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# GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ALMP | Active Labour Market Programme Measures |
| AOP | Annual Operational Plan |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisations |
| CSW | Centre for Social Work |
| ILO | International Labour Organisation |
| IOM | International Organisation for Migration |
| IPA | Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance |
| IoSP | Institute of Social Protection |
| JP | Joint Programme |
| LFS | Labour Force Survey |
| MDG-F | Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund |
| MDTF | Multi Donor Trust Fund |
| MERD | Ministry of Economy and Regional Development |
| MHMRPALSG | Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, Public Administration and Local Self-Government |
| MLSP | Ministry of Labour and Social Policy |
| MoYS | Ministry of Youth and Sports |
| NES | National Employment Service |
| NIP | National Investment Plan |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| NSC | National Steering Committee |
| PB | Peace Building |
| PIU | Programme Implementation Unit |
| PMC | Programme Management Committee |
| RSO | Republic Statistical Office |
| SCILD | Strengthening Capacity for Local Inclusive Development |
| SIPRU | Social Inclusion & Poverty Reduction Unit |
| SMART | Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-related [targets] |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UN-HABITAT | United Nations Human Settlements Programme |
| UNHCR | United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children’s Fund |
| YEM | Youth Employment and Migration |
| YO | Youth Office |

# PREFACE

This Mid-Term Evaluation covers assistance to the efforts of the Republic of Serbia by the Peace Building and Inclusive Development Programme (PBILD), implemented by the United Nations and funded by the Government of Spain under the Spanish MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F), and the Governments of Liechtenstein, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland under The Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF).

This Evaluation Report has been prepared by Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic (for the MDTF part) and Robin Philip Sluyk (for the MDG-F part) during September 2011 and reflects the situation as of 16 September, when the fieldwork was finalised. Formal programme documentation, programme progress reports, other relevant reports, documents and materials dealing with South Serbia, and interviews with a variety of stakeholders provide the basis for the assessment presented in this Report.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The “Peace Building and Inclusive Local Development Programme” (PBILD) is a joint UN initiative, implemented in South Serbia. It consists of two parts: the “Strengthening Capacity for Inclusive Local Development in South Serbia” (SCILD), financed by the Government of Norway, the International Development Cooperation Agency of Sweden (SIDA) and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) through the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF); and the “Promoting Peace Building in South Serbia” (PB), sponsored by the Government of Spain through the Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund (MDG-F).

The PBILD Programme supports development of institutional capacities to generate an **enabling environment** in which South Serbia can drive its own development and contribute to Serbian development as an active regional partner. The programme goal is to form a comprehensive and long-term partnership of local institutions that guide the development of the region and mitigate factors with potential to fuel the re-emergence of conflict. The Programme works in partnerships with national government – Ministry of Economy and Regional Development; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, Public Administration and Local Self-Government; Ministry of Labour and Social Policy; Ministry of Youth and Sports; institutions such as Coordination Body, Ombudsperson’s office, thirteen municipalities in the region, social service providers and a range of social agents from civil society, private sectors, other international and local organisations and citizens. Six participating agencies – UNDP, UN-HABITAT, UNICEF, UNHCR, IOM and ILO implement the programme activities.

The following is the brief summary of main evaluation findings of the Mid-Term Evaluation.

**EVALUATION FINDINGS**

**Relevance:** Overall, the PBILD is a very relevant and desired programme. It is based on clearly identified problems and takes into account the particularities and specific interests of women and men, ethnic minorities, disadvantaged groups and specific interests of different age groups. The programme has invested efforts to develop the monitoring and evaluation framework, which includes a set of SMART indicators, needed to measure the progress of the programme in achievement of its set goals. The Programme also conducted the Inclusive Development Opinion Survey and needs assessments within individual components, which provided baselines for the goof quality measurement of progress.

**Ownership:** The PBILD Programme’s interventions respond to national and regional policies and identified needs of the target population. The national authorities have participated fully into the programme design and implementation since the beginning of the programme. The local authorities did not participate in the design phase of the programme, but are fully engaged and supportive of the programme since the beginning of its implementation. The programme involves proactively civil society organisations and other social agents in its activities.

**Efficiency**: Overall, the programme efficiency has been significantly affected by initial delays during the inception phase: all but one of the UN Agencies managed to deliver timely. The programme has started accelerating its activities since the beginning of 2011, and once sub-projects have started, efficiency has been improving. The existent management model hampers the efficiency due to the fact that each participating agency applies its own administrative, financial and reporting procedures. The management team does not have sufficient power to manage the programme since this role is reduced to a coordinating one. The PBILD team does coordinate well in the field, however further opportunities should be sought to enhance coordination at the level of head offices of UN Agencies. The Programme has not sufficiently explored the potential synergies between programme components. The pace of implementation means that majority of programme outputs should be complete at the close of the programme.

**Effectiveness:** The PBILD Programme is making substantial progress towards the effective achievement of programme objectives, Millennium Development and thematic window goals.The PBILD programme delivers quality products, and shows flexibility to adapt its approach to best meet the needs of local counterparts and changing environment. Despite the delay, it is foreseen that the programme may achieve its planned outputs if it manages to continue the implementation rate it started to pick up around the time of this evaluation.

The Programme has established three important management and oversight bodies: the Programme Management Committee (PMC), the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Programme Steering Committee (PSC). These bodies are engaged in decision-making processes and oversight of the programme. The programme has devised and is implementing a set of interventions to respond to the needs of beneficiaries. There appears to be a good mix of final beneficiaries among different groups, such as national minorities, children, women and young people, as well as government institutions.

**Sustainability:** The Programme is strongly supported by national and local institutions. Nevertheless, the sustainability of results of the PBILD programme depends largely on the level of technical, human resource and financial capacities of government counterparts and their commitment to the sustainability of the PBILD components.

**Recommendations**

The following are the recommendations coming out of the Mid-Term Evaluation:

1. **Revise the Results Framework of the Programme**. The programme would benefit from revised results framework, which would include SMART outcomes, outputs and indicators.
2. **Continue efforts to integration inputs of individual UN Agencies into the ‘Delivering as One’ framework**. The Programme efficiency and effectiveness would benefit to a large extent from aligning the administrative, financial, reporting and importantly management procedures.
3. **Continue efforts to integration inputs of measurements to improve efficiency and effectiveness.** The use of Gantt charts is recommended. Future capacity building efforts (trainings, workshops etc) should include pre- and post knowledge testing mechanisms.
4. **Explore the potential synergies between programme components but also with other relevant programmes, interventions or initiatives that are implemented in South Serbia**. The programme did not succeed so far to find synergies between components implemented by different UN Agencies. Such synergies should be proactively explored and implemented to improve effectiveness and impact of the programme.
5. **Continue supporting and empowering local governments to fulfil their obligations towards protecting rights of their citizens**.
6. **Extend the programme duration**. The MTE would suggest a 9-12 month period.
7. **Devise an Exit Strategy for the Programme**.

**MAIN REPORT**

# 1. INTRODUCTION

|  |
| --- |
| 1.1. Background |

The current mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the South Serbia Joint UN Programme “Peace Building and Inclusive Local Development’ (PBILD)”, particularly its integral projects for “Strengthening Capacity for Inclusive Local Development in South Serbia (SCILD)” and "Promotion of Peace Building in South Serbia” (PB) was commissioned to the team of two evaluators in August 2011 to satisfy internal requirements for quality management and accountability in project management. The MTE exercise was conducted in the period August - September 2011, included internal consultation processes and the finalisation of the report for the SCILD and PB projects and their further incorporation into the integral report for the PBILD Programme by the evaluation team.

The timing and scope of the process are expected to substantively inform the continuation and completion of the project by 2012. As per specification from the UN, the geographical focus of the review concentrates on South Serbia, where the majority of interventions took place. As per the ToR and as further detailed in initial consultations between PBILD and the Evaluation Team, particular focus of the evaluation was to be laid on assessing relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, and sustainability prospects; and particularly to assess capacities and possible gaps in implementation of projects that are subject of this mid-term evaluation. The findings of the MTE will inform the Programme implementation in the remaining period of implementation.

Within the PBILD program, the project for “Strengthening Capacities for Inclusive Local Development in South Serbia” is jointly implemented by three UN agencies: UNDP, UNICEF and ILO, working together from the Project Office in Bujanovac. Three international donors fund the project, namely: the Swedish International Development agency (SIDA); Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC); and Kingdom of Norway. The support amounts to over USD 5,4 million and is channeled the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF).

The other part of the PBILD Programme, ‘Promoting Peace Building in South Serbia’ is jointly implemented by five UN agencies: UNDP, UNICEF, IOM, UN-HABITAT and UNHCR, an integral part of the Project office in Bujanovac. This part of the project is funded by the Spanish MDG-F and amounts to USD 2,5 million.

At the central level, the Ministry Human and Minority Rights, Public Administration and Local Self-Government is the lead ministry for the programme, while PBILD also cooperates with the Ministries for Youth & Sports; Education; Economy & Regional Development; Labour & Social Policy, and Health. Additionally, PBILD works closely with the Ombudsman’s Office, the Co-ordination Body for Presevo Bujanovac and Medvedja, and the Serbian Commissariat for Refugees.

At the local level, PBILD works with the 11 municipalities of Bojnik, Crna Trava, Lebane, Vlasotince, Medvedja, Bosilegrad, Bujanovac, Presevo, Surdulica, Trgoviste and Vladicin Han, and the two cities of Vranje and Leskovac.

|  |
| --- |
| 1.2. Evaluation purpose and scope |

Based on the guidance provided in the ToR and the review of the project documentation, the following evaluation matrix was developed, comprising of three main streams to be evaluated:

1. To determine the programme’s **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the National Development Strategies, the **Millennium Development Goals and the EU accession process**, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
2. To understand how the Joint Programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. The purpose of the analysis is to seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the **‘Delivering as One’-** framework.
3. To identify the programme’s **degree of effectiveness and sustainability** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives as specified in the Joint Programme project document.

|  |
| --- |
| 1.3. Methodology used in the evaluation |

The Mid-Term Evaluation of the PBILD Programme project details key areas and questions based on the scope of the evaluation questions, and provides an assessment of contributions and achievements under each of the project outcomes.

**Outcome 1** - Community Cohesion and Human Capital: Communities in South Serbia are stronger, more integrated, and better able to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict risk.

**Outcome 2** - Public Services: More equitable and improved access to public services and welfare benefits (including basic registration documentation, health and education)

**Outcome 3** - Economic Development: Increased overall economic prosperity of the region, and reduced discrepancies in wealth and employment between ethnic groups, and with other parts of the country.

**Outcome 4** – Migration Management: Migrants from the region fully participate in the social and economic life of the region and thereby contribute to the development of their wider communities and Serbia’s EU integration aspirations.

To respond to the specific structure of the PBILD Programme, which integrates two projects whose activities interlink and intertwine, the Evaluation Team works together to assess and analyse achievements and contributions that the actions of the two projects to the outcomes and the Programme goal.

This mid-term evaluation focuses on the actual performance of the JP, mainly on the outputs being produced. It assesses the effectiveness 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. A presentation of the EQs with corresponding judgment criteria, indicators, sources of information and Evaluation Question (EQ)-specific remarks on methodology are found in the Evaluation Matrix (Annex 1).

The methodology for preparing this evaluation report comprised initial data collection, document research and literature survey, and interviews (see Annex 2 and Annex 3). Following an initial desk analysis undertaken by the Evaluators, primary data has been gathered through structured and in-depth interviews with all the relevant stakeholders in Serbia. The field visit to South Serbia enabled direct contact with implementing bodies, programme partners, and other relevant stakeholders and constitutes an important source of information.

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

# 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION CARRIED OUT

## 2.1. Initial concept

The “Peace Building and Inclusive Local Development Programme” (PBILD) is a joint UN initiative, implemented in South Serbia. It consists of two parts: the “Strengthening Capacity for Inclusive Local Development in South Serbia” (SCILD), financed by the Government of Norway, the International Development Cooperation Agency of Sweden (SIDA) and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) through the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF); and the “Promoting Peace Building in South Serbia” (PB), sponsored by the Government of Spain through the Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund (MDG-F).

PBILD builds on the UN’s previous continuous programme interventions in South Serbia since the 2001 conflict (MIR and MIR2), and co-ordinates closely with PROGRES (the ‘European Partnership with Municipalities’ Programme), sponsored by the EU and the Government of Switzerland and implemented by UNOPS, which also covers the two districts of South Serbia where PBILD operates. Close co-ordination between PROGRES and PBILD has led to a clear division of labour on a number of areas, including gender regional working groups where PBILD focuses on South Serbia and PROGRES on its other region, South west Serbia.

**The overall objective of PBILD** is ‘to reduce the discrepancies that currently exist between Jablanica and Pcinja Districts and the remainder of Serbia’. This is to be achieved through the following outcomes as supported by the MDTF and the MDG-F:

**Outcome 1 - Community Cohesion and Human Capital: Communities in South Serbia are stronger, more integrated, and better able to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict risk**

 Output 1.1 - Increased confidence of local population in key institutions of local and national government

 Output 1.2 - Strengthened inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration among adolescents and young people

**Outcome 2 - Public Services: More equitable and improved access to public services and welfare benefits (including basic registration documentation, health and education)**

 Output 2.1 - Municipalities have strengthened ability to formulate, implement and monitor policies in relation to public service provision, and in particular, develop an awareness of the differential impact of policies on different ethnic groups

 Output 2.2 - Vulnerable and ethnic minority children have improved access to public services and benefits to which they are entitled

 Output 2.3 Improved quality of public services, especially in those sectors that have potential to increase inter-ethnic dialogue and reduce conflict risk

 Output 2.4 Support to capacity development and awareness raising of the role of Ombudspersons Outreach Office in South Serbia

**Outcome 3 - Economic Development: Increased overall economic prosperity of the region, and reduced discrepancies in wealth and employment between ethnic groups, and with other parts of the country**

 Output 3.1 - The labour market disadvantage of population groups and geographical areas (i.e. municipalities) reduced through more and better access to targeted active labour market programmes that respond to labour market requirements.

