmental strategy that should also ensure sustained action in these areas. It remains to be seen, however whether the overall goal is realistic and can be achieved, aiming at having a youth office in each Serbian municipality. At present there are 115 offices operating compared with the situation three years ago where only five existed. The role and status of these offices is still not regulated, despite the fact that national authorities and the donor community have put a lot of emphasis on it. Youth Office Coordinator jobs are not considered as systemized public posts, putting many Coordinators in a rather uncomfortable situation as concerns their professional recognition and remuneration. Under the guidance of the MoYS, working procedures for Youth Office Coordinators are under preparation. Discussions are also on-going in respect to establishing a national association for Youth Office Coordinators. Proper funding of individual youth offices presents an issue of concern, despite very encouraging examples of youth offices actively seeking grant funds from national and donor support programmes. All these obstacles certainly influence the way youth offices will maintain their performance in respect to Info point services and integrated service delivery. It has now been agreed with the MoYS that YEM will support the establishment of a national association of local youth offices with the aim to strengthen their role, status and mandate. The cost will be shared by GIZ and YEM.

National discussions about a revised framework for education and vocational training, including the related accreditation and certification measures are moving slowly.Overall, it is of vital interest for Serbia to establish favourable conditions for the increase of direct investment and productive employment. The education system as a whole, and particularly vocational schools, still need to substantially raise qualification levels, make better links with higher education and improve coordination with the business sector to create better opportunities for young people to connect with the job market. The YEM JP has suffered from the absence of the Ministry of Education as a strong key partner. Initial programme design should have required close involvement and active participation from the beginning of education and vocational training representatives. During the course of programme delivery, this situation has improved to some extent. On the positive side, a national partnership of private, public and civil society to work together to promote the introduction of entrepreneurial learning in the educational system of Serbia has been established. It has been announced that in 2011, the national partnership will work on a draft strategy for lifelong entrepreneurial learning, which will be provided to the Serbian Parliament for adoption. The creation of an institutional framework for entrepreneurship learning is an important prerequisite for addressing youth unemployment, assisting small and medium enterprises and the harmonization of national legislation with EU legislation.

***Overall, sustainability of administrative capacity, i.e. of trained and experienced staff, is uneven.*** Administrative capacity building, that is the utilisation of the knowledge, skills and experience gained in the YEM JP, could be better sustained. In many beneficiary institutions, administrative sustainability is still adversely affected by inadequate working and remuneration conditions in the public service. The main threats to sustainability are seen as low motivation, lack of incentives and low salaries in the civil service. The lack of a systematised training for new counselors and advisers both at NES and CSWs is apparent and jeopardizes sustainability. In particular, in the Belgrade region, staff fluctuation in national and local offices remains a problem. In the absence of stable staffing it will be important to promote the identification and use of sustainable training systems, including team building and management, state-of-the-art supervision and anti-stress programmes.

***A good degree of consistency as regards visions and actions of the different partners involved has been ensured.*** The various actors in the YEM JP demonstrate a degree of consistency with the aims and activities of the intervention. This is particularly so in the target regions where political ownership is clearly demonstrated together with the political will to improve the living of the people through regional or territorial cooperation. Visions sometimes fall short once national and regional funding is seen as the major impediment to realising such long-term perspectives. It is obvious from the programme, however, that migration issues have at times been superseded by the employment agenda, also reflecting national priorities. In respect to the social protection indicators there is not always full clarity as concerns the MoSP and its timely use of indicators for evidence-based policy making and annual reporting. Much is currently delegated to the IoSP which acts as a service provider for the MoSP, but this institution cannot replace policy guidance by the respective line ministry.

***The leadership of the UN Resident Coordination, in particular, has stimulated ongoing exchanges among agencies to share lessons learned and experiences.*** YEM JP has benefited from the Joint Communication and Advocacy Strategy prepared by the Resident Coordination Office for the three running JPs in Serbia. However, increased communication and advocacy is still desirable in order to embed the YEM results being achieved within the national partner institutions. Knowledge sharing includes cross-fertilization among YEM participating agencies in terms of methodologies and approaches, as well as an exchange and interaction with other YEM programmes around the world. The setting up of an overall monitoring and evaluation strategy has been less successful since no overall inter-agency agreement could be found in time for the JPs in Serbia. The YEM JP has been pragmatic in setting up its own monitoring agenda. Two independent monitoring missions have now been conducted, facilitating programme performance and external reflection of implementation progress.

1. **CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

This chapter sets out the Evaluator’s conclusions on the strategy and performance of the YEM JP. Lessons learned from the strengths and weaknesses of the way the programme was programmed and implemented can help optimise the approach to future support.

**4.1 Conclusions**

Overall, the YEM JP is highly relevant and addresses key issues in respect of Serbia’s socio-economic development. The programme design has been ambitious in scope and coverage relative to its timeframe and resources. Targeting disadvantaged young men and women, especially those most at risk of social exclusion and prime candidates for emigration has been a crucial success factor for this well designed intervention. The programme also focuses well on developing evidence-based policies on youth employment, on strengthening the capacity of national institutions to design integrated labour market and social services aligned with policy objectives and on supporting local institutions in piloting innovative employment programmes and social services.

Programme implementation was characterised by initial delays in all components, but once projects started, efficiency improved rapidly. Individual YEM components and sub-projects appear to be innovative in tackling youth employment and migration and have made good use of the technical experience and good practice existing at the various agencies involved.

National partners’ commitment is obvious within the youth employment component but varies when it comes to the assessment of the social protection and labour migration components. MERD and NES are strong key players and are making pro-active use of the support on offer. The situation in social protection is different, with the MoLSP facing a huge reform agenda, requiring heavy legislative and administrative adjustments, suffering at the same time from capacity shortages both at national and local levels. Similar is the situation for the national partners dealing with the migration agenda, where crucial under-resourcing, limited overall political recognition and ongoing considerations for institutional changes make effective programme delivery particularly difficult. This somehow reflects a limited interest of the government in pro-actively managing migration, particularly in tackling labour migration. The programme has made very good use of existing inter-ministerial working groups and has also stimulated the establishment of further overall coordination mechanisms. It is very positive point that the YEM implementation and cooperation structures have encouraged the participation of many national stakeholders, in particular those not highly involved in the programme implementation. Full inclusion of the education sector as a key partner would have been beneficial for the programme.