 Output 3.2 - Increased funding for regional and municipal level projects that will impact upon job creation

**Outcome 4 – Migration Management: Migrants from the region fully participate in the social and economic life of the region and thereby contribute to the development of their wider communities and Serbia’s EU integration aspirations.**

 Output 4.1 Municipal Administrative Services better meet the needs of Migrants  Output 4.2 Municipal Capacity Development to Manage Migration Issues

The **MDG-F** sponsored intervention is implemented together with the above outcomes, and focuses **on Outcome 1** with the following Outputs:

Output 1.1 Enhance political participation of women and ethnic minorities in South Serbia.

Output 1.2 Strengthened inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration among adolescents and young people.

Output 1.3 Strengthened capacities of local self-governments, institutions and civil society organisations to engage in conflict / violence prevention planning through conflict mediation training, participation, dialogue and partnerships for improved safety in municipalities and for better understanding of local aspects of conflict and adequate solutions.

Output 1.4 Displacement reduced through multi-faceted dialogue; improved livelihoods and living conditions for IDP-s (especially particularly vulnerable categories of the IDP population such as single headed female households).

PBILD thus contributes to achieving many of the Serbia UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) priorities and country programme outcomes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UNDAF Outcome | PBILD contribution |
| UNDAF Outcome 1: Strengthened Good Governance | In particular through capacity-building for local government on gender and minority rights, support for the Ombudsperson’s Office, and capacity-building and funding for civil society, including partnership work with local government. |
| UNDAF Outcome 2: Sustainable Development and Social Inclusion Enhanced | In particular through work on access to education and health services, through work to capacitate and empower youth, and through work on employment and upgrading vocational education training in the area. |
| UNDAF Outcome 3: Increased Regional Stability and Co- operation | In particular through work to promote regional development and co- operation across the PBILD target area and between local and central government, through both research on and capacity-building for migration management, and through facilitating and promoting partnership between civil society and local government. |

The entire PBILD JP uses a pass through fund modality through the MDTF office that resides with the UNDP HQ Belgrade office as Administrative Agent.

The PBILD Programme office in Bujanovac opened in March 2010. The multi-agency Programme team was fully established by July 2010.

|  |
| --- |
| 2.2. Description of the programme intervention so far - the hypothesis of change of the programme |

The PBILD programme applies a **holistic approach** towards peace building and inclusive development of South Serbia through combining interventions of building confidence, strengthening local governance mechanisms, providing employment and infrastructure development projects and building mechanisms for migration management. The Programme structure is complex and involves a range of partners, donors and stakeholders, requiring intensive coordination between the UN Agencies, the donors and the partners. This section provides the overview of achieved results within the timeframe covered by this MTE. Due to delays in the inception phase of the Programme, most programme activities are still in the initial phase of implementation. That is why this MTE only discusses the current state of affairs, as it was not possible at the time of finalisation of the Report to assess the overall contribution of the majority of activities to set objectives.

**Outcome 1. Communities in South Serbia are stronger, more integrated, and better able to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict risk**

Overall, the SCILD component of the work under Outcome 1 has only started, so it is too early to provide the assessment of the outcome. Nevertheless, the activities undertaken so far point towards great significance and added value of the Programme in the process of confidence and peace building in the target region. The Inclusive Development Opinion Survey produced by the Programme has brought significant information on the status of communities, especially in terms of social capital, opinions and perceptions of young people, minorities and women. These data are a valuable resource both for the Programme, whereby baselines have been established, but also for other stakeholders who work or plan to work in the area.

Partnership with the Coordination Body for Bujanovac, Presevo and Medvedja has initiated important moves forward in terms of supporting educational opportunities, and more coordination of work in the South Serbia, particularly the three above-mentioned municipalities. Work with youth leaders and youth offices on peer mediation has been very useful and provides strong prospects of increased communication and inter-ethnic links in South Serbia. Joint activities of the PBILD Programme and the Ministry of Youth and Sports (MoYS) have contributed to increased awareness of the need to support youth activities and exchanges through establishment and functioning of Youth Offices in local communities.

Safety Coalitions were established with the aim of monitoring the safety situation in eight partner municipalities, enhancing prevention that contributes to improve citizens’ safety. The Safety Coalitions provide the communities with recommendations through formulating Local Safety Strategies, as well as professional expertise when determining the needed activities in this area. Methodological Guidelines for Preparation of Safety Strategies have been prepared. Mediation was provided to local professionals and PBILD staff.

Through extensive and close cooperation with local government officials, the Serbian Commissariat for Refugees and the Centres for Social Work, sustainable accommodation solutions for IDP-s living in Collective Centres has been finalised. Data entry of dislocated registry books has finished, and the provision of legal aid to IDP-s has surpassed its foreseen targets.

* **Output 1.1 – Increased confidence of local population in key institutions of local and national government.**

This component of the PBILD programme was initiated by an Inclusive Development Opinion Survey in the target region. The purpose of the survey was two-fold: 1) to assess the opinions of the local population on issues such as: the level of trust and satisfaction with institutions; numbers of people (especially women and the youth) who voted in elections and their opinions; and the level of social capital and ties among different ethnic groups; and 2) to establish baselines for the work of the Programme towards enhancing confidence of local population in key institutions and national government. The Survey provided very important information on the status of social capital in South Serbia and crucial baselines for the work of the Programme.

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 1. Highlights from the Survey**  The Survey findings show that 48% of women voted in the last local elections in 2008. Also, the poll indicated high percentage of citizens from national minorities did vote in the last local elections[[1]](#footnote-1). The findings show important indications of social capital in the region, whereby 44% of Serb respondents object to Albanians and 32% to Roma as neighbours. Among Albanian respondents, 9% object to Serbs and 8% object to Roma as neighbours. Finally, 21% of Roma object to Albanians and 1% object to Serbs as neighbours. The survey on the level of trust to institutions indicates that 35% of local population are not aware of existence of the Coordination Body (CB); while 38% of these who are aware of this Body are not satisfied with their work. Importantly, 1.33 was the average score of trust in institutions, which was extremely low rating[[2]](#footnote-2). |

Based on the Survey findings, the Programme began its cooperation with the CB towards designing activities to support the work of this Body. A grant agreement was signed between the two partners in amount of 50,000 USD. The funds support activities of importance for building capacities and visibility of the Body and increasing its outreach in the local communities. The CB has undergone a series of capacity building activities. These activities included study tours for Working Groups for Higher Education towards establishment of higher education institution in the South Serbia. The study tour was organised in Vojvodina with the aim to visit and discuss with educational institutions operating in multilingual and mutliethnic communities. Also, the CB attended trainings on how to create educational and cultural policies. Within the outreach work of the Coordination Body, this institution developed a youth grant scheme to support youth projects that would deal with gender and interethnic relations. Out of four proposals, one project was selected.

* **MDG-F Output 1.1 - Enhance political participation of women and ethnic minorities in South Serbia**

The survey assessment ‘Gender Equality at the Local Level’ was undertaken, studying the position of women and men in social, political, economic and cultural life at local level. It resulted in recommendations that were published in the brochure ‘Women and men in South Serbia’. Targeted trainings were organised for Gender Councils, gender co-ordinators and the Gender Regional Working Group on gender mechanisms and policy formulation, as well as gender budgeting. The Training Needs Assessment for local self-governance, Co-ordination Body and representatives of the main political parties in Pcinja and Jablanica districts has been finalized. Training needs assessment on gender and minority rights in Jablanički and Pčinjski district was conducted in June 2011. Terms of Reference of the training for Representatives of the main political parties in South Serbia on how to formulate and advocate for inclusive development policies were developed.

The mapping of CSO-s and their needs in 13 municipalities is finished. The selection took place through the Regional Working Groups of the Local Economic Development Agencies. The mentoring project saw 15 CSOs applying for training in gender and minority rights, with 19 people attending. Contracts with 7 CSO-s from Jablanica and Pcinja districts were signed in support of implementing projects aimed at gender equality and minority rights and are ready for implementation in September 2011.

The selection of strategic documents has finished. Seven plans (a.o. Vladicin Han, Bujanovac, Surdulica, Medevedja, Lebane) will be revised, while one new plan (Vranjska Banja, a new municipality in its own right since early 2011) is included as well. Linkage is sought with the DevInfo System for the correct formulation of indicators.

The gender awareness training for local media journalists and editors and workshops (including development of curricula) were finalised on September 17, 2011. The mentoring to raise local media awareness and mentoring of, and capacity for gender- and minority rights-sensitive and conflict-sensitive reporting is ongoing.

* **Output 1.2 – Strengthened inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration among adolescents and young people.**

The Report with findings of the Social Inclusion Opinion Survey on Youth provided forimproved understanding of the situation among youth in south Serbia among youth and general public, and helped raise awareness on youth, current trends and perceptions among the youth, their needs and problems.

The PBILD programme has established strong partnership with the Ministry of Youth and Sports (MoYS) in Serbia. The two partners have jointly developed a range of advocacy and outreach activities for young people. Thanks to strong advocacy, the PBILD succeeded in establishing of one new and formal opening of additional two Youth Offices (YOs). The PBILD and the Ministry organised a range of capacity building activities for youth offices and relevant municipal representatives and CSOs in the region dealing with youth issues, which contributed to strengthening the YO regional networking and improving their links with the MoYS.

The PBILD programme and the MoYS jointly prepared a grants scheme for inter-ethnic relationship building, that consisted of two lots: a) partnership grants between Civil Society Organizations and Local Self-Governments and b) partnerships between Civil Society Organizations and Youth Offices from south Serbia focusing on strengthening inter-ethnic and inter- social understanding and co-operation through strengthening local youth policy and programmes. Ten projects have been selected. The Projects will start implementation in October 2011. It is expected that the projects will contribute to increasing youth participation, inter-ethnic collaboration and social inclusion of the most vulnerable youth.

* **MDG-F Output 1.2 - Strengthened inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration among adolescents and young people**

In addition to the CESID-implemented PBILD Inclusive Development Opinion Survey, which includes a specific chapter on youth in the region, the mapping of the local youth policy infrastructure and initial assessment of Youth Office capacities was finalised, which formed the basis for prioritisation of municipal support through grants and capacity development.

A PBILD youth workshop, ‘Strengthening of youth policy and youth programs in southern Serbia’, was held on 15 November 2010 with the Co-ordinators of Youth Offices, municipal representatives, CSO-s and the Ministry of Youth & Sport (MoYS). The workshop was organised in close collaboration with the MoYS and provided for participants’ definition of the required types of support for institutional development and capacity building in the implementation of youth policy at the local level by PBILD. Through the Inclusive Development Opinion survey, baselines on key indicators related to social inclusion, migration, interethnic relations and other topics relevant to youth were defined that were used to produce an application package on grants for youth projects. Youth related data were distributed amongst policy makers, youth clubs and the wider public, serving as a baseline for monitoring changes in support of social inclusion, participation and volunteering, as well as evidence for local policies.

* **MDG-F Output 1.3 - Strengthened capacities of local self-governments, institutions and civil society organisations to engage in conflict / violence prevention planning through conflict mediation training, participation, dialogue and partnerships for improved safety in municipalities and for better understanding of local aspects of conflict and adequate solutions.**

In close cooperation with partner municipalities, a total of 46 training sessions to more than 500 participants, Safety Council/Coalition members, Municipal staff and interns, and Police officers were delivered in 11 partner municipalities by seven “Safer Cities”- Trainers, who were selected in close collaboration with IOM. They are all local trainers from partner municipalities, and as a good example of capacity building, add a value to project sustainability. Up to date, the Safer Cities component delivered a total of 46 training sessions to more than 500 participants on participatory planning for improved urban safety. Methodological Guidelines for Preparation of Safety Strategies have been prepared and tailored from the UN-HABITAT Global Safer Cities Toolkit. Being involved in the formulation process through questionnaires, interviews, reporting and validation workshops, Safety Coalition members were directly involved in the formulation and finalisation of Safety Diagnoses. These were presented and adopted by present participants. In five municipalities, key priority areas were identified in consensus between present stakeholders, making a first step towards formulation of Safety Strategies/Action plans.

Through intervention by IOM, 30 representatives from key local institutions (Centres for Social Works, National Employment Service, primary and secondary schools, the media etc.) and CSO-s from Jablanicki and Pcinjski districts received the training in 3 modules (Conflict and Mediation-Concept and Context, The Role of a Mediator-Techniques and Skills of Mediation, Family and Partnership-Family Mediation) of conflict mediation training roll out which commenced in the reporting period. `Conflict management through mediation skills` training boosts local professionals understanding of conflict and their abilities to manage and mediate conflict in their every day jobs. Mediation training was also provided to PBILD staff.

* **MDG-F Output 1.4 - Displacement reduced through multi-faceted dialogue; improved livelihoods and living conditions for IDP-s (especially particularly vulnerable categories of the IDP population such as single headed female households).**

This output, in contrast with the overall implementation pace of PBILD, was finalised by July 2011, in line with its initially planned 18-month time frame. Moreover, many of the set targets have been overachieved. UNHCR achieved this milestone amongst others though activation of its professional partnership network with NGO-s PRAXIS, INTERSOS, the Danish Refugee Council, Vizija as well as through contracting with the Municipality of Vranje.

Through the free legal aid component, PBILD has successfully solved 2,569 legal aid requests instead of the initially planned 2,000. This was achieved by arranging for the service to be free of taxes. Additionally, due to savings made during purchases of building material, 12 (instead of 10) applications were approved, bringing the totals up to 33 (instead of 27) building material packages distributed. Finally, the purchase of the last six village houses under this project was approved in May 2011, resulting in a total of 24 (instead of 14). In all, fifteen families (37 persons) were enabled to leave the Collective Centers (CC) and move towards a permanent housing solution. Through the intervention, CC ‘Hotel Atina’ in Leskovac could close its doors.

The complete data entry of some 600,000 records from dislocated registry books from four municipalities in Kosovo was finalised by June 2011. Use was made of 20 unemployed people for data entry, in close coordination with the National Employment Service.

The beneficiaries of this Output have not only enjoyed a sustainable solution to their housing issues; this intervention also enabled them to focus on other important matters as job hunting and paying for school fees, while extending their social networks and speeding up their integration into society. Moreover, since the majority of the IDP families have an agricultural background, the village housing project enabled a more natural continuation of their lives. The legal aid has significantly helped families ease the tension of living without necessary documents. The automated records from the Municipalities of Gnjilane, Vitina, Kosovksa Kamenica and Novo Brdo will enable IDP-s to exercise their fundamental rights to easier access to public services.

**Outcome 2. Improved and more equitable access to public services and welfare benefits (including basic registration documentation, health and education) reduce feelings of exclusion and inter-ethnic tension.**

The PBILD Programme activities have so far initiated a series of improvements of the system of public services towards better and more equitable access by vulnerable and excluded groups. Groundwork for improved education of children, especially those from minority groups has been laid by investing in capacities of teachers to apply active learning methods and innovations in teaching Serbian as a foreign language. This activity will enhance potential and access of children from minority groups to further education and employment. The establishment of Ombudsperson outreach offices has been an important step forward towards ensuring better protection and inclusion of excluded groups, but also an investment in building confidence and trust in national institutions. The PBILD Programme also secured firm cooperation with relevant Ministries, local authorities, social service provider institutions, which is a strong investment into building sustainable structures and higher impact of achieved results.

* **Output 2.1 – Municipalities have strengthened ability to formulate; implement and monitor policies in relation to public service provision, and in particular, develop an awareness of differential impact of policies on different ethnic groups.**

The Programme has initiated its support to strengthening the municipal capacities to develop and implement quality policies by establishment of four Regional Working Groups (RWG) in order to strengthen local capacities and encourage regional networking. These RWGs are focusing on areas of: Gender Equality; Integrated Regional Development; Environment and Waste Management; and Migration and gather representatives from each of the 13 Jablanicki and Pcinjski district municipalities, as well as active civil society organizations. The working group sessions resulted in „terms of reference‟ for each RWG and the development of an action plan, including follow up work on raising awareness of local civil servants about topics of focus of each RWG. As they are regional in character, these bodies will bring significant contribution to building links and networks among professionals and political appointees from different municipalities, exchange of information and potentially joint regional or bilateral projects among municipalities in the region. Also, the work of these RWGs is expected to contribute to harmonization of approach and standards of work in relevant areas in the target municipalities.

The response to the weak statistics on children in South Serbia, especially at the local level, has been two-fold: investing in the statistical software - DevInfo, and developing the capacities of relevant municipal departments to develop social indicators, conduct M&E of inclusive development policies in communities, etc. Primary focus of the PBILD Programme was to enhance the use of the DevInfo as a user-friendly tool for monitoring the socio-economic situation, development results and the dissemination of data. The support to DevInfo was directed through work with the Republic Statistics Office to adapt DevInfo for use at local level. Trainings for various representatives of municipal authorities and other relevant actors in the PBILD target municipalities have been conducted to develop skills and knowledge for M&E, and the DevInfo.

* **Output 2.2 – Vulnerable and ethnic minority children have improved access to public services and benefits to which they are entitled.**

The Programme invested in ensuring access to free legal assistance for civil registration and obtaining personal documents for Roma in target communities. Through direct work with Roma representatives a total of 100 children filed requests for documents, out of which 78 have succeeded in getting the documents until today. The Programme also enabled 408 adults to obtain documents.

In order to enhance cooperation and coordination between different institution providing social protection and inclusion services in communities, the Programme facilitated a range of expert meetings gathering representatives of Centres for Social Work, municipal registry offices, police stations, trustees for IDP-s and refugees, health centres and CSO-s (especially those representing and/or dealing with vulnerable groups) in the target communities. These meetings were good venues for experts to discuss ways for cooperation, to exchange and learn about systemic obstacles and legislative gaps in the system for social protection and inclusion, and ways to facilitate civil registration procedures.

The programme also works closely with the Ministry of Health, to extend its work with Roma Health Mediators (RHMs) and primary health care institutions. So far, the Programme supported development of a software package for easier reporting by Roma Health Mediators in partnership with Telenor (a Norwegian mobile phone company), and commissioned the work for designing the package of interventions for improving access to health services for vulnerable children, especially Roma.

* **Output 2.3 – Improved qualities of public services, especially in those areas that have potential to increase inter-ethnic dialogue and reduce conflict risk.**

The strategy towards improving quality of public services for better inter-ethnic dialogue focuses on improvement of education system by investing in developing skills of teachers in the target educational institutions for child cantered learning, safe and stimulating learning environment. The PBILD Programme works with teachers, particularly those teaching Serbian as foreign language, on developing skills for applying active learning methods towards inclusive education (providing children with skills for creating their own knowledge and effective social communication).

Within these efforts, a special module of Active Learning teaching methodology for teaching Serbian and Albanian languages was developed and a series of in-service teacher training sessions were organised for 74 teachers in South Serbia. These trainings were useful space for teachers coming from different ethnic groups to discuss innovations and challenges in teaching Serbian as a foreign language, but also to meet and create links among themselves. Ten primary schools in the region participate in the implementation of the training package, while four schools in Presevo have been identified for piloting of the training module. The Ministry of Education endorses the developed module, which is a strong input for sustainability of the achievements.

* **Output 2.4 – Support to capacity development and awareness raising of the role of Ombudspersons Outreach Office in South Serbia.**

The PBILD Programme established cooperation with the Ombudsperson’s office and supported the Office to establish municipal ombudsperson outreach offices, as envisaged in the Law on Local Self governance. Even though the process of establishment of these offices in three municipalities of Presevo, Bujanovac and Medvedja was slow, all three offices have been established by summer 2011. The PBILD programme supports capacity building of the Ombudsperson’s team through mentoring, trainings, and study visits to other Ombudsperson’s offices in Europe. The Ombudspersons Outreach Offices, staffed by a proactive multi-ethnic team, are an effective way to address existing inequalities, perceptions of inequalities, low access to public services and other problems related to human rights and related to the performance of public administration. It is expected that these offices will contribute to improvement of trust and confidence of local population in national institutions.

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 2. Ombudsperson Office roles**  The Ombudsperson is empowered by law to investigate citizens’ complaints and ex officio cases. The Law stipulates that the Ombudsperson’s findings are prima facia evidence of a violation and, based on that, the Ombudsperson’s suggests a basis for remediation following an investigation of a citizen’s complaint. While the Ombudsperson’s opinion is not legally binding, defendants are obliged to respond within two months; and, if they fail to take remedial action, then penalties may be imposed. The Ombudsperson also fulfils a “policing” function of the quality of Public Administration in Serbia and can request dismissal of public officials who violate the law and request sanctions. The Ombudsperson protects both the quality of administration and human rights. The Ombudsperson is a corrective force in the law and has challenged a number of administrative institutions in front of the courts. |

**Outcome 3. Increased overall economic prosperity of the region, and reduced discrepancies in wealth and employment between municipalities, between ethnic groups and between women and men.**

Overall for Outcome 3, the groundwork in strengthening the capacities of the NES to deliver employment services and active labour market programmes targeting to the most disadvantaged groups. Improvements have been made in capacities of the RDA to better identify, prepare and implement projects oriented towards business growth and investment.

* **Output 3.1 – The labour market disadvantage of population groups and geographical areas (i.e. municipalities) reduced through more and better access to targeted active labour market programmes that respond to labour market requirements**

The programme works in partnership with the local branches of the National Employment Service (NES) towards strengthening local employment potential. The partners initiated the work by conducting a study to identify the labour demand and supply in the labour market in South Serbia in order to design the vocational training to be conducted in local NES offices. This activity has been beneficial both to gather the baseline data but also to build capacities of the NES offices to gather and analyse data relating to labour supply and demand. Simultaneously, the Programme invests in developing capacities of the NES offices to deliver employment services and active labour market programmes targeting to the most disadvantaged groups of the population.

The PBILD Programme and the NES initiated the active labour market measures at the beginning of September 2011. Currently, it is too early to assess the potential benefits of this activity.

* **Output 3.2 – Increased funding for regional and municipal level infrastructure projects that will impact upon job creation.**

The programme works in close partnership with the Regional Development Agency (RDA) to develop capacity to better identify, prepare and implement key infrastructure projects that will encourage business growth and facilitate investment, and to access regional development funding sources, through instruments such as the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) and the National Investment Plan (NIP).

Under the leadership of the RDA the Call for Regional Development Grants was launched in October 2010. The Agency received 18 applications, out of which eight (8) projects involving 12 municipalities were selected.

**Outcome 4. Migration Management: Migrants in South Serbia are provided with appropriate support to participate in the social and economic life of the region.**

The migration component is to address the migration management capacity of the different municipalities in the region and to raise awareness of the need for better migration management in the region. Emphasis is placed on improving access to administrative services and integration of migrant needs in planning procedures that the local government is responsible for. Investment in this sector is very important as the South Serbia region struggles with high emigration rates, which have especially been visible since the visa facilitation was granted to Serbia at the end of 2009. Significant numbers of South Serbian citizens fled Serbia since then to seek asylum in European states.

The two outputs of this component are the following:

* Output 4.1 (UNDP) – Municipal Administrative Services better meet the needs of Migrants; and
* Output 4.2 (UNDP) – Capacity Development to Manage Migration Issues.

The two outputs focus on institutional capacity building and awareness raising, and their activities have been integrated to provide for comprehensive achievements in the sector of migration management. As the activities and achievements have been the combination of the work within two outputs, the overview of results within this component will be discussed within these two areas: institutional capacity building and awareness raising.

**Institutional capacity building**

Promotion of the values and needs for Social Partnership through projects including partnerships of different institutions and CSO-s has been an important focus of the Migration component. The PBILD programme’s Call for projects resulted in 13 Social partnership projects in the region, whereby 10 municipalities participated. The projects selected have different purpose, five (5) projects focus on development of Citizen Assistance Centres for migration; six (6) projects focus on direct services to citizens (outreach); and two (2) projects aim at improving the employability and housing for extremely vulnerable groups (such as Roma and elderly), who are affected by migration. It is interesting that these projects include a variety of partners, and encourage engagement of workforce from employment bureaus and vulnerable groups.

**Improvement of citizen advisory services**

Fulfilment of obligations for re-admission is a challenge for Serbia as returning migrants often do not have personal documents, and thus struggle to access basic social services, such as health, access to education, social welfare, etc. That us why the PBILD programme invests in improving citizen advisory services through work with partners such as Centres of Social work, CSO-s, health centres, police, etc. whereby the municipal authorities are the main partners, through strengthening the capacities and knowledge of these partners to proceed in line with the re-admission agreements with EU countries.

**Information on rights of citizens related to migrations**

The PBILD organizes its work through trainings and publications. The trainings focus on transferring the tools and know-how on how to proceed with readmission agreement and how to provide assistance to returnees.

The PBILD published relevant publications on migration management and re-admission, such as the Guide on how to proceed in readmission agreement, in cooperation with the Ministry of Social Affairs. Information leaflets and booklets for returning migrants containing information on rights and services related to migrations have also been produced in cooperation with the Ministry. Finally, the leaflets for potential migrants, explaining the notions of asylum and asylum systems in European countries have been produced.

**Revision of social protection strategies and action plans**

The PBILD programme provided strong support and technical assistance to municipalities to develop/revise their social protection strategies and action plans in order to integrate the migration perspective into the measures of municipalities. The social protection strategies, integrating migration were developed in Trgoviste and Presevo, who did not have such a strategy before. In other municipalities, the PBILD continue to organize the inclusive strategy development through public hearings and other inclusive methodologies.

**Awareness raising for better migration management**

A study on migration that was conducted within the Inclusive Development Social Survey provided valuable information on the perceptions and reasons for (potential) migration of citizens in South Serbia. The study provided strong baselines for all programme components, and particularly for the migration management. As this study was the first of such kind for South Serbia, it initiated activities by different institutions to tackle the migration problem in the region. The Coordination Body produced a leaflet for potential migrants reflecting on the study, while the Commissariat for Refugees took it as guidance note for its activities.

**Research grants**

Based on identified data gaps and weaknesses in municipal plans, a research programme on migration was elaborated and research grants were provided for empirical research on policy-related issues related to migration in/from South Serbia. Five (5) research grants were selected, focusing on: youth and migrations; rural outmigration; gender and migration; ethnic minorities and migration, and returnees and migration. The research studies are in the first month of implementation at the moment of finalisation of this Report.

***Roundtables and conference***

Two regional roundtables were organised during the course of the Programme so far, inviting ambassadors, experts, representatives of national and local governments, CSO-s, etc. to discuss the migration issues in the region and policy implications for South Serbia and Serbia as a whole.

Upon finalisation of the research studies, a conference will be organised to present findings and discuss policy relevance and implications for the government and citizens.

# 3. LEVEL OF ANALYSIS: EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The PBILD programme entails a comprehensive set of interventions aiming at improving the inclusive development prospects of the South Serbia region. The programme is implemented in a complex socio-economic and political context and includes a range of partners from national and local governments, social service providers and CSOs, as well as young leaders from the region. This Chapter examines the PBILD Programme performance and provides analyses of the Programme components in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability prospects. The consideration of these criteria is based on a set of evaluation questions and related evaluation criteria and indicators as detailed in Annex 1. For easier reference, each Evaluation question is added before the discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| 3.1 Design level |

**Relevance: the PBILD Programme is very relevant to the development context of Serbia, and particularly of South Serbia. It has shown flexibility to adapt its approach to the recognised needs of the partners and beneficiaries.**

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 1.** Is the identification of the problems with their respective causes clear in the Inclusive Development programme? |

***The PBILD Programme components are strongly based on adequate needs assessments and problem identifications.*** A range of social and economic factors affect the South Serbia region making it one of Serbia’s least developed regions. Figures on human development highlight the large differences that exist between South Serbia and the rest of the country[[3]](#footnote-3). The overall unemployment rate in Pcinjski District (with 38%) and Jablanicki District with 43% is significantly higher than the *national unemployment rate (currently at around 20%).* Although the region is home to 6.4% of Serbia’s population, it accounts for 18% of the country’s poor [[4]](#footnote-4).

Young people in the region struggle with high unemployment rates and poor educational prospects. The difficulties to access education especially affect Albanian and other minority groups due to lack of knowledge of Serbian language. The Programme addresses these needs through a range of regional economic development activities, strengthening social protection policies and services and activities to improve the quality of teaching of Serbian as foreign language in schools in South Serbia.

Political factors affect the stabilisation of the South Serbia region, particularly the municipalities of Presevo, Madvedja and Bujanovac where 90 percent of the Albanian population in Serbia lives[[5]](#footnote-5). The Programme is designed to support the government commitments to promote social, political and economic recovery in the region and address latent tensions and polarisation between ethnic groups at local level.

Besides, theprogramme is designed to reflect the strategic priorities of the donors, identified as supporting inclusive development of Serbia, improving migration management and overall EU integration prospects of the country.