The programme currently presents the best performing JP in Serbia. In particular the tangible results being produced by the youth employment component in terms of increased employability of young people from vulnerable groups through the YEF is fully appreciated both by national partners and final beneficiaries. The contribution to improved evidence-based policy making in youth employment is obvious. The YEM programme is expected to achieve most of its defined outcomes within the given timeframe for implementation. Results and impacts would be even stronger if the programme was given a time-limited extension. Adoption of strategic outputs and thus transferring them into intermediate and wider impacts is lagging behind schedule in some cases, such as certain parts of the social protection and labour migration components.

The likelihood for replication of successful pilot initiatives is good in general but since many initiatives, especially the integrated service delivery, has just started, even immediate impacts have not materialised yet. YEM has contributed to preparing the basis for further institutionalisation of social indicators. Harmonisation of their processing is pending on the by-law development on evidences in the revised social protection system. The outcome of the integrated service delivery piloting will be a finalised model, which will enable NES and CSWs to address jointly the issue of disadvantaged unemployed people, and which approach can be applied to the entire country. In this respect, the positive role of the YEM JP is already visible when it comes to institutional cooperation but more needs to be done to bring the model into effective inter-institutional practice. More difficult to predict are the wider consequences of the integrated service model when it comes to activation of social benefit receivers and their integration into the labour market. Much will depend on the revised social protection legislation being put in place soon and the pro-active engagement of NES and CSW branches in making the integrated service model a success. Expectations in terms of creating employment for young social benefit receivers are low in the field. Employment rates between 5% up to 15% for those young people benefiting from the integrated service delivery model are considered already as a success at the level of local NES and CSWs.

For some activities, follow-up actions are already being considered or have started by means of the EU pre-accession instrument and other support mechanisms. Nevertheless, the underlying reform agenda is substantial and ambitious for Serbia. An extension would allow the deepening of impacts, notably legislative and administrative improvements, and the strengthening of immediate and longer term sustainability. Considerations in respect of a YEM II programme are being initiated. Taking into account the political dimension of the particular intervention area and the success of programme being achieved, continued support from UN funds should be regarded as highly beneficial.

Active promotion of the programme as a joint exercise and its materialising effects is adequate but, while accepting the success of the YEM JP, there is still some room for improving communication and advocacy. The programme, largely presenting a case of good practice, would certainly benefit from it. Moreover, the outputs of the migration component, where national partners’ actions have been quite modest so far, would certainly benefit from increased promotion.

Despite the success of YEM JP, implementation has suffered from the prevailing implementation approach for JPs, namely the absence of a strong and integrated programme management, coordination and reporting structure and limited integration of inputs into joint work packages demonstrated by the factual separation and presentation of individual agency inputs already at the initial design stage. Joint programming is also still too much based on a segregated approach based on individual agency considerations which are later harmonised under a JP umbrella. Whilst the overall programming efforts are clearly need-driven a stronger leadership role of the national partners in planning would still be desirable.Differences in planning cycles, operational procedures and reporting systems also create difficulties for joint programming and increase the administrative burden for all agencies involved. Whilst individual components are largely managed well by the individually responsible agencies, YEM Serbia has demonstrated that strong overall leadership and guidance is unlikely to be achieved on the basis of independent parallel budgeting and implementation provisions. Overall cost effectiveness, above individual agencies’ parts, is difficult to predict in respect to value-for money and synergetic effects from the prevailing JP approach.

* 1. **Lessons learned**

Joint programming and joint programmes

The evaluation findings raise wider questions about joint programming. Joint programming should not be an end in itself and it would be useful to develop criteria to determine when joint programming is the most appropriate approach. In the case of YEM Serbia the joint programme was based on the given thematic window, and within limitations, such as the rather isolated and low funded migration part, the programming approach has largely fulfilled its purpose. Clear expectations of joint programming and indicators for measuring its efficiency and effectiveness in terms of process and outcomes are welcome, however. Adherence to mandates, while a good idea in principle, creates challenges for joint programming and can potentially reduce efficiency.

Management and coordination mechanisms for JPs need to be explored and agreed by the UN agencies involved prior to implementation. Efficient programme implementation by means of independent parallel streams raises questions on overall efficiency and cost-effectiveness. A way forward could be seen in the form of a revised implementation approach giving the UN Resident Coordinator a supervisory role in managing JPs. This would require inter-agency agreement.

Youth employment and migration

Feedback from field visits confirms that local institutions involved in piloting can be greatly encouraged and motivated by clear coordination, guidance and information dissemination from the respective central state institution. For instance, good examples have been found in the areas of NES and Youth Offices. On the other hand, CSWs often complained about a lack of information and guidance from the MLSP when it came to their role and expectations as regards piloting innovative concepts at local levels. Here, apparently, too much advocacy and information responsibility was left with the agencies and contractors.

Social enterprise has been one of the innovative elements in the programme. The allocation given for this is clearly insufficient to achieve broader impacts outside of these immediately assisted companies. The thematic context however currently receives great attention in Serbia and many NGOs are actively facilitating the development of social enterprises as a means to provide employment possibilities for vulnerable groups. Future UN assistance in this area could greatly enhance the successful introduction of this measure. In particular, piloting and outreach could immediately provide socio-economic improvements because the current legal base does not recognise social enterprises and their status and tasks are still subject to political and administrative discussions.

Migration does not receive sufficient attention by the national stakeholders, despite increased awareness on the prevailing adverse socio-economic trends. It is apparent that the external migration agenda is driven entirely by those countries concerned with illegal and unregulated migration. The responsible national institutions still have a low profile and very limited competencies and funds. The issue of internal migration should receive stronger consideration once the Serbian regional and rural development policies move towards the adoption of the aims and requirements of the EU social and economic cohesion agenda.

1. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

This Report recommends three sets of actions. One set of recommendations concerns design of future joint programmes, whilst the second set of recommendations focus on the YEM JP, and in particular the need to strengthen communication and advocacy. Thirdly, proposals are made for extending the programme duration in order to emphasise its success, completeness and sustainability. More specific recommendations will be in the monitoring reports being produced from the second programme monitoring round, held in February and March 2011.

**5.1 MDG-F Secretariat**

Extension of programme duration

Together with other institutions and partners involved, the Secretariat should consider granting a time extension to this programme. Despite the fact that the achievement of objectives within the current timeline is considered very good and partly excellent, more time would be beneficial to allow the YEM programme’s immediate impacts to appear more visibly. In this event, programme success and the good practice character of YEM Serbia could be much better explored and disseminated. A no additional cost extension of 6 months would allow the follow up of sustainability actions being taken by the national partners. The benefits from an extension could even be further strengthened by actively seeking additional donor funds in order to allow a limited number of extra activities to take place.

**5.2 YEM JP Project Management Committee**

Extension of programme duration

The YEM PMC should take a favourable view on extending the programme lifetime. In order to identify financial means for an extension an enlarged PMC should be organised in the form of a “sustainability conference”. The purpose is to present the achievements today and the detailed prospects for sustainability, as well as further activities needed for immediate strengthening of impacts and sustainability. The donor community should be invited as the main target group of such conference, and their ideas for providing funding for covering an extended programme period should be explored. National partners, in particular, MERD, should consider leading presentations and discussions in such a conference.

Remaining programme time, in particular in the case of any extension granted, should be utilised to incorporate education and vocational training elements into the remaining programme activities. The Ministry of Education, including its regional centres, and institutions dealing with vocational training, should be invited to take a stronger interest in the programme, its outcomes and perspectives.

Communication and advocacy

There is still a need – and sufficient time - to further strengthen the joint communication and advocacy campaign for the programme. The JP Manager should be requested to further increase the efforts for promoting programme achievements under the unified umbrella of the MDG-F joint programme.

In line with launching the Campaign on Migration, the JP Manager should consider to using this activity as a basis for promoting all other outputs produced by the migration component and to call for immediate adoption and absorption by the national authorities. The Commissariat for Refugees and the Ministry of Diaspora should undertake further immediate measures to ensure greater involvement and quicker decision-making as concerns the output of the labour migration component.

There is a need for all government partners to continue with providing training on technical needs, awareness and increased acceptance as concerns all aspects of the YEM activities, in particular in respect to the integrated service model and case management. In the absence of stable staffing in many areas supported by the YEM JP it will be important to further promote the identification and use of sustainable training systems, in particular the provision of regular training courses and counselling activities, financed from national funds, which particularly allow new incoming staff and final beneficiaries to acquire their first hands-on knowledge.

Design of future joint programmes

Future joint programmes in the area of YEM should take account of the need to be fully inclusive by actively involving the education and vocational training sector at the programming stage. Ministry of Education needs to be a key partner in all future similar activities.

In the event of a future programme having a migration component, it is recommended that migration activities are designed as an important cross-cutting issue, complementing all other programme activities accordingly. Capacity building in migration management is needed in order to support increased awareness on the migration issue as such and to build up experience for improved coordination and implementation of migration policy measures. Special attention should be given to the identification and inclusion of returnees, a particular vulnerable group that does not receive sufficient consideration in the current programme.

Future support to social protection should deeply explore ways for increasing employment perspectives for young social benefit receivers benefiting from the integrated service model. Moreover, the selection of future pilot areas for employment interventions should take account of the rather privileged situation of the city of Belgrade. Pilot interventions targeting the most vulnerable groups in the labour market should preferably take place in socio-economically disadvantaged locations outside of the capitol area.

Design of future JPs should put clear emphasis on exploring coordination and management mechanisms in order to strengthen efficiency. Design of future JPs should also actively promote the identification of synergy effects. Future JP needs to ensure that programme consistency is ensured also via a common communication platform. Creating a unified identity is a key requirement for a successful JP. It is important that all parties agree to communicate consistently on the purpose and expected results of the government reform, effort. Individual national counterpart or agency results nevertheless have to acknowledged, but should be communicated in a harmonised way. A revised and really unified implementation approach giving the UN Resident Coordinator a supervisory role in managing JPs could effectively improve the quality of programming, implementation and communication.