Perhaps another strong argument for the relevance of the programme are the recent developments in the wider region, such as the tension at the border between northern Kosovo and Serbia, and the anti-Roma demonstrations in neighbouring Bulgaria (seen as the worst violence since the economic crisis and hyperinflation of 1997). These events show once more that continuing peace building efforts are instrumental in developing a stable and viable society.

***The PBILD logic is lost though its logical frameworks.*** Against these needs in the region, the intervention through the PBILD components demonstrates clear values and logic. The programme document is based on a realistic needs assessment. Four defined priorities (outcomes) directly respond to national policies, systems and services. However, the targets set are ambitious and present a long-term commitment that will require longer programmatic support for their full achievement. Also, the assessment of the programme outcomes indicates that individual activities have been developed independent from each other, reflecting the individual approach of individual agencies following their respective country strategies and goals. Individual components have the potential for strong synergies and integration of activities, and these should be explored and applied more coherently.

In addition, the Peace Building- interventions under Outcome 1 are poorly defined. The numbering of Outputs was kept the same as the SCILD part, although Output 1.1 has a different goal. (SCILD: ‘Increased confidence of local population in key institutions of local and national government’ versus PB: ‘Provide support to institutional strengthening of the governance structures in South Serbia to facilitate participation of women and ethnic minorities in policy and decision-making processes’.) Output 1.2 remained unchanged; however it is supported by different Smart Outputs and Activities. The MDG-F further added its own Outputs 1.3 and 1.4 under the shared Outcome 1. This mixed defining of responsibilities and ultimately mixed implementation makes it difficult to properly evaluate each of the donors’ involvements, and may lead to obscured conclusions on efficiency of activities that further hamper management’s correcting role in implementation.

Another point is related to the phrasing, or the language used, when drafting the outcomes and outputs. Many of them have a pluralistic character, i.e. some outcomes carry elements of activities, and some outputs have indicator-like elements. This is confusing when actually drafting supporting activities and defining SMART indicators, and leaves many readers in doubt about the actual intention and direction of the programme.

In accordance with the theory and practice of the logical framework analysis (LFA), and the use of the logical framework matrix (LFM), project designers are strongly encouraged to make use of unambiguous language. One needs to know what an objective is, or a result (outcome), as well as an activity (output), and equally important, how to define them.

As a rule, a result should describe a change in a situation as intended after the intervention as compared to before. Phrases such as ‘improved’, ‘strengthened’, or ‘increased’ can often be found here for that reason. It provides for any reader a clear description of where the action is going to lead. Moreover, when used properly, it will also allow the project’s designers to define their indicators properly in line with the SMART criteria. This in turn creates a solid basis for monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

In turn, if these rules are not applied, the LFM loses its logic and causality, and many times this results in weak indicators, imperiling both implementation and evaluation. It is very common and in fact recommended that the implementing project team revisits its LFM regularly, and updates/adjusts it to circumstances while abiding by the rules of LFA.

The point that the MTE makes here is that the matrix of the programme document does not make use of unambiguous language; hence the results, activities and indicators have pluralistic characters. In other words, they bear elements of each other, which creates ambiguity about the project’s purpose, planned achievements and process.

As an example, we can look at Smart Output 1.1g:

‘By the end of the JP, national and especially local broadcast and print media offer increased production of news, information and entertainment in local languages which is gender sensitive, thereby contributing to peace building’.

This output has all the elements of an indicator (not to mention the extended measuring criteria of the part after the last comma), and could be used as such to measure the extent in which its corresponding output has been achieved. It is however *not* an output that itself can be achieved through programme activities only.

Similarly, if we look at Smart Output 1.2a:

‘Institutional mechanisms for participation and development of young men and women (of different ethnic background) are strengthened in three selected municipalities’.

This output has all the characteristics of a result, which could be achieved through a series of activities, and be measured through a set of indicators; it is however not an output. Analogous occurrences happen with Smart Outputs 1.3d (‘indicator’) and Output 1.3e (‘result’). The analysis of the LF for the SCILD component shows similar struggles.

A semantic point is made here that is advised not to use the terms ‘outcome’ and ‘output’, rather to make use of ‘result’ and ‘activity’. The literature on this subject agrees that ‘outcome’ is highly synonymous with ‘result’, and ‘output’ with ‘activity’. The advantage of using result and activity is that these are terms less likely to be misunderstood, and they do not suffer from the grey area of overlapping that outcome and output instigate. The examples above from the PBILD matrix clearly show that this is an existing problem.

Finally, PBILD-s overall objective bears a similar element as well. It should not read *“to reduce the discrepancies…”* but rather *“to contribute to the reduction of…”* (or similar). This is for the simple reason that no single programme (or project) would ever achieve such objective, or in fact any overall objective (an example is the discrepancy in employment, which is a relatively small part of the intervention). It is recommendable that the programme is ambitious, but this should be reflected through proper indicators, and not through the objectives. The danger lies in the fact that a first glance at the programme leads to conclude that it “failed to achieve”, while given the entire context this may be an unfair and untrue verdict.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 2.** Does the Inclusive Development take into account the particularities and specific interests of women and men, specific age groups, ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged groups in the areas of intervention? |

***Particularities and specific interests of women, minorities and ethnic groups have been taken into account by the PBILD programme***. The assessment of the extent to which the Programme takes the particular needs of women, minorities and ethnic groups into account shows that the programme has been developed and maintains a gender and minority rights sensitive approach. Activities implemented by the Programme place strong emphasis on gender balance, while special care is given to including members of minority groups into all activities. The project team includes a satisfactory ration of male and female team members, while the team also includes members coming from minority groups. This is especially important in a region that is very sensitive to minority issues. Gender rights, minorities and ethnic groups are an integrated part of the programme activities.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 3.** 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 background with special emphasis on multi-cultural context and the EU accession process? |

***The intervention strategy has been sufficiently adaptive to the changing and new needs of the target groups***. ***The Programme has been sufficiently flexible to respond to obstacles that appeared from the political and socio-cultural specificities of the region***. The programme interventions framework has been set broadly, which increased the flexibility and adaptability of the progamme. This turned out to be helpful for the Programme to adapt to the new needs and changing political environment, but also to ensure adequate measures have been taken in light of significant delays in the inception of the programme. At the same time, the Programme has been very relevant and flexible to adapt to new needs of the EU integration, especially in the area of public administration reform, migration management and social protection agenda. The programme’s flexibility to adapt its approach and interventions to changing needs of the Coordination Body and the Ombudsperson’s outreach offices in the field were remarkable and provided for stronger impact prospects. At the same time, the adapted approach of the programme in the area of migration management – from individual approach to establishment Citizens Advisory Centres for migration towards social partnership project was an excellent intervention that enables creating links, partnership and joint actions by different institutions, including government, social service providers, civil society and citizens themselves. Such joint projects place strong input for sustainability and higher impact of efforts.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 4.** Are the follow-up indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the Joint Programme? |

***The programme has been revising monitoring indicators during the programme implementation to better meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the programme.*** The programme has invested in revising the monitoring and evaluation framework. A range of M&E exercises have been conducted to improve the programme monitoring framework, but also to improve the indicators to comply with the SMART[[6]](#footnote-6) criteria. The initial programme framework was burdened by unclear indicators that cannot be defined as SMART; however, the revisions made significant improvements to the targets. The Inclusive Development Study provided strong baseline data as well as Needs Assessments that were conducted for various components of the programme. At the moment, the programme measures its progress through a set of indicators, baselines and targets that are given for many activities. Quantified outputs have been defined wherever possible. The PCM has also adopted the revised M&E framework. Where possible, programme indicators have been followed up and the results are summarised in Annex 2.

Notwithstanding the recommendable efforts made by PBILD to revise its indicators, the MTE suggests that it is highly advisable for the programme to revisit its logical framework, and use this revised version to define its indicators. It is predominantly the logic of the approach that fails. With a repaired logic, workable indicators are easier to define, achievements are easier to measure and results are easier to achieve.

**Ownership: the PBILD Programme document contains clear reference to national policies and strategies, as well as the EU integration priorities within areas of relevance for the programme. The programme was developed with participation and leadership by national government. The local governments were not actively involved in the design stage of the programme, but the local authorities are actively engaged in the implementation and monitoring of the programme.**

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 5.** To what extent do the intervention objectives and strategies of the Inclusive Development programme respond to national and regional plans and programmes, to identified needs, and to the operational context of national politics? |

**The objectives and strategies of the Inclusive Development programme respond to national and regional plans and programmes, as well as national and local policies**. As discussed in the section on Relevance above, the programme includes strong references to national policies and strategies in the programming documents. Primarily, the Programme corresponds with the following country strategies: Strategy of Development in the Republic of Serbia in the period from 2009-2012; the Public Administration Reform Strategy, the National Strategy for Accession to the European Union; the Regional Development Strategy; the National Economic Development Strategy; Social Protection Development Strategy; Strategy for improving the position of Roma in Serbia; The strategy of reintegration of returnees under the Agreement on Readmission; The national strategy for prevention and protection of children from violence; National Youth Strategy; Strategy for long-term economic development of South Serbia - Presevo, Bujanovac and Medvedja; etc.[[7]](#footnote-7). In addition, the municipal strategies of all 13 municipalities have been consulted.

The programme document contains clear justification of the needs of target groups that provides the basis for selection of strategies and key steps of the programming cycle. The Programme should invest further efforts in creating synergies and joint actions of involved UN partners, towards extending and multiplying achievements and impact prospects.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 6.** 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? |

***The country’s national government representatives have actively participated in the design and implementation stages of the programme***. The programme established three Committees: the Programme Management Committee (PMC), the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) and the National Steering Committee (NSC). The PBILD Programme Management Committee (PMC) is a body that provides oversight for PBILD, reviews progress and takes key decisions on implementation. A National Steering Committee (NSC) and Programme Steering Committee (PSC) are foreseen and serve as a higher level of oversight for PBILD, with government policy and donor co-ordination in particular in mind. Members of the PSC are therefore confirmed as the NSC, with the addition of representatives of the three bi-lateral donors, SIDA, SDC and the Norwegian Embassy. These bodies are crucial mechanisms for participatory decision-making in the programme, as they approve all strategic documents and reports of the Programme. They seem to function very well, and serve their purpose; it may deserve recommendation to re-visit reporting policies since they have proven to be a drain on the programme. A unique, one-model-serves-all report may be the solution.

Local authorities have not been actively involved directly in the programme design. After numerous consultations, the MTE concludes that this aspect of the design of PBILD was based on strategies and plans of each of the participating agencies, which in itself were developed through field based assessments. Ownership of the local level then exists in this levelled model. This approach deserves understanding in case time is short, or when it is not desirable to re-visit stakeholders with a similar set of questions. The MTE finds that it would have been better to have direct local input to the design, however, the complexity of interventions does justify (at least to some extent) this ‘shortcut’ that was taken by the programme.

For a systematic overview of the Committees please see the chart on the following page.

**Management arrangements: Coordination mechanism**

**Inclusive Development MDGF (Peace Building)**

Programme Steering Committee:

* Government Representatives, Ombudsperson Office, Secretariat for Refugees, Coordination Body
* Donors
* UN agencies
* *(regularly meets twice in a year and as needed)*

Short and long term support:

* Local consultants/experts
* International consultants/experts

Short and long term support:

* Local consultants/experts
* International consultants/experts

Joint Programme Implementation Unit:

(Inclusive Development and Peace Building)

* Programme Management (PM, DPM)
* Support Staff

Joint Programme Management Board/Committee:

(Inclusive Development and Peace Building)

* UN RC/UNDP RR or her/his representative
* Government Representatives, Ombudsperson Office, Secretariat for Refugees, Coordination Body
* UN agencies
* Municipalities representatives
* Donor representatives

*(Regularly meets quarterly and as linked to the inception report)*

National Steering Committee: *(Steering Committee for all MDGF funded projects in the country meets twice in a year)*

* Government representative
* UNRC
* Spanish ambassador

***Local authorities and social agents participate actively in the implementation of the programme***. The design stage of the programme did not involve local authorities and social agents in the development of the interventions to a large extent. However, the Programme team pays special attention to involving these stakeholders in the programme management committees and other activities of the programme.

|  |
| --- |
| 3.2 Process level |

**Efficiency: Overall, programme efficiency has been significantly affected by the delays in the inception phase of the programme. Nevertheless, once the programme became fully operational, the efficiency has rapidly improved. The programme has achieved its full pace only since September 2011.**

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 7.** To what extent does the Joint Programme’s management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) contribute to obtaining the predicted products and results? |

***The JP’s management model does deliver upon its commitments and contribute to predicted products and results. However, there is a room for improvement in information flows between partners, decision-making process and synergies between the UN Agencies involved in the programme.*** The programme suffered to great extent to significant delays in the inception phase during the establishment of the programme office and the team. The delay was primarily caused by complicated procedures and lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities of different partners during the set up of the programme. The programme team in the PBILD office is professional, experienced and does function in team spirit, and the economic, human and technical resources are sufficient for good quality work towards programme results. The dedication and motivation of the team members contributes strongly to cooperation and joint activities by different partners. Worth mentioning are the efforts of staff members to work together in different components where synergies are possible (e.g. UN-HABITAT and IOM, UNICEF and UNDP, etc.). Nevertheless, further improvements are recommendable in terms of information flows; cooperation and synergies between head offices of the UN Agencies involved in the programme. There has been an additional administrative burden experienced by the management team of the programme in terms of reporting, as participating agencies require separate channels of reporting and management, which does not help the already complicated reporting lines of the programme.

Efficient management of the PBILD programme suffers from the situation that whilst individual components are managed well by the respective agency, competencies and responsibilities of the overall management team remain weak and are often limited to advice and collegial guidance. Effective supervision of resources and experts is not sufficiently ensured due to limited insight into other agencies’ work. Additionally, in case of effective representation and communication and other appreciated unified programme elements, the development of a harmonised overall approach is limited by agency-specific procedures and guidelines. The findings of this MTE point towards the need for the management team to have stronger managerial powers in order to ensure better alignment of the programme components to the overall goals, and to ensure synergies, which would lead to better efficiency and cost-effective delivery. The mere coordination role of the management team is not sufficient for ensuring effective management of the programme.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 8.** To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other, with the government and with civil society and other programmes/projects implemented in the area of intervention? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation? |

***Coordination between participating agencies in the programme has significant room for improvement. The Programme coordinates well with the government and with civil society and other programmes/projects implemented in the area of intervention. The programme developed a Communication Strategy that has significantly improved the coordination, as well as the internal and external communication of the Programme***. The complex programme development process and delays in its set up and inception have significantly affected coordination between partners. Over time and thanks to the efforts of the management team, particularly the Deputy programme manager, the inter-agency coordination is developing steadily and the coordination and cooperation within the PBILD team is well established. Nevertheless, the coordination and cooperation between head offices of participating agencies have significant room for improvement.