**ANNEXES**

**Annex 1 – Evaluation matrix**

**#**

| **Overall evaluation question** | **Key**  **question** | **Specific**  **sub-question** | **Data**  **sources** | **Data collection method** | **Indicators/ success standards** | **Methods**  **for data analysis** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EQ 1 –**  **Design level** | ***Relevance:***  ***The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the MDG goals and the policies of associates and donors.*** | Is the identification of the problems, inequalities and gaps, with their respective causes, clear in the joint programme? | Programme documentation | Desk study | Clarity of objectives;  Quality of strategic planning documentation;  Availability of needs assessment;  Alignment of programme activity to real needs | Qualitative analysis of data |
| Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women, and men in the areas of intervention? | Programme documentation;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Alignment of programme activity to real needs;  Any important area not covered by the programme that should have been included | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent has the intervention strategy been adapted to the areas of intervention in which it is being implemented? What actions does the programme envisage to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural context? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of programme obstacles and related corrective actions | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Are the follow-up indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme? | Programme documentation;  Progress/ monitoring reports | Desk study | Quality of strategic planning documentation and monitoring indicators | Qualitative analysis of data |
| To what extent has the MDG-F Secretariat contributed to raising the quality of the design of the joint programmes? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Support given during programming | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| ***Ownership:***  ***Effective exercise of leadership by the country’s social agents in development interventions*** | To what extent do the intervention objectives and strategies of the Joint Programme respond to national and regional plans and programmes, to identified needs, and to the operational context of national politics? | Programme documentation;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Quality of strategic planning documentation | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent have the country’s national and local authorities and social agents been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the development intervention? | Programme documentation;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Whether stakeholders were consulted;  Degree of consultation | Qualitative analysis of data  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| **EQ 2**  **Process level** | ***Efficiency:***  ***Extent to which the resources/inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results*** | How well does the joint programme’s management model – that is, its tools, financial resources, human resources, technical resources, organizational structure, information flows and management decision-making – contribute to obtaining the predicted products and results? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Managerial and administrative capacities;  Quality of management/ monitoring process;  Clear allocation of the roles and responsibilities within and between agencies;  Availability of procedures and guidelines | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other and with the government and civil society? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation? | Programme documentation;  Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Quality of structured coordination process;  Clear allocation of the roles and responsibilities within and between agencies;  Availability of procedures and guidelines | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that prevent counterparts and beneficiaries from becoming overloaded? | Programme documentation;  Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Quality of structured coordination process;  Clear allocation of the roles and responsibilities within and between agencies;  Availability of procedures and guidelines | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure the completeness of the joint programme’s results? How do the different components of the joint programme interrelate? | Programme documentation;  Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Quantitative/ qualitative measure of outputs;  Quantitative/ qualitative description of tools/ activities/ resources;  Unused resources/ excess resources provided;  Factors that contributed to achieving/ non-achieving outputs | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Are work methodologies, financial tools, etc. shared among agencies and among joint programmes? | Programme documentation;  Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Clear allocation of the roles and responsibilities within and between agencies;  Availability of procedures and guidelines;  Quality of communication | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Have more efficient (sensitive) and appropriate measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural context identified? | Programme documentation;  Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of programme obstacles and related corrective actions | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| ***Ownership:***  ***Effective exercise of leadership by country’s social agents in development interventions*** | To what extent have the target population and the participants made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation have taken place? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Actual involvement of beneficiaries in implementation | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent have national public/ private resources and/ or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme’s objective and produce results and impacts? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of resources and counterparts engaged in implementation | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| **EQ 3**  **Results level** | ***Effectiveness:***  ***Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance.*** | Is the programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results?   * 1. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?   2. To what extent is the programme contributing to the goals set by the thematic window, and in what ways? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Availability of improved procedures, guidelines and strategies;  Availability of suitably qualified skilled staff and adequate financial resources;  Extent to what MDG-F assistance has contributed to the improvements;  Factors contributing to effectiveness/ ineffectiveness;  Prevailing observed changes in political/ administrative behaviour, procedures, structures;  Prevailing observed changes identifiable for the national/regional macro- and/or micro socio-economic situation | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Timeliness of outputs produced | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Do the outputs produced meet the required high quality? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Quality of outputs produced | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Does the programme have follow-up mechanisms (to verify the quality of the products, punctuality of delivery, etc.) to measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of planned/ realized follow up mechanisms | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Is the programme providing coverage to beneficiaries as planned? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Extent of beneficiary coverage | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving? | Programme documentation;  Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of innovative measures and concepts | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of good practice | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| In what ways has the joint programme contributed to the issue of fair youth employment? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of measures facilitating fair youth employment | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| In what ways has the joint programme contributed to the issue of internal and/or external migration? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of measures facilitating the reduction of migration problems | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of measures facilitating the reduction of disparities as concerns sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EQ 4**  **Sustainability** | ***Sustainability:***  ***Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.*** | Are the necessary premises occurring to ensure the sustainability of the impacts of the joint programme? At local and national level:   * + 1. Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions?     2. Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme and to repeat it?     3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national and local partners?     4. Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?     5. Is the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure a cycle that will ensure the sustainability of the interventions? | Programme documentation;  Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Availability of financial/ human means and networks for continuation of activities and further improvements;  Outputs contribute to achievement of the strategic objectives;  Horizontal public administration and national/ regional cooperation systems stable and adequate;  Ongoing national finance available for maintenance, insurance, replacements, consumables, etc.;  Secured provisions in place for ongoing staffing, staff replacement and training;  Procedures and systems fully documented, with defined responsibility for updating | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent are the visions and actions of partners consistent or divergent with regard to the joint programme? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Consistency of visions/ actions with agreed measures;  Ownership is demonstrated by managers responsible for onward strategic implementation of programme outputs | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |
|  |  | In what ways can governance of the joint programme be improved so that it has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability? | Progress/ monitoring reports;  Stakeholder opinion | Desk study;  interviews | Identification of programme measures for increased strengthening of sustainability | Qualitative analysis of data;  Interpretation of interviews and observations |

**Annex 2– Serbia Youth Employment and Migration – Hierarchy of outcomes**

**Wider societal outcomes**

UNDAF Outcome 3.7 – Improved Network of Employment Services and Strengthened Employment Promotion Policies

UNDAF Outcome 3.1 – Sustainable Development Plans that Effectively Respond to the Need of People, Communities and Promote Rural Development

**Intermediate outcomes**

Intermediate outcomes

1. Youth employment and Migration Policy Objectives are included into National Development Strategy

3. Integrated Employment and Social Services Targeting Young Returnees and Other Disadvantaged Young Women and Men Implemented in Three Target Districts

2. National Institutions Develop Integrated Labour Market and Social Services that Meet Employment and Migration Policy Objectives Targeting Disadvantaged Young Women and Men

**Immediate outcomes**

2.1. A system integrating labour market, migration and social services for youth established and functioning

2.2. The capacity of the National Employment Service, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and Ministry of Youth and Sport to deliver targeted youth employment and social services strengthened

2.3. A long-term national financial mechanism to implement employment measures targeting disadvantaged youth established and implemented

3.1. Local partnerships for youth employment strengthened to coordinate implementation of employment programmes that are linked to social services

3.2. Integrated packages of active labour market measures implemented through the financing of the Youth Employment Fund in the target districts

3.3. Youth awareness raised on existing local services as well as on risks of irregular migration

* 1. Knowledge base on youth employment and migration improved to inform national development strategy and action plans
  2. Policy on management of labour migration, including returns of young Serbians, developed and linked to employment policy and strategies
  3. Youth employment and migration targets included in national development strategy

**Annex 3 – Overview Serbia Youth Employment Fund**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **TOTAL** | | | **Belgrade** | | **Pcinjski** | | **S. Backa** | | **Nisavski** | | **Pomoravski** | | **Categories** | | | |
| **Measure** | **YEF** | **NES** | **TTL** | **YEF** | **NES** | **YEF** | **NES** | **YEF** | **NES** | **YEF** | **NES** | **YEF** | **NES** | **Women** | **Roma** | **PWDs** | **Returnees** |
| Training | 802 | 535 | 1337 | 38 | 60 | 149 | 31 | 302 | 192 | 241 | 160 | 72 | 92 | 628 | 281 | 13 | n.a. |
| Self employment | 85 | 53 | 138 | 11 | 6 | 18 | 5 | 34 | 32 | 8 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 52 | 11 | 6 | n.a. |
| Job creation for PWDs | 49 | 45 | 94 | 28 | 25 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 37 | 2 | 94 | n.a. |
| Work placement | 0 | 330 | 330 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 133 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 50 | 138 | 36 | 0 | n.a. |
| **TOTAL** | **936** | **963** | **1899** | **77** | **160** | **170** | **68** | **346** | **366** | **255** | **213** | **88** | **156** | **855** | **330** | **113** | **n.a.** |