The programme coordinates well with the government, the donors and the civil society throughout the programme components. The PMC, as the programme’s coordination platform, guides the implementation process through strong decision making procedures. Civil society organisations are closely involved in implementing certain activities and they are coordinating well with their respective UN agencies.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 9.** Are there efficient coordination mechanisms to avoid overloading the counterparts, participating population/actors? |

***The programme team ensures that implementation of the activities does not overload the counterparts, participating population and relevant actors.*** 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.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 10.** Is the pace of implementing the products of the programme ensuring the completeness of the results of the Joint Programme? How do the different components of the Joint Programme interrelate? |

***The programme components comply with strategies set and implemented by individual agencies, and there is limited evidence of the recognised values and need to create synergies towards ensuring completeness of the results of the JP***. Assessment of individual strategic frameworks of participating agencies shows that individual UN Agency’s PBILD programme components have been envisaged and extracted from these documents. The assessment shows that individual agencies do not always view their work as a joint effort at both national and regional levels, and the visibility of the PBILD programme as a joint UN team has not been visible to satisfactory level.

One interesting aspect of the programme design is Outcome 4 (“Migration”), which is implemented by UNDP. At first glance this looks like a classic intervention by the IOM, which itself is involved in PBILD through mediation training delivery under Outcome 1. The reason for this is not quite clear to the MTE. In the context of the ‘Delivering as One’--approach, one may assume that the best synergetic effects and efficiency are served when the agencies work on fields that are ‘classically’ theirs. Additionally, any chance of peer-to-peer counselling on migration between these PBILD partners that would illustrate this, is futile with the Migration component picking up speed only since a few months, and the IOM involvement in PBILD practically finished. It is advised to study this further for future programming to avoid confusion amongst donors, partners, beneficiaries, and the general public.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 11.** Are work methodologies, financial instruments, etc. shared among agencies, institutions and Joint Programmes? |

***The level of shared work methodologies, financial instruments, reporting instruments, etc. is not at satisfactory level***. The consequence of the above-discussed low level of partnership and synergies at decision-making levels between UN Agencies is the fact that the work methodologies, financial instruments have not been shared to satisfactory level. On a positive note, the UNICEF and UNDP recognised the need to create joint financial instrument and opened up such possibility within the work on the Outcome 2.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 12.** Have more efficient (sensitive) and appropriate measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural problems identified? |

***The PBILD Programme has shown a good degree of flexibility in order to respond to the relevant political and social-cultural context.*** The programme has adapted its approach to almost each component of the programme during the inception phase but also during the implementation of the programme activities. For instance, the approach to work with Ombudsperson’s office was changed due to changing needs in the field. Moreover, the work on relief for IDP-s extended this flexibility to cost-efficiency: savings made during tenders, and negotiations on tax breaks immediately resulted in increased coverage by handling more cases. Similar examples may be found within the Migration component and within the work on the Outcome 2.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 13.** In what way has the Joint Programme contributed to EU accession agenda? |

***The PBILD programme contributes to EU accession agenda to a large extent***. The programme addresses a number of strategic pre-accession priorities, which have been established by the EU in the European Partnership. Specifically, the Multiannual Indicative Planning Document (MIPD) for Serbia for the period of 2011-2013[[8]](#footnote-8) identifies the following priorities: Strengthening the rule of law and public administration reform; overcoming the economic Crisis and improving competitiveness; and Social Inclusion and Reconciliation. The contribution of the PBILD to each of the three priorities is as follows:

**Strengthening the rule of law and public administration**

While the PBILD does not work on EU priorities within the rule of law (judicial reform, fight against corruption and organised crime), it contributes to public administration reform through its work with local governments on improvement of citizens’ access to services (registration, support to Citizens’ assistance centers, activities within Working groups, etc). In such way, the PBILD contributes to the EU vision of the Serbian public administration as efficient, merit-based and accountable civil service, responding to its citizens.

**Overcoming the economic crisis and improving competitiveness**

This challenge has been identified both by the enlargement strategy 2010-2011 and the MIPD document. The MIPD documents stresses emphasis on improvement of Serbia’s business environment and infrastructure. The PBILD’s partnership with the Regional Development Agency towards strengthening capacities of this Agency and local municipalities to increase business opportunities through improvement of infrastructure and capacities for business management contributes to this important EU priority for Serbia.

**Social inclusion and reconciliation**

Finally, the MIPD document places integration of vulnerable groups and minorities, including the Roma, as well as refugees, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and returnees in accordance with the Readmission Agreement as a challenge for Serbia. Also, the MIPD highlights issues such as high levels of unemployment (especially youth unemployment), low labour force participation rates, poverty, low inclusion and high drop-out rates from the education system of vulnerable groups. The PBILD programme places strong emphasis and intensively works with these groups in order to empower them and improve their livelihood conditions. In such way, the PBILD contributes significantly to this EU priority for Serbia.

|  |
| --- |
| 3.3 Results level |

**Effectiveness: It is still too early in the programme implementation to make an assessment of the progress towards effective achievement of programme objectives. This is due to delays in the programme implementation. Still, the programme so far has made progress towards achievement of objectives contributing to Millennium Development and thematic window goals.Particular contribution was made by production of valuable studies on the state of minority rights, migrations, and gender and youth situation in South Serbia. Performance of social protection and migration components is good.**

**Most effectively is the relief work done for IDP-s under Output 1.4, which was finalised as planned in July 2011 and has overachieved on its initial targets.**

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 14.** To what extent the intervention strategy responded to interethnic tensions (design and results level)? |

**The programme intervention is designed towards** reduction of inter-ethnic tensions and conflict risk. Specifically, its Outcome 1 reads: Community Cohesion and Human Capital: Communities in South Serbia are stronger, more integrated, and better able to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict risk. Within this Outcome, therefore, all outputs aim towards reducing the conflict risk through number of measures, such as: enhancement of political participation of women and minorities; strengthening inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration among adolescents and young people; increasing knowledge and capacities of local self governments and social partners to engage on conflict / violence prevention; and improvement of livelihoods and living conditions for IDPs (especially female IDPs).

**The activities implemented so far within these efforts are described in the Section 2.**2. Outcome 1, while the sections on relevance of the Programme also points to strong response of the Programme to the challenges of interethnic tensions. The outcomes of the interventions are still early to measure, but the activities conducted so far point to positive outputs achieved (Please, see Section 2.2. Outcome 1 for a detailed description of activities and their immediate results).

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 15.** Is the programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results? |

***Overall, it is early to assess*** progress of the programme towards achieving the stipulated results. This is due to significant delays in the programme’s inception phase. The programme is gaining its momentum only in the period since the beginning of 2011, when majority of projects and activities have been successfully initiated.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 16.** To what extent and in what ways is the Inclusive Development programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels? |

The ***programme significantly supports the Millennium Development Goals of Serbia within the given thematic window.*** The PBILD programme tackles all issues of relevance to inclusive development of Serbia and contributes to achievement of the following MDG-s:

* **Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger** – the PBILD invests efforts in improving livelihoods of vulnerable groups (such as IDP-s, minority groups) through a range of activities, such as improving access to social services; increasing employability through activities with the NES offices; improving regional development prospects through projects with municipalities and regional development agencies; and through improvement of access to education; improving vocational education and training.
* **Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education –** through activities for improving primary school teaching for minority or vulnerable children
* **Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women –** through supporting the establishment of gender commissions, and awareness raisingon the importance of gender equality for municipal officials, political parties and civil society.
* **Goal 4: Reduce child mortality** – the outreach activities to children from most excluded and vulnerable groups (such as Roma) and improving their access to health care, education and social welfare by enabling them to register and obtain personal documentation, the PBILD contributes to improvement of lives and reducing potential for child mortality. This is especially as obtaining personal documents facilitates access to health care for vulnerable and minority children and their families.
* **Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability *-*** through work on providing IDP-s in collective centres with sustainable accommodation solutions.

Establishment of database on young people, women, national minorities and the status of migration has been important contribution to the government to develop and implement more effective and better targeted national and regional policies. Support to improvement of social protection, migration management; youth and gender policies and structures in local communities contribute to stronger policy and institutional framework and mechanisms for protection and inclusion of marginalised groups. The closing of the collective centre X for IDP-s in Vranje through providing sustainable alternative housing solutions has further improved living conditions for the most vulnerable families, while releasing the municipality and wider community of social and financial burden of maintaining a less desirable transit situation.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 17.** Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes? |

***The Programme struggles to fulfil its outputs within the stipulated timeline.*** The significant delays in the inception phase have affected the delivery of outputs so far. Implementation has been greatly accelerated since the beginning of 2011, and the vast majority of outputs are expected to be delivered within the current lifetime of the programme, planned to terminate in October 2012. However, limited capacities of local partners remain significant factor for relevant for absorption and especially sustainability of majority of envisaged outputs.

**Assessment of the effectiveness of outputs of the Programme**

Designing comprehensive development projects aimed at addressing marginalised and excluded groups in complex political and socio-economic contexts, is a rather challenging task. In such circumstances, constructing log frames that fulfil the SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) criteria is especially demanding. The assessment of the PBILD results frameworks shows this struggle, as the broad nature of the Output statements is making for a very ambitious task that could stand as a project goal in itself. This is a very relevant constraint in the assessment of the effectiveness of the programme outcomes at the time when this Mid-Term Evaluation is conducted.

Closely linked to this constraint is the fact that this Mid-Term Evaluation takes place very early in the de-facto programme implementation. This is due to the fact that the inception phase of the programme lasted very long (almost a year –the contract was signed in October 2009, the office was established in March 2010, the team was completed only in July 2010, and many activities were initiated by September 2010). Additionally, PBILD saw at least five staff changes (amongst which is the Programme Manager position) that further hampered implementation speed. The programme was geared up at the beginning of 2011 upon finalisation of the Inclusive Development Opinion Survey, which provided a wealth of baseline data for the programme. Since the beginning of 2011, a range of different Calls for proposals, trainings and events were prepared and launched and the programme is now in the phase of gearing up the social partnerships and projects in the field. The following is the assessment of the extent to which the individual outcomes and outputs are expected to be effectively achieved. This assessment is based on the review of activities implemented so far by the Programme. As such, this section is closely tied and based on the overview presented in Section 2.2. (Description of the programme intervention so far - the hypothesis of change of the programme).

**Outcome 1. Communities in South Serbia are stronger, more integrated, and better able to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict risk**

* **Output 1.1 – Increased confidence of local population in key institutions of local and national government.**

***So far, Output 1.1 has been moderately progressing towards its achievement.*** The Inclusive Development Opinion Survey provided extensive data on the state of the communities of South Serbia and perceptions of its citizens on a number of issues, including inclusion, participation, migration prospects and overall trust of citizens in national government. This was a very important study and a great contribution to evidence-based policy making for the government at national and local levels but also other donors and social agents.

The PBILD established good working relationship with the Coordination Body; however joint activities are significantly delayed so it is early to assess the level of effectiveness of this cooperation.

* **MDG-F Output 1.1 (UNDP) - Enhance political participation of women and ethnic minorities in South Serbia**

***This Output is likely to be achieved***. Similarly, this Output has been progressing moderately. Assessments on gender and CSO-s have provided bases for the designing of training sessions that will develop understanding of and capacity to deal with these issues. Sponsoring and mentoring of projects for CSO-s should further enhance lessons learned. After an initial selection phase, structural support to revise and develop local inclusive strategies is continuing.

The programme established and maintains close working relationships with the Regional Working Group on Gender, CSO-s and media, as well as with municipality officials. However, the late start prevents the MTE to assess real effects of these activities. It is expected that this Output may be achieved on time if the implementation pace remains at least at the current level.

* **Output 1.2 – Strengthened inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration among adolescents and young people.**

***Output 1.2 is expected to be largely achieved.*** The partnership with the Ministry of Youth and Sports is a crucial investment into ensuring that the achievements within this component will be institutionalised and thus sustainable. Joint work of the PBILD and the Ministry throughout the work on advocacy for Youth offices, designing and launching the Call for proposals and selection of projects shows is perceived as very positive, and indicates towards successful completion of activities under this output.

* **MDG-F Output 1.2 - Strengthened inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration among adolescents and young people**

***This Output is expected to be achieved****.* Through active engagement with youth on a variety of levels, using the findings of the “Youth in Serbia” survey, this intervention is entering its stage of mentoring youth organisations, CSO-s as well as local authorities through support in project design and implementation. This should have a significant effect building awareness, capacity as well as foundations for the future through gained knowledge and experience, and strengthened networks with all interlocutors. Unfortunately, the project coordinator arrived at the team as one of the last (August 2010), and it remains to be seen whether this output will be achieved within the planned timeframe; if the current pace of implementation is continued, indications are that it may.

* **MDG-F Output 1.3 - Strengthened capacities of local self-governments, institutions and civil society organisations to engage in conflict / violence prevention planning through conflict mediation training, participation, dialogue and partnerships for improved safety in municipalities and for better understanding of local aspects of conflict and adequate solutions.**

***Output 1.3 is expected to be fully achieved.*** The majority of mediation training has been delivered, and eight new Safety Coalitions have been formed to institutionalise the knowledge and experience gained. Training and workshops for local professionals and PBILD staff has been finalised. It can be argued that this output actually over-achieved, considering the fact that trainings for Pcinja District Police and Bujanovac Municipal Staff were not planned by ProDoc and subsequently have been delivered upon request of mentioned stakeholders, which created added value for PBILD and Safer Cities. The capacities of local actors will be strengthened further through continuing Safer Cities Pilot Initiatives. Further meeting venues are being organised to exchange good practices, and defining proper communication and dissemination tools to support local-to-local dialogues. Although the intervention has a deadline of April 2012, it is expected to be achieved since activities have commenced with less delay (March 2010).