**Annex 4 – Indicators of Achievement**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome of Joint Programme: 1. Youth Employment and Migration Policy Objectives are Included into National Development Strategy** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Outcome** | **SMART Outputs** | | **Responsibility** | | **Observation/ Remarks** |
| **1.1. Knowledge base on youth employment and migration improved to inform national development strategy and action plans.** | At least 15 key indicators of the youth  labour market, including informal employment and migration developed and regularly collected | | ILO | | 15 indicators of the youth labour market have been developed and are computed regularly on the basis of data collected bi-annually through the LFS. Data collected by the LFS has additionally been improved and expanded, so that it now provides for data on youth transition from school to work and internal movement. |
| At least 5 key youth migration indicators developed and regularly collected | | IOM | | First draft of survey on Diaspora completed and presented to inter-ministerial coordination body on migration. Revised second draft completed.  15 migration indicators are computed and segregated from LFS data. |
| At least 10 key indicators for youth social protection developed and regularly collected | | UNICEF | | 10 national and local indicators on youth social protection defined and principal collection methods established. |
| Number of youth labour market, migration and social protection indicators integrated into the DevInfo database system[[3]](#footnote-3) | | UNICEF | | Capacity building for employment policy makers has been conducted through a series of training activities on data requirements and analysis as well as labour market indicators.  The Employment Strategy 2011-2020 features five youth labour market indicators. |
| Number of developed youth labour market indicators used in policy-making | | ILO | | 15 indicators of the youth labour market have been developed and are computed regularly on the basis of data collected bi-annually through the LFS. |
| Number of developed youth migration  indicators used in policy-making | | IOM | | Proposed youth migration indicators not put in use yet. |
| Number of developed youth social protection indicators used in policy-making | | UNICEF | | Proposed social protection indicators not put in use yet. |
| Data for national MDG indicators collected | | IOM | | Indicator not directly related to programme outcomes. RSO is collecting data for national MDG indicators with regular bi-annual updates. MDG indicators incorporated into National Development Strategy; Strategy not approved yet. |
| **1.2. Policy on management of labour migration, including returns of young Serbians, developed and linked to employment policy and strategies.** | Labour migration policy and action plan with specific priorities and outcomes, which are aligned with national MDG indicators, adopted by the Serbian Government | | IOM | | Consultations with MMERD, Ministry for Diaspora and Commissariat for Refugees completed and priorities for LMS agreed.  Workshop on labour migration strategy for inter-ministerial working group organised.  MERD supported by YEM with drafting of the new law on employment of foreigners.  White paper for a labour migration strategy for Serbia completed. |
| **1.3. Youth employment and migration targets included in national development strategy.** | Number of measurable targets on youth employment included in the national development strategy | | ILO | | Following the work commissioned by YEM JP on youth employment projections and target setting for the Employment Strategy 2011-2020, the MERD included a set of six measurable youth employment targets into the Strategy. These are to be achieved by 2020 as follows:   1. Youth activity rate 30.7% 2. Youth employment rate 23.3% 3. Youth unemployment rate 24% 4. Ratio of youth unemployment rate to general unemployment rate 2.1:1 5. Youth (15-19) participation in education 90% 6. Youth (20-24) participation in education 40% |
| Expenditure for reaching measurable targets on youth employment envisaged by national development strategies planned in the budgetary framework | | ILO | | Currently considered by MERD |
| Number of measurable targets on youth migration included in the national development strategy | | IOM | | Principal provisions made in the white paper on labour migration. No immediate results yet. |
| Expenditure for reaching measurable targets on youth migration envisaged by national development strategies planned in the budgetary framework | | IOM | | Principal provisions made in the white paper on labour migration. No immediate results yet. |
| One Advocacy campaign conducted by  organizations representing the interests of young people to prioritize youth  employment and migration targets in national development policies | | UNDP | | Done. As a result of the NGO advocacy campaign, a Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry and Economy and Regional Development and Ministry of Education has been signed as a foundation to introduce entrepreneurial learning into the Serbian educational system. Another outcome of the advocacy campaign is the establishment of “advocacy base”, a core group of interested NGOs and institutions, which will continue advocating as a group. |
| **Outcome of Joint Programme: 2. National Institutions Develop Integrated Labour Market and Social Services that Meet Employment and Migration Policy Objectives Targeting Disadvantaged Young Women and Men** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Outcome** | **SMART Outputs** | | **Responsibility** | | **Observation/ Remarks** |
| **2.1. A system integrating labour market, migration and social services for youth established and functioning.** | An integrated service delivery system based on referral targeting disadvantaged youth developed | | ILO | | The inter-ministerial working group, established through YEM JP, developed a set of operational procedures for the delivery of integrated services to disadvantaged youth. The final system of integrated service delivery will be developed taking into account the experience and lessons learned stemming from the piloting that commenced in February 2011. |
| **2.2. The capacity of the National Employment Service, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and Ministry of Youth and Sport to deliver targeted youth employment and social services strengthened.** | Number of NES Branch Offices participating in delivery of and type of services that are integrated to target the needs of disadvantage youth | | ILO | | Piloting of the integrated service delivery model commenced in February 2011 in seven municipalities. A functional assessment of the NES has been carried out by YEM in order to identify areas for improvement of NES client services and recommendations have been presented to NES and MERD top management. These recommendations are guiding the NES capacity development activities. |
| Model for annual operational action plans of CSWs elaborated in the  Handbook for Operational Planning for CSW on the basis of the agreed  methodology, guidelines and minimum content with MLSP | | UNICEF | | Capacity building for AOP development finalised with 35 CSWs – Capacity building for local community informing and communication finalised with 11 CSWs.  Handbook on AOP for CSWs developed, printed and distributed. |
| Number of YO participating in the  delivery of and type of services that are  integrated to target the needs of disadvantaged youth | | UNICEF | | 6 YOs capacitated for developing project proposals addressing needs of disadvantaged youth recommendations for the improvement of youth employability of and NES functioning. |
| Number of disadvantaged and returning youth treated with targeted employment and social services, disaggregated by type of assistance they receive from CSW, gender and rural / urban residence | | UNDP | | 18 CSW beneficiaries included into “on the job- training”. Desegregation - 13 female and 5 male, social assistance beneficiaries, 11 belonging to Roma minority, 2 female domestic violence victims (one currently lives in shelter). |
| Number of referrals of disadvantaged young women and men between CSW, NES branch offices and local Youth Offices demonstrating an improved mechanism for integrated service delivery | | UNDP | | Not available. |
| **2.3. A long-term national financial mechanism to implement employment measures targeting disadvantaged youth established and implemented.** | A long-term financial mechanism (Youth Employment Fund) set up to implement employment measures | | UNDP | | Models for assuring sustainability of the YEF have been presented to the Government. At the moment it is expected that the YEF will continue as a separate budget line within NES. |