* **MDG-F Output 1.4 - Displacement reduced through multi-faceted dialogue; improved livelihoods and living conditions for IDP-s (especially particularly vulnerable categories of the IDP population such as single headed female households).**

***Output 1.4 has been over-achieved*.** Not only did the intervention managed to finish on time, due to savings made and negotiations undertaken, the total of covered cases is higher than originally planned. PBILD faces the unique opportunity to actually monitor the effect, impact and sustainability possibilities of one of its interventions during its lifetime. The MTE would urge the PBILD management to accept this challenge, and in close cooperation with UNHCR design mechanisms to follow up on cases, and to continue to find synergies to include beneficiaries in other parts of the programme where feasible.

**Outcome 2. Improved and more equitable access to public services and welfare benefits (including basic registration documentation, health and education) reduce feelings of exclusion and inter-ethnic tension.**

* **Output 2.1 – Municipalities have strengthened ability to formulate; implement and monitor policies in relation to public service provision, and in particular, develop an awareness of differential impact of policies on different ethnic groups.**

***Output 2.1 is expected to be largely achieved.*** The PBILD investment in establishing and maintaining the work of Regional Working groups already brings benefits to municipal authorities, in terms of building links, networks and new partnerships between municipalities. Awareness raising and capacity development activities that happen within groups are viewed as positive and will be beneficial for development of policies and structures that were missing (e.g. gender commissions, regional development, etc.).

Investment in building M&E capacities of local authorities, and especially capacities for establishment and updating DevInfo and related social indicators will be significant value added for establishing and maintaining evidence base on social status of children and families in the region. It is expected that these efforts will also contribute significantly to synchronising the national statistics on children and families in Serbia.

* **Output 2.2 – Vulnerable and ethnic minority children have improved access to public services and benefits to which they are entitled.**

***Output 2.2. is expected to be achieved.*** Good practices of integrated and coordinated approach to enabling access to social protection services through enabling free legal aid and obtaining personal documents for extremely vulnerable groups such as Roma are already brining results for Roma children and their families in South Serbia. Expert meetings gathering representatives of local authorities and social service providers are useful as confirmed by reactions from participants, which are clearly positive. The Programme has managed to create a foundation for partnership between institutions, however these is on-going need to continue working towards harmonisation of different working procedures among the different services (CSW, local authorities, health centres, etc.).

* **Output 2.3 – Improved qualities of public services, especially in those areas that have potential to increase inter-ethnic dialogue and reduce conflict risk.**

***Output 2.3 is expected to be moderately achieved.*** This is a very ambitious Output, and its focus on improving active learning methodologies for teaching Serbian as a foreign language will need on-going strong support by teachers, local and national partners. It will require on-going full support by the Ministry of Education to recognise, adopt and extend the new teaching methodologies to all educational institution. At the same time, the Programme will need to invest in raising awareness and commitment by local authorities in communities where educational institutions hosting students from different ethnic groups to support and sustain new teaching approaches and methodologies. The work of the PBILD programme on teacher training is bringing changes at individual level, but further coordinated efforts will need to be invested to start making changes on higher levels.

* **Output 2.4 – Support to capacity development and awareness raising of the role of Ombudspersons Outreach Office in South Serbia.**

***Output 2.4 is expected to be achieved.*** Supporting the Ombudsperson’s office withcapacity development for fulfilling its mandate in South Serbia, particularly Bujanovac, Presevo and Medvedja has already brought significant improvements in the approach and work of the Outreach team in the region. Further investment in their capacity building through study visits and mentoring will be very beneficial for the Outreach team, but also for the Ombudsperson’s head office in Belgrade. The flexibility of the programme to revise and adapt its approach to the new needs of the Ombudsperson’s office once the programme started its full implementation has been a good practice as it enabled the beneficiary to fully benefit from the Programme’s intervention.

**Outcome 3. Increased overall economic prosperity of the region, and reduced discrepancies in wealth and employment between municipalities, between ethnic groups and between women and men.**

* **Output 3.1 – The labour market disadvantage of population groups and geographical areas (i.e. municipalities) reduced through more and better access to targeted active labour market programmes that respond to labour market requirements**

***So far, Output 3.1 has been moderately progressing towards its achievement.*** This component of the programme lags behind all other components. The Study on labour demand and supply has been conducted, but the activities for initiating the active labour market measures will only begin in September 2011.

* **Output 3.2 – Increased funding for regional and municipal level infrastructure projects that will impact upon job creation.**

***Output 3.2 is expected to be largely achieved.*** Capacity building of the Regional Development Agency but also the Integrated Regional Development Working Group has strengthened local capacities for actively tackling integrated regional development and ability of the partners to develop and implement regional projects.

**Outcome 4. Migration Management: Migrants in South Serbia are provided with appropriate support to participate in the social and economic life of the region.**

* **Output 4.1 – Municipal Administrative Services better meet the needs of Migrants.**

***Output 4.1 is expected to be achieved.*** Integrated approach to development of social partnerships between social service providers, CSO-s, local authorities, and other social agents will bring significant benefits to those vulnerable and affected by migrations. Investing in Citizens’ Assistance Centres, providing information and advisory services to potential and/or returning migrants on their rights and obligations will have positive impacts on the migration management measures for South Serbia.

* **Output 4.2 – Capacity Development to Manage Migration Issues.**

***Output 4.2 is expected to be achieved.*** The advocacy, information sharing and awareness raising campaign on the need and measures for migration management has already produced immediate political impacts. The roundtables, media appearances and individual meetings with relevant stakeholders and decision makers lead to better understanding and stronger commitment of local and national stakeholders for migration management. Migration and social protection indicators are available thanks to the study conducted by the Programme, and further efforts need to be made to continue advocating for migration management measures that will include strong social protection and inclusion perspective.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 18.** Do the outputs produced meet the required high quality? |

***The PBILD delivers good 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 programme delivers good quality products, which respond to the needs of given beneficiary.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 19**. 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? |

***The management and follow-up mechanisms of the Programme have been significantly improved during the programme implementation to adequately measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results.*** The programme invests significant efforts in strengthening the monitoring and evaluation framework and developing SMART indicators. However, the programme would benefit significantly from full-scale revision and update of the results framework in order to adopt SMART criteria for the outcomes, outputs and indicators. The programme so far has been burdened by complicated and overlapping reporting requirements that take a lot of energy of the management team. Each donor, the management boards (PMC, NSC, and PSC), but also individual UN Agencies have their own reporting requirements and formats, which poses significant challenge to management team but also the Programme team to prepare multiple reports. The programme would benefit significantly from aligning the reporting requirements and formats.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 20.** Is the programme providing coverage to beneficiaries as planned? |

***The programme largely provides coverage to the government counterparts and beneficiaries as expected.*** All relevant central state and local institutions dealing with target groups and areas of expertise of the programme are involved in the programme. The target areas for regional activities have been chosen well, taking into account the size and complexity of the underlying socio-economic problems. Overall, there appears to be a good mix of final beneficiaries among different social groups, comprising in particular excluded and vulnerable groups, such as minorities, young people, children and women. The PBILD programme provides support to returning and potential migrants.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 21.** In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving? |

Please, refer to the discussion on EQ 3 for detailed discussion on this. In addition, the intervention by UN-HABITAT deserves credit for taking the concept of ‘Safer Cities’ further in this area. Trainings for the Pcinja District Police and Bujanovac Municipal Staff, not planned originally through the ProDoc, are being delivered upon request of these stakeholders, illustrating PBILD’s flexibility and capacity to immediately act upon needs that may arise. This may create a basis for replication in the future.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 22.** Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified? |

***Effective delivery of free legal aid and support to social inclusion of Roma, as well as the provision of sustainable housing solutions to IDP-s has been the key success of the PBILD programme so far.*** The key obstacles to obtaining personal documents for the majority of Roma in south Serbia are the time-consuming and complicated procedures for registering in the civil registry books that create an obstacle to families to access social, health, education and other services. The PBILD programme has assisted Roma to register in the civil books through the provision of free legal assistance to obtain their personal documents. Implemented by NGO PRAXIS, assistance to Roma is being delivered in all 13 municipalities of the Jablanica and Pcinja districts and fosters the social inclusion of Roma and fulfilment of their basic human rights. The DRC and INTERSOS contributed significantly in providing alternative housing solutions through a set of well-designed mechanisms.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 23.** In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to the issue of decent employment? |

It is too early in the programme implementation to assess the degree to which the Joint Programme component contributed to the issue of decent employment. At the moment when the Evaluation was conducted, the Programme was finalising the agreements with the NES offices, and the educational component did not start yet (please, see Section 2.2. Outcome 3 for detailed overview of activities conducted so far).

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 24.** In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to the issue of conflict/violence prevention? In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to the improvement of living conditions for IDPs and returnees? |

***The Joint Programme contributed to the issue of conflict/violence prevention to satisfactory extent so far***. The PBILD programme works closely with the relevant Ministries, Coordination Bodies, and Ombudsperson’s office on their capacity building, strengthening institutional structures (establishment of the Youth Offices and Ombudsperson’s Outreach offices), and outreach to their target groups ((please, see Section 2.2. Outcome 1 for a detailed overview of activities conducted so far)

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 25.** In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to the issue of internal and/or external migration, youth and gender specificities of the programme context? |

***The Joint Programme contributed to the issue of internal and/or external migration, youth and gender specificities of the programme context to satisfactory extent so far***. The programme conducted comprehensive study on the status of young people, women and perspectives on migration in the South Serbia region. This Study provided valuable insight into perceptions, status and opinions of the population on a range of issues affecting the quality of life of citizens in this region. The support to Youth Offices, the Regional Working Groups on Gender and social partnerships to tackle migration issues already bring benefits at local level ((please, see Section 2.2. Outcome 1 and 2 for a detailed overview of activities conducted so far). Further investment in these important areas of work will bring positive effects on the local population.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 26.** In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to economic and regional inclusive development? |

***The Joint Programme contributed to the issue of economic and regional inclusive development to satisfactory extent so far.*** As discussed in the section on Output 2.4 the programme’s support to the Regional Development Agency (RDA) increased capacities of the Agency and its partners to better identify, prepare and implement key infrastructure projects. Also, the distribution of Regional Development Grants to local municipal partners will open opportunities for regional development initiatives. However, it is still too early to measure this as the grants have not been implemented at the moment of Evaluation.

The work with the NES office has already brought positive effects on the level of capacities of local NES offices to initiate the active labour market measures. Nevertheless, as specific activities with final beneficiaries did not start at the moment of the Evaluation, it is not possible to measure the extent to which these measures contributed to economic development. (Please see Section 2.2. for a detailed overview of activities conducted so far).

***The Programme faces challenges in claiming capacity development.*** Across the entire scope of activities of PBILD, a large number of trainings, workshops and seminars have been held, and more are planned in near future. Reports and records have shown that these have been well received through evaluation forms handed out to and filled in by participants. However, this only tells a part of the capacity development story. Across the board, but with the exception of trainings done under the UN-HABITAT segment, the programme failed to include pre- and post testing of knowledge and skills when organising training, which is the actual evidence of change in capacities. Without this testing, the assumption is created that the trainings and workshops become a goal in itself, rather than a supporting tool to achieve a goal. The reason for this occurrence lies most likely with the original indicators, which are only quantitative in nature (“Number of…”) and have no quality elements (e.g. “at least x (or % of) participants score a minimum of y points on test”). PBILD outsources many of the trainings, hence it deserves recommendation to include pre- and post testing in the ToR for training providers. The programme may do well in following the methodology as illustrated by the trainings delivered through the UN-HABITAT intervention.

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 27.** What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the Joint Programme in accordance with the sex, age, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent? |

***The Joint Programme is contributing to empowerment of women.*** The gender working groups work towards creating measures for women participation. The work with young people through a variety of initiatives by IOM and UNICEF have contributed to the creation of a new generation of youth activists, and the strong partnership with the Ministry of Youth enables the extension of positive results achieved by the programme. Work on registering children with the local birth registry offices have opened significant opportunities for children to access education and the social protection system. Investment in support and capacity building of the Ombudsman office and the Coordination Body for Presevo, Bujanovac and Medvedja has significantly improved access to services for minority groups. In addition, the work on improving skills of teachers of Serbian as foreign language will significantly contribute to overall improvement of language skills of minorities to whom Serbian is not a mother tongue. These measures also contribute to positive effects on minority groups as the government will be better able to understand and respond to needs and rights through development of targeted policies (e.g. educational, cultural) for minority groups.

The Programme is implemented in predominantly rural areas, and the activities conducted most often represent the only educational, creative or developmental interventions in the area. Particularly the work of Youth Centers, small projects implemented (such as the Multiethnic Theatre group work in Lebane) contribute to increased knowledge and familiarity between ethnic groups, and decreasing social distance between different ethnic groups living in the region. Furthermore, support to the work of Mobile teams in the rural areas contributes to better outreach to isolated areas, and especially to the elderly in these regions. (Please see Section 2.2. for a detailed overview of activities conducted so far under each Outcome).

|  |
| --- |
| 3.4 Sustainability |

**Sustainability: the programme implementation is still not at the stage where sustainability prospects may be adequately measures. Still, most achievements of the PBILD programme in terms of institutionalising structures and policies gives indications towards positive sustainability prospects.**

|  |
| --- |
| **EQ 28.** Are the necessary premises occurring to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the PBILD programme? Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions? |

***Strong national and local government commitment and support facilitates sustainability of PBILD components.*** There is clear evidence about excellent leadership and commitment demonstrated by the MERD and MoYS. Also, there is evidence of support to the programme by the local authorities in the target region. Capacity building efforts, support to establishing and maintaining local policies and structures (e.g. youth offices, Regional working groups, Citizen Advisory services, Safer City Councils, revision and/or adoption of social and other relevant policies, etc.) bring benefits to strengthen their institutional sustainability and professionalised approach to organising and offering services to vulnerable and excluded groups.

***Sustainability prospects of the PBILD components are mixed.*** Sustainability of the PBILD components depends largely on the factors such as: technical and financial capacities of the local and national government partners. Local governments have limited capacities (both financial and technical) to continue following the new approaches, policies and services (to be) established by the PBILD programme. There is a need to continue investing in building capacities of local authorities, primarily through mentoring and on-job training to acquire and familiarise with new approaches as promoted by the programme. This is especially relevant for new measures, policies, structures and services for vulnerable groups (e.g. Roma, returning migrants, minorities), as such areas are also affected by low motivation and commitment of the government authorities to assist these groups.

# 4. CONCLUSIONS

The PBILD Programme has been a very relevant vehicle for enhancing capacities for inclusive development and peace building in South Serbia. The programme adequately targets and promotes positive policy and institutional measures to protect and empower socially excluded groups such as minorities, young people, children, women and potential and returning migrants. The programme’s investment in building evidence base on social indicators and current status of vulnerable groups in the region has become valuable resource for local and national government, but also international partners and social agents to develop interventions and measures to improve the status of vulnerable groups.

The programme’s work on strengthening capacities of national and local authorities, social service providers, regional development agencies, civil society and representatives of socially excluded groups themselves is a significant contribution to developing social capital, networks and links between social partners, but also contribution to developing effective and sustainable frameworks for protection of vulnerable groups. Venues provided by the programme to bring together and connect representatives of different ethnic groups around joint interventions significantly contribute to building confidence among these groups and increases potential for peaceful conflict resolution and peace building.

However, such broadly set programme framework and large scope of activities to be implemented provide significant challenges to the programme to keep its focus and not to overburden its counterparts and beneficiaries by large amounts of activities and measures. Development projects involving many partners, covering multiple municipalities and targeting different groups are by their nature complex and difficult to present in the generally rigid results framework. The PBILD results framework struggles with explaining clearly the link between the concrete activities (with target groups) with general changes, especially connecting these with objectively verifiable indicators (OVI-s). The review of the Programme’s results framework indicates this struggle. The Programme ‘log-frames’ (there are two: the MDTF “Indicators of Achievement”-matrix, and the MDG-F “Programme Monitoring Framework”) show rather poor development of the Programme intervention, with the fact that the outputs, activities and indicators are not clear, not SMART and not linked to each other, which provides certain difficulties in understanding properly the project logic. This may be explained by the fact that this Joint Programme has been brought together by putting together strategies, desired outcomes of individual UN agencies. However, the Programme would benefit from revision of the results framework, which would enhance the links between outcomes and outputs and would strengthen the links between interventions of individual agencies.

The Programme efficiency and effectiveness is affected by the delays in the inception phase, with the exception of Output 1.4 that was finished as planned. Nevertheless, the programme is accelerating its activities and has already gained momentum for the majority of its activities. However, despite the partial success of the programme, implementation suffers from the following dynamics:

1. Continued individual approach to separate interventions by participating UN agencies; limited integration of inputs into joint work plans demonstrated by the factual separation and presentation of individual agency inputs already at the initial design stage and continued during implementation;
2. Absence of strong and articulated support of all partners to integrated programme management, especially in terms of transferring the leadership from individual agency headquarters to the programme management team;
3. Lack of coordination between agencies, clear and unified reporting guidelines, format and reporting structure;
4. Lack of joint effort to create common planning cycle, operational procedures and reporting system for the purpose of ‘Delivering as One’- projects, in order to decrease the administrative and financial reporting burden and harmonise the administrative framework of such projects;
5. Lack of demonstrated effort of all but one of the individual UN Agencies to ensure cost effectiveness and synergies of the programme.

# 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the assessment conducted for the purpose of this Mid Term Evaluation, the following recommendations for the Programme have been drawn:

**1. Revise the Results Framework of the Programme**

However difficult it is to fit the results framework within the SMART criteria, still efforts should be invested to develop a logical framework that actually reflects causality between activities undertaken and results to be achieved. This will have multiple benefits: the intervention will be clearer to the donor, partners and other involved stakeholders; it will also facilitate the implementation, hence it will be easier to report and provide evidence for the achievements.

**2. Continue efforts to promoting coherence and ‘Delivering as One’ operating principles.**

All participating UN Agencies should put efforts to integrate their Agency-specific results, strategies, administrative and financial procedures and guidelines towards facilitating implementation of Joint Programmes, such as the PBILD. Special efforts should be placed in empowering the management team to take full leadership of the programme, instead having only a coordinating role, which subsists on the good will of participating agencies. Such approach would significantly improve the efficiency and effectiveness of programme interventions, but also would represent a role model of synergies, coordination and cooperation in delivering development interventions.

**3. Continue efforts to integration inputs of measurements to improve efficiency and effectiveness**

The management should re-consider the format that is in use for the work plans. The current Excel tables are correct but do not provide sufficient tools for management and coordinators to plan ahead and act. The use of Gantt charts or similar is recommended; it will support improving overall efficiency.

When organising training and other capacity developing activities, the programme should include pre- and post testing mechanisms in the ToR for training providers. The current evaluation sheets in use are merely measuring the quality of the training itself, but do not provide insight in changes in capacity. This will contribute to the overall effectiveness of the programme.

**4. Explore the potential synergies between programme components but also with other relevant programmes, interventions or initiatives that are implemented in South Serbia.**

The Programme has vast potential for synergies within its components that are implemented by different UN Agencies. Synergies, such as between UNICEF and UNDP (for the purpose of joint Call for proposals) should serve as example of good practice and should be further nurtured wherever possible Other programmatic synergies should also be proactively explored. Coordination with one other UN intervention in the region, the UNOPS implemented PROGRES, has been improving and this process should be intensified.

**5. Continue supporting and empowering local governments to fulfil their obligations towards protecting rights of their citizens.**

On-going capacity development measures that the Programme implements increase knowledge, sensitivity and commitment of the local authorities towards designing and implementing measures to protect and fulfil rights of social excluded groups. Mentoring and advisory roles of the programme should be reinforced, with special attention to advisory to local governments to develop and implement fully social protection and inclusion policies and services for extremely vulnerable groups such as Roma.

**6. Extend the programme duration.**

The PBILD programme tackles a range of developmental challenges that South Serbia faces today. On-going commitment from the donor community and national government should be granted to extending the Programme in order to reinforce the achievements today and explore opportunities to support activities needed for immediate strengthening of impacts and sustainability.

The extended programme time, in particular in the case of any extension granted, should be utilised to further support social protection, migration management and integrated regional development components. The MTE would suggest a period of 9-12 months.

**7. Devise an Exit Strategy for the Programme**

The Programme should start devising the Exit strategy. Such strategy would enable the Programme team, the donors and the UN Agencies to establish a set of clear steps for ensuring that the achieved results of the programme become sustainable and institutionalised within the municipal and regional policy and institutional frameworks.

Proposed elements of such a strategy are: a) include an evaluation of the key indicators and achievement; b) study and guarantee (local) government commitment; c) ensure community contribution; d) continuing technical support; and e) communication of the strategy to all stakeholders.