| Number of active labour market programmes by type targeting disadvantaged youth, including young returnees financed by the YEF (at  both national and local level) | | ILO | | A set of six measures, designed to be combined and to complement each other are financed by the YEF. The measures are targeted at youth, 15-30 years of age, with low education and unemployment lasting at least three months:   1. Institution based training 2. Pre-employment qualification 3. Work training 4. Employment subsidy 5. Work trial 6. Self employment   Additionally, three more measures are offered to Persons with disabilities: adaptation of work premises and/or work stations and wage subsidy and two grants are offered for single parents and unemployed residing in rural areas in the form of a child care grant and mobility grant. |
| Cost-effectiveness of active labour market programmes targeting disadvantaged youth, including young returnees, financed by the YEF (at both national and local level) assessed | | ILO | | Preliminary work on assuring quality data has been conducted. IT software has been designed and attached to the NES Unified Information System to allow for the calculation of total financial expenditure per individual beneficiary. Cost effectiveness assessment is possible only at a later stage once activities have finished. |
| Framework for the development and  management of PPPs developed | | ILO | | Initial analysis revealed that PPP in Serbia does not exist yet. Therefore, the activity has been re-oriented towards social enterprises. Analysis of the existing legal framework for social enterprises with recommendations for amending legislation has been conducted. A guide for establishing social enterprises within the current legislative framework is being prepared. |
| At least 10 private enterprises are  contributing to selected youth employment initiatives through CSR | | UNDP | | 12 social enterprises are being supported with micro-grants in order to receive their operations (marketing, financing, business planning etc.) and thus to foster their employment possibilities. |
| **Outcome of Joint Programme: 3. Integrated Employment Programmes and Social Services Targeting Young Returnees and Other Disadvantaged Young Women and Men Implemented in Three Target Districts** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Outcome** | **SMART Outputs** | **Responsibility** | | **Observation/ Remarks** | |
| **3.1. Local partnerships for youth employment strengthened to coordinate implementation of employment programmes that are linked to social services.** | Local councils identified in at least 6 municipalities for capacity building | UNDP | | Assessment of capacity of all local councils in the three target regions completed – results include recommendations of six municipal councils which will get further support through the JP in order to identify priorities for inclusion of vulnerable youth and implementation of active labour market measures on the municipality level. | |
| Local DevInfo databases for 6 focal municipalities developed and functional | UNICEF | | Ongoing. | |
| Local strategies, plans and reports in 6 focus municipalities are referring to  DevInfo database as a source of information | UNICEF | | Year 3 activity. Training in selected municipalities started in January 2011. | |
| At least 6 municipalities in the 3 target districts produce annual reports providing updated data on youth that is instrumental for evidence-based policy making and strategies regarding youth  employment | UNICEF | | Ongoing. Capacities of local employment councils to develop local employment action plans strengthened through series of trainings provided.  Development of the "Guide for Development of Local Employment Action Plan" supported which is now widely used by local employment councils. | |
| Number of secondary eligibility criteria defined to prioritize and coordinate the  implementation of employment programmes for disadvantaged youth that are linked to available social services in each NES Branch Office | UNDP | | Not available yet. | |
| At least 6 municipalities successfully using a set of replicable resources (funds, project ideas) for the delivery  of integrated services to disadvantaged young men and women | UNDP | | Mentoring support to local policy councils completed, resulting in identification of priority categories of vulnerable young unemployed persons to be supported through the Youth Employment Fund. | |
| Number of disadvantaged young men and women informed about and  participating in employment programmes and/or social services for the first time as a result of improved outreach activities of state institutions | UNDP | | Not available yet. | |
| Number of annual operational action plans of CSWs developed and implemented  Number of CSW offices in 6 key municipalities use referral and information outreach methods targeting disadvantaged youth. | UNICEF | | 10 CSWs strengthened to produce AOP by October 2010.  10 CSWs produced own AOPs by end of 2010. | |
| Number of CSW and NES branch offices covering municipalities in the three target districts participating in the delivery of and type of services that are integrated to target the needs of disadvantaged youth | UNDP | | Ongoing. Mentoring support to local policy councils completed, resulting in identification of priority categories of vulnerable young unemployed persons to be supported through the Youth Employment Fund. | |
| Number of Youth Offices ‘ staff participating in number of local council meetings regarding activities affecting  youth | IOM | | Not available. | |
| At least 6 Youth Offices established InfoPoints | UNDP | | InfoPoints established in 17 municipalities enabling better access to information to youth; Capacities of Youth Offices to autonomously manage info-points developed. | |
| At least 6 Youth Offices autonomously manage InfoPoints | UNDP | |
| Number of young women and men utilizing information available through pilot InfoPoints | UNDP | | Info-points have been used by approximately 4350 beneficiaries since their establishment. | |
| Number of YO managing programmes for disadvantaged youth | UNICEF | | YO project proposals of 4 (out of 5) finalised and activities initiated at the end of 2010. Projects are focused on vulnerable young people (with respective desegregation to young men and young women): Roma, young people with disabilities, beneficiaries of family allowance, young people with first and second levels of education, etc. The 4 projects expected to encompass cumulatively ~700 young people. | |
|  | At least 400 young women and men benefited from Youth Offices |  | | 4 municipalities are targeted by the programme. The number of benefitting youth varies between 50-120/ municipality. | |
| **3.2. Integrated packages of active labour market measures implemented through the financing of the Youth Employment Fund in the target districts.** | All NES Branch Offices in the three target districts provide integrated packages of active labour market measures targeting young returnees and other disadvantaged youth through the funding of the YEF | ILO | | ALMPs are available to unemployed youth in five districts in Serbia: Southern Backi, Pcinjski, Nisavski and Pomoravski in each of the five NES branch offices (Belgrade, Novi Sad, Vranje, Nis and Jagodina) and in each of the 42 outreach offices of these five branch offices. Measures have been successfully promoted. | |
| 1,750 disadvantaged youth (50% women, 20% Roma and 10% youth with disabilities) are trained in occupations required by enterprises and 60% are employed in decent work | UNDP | | So far 1,899 disadvantaged young people have been trained by the YEF:   * 855 women (45%) * 330 Roma (17,4%) * 113 PWD (6%) * 138 people received qualification for self-employment (7%)   No data on actual employment of beneficiaries available yet. | |
| 1,000 disadvantaged youth (50% women, 20% Roma and 10% youth with disabilities) participate in work placement programmes and 60% are employed in decent work | UNDP | |
| 250 disadvantaged youth (50% women, 30% Roma and 5% youth with disabilities) receive self-employment assistance | UNDP | |
| **3.3. Youth awareness raised on existing local services as well as on risks of irregular migration.** | At least 7,000 information packages developed and disseminated | IOM | | 6000 copies of revised Right to Know Guide being distributed in the first run. | |
| Number of disadvantaged youth informed about available services and safe migration through number of articles in national and local print media, number of TV appearances,  number of radio appearances  and number of advertisements aired/published on electronic and printed media | IOM | | Not available yet. Online info campaign completed and due to start in March/ April 2011. | |

**Annex 5 List of Interviews**

| Institution | Interviewee | Date |
| --- | --- | --- |
| IOM | Mr. Gerold Schwarz  Programme Manager | 21/02/2011  22/02/2011  01/03/2011 |
| ILO | Ms. Dragana Marjanovic  Deputy Programme Manager | 21/02/2011 |
| UNDP | Ms. Irma Lutovac  Deputy Programme Manager | 21/02/2011 |
| UNDP | Ms. Milena Isakovic  Coordinator | 21/02/2011 |
| UNDP | Ms. Natasa Ivanovic  Coordinator | 21/02/2011 |
| UNICEF | Ms. Ketlin Brasic  Coordinator | 21/02/2011 |
| UNICEF | Ms. Aleksandra Jovic  Coordinator | 21/02/2011 |
| UNICEF | Ms. Jelena Zajeganovic  Coordinator | 21/02/2011 |
| Ministry of Human and Minority Rights | Mr. Bela Ajzenberger  Assistant Minister | 22/02/2011 |
| Ministry of Youth and Sport | Ms. Jelena Knezevic  Department for Youth | 22/12/2011 |
| Ministry of Economy and Regional Development | Ms. Ljiljana Dzuver  Assistant Minister | 23/02/2011 |
| Ministry of Economy and Regional Development | Ms. Jelena Vasic  Advisor | 23/02/2011 |
| Republic Statistical Office | Ms. Dragana Djokovic Papic  Advisor | 23/02/2011 |
| Republic Statistical Office | Mr. Vladan Bozanic  Advisor | 23/02/2011 |
| Republic Statistical Office | Mr. Vladica Jankovic  Advisor | 23/02/2011 |
| Ministry of Labour and Social Policy | Ms. Nevena Rajkovic  Head of Sector for Normative and Legal Affairs | 23/02/2011 |
| NGO Amity | Ms. Nada Sataric  Coordinator | 23/02/2011 |
| Institute for Social Protection | Mr. Zika Gajic  Director | 24/02/2011 |
| Institute for Social Protection | Ms. Suzana Ivanovic  Advisor | 24/02/2011 |
| National Employment Service | Ms. Danica Vasiljevic  Deputy Director | 24/02/2011 |
| NGO Civic Initiatives | Mr. Marko Stojanovic  Coordinator | 24/02/2011 |
| NGO Group 484 | Mr. Gordan Velev  Coordinator | 24/02/2011 |
| National Employment Service Backi Petrovac | Ms. Miluska Ponigerova  Chief of Office | 25/02/2011 |
| Centre for Social Work Backi Petrovac | Mr. Rastislav Lebat  Case Manager | 25/02/2011 |
| Youth Office Backi Petrovac | Ms. Viera Tarnoci  Youth Coordinator | 25/02/2011 |
| National Employment Service Vranje | Mr. Zoran Antic  Chief of Office | 28/02/2011 |
| Centre for Social Work Vranje | Ms. Verica Mihajlovic Nikolic  Director | 28/02/2011 |
| Youth Office Surdulica | Mr. Miroljub Ivanovic  Youth Coordinator | 28/02/2011 |
| National Employment Service Palilula | Ms. Dragana Konakov Radovanovic  Director | 01/03/2011 |
| Centre for Social Work Palilula | Ms. Snezana Jovanovic  Director | 01/03/2011 |
| Local Employment Council Zvezdara | Ms. Dragana Poverenovic  NES Branch Office Director | 01/03/2011 |
| IOM | Mr. Gregoire Goodstein  Chief of Mission | 01/03/2011 |
| SIPRU | Ms. Jelena Milovanovic  Advisor | 02/03/2011 |
| SIPRU | Ms. Jelena Markovic  Advisor | 02/03/2011 |
| UN Resident Coordinator Office | Mr. William S. Infante  UN Resident Coordinator | 02/03/2011 |
| UN Resident Coordinator Office | Ms. Borka Jeremic  UN Coordination Specialist | 02/03/2011 |
| MDG-F | Ms. Vedrana Trsic  Communication and Advocacy Analyst | 02/03/2011 |
| Faculty of Economy | Mr. Mihail Arandarenko  Professor Labour Economy | 02/03/2011 |
| Commissariat for Refugees | Ms. Svetlana Velimirovic  Deputy Commissioner | 02/03/2011 |

**Annex 6 List of documents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Originator | Date | Title of Document |
| MDG-F/ Republic of Serbia | 2008 | Joint Programme “ Support to National Efforts for the Promotion of Youth Employment and Management of Migration ” |
| MDG-F/ Republic of Serbia | 2009/ 2010 | National Steering Committee Meeting Minutes |
| MDG-F | 2009 | Serbia YEM Inception Report and Work Plan |
| MDG-F/ Republic of Serbia | 2009/ 2010 | Programme Management Committee Meeting Minutes |
| MDG-F | 2009/ 2010 | Serbia YEM Joint Programme Monitoring Reports |
| MDG-F/ UNDP | 2010 | First Annual Report for the Youth Employment Fund |
| MDG-F/ ILO | 2009 | Improving the Serbian Labour Force Survey Data and Analysis |
| MDG-F/ ILO | 2009 | Improving NES services for disadvantaged youth |
| MDG-F/ ILO | 2009 | Integrated Service Delivery operational procedures report |
| MDG-F/ ILO | 2010 | Good Practices in Providing Integrated Employment and Social Services in Central and Eastern Europe |
| MDG-F/ ILO | 2009 | YEF Management Framework |
| MDG-F/ ILO | 2010 | YEF Sustainability Models |
| MDG-F/ ILO | 2009 | Guidelines to Administer Active Labour Market Programmes Targeting Disadvantage Youth |
| MDG-F/ ILO | 2009 | Employers occupation and skill needs survey |
| MDG-F/ ILO | 2009 | Skills survey report |
| MDG-F | 2010 | Performance Monitoring YEM 2010 |
| MDG-F | 2010 | YEM Programme Monitoring Framework Revised |
| MDG-F/ IOM | 2010 | Final Report –Capacity Building of the Youth Offices |
| MDG-F/ IOM | 2010 | EU Acquis on the Employment of TCN |
| MDG-F/ IOM | 2010 | Comparative Study on the Employment of Foreign Nationals  in France, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro |
| MDG-F/ IOM | 2010 | The Serbian Diaspora and Youth: Cross-Border Ties and Opportunities for Development – final draft |
| MDG-F/ UNDP | 2010 | Analysis and Model of Info Point Systems |
| MDG-F/ UNDP | 2010 | Analysis of innovative public- private partnership best practices related to youth employment |
| MDG-F/ UNDP | 2009 | Impact of the financial crisis on the labour market and living conditions outcomes |
| MDG-F/ UNDP | 2009 | Capacity Assessment of Local Policy Councils |
| MDG-F | 2010 | Assessment of youth offices’ activities and technical conditions relevant for establishment of info points |
| MDG-F | 2010 | Support to the employment of socially excluded youth -  guidelines for the development of integrated services of the labour market and social services |
| MDG-F/ ILO |  | Youth key labour market indicators |
| ILO | 2008 | Young people and their transition to decent work in the Western Balkans |
| ILO | 2006 | ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration  Non-binding principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration |
| Ministry of Economy and Regional Development | 2009 | Youth Employment Policy and Action Plan 2009-2011 |
| Ministry of Youth and Sport | 2010 | Strategy of Career Guidance and Counselling in the Republic of Serbia |
| Cathryn Thorup | 2004 | What works in youth employment in the Balkans |
| European Commission | 2009/2010 | Serbia Progress Report |

1. Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-related [targets] [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See also Mid-Term Evaluation of the Youth Employment and Migration Programme in Serbia. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. DevInfo is a database system to organize, store and display data in uniform format to facilitate data sharing between government departments and UN agencies using the same system, in order to monitor social development. It is integrated environment with unique possibility of connecting indicators with strategic frames like the Millennium Development Goals in order to monitor their realisation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)