# Annex 1 – Evaluation matrix

| **EVALUATION CRITERIA** | **EVALUATION QUESTIONS (EQ)** | **JUDGEMENT CRITERIA (JC)** | **INDICATORS** | **SOURCES OF INFORMATION (SOI)** | **EQ SPECIFIC METHODOLOGY** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RELEVANCE** | **EQ 1.** Is the identification of the problems, with their respective causes, clear in the Joint Programme? | JC 1.1. The identification of problems and causal relationships is clear. | 1.1. The Programme documents lay out clear presentation of the problems and their root causes. | The Programme documents | Desk review. |
| **EQ 2.** Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women and men, specific age groups, ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged groups in the areas of intervention? | JC 2.1. Level of gender-mainstreaming by programme partners and relevant government institutions  JC 2.2. The interests of women and men, ethnic minorities and disadvantaged groups are clearly defined and well elaborated in the programme | 2.1. Gender is mainstreamed throughout the programme  2.2. Objectives on the strategic level reflect support for interests of women and men and disadvantaged groups, and respect for and protection of minorities. | The program document  Reports  Interviews with relevant stakeholders and representatives of target groups | Desk review.  Field work |
| **EQ 3.** 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 background with special emphasis on multi-cultural context and the EU accession process? | **JC 3.1.** The intervention strategy and use of financial assistance are relevant to and respond to the needs in the area of intervention.  **JC 3.2.** The Programme develops strong partnerships and mediation actions to respond to obstacles that may arise.  **JC 3.3.** The programme objectives are relevant to the European Commission strategies and EU accession process. | **3.1.1.** The objectives of the Programme have been reflected in the allocation of financial assistance over the evaluation period 2009-10, overall and on national level.  **3.2.1.** The Programme is based on strong logical framework. The programme allows for accurate and timely participation of a range of partners from different sectors and other key stakeholders in:  - Needs assessment  - Strategy selection  - Other key steps of the programming cycle  **3.3.1.** Objectives on the program level reflect support for human rights and respect for and protection of minorities. There is consistency between the way the EU accession priorities are reflected in the objectives on the different levels | Programme documents.  Reports from various sources.  Interviews with relevant actors.  Interviews with programme staff and core partners. | Desk review.  Field work. |
| **EQ 4.** Are the follow-up indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the Joint Programme? | **JC 4.1.** Indicators are used in relevant programming and monitoring and are SMART | **4.1.1.** Indicators are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound Percentage of relevant monitoring reports containing indicators  **4.2.1.** SMART indicators are systematically referred to and uniformly applied | Programming documents | Review of objectives comprised in the programming documents and assessment of their quality, clarity and specificity in view of the described sector and context needs. |
| **Ownership in the design:** **Effective exercise of leadership by the country’s social agents in development interventions** | **EQ 5.** 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? | **JC 5.1.** The intervention is informed about and has considered the existing national authorities' policies and strategies.  **JC 5.2.** Strategies and programme activities coherently and comprehensively address identified needs | **5.1.1.** References to national policies and strategies in the programming documents  **5.2.1.** Absence of contradiction between the priorities of the programming documents and of national policies and strategies | Programming documents  Country/regional strategies  Relevant studies, publications, documents by donors, international and local agencies, etc.  EU Progress reports  Interviews with UN Agencies and relevant stakeholders | Analysis of the SCILD programming documents and national policies and strategies in order to identify consideration, interconnectedness, absence of it or contradiction. |
| **EQ 6.** 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? | **JC 6.1.** Design stage of the programme ensured adequate and timely participation of a range of actors coming from national an local governments, social agents and other key stakeholders | **6.1.1.** The design stage of the programme allowed for accurate and timely participation of a range of other key stakeholders in:  - Needs assessment  - Strategy selection  - Other key steps of the programming cycle  **6.2.1.** Programming documents contain references to participation by a range of national and local government actors, social agents and other key stakeholders | Program documents pertaining needs assessments, strategy selection and other key steps of the programming cycle.  Program documents including strategies, and results framework. | Review of the programme design process and its products (programme document) in order to determine if and to what extent programming ensures representative participation by relevant actors in needs assessment, strategy selection and other key steps in the programming cycle. |
| **Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results** | **EQ 7.** To what extent does the Joint Programme’s management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) contribute to obtaining the predicted products and results? | J**C 7.1.** The administrative and organizational structures are in place ensuring the **effective** implementation of the Programme | **7.1.1.** Performance by administrative and organizational structures vis-à-vis agreed targets  **7.1.2.** Flexibility of administrative and organizational structures in adapting to changing external conditions  **7.1.3**. Contribution by administrative and organizational structures to ensuring visibility of the Programme | Programme documents.  Progress and monitoring reports  Reporting by National Authorities, Civil society and the media.  Structured interviews with Programme staff, UN Agencies, national authorities, programming and implementing actors, and beneficiaries of the Programme | Mapping of administrative and organisational targets as per r agreement and financing agreement    Mapping of administrative and organisational achievements vis-à-vis targets      Field work including structured interviews and focus groups |
| **EQ 8.** To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other, with the government and with civil society and other programmes/projects implemented in the area of intervention? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation? | **JC 8.1.** Programme implementation is based on well-developed coordination lines between participating agencies.  **JC 8.2.** The Programme takes accurately and timely account of other interventions promoted by government, civil society and other key donors  **JC 8.3.** Internal communications methodology is clear and logical. | **8.1.1.** Programme contains strong reference too coordination mechanisms between participating agencies.  **8.2.1.** The programme procedures allow for accurate and timely integration of information on other interventions promoted by government, civil society and by donors  **8.2.2.** Programme document contains reference to other interventions promoted by government, civil society and donors  **8.3.1.** Programme documents contain elaborated internal communications strategy | Review of the programme documents.  Other donors’ programming documents, progress reports, and monitoring and evaluation reports.  Interviews with representatives of government, civil society and donors. | Review of the programme document, monitoring and progress reports in order to determine whether programme implementation prevents duplication and overlap and promotes synergy with interventions (strategies, policies, programmes, projects) that are promoted by other stakeholders. |
| **EQ 9.** Are there efficient coordination mechanisms to avoid overloading the counterparts, participating population/actors? | **JC 9.1.** Programme implementation is based on well-developed coordination lines between participating agencies. | **9.1.** Programme contains strong reference too coordination mechanisms between participating agencies. | Review of the programme documents. | Review of the programme document, monitoring and progress reports in order to determine whether programme implementation prevents duplication and overlap and promotes synergy. |
| **EQ 10.** Is the pace of implementing the products of the programme ensuring the completeness of the results of the Joint Programme? How do the different components of the Joint Programme interrelate? | **JC 10.1.** The programme procedures are in place ensuring the efficient implementation of the programme. The programme implementation procedures are characterized by: clear and formal assignment and division of responsibilities, staffing and budgeting arrangements, and systematic monitoring data collection and analysis mechanisms.  **JC 10. 2.** The implementation of different components effectively contributes to achievement of results. | **10.1.1.** Programme structure in place through formal appointment of staff and adoption of program implementation procedures  **10.1.2.** Performance by organizational structures vis-à-vis agreed targets as per inter-agency agreements and financing agreement  **10.1.3.** Amount of financial, human and other resources used by the Programme  **10.2.1.** Progress and monitoring reports demonstrate satisfactory level of efficiency of the programme implementation | Revision of program documents, agreements; administrative data (procedures, staffing arrangements and structures)  Progress reports  Monitoring reports | Mapping of administrative structures;  Mapping of organisational structures  Mapping of data collection and analysis mechanisms  Review of administrative and organisational structures vis-à-vis “benchmarks” as per agreement  Field Missions including semi - structured interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| **EQ 11.** Are work methodologies, financial instruments, etc. shared among agencies, institutions and Joint Programmes? | **JC 11.1.** The programme contains clear reference to division of responsibilities between agencies, work methodologies, financial instruments, etc. ensuring the efficient implementation of the programme. | **11.1.1.** Programme structure in place through adoption of formal programme implementation procedures | Revision of programme documents, agreements; administrative data (procedures, staffing arrangements and structures)  Progress reports, Monitoring reports | Mapping of organisational structures  Field Missions including semi - structured interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| **EQ 12.** Have more efficient (sensitive) and appropriate measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural problems identified? | **JC 12.1.** The Programme is evidence based with a focus on the nature, scope and meaning of the political and socio-cultural problems.  **JC 12.2.** The programme approach is flexible and allows adoption of efficient and sensitive measures based on recognised changing and/or arising needs of the target groups. | **12.1.1.** The programme allows for collection, analysis and integration of evidence on the political and socio-cultural problems in the target region and wider context.  **12.2.1.** The programme builds on evidence on the political and socio-cultural problems in the target region and wider context | Country/sector reports.  Third party evaluations and studies  Interviews with relevant programme staff, UN Agencies, civil society, key governmental actors and other donors | Review of the programme implementation process in order to determine if and to what extent the programme ensures quality needs assessment, on-going monitoring of the external factors, etc. |
| **EQ 13.** In what way has the Joint Programme contributed to EU accession agenda? | **JC 13.1.** The programme contributes to the EU accession strategic objectives and agenda | **13.1.1.** Evidence of planned concerted action in relation to the programme contribution to EU accession strategic objectives | Programme documents  EU progress reports  Structured interviews with UN Agencies, national authorities, programming and implementing actors, and beneficiaries | Desk study of internal and external information sources  Field Missions including interviews and focus groups |
| **EQ 14.** To what extent the intervention strategy responded to interethnic tensions (design and results level)? | **JC 14.1.** The programme strategy responds to the interethnic needs and pressures. | **14.1.1.** Evidence of planned concerted action to respond to interethnic needs and pressures.  **14.1.2.** Evidence of developed risks/assumptions framework and mediation measures. | Programme documents  Programme progress reports  Structured interviews | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and beneficiaries |
| **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.** | **EQ 15.** Is the programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results? | **JC 15.1.** The programme is making identifiable impacts so far in its implementation. | **15.1.1.** Documented results acknowledge progress towards achievement of results set up by the programme.  **15.1.2.** Results of the Programme support are acknowledged by and benefit the society at large | Basic project documentation  Project Progress Reports  Interviews with direct and non-direct project stakeholders  Interviews with relevant stakeholders | The progress towards achievement of results will be based on the evaluation team’s validation of the progress. The investigation of this will focus on a number of sampled municipalities, beneficiaries and partners of the Program within different components, in accordance with the evaluation methodology. The work on this EQ will be based on interviews with direct and non-direct stakeholders |
| **EQ 16.** To what extent and in what ways is the Joint Programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels? | **JC 16.1.** The programme contributes to achievement of MDGs at local and national levels. | **16.1.1.** Documented results acknowledge progress towards achievement of results that contribute to MDGs at local and national level. | Basic programme documentation  Project Progress Reports  Interviews with direct and non-direct project stakeholders  Interviews with relevant stakeholders | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and beneficiaries |
| **EQ 17.** Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes? | **JC 17.1**. The programme is implemented within agreed timeframe. | **17.1.1.** Documented progress in achievement of outputs within the agreed timeframe. | Programme documents  Progress reports  Structured interviews with UN Agencies, national authorities, programming and implementing actors, and beneficiaries | Desk study of internal and external information sources  Field Missions including interviews and focus groups |
| **EQ 18.** Do the outputs produced meet the required high quality? | **JC 18.1.** The programme set quality standards for outputs to be achieved.  **JC 18.2.** The outputs of the programme meet the quality standards. | **18.1.1.** Documented quality standards for outputs to be produced.  **18.2.1.** The programme and its partners approve outputs based on quality standards. | Programme documents  Progress reports  Structured interviews with UN Agencies, national authorities, programming and implementing actors, and beneficiaries | Desk study of internal and external information sources  Field Missions including interviews and focus groups |
| **EQ 19**. 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? | **JC 19.1**. The formal and operational monitoring system is in place ensuring the efficient monitoring of the programme. The Monitoring system is characterized by: clear and formal assignment and division of monitoring responsibilities, staffing and budgeting arrangements, and systematic monitoring, data collection and analysis mechanisms. | **19.1.1.** Monitoring structures in place through formal appointment of a monitoring post and adoption of monitoring procedures  **19.1.2.** Quality data collection, analysis and disbursement mechanisms in place and in use. | Programme documents  Internal structures  Organisational data on monitoring procedures, staffing arrangements and structures  Programme Progress reports | Mapping of organisational structures  Mapping of data collection and analysis mechanisms  Review of monitoring framework and progress reports  Field Missions including semi - structured interviews with relevant monitoring staff. |
| **EQ 20.** Is the programme providing coverage to beneficiaries as planned? | **JC 20.1.** The programme implementation responds to the needs of all envisaged beneficiary groups.  **JC 20.2.** Quality needs assessment and response formulation are providing timely, accurate and comprehensive inputs to the planning and implementation based on problem analysis and budgetary and financing requirements | **20.1.1.** Evidence of coverage to all envisaged beneficiary groups.  **20.2.1.** Sector/beneficiary group needs assessments are acknowledged and given an effective and appropriate follow up in implementation of the programme | Programme documents  Progress reports  Structured interviews with UN Agencies, national authorities, programming and implementing actors, and beneficiaries | Desk study of internal and external information sources  Field Missions including interviews and focus groups |
| **EQ 21.** In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving? | **JC 21.1.** The programme has evidenced flexibility to adapt its approach to respond to raising needs during its implementation. | **21.1.1.** Records of programme revisions whereby new approaches and innovative measures were introduced to problems and needs arising during the implementation.  **21.1.2.** There is evidence of innovative measures developed by the programme. | Programme documents  Progress reports  Structured interviews with UN Agencies, national authorities, programming and implementing actors, and beneficiaries | Desk study of internal and external information sources  Field Missions including interviews and focus groups |
| **EQ 22.** Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified? | **JC 22.1.** The programme’s knowledge management contains evidence of good practices, success stories, or transferable examples for wider use and institutional memory. | **22.1.1.** Records of good practices, success stories, or transferable examples available and easily accessible via internet or other communication sources. | Programme website  Progress reports  Structured interviews with UN Agencies, national authorities, programming and implementing actors, and beneficiaries | Desk study of internal and external information sources  Field Missions including interviews and focus groups |
| **EQ 23.** In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to the issue of decent employment? | **JC 23.1.** The programme contributes to the issue of decent employment. | **23.1.1.** Documented results acknowledge progress towards achievement of results that contribute to the issue of decent employment. | Basic programme documentation  Project Progress Reports  Interviews with direct and non-direct project stakeholders | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and beneficiaries |
| **EQ 24.** In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to the issue of conflict/violence prevention? In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to the improvement of living conditions for IDPs and returnees? | **JC 24.1.** The programme contributes to the issue of conflict/violence prevention.  **JC 24.2**. The programme contributes to the issue of improvement of living conditions for IDPs and returnees. | **24.1.1.** Documented results acknowledge progress towards achievement of results that contribute to the issue of conflict/violence prevention.  **24.2.1.** Documented results acknowledge progress towards achievement of results that contribute to the issue of improvement of living conditions for IDPs and returnees. | Basic programme documentation  Project Progress Reports  Interviews with relevant stakeholders | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and beneficiaries |
| **EQ 25.** In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to the issue of internal and/or external migration, youth and gender specificities of the programme context? | **JC 25.1.** The programme contributes to the issue of internal and/or external migration, youth and gender specificities of the programme context. | **25.1.1.** Documented results acknowledge progress towards achievement of results that contribute to the issue of internal and/or external migration, youth and gender specificities of the programme context. | Basic programme documentation  Project Progress Reports  Interviews with direct and non-direct project stakeholders  Interviews with relevant stakeholders | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and beneficiaries |
| **EQ 26.** In what ways has the Joint Programme contributed to economic and regional inclusive development? | **JC 26.1.** The programme contributes to economic and regional inclusive development. | **26.1.1.** Documented results acknowledge progress towards achievement of results that contribute to economic and regional inclusive development. | Basic programme documentation  Project Progress Reports  Interviews with direct and non-direct project stakeholders | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and beneficiaries |
|  | **EQ 27.** What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the Joint Programme in accordance with the sex, age, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent? | **JC 27.1.** The programme has positive effects on different groups, relevant to their sex, age, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population. | **27.1.1.** Documented results acknowledge positive effects on different groups, relevant to their sex, age, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population. | Basic programme documentation  Project Progress Reports  Interviews with relevant stakeholders | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and beneficiaries |
| **Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.** | **EQ 28.** Are the necessary premises occurring to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the PBILD programme? | **JC 28.1.** Produced outputs of the programme are endorsed by government counterparts. | **28.1.1.** Evidence of support and endorsement of program outputs by the government counterparts. | Project Progress Reports  Interviews with relevant stakeholders | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and beneficiaries |
| **EQ 29a.** Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions? | **JC 29a.1.** National and local government counterparts support and endorse the programme. | **29a.1.1.** Evidence of governments’ support and endorsement of the program | Programme documentation  Interviews with government stakeholders | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and beneficiaries |
| **EQ 29b.** Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme and to repeat it? | **J.C. 29b.1.** Local government institutions have technical capacity and commitment to follow up on the achievements of the programme. | **29b.1.1.** Evidence of application of knowledge and skills of the government counterparts that were acquired from the participation in the program activities in their work.  **29b.1.2.** Recommendations from the programme effectively used | Adopted and revised Strategies adopted by relevant government counterparts with support by the programme.  Programme Progress reports and other relevant studies and documents  Interviews with relevant Government and CS representatives | Mapping of adopted and revised strategies supported by the programme  Mapping of governmental mechanisms administrative and management structures that have participated in the programme  Interviews and focus groups with government representatives to discuss the application of acquired knowledge. |
| **EQ 29c.** Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners? | **J.C. 29c.1.** National partner government institutions have technical to follow up on the achievements of the programme. | **29b.1.1.** Evidence of application of knowledge and skills of the government counterparts that were acquired from the participation in the program activities in their work.  **29b.1.2.** Recommendations from the programme effectively used | Adopted and revised Strategies adopted by relevant government counterparts with support by the programme.  Programme Progress reports and other relevant studies and documents  Interviews with relevant Government and CS representatives | Mapping of adopted and revised strategies supported by the programme  Mapping of governmental mechanisms administrative and management structures that have participated in the programme  Interviews and focus groups with government representatives to discuss the application of acquired knowledge. |
| **EQ 29d.** Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme? | **J.C. 29c.1.** Government institutions have sufficient capacity to follow up on the achievements of the programme. | **29c.1.1.** Evidence of commitment and budget allocations for follow up on adopted strategies, approaches to work and measures developed with support of the programme. | Adopted and revised Strategies adopted by relevant government counterparts with support by the programme.  Programme Progress reports and other relevant studies and documents  Interviews with relevant Government and CS representatives | Mapping of adopted and revised strategies supported by the programme  Mapping of governmental mechanisms administrative and management structures that have participated in the programme  Interviews and focus groups with government representatives to discuss the application of acquired knowledge. |
| **EQ 30.** To what extent are the visions and actions of the partners consistent or divergent with regard to the Joint Programme? | **JC 30.1.** Programme partners have consistent vision of the programme and its envisaged approach and achievements. | **30.1.1.** Chronicles of joint vision of the partners regarding the programme and its envisaged approach and achievements. | Basic programme documentation  Project Progress Reports  Interviews with relevant stakeholders | Desk study of internal information sources  Field Missions including interviews with staff members and partners. |
| **EQ 31.** In what ways can the governance of the Joint Programme be improved so that it has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability? | Response to the EQ 31 will be derived from the conclusions, based on the EQs 1-30. | | | |

# Annex 2 – Presentation of achievement of outputs and changed indicators within the SCILD component

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome of Joint Programme: 1. Communities in South Serbia are stronger, more integrated, and better able to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict risk** | | | | | | | | |
| Output | Indicators | | | | Responsibility | | | Observation/ Remarks |
| 1.1. Increased confidence of local population in key institutions of local and national government. | Perceptions on Coordination Body effectiveness in municipalities of Bujanovac, Presevo and Medvedja | | | | UNDP  Coordination Body  LSGs  NGO associations  Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, Public Administration and Local Self-Government | | | The Programme has established cooperation with the Coordination Body. Capacity building activities have been organised for the CB staff. The Programme conducted the CfP for project with leadership by the CB. |
| Number of instances where lobbying and advocacy by CB at central level has resulted in direct action by Central Government | | | | Advocacy by CB resulted in improvements in the educational measures for the three municipalities. |
| Number of instances where lobbying and advocacy by CB at local level have resulted in changes or action by stakeholders at the local level | | | | The CB succeeded to ensure 12 scholarships for students of Albanian and Serbian nationality for University of Novi Sad. |
| CSOs working in partnership with local government | | | | The Call for Proposals for CSOs working with local government has been open and at the moment, the CB and the PBILD are in the process of selecting the projects. |
| CSOs from the region applying for and accessing funds available at national level | | | | The CSOs are informed on opportunities for funding by the PBILD programme through different activities. No record of successful applications for funds at national level by CSOs from the region was found. |
| 1.2. Strengthened inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration among adolescents and young people. | Number of Youth Offices and Youth Centres who has been newly established or strengthened in the programme priority areas | | | | UNICEF  Ministry of Youth and Sport  Selected NGOs  Local Media  Coordination Body | | | Youth Offices were established before the programme started. The CfP for Youth Projects under which youth clubs will be funded has been conducted in spring 2011. 10 projects have been selected. |
| Number of youth of different ethnicities that have undergone relevant programmes organised for them locally | | | | Different capacity building activities have ben organised in cooperation with the Ministry of Youth and Sports. |
| Number and type of concrete advocacy, peer education and other activities initiated by youth groups and number of positive small-scale social change achievements made and other young people reached. | | | | Such activities have not yet started due to delays in the Programme. CfP for youth projects was conducted. 15 applications were submitted, out of which 8 projects were selected. |
| Number of exchanges and events involving mix ethnicity groups from the region | | | | Opportunities for young people of different ethnic groups have been opened through inclusion of young people in activities and workshops on Mediation (organised by IOM), youth capacity building, small projects, etc.  Small youth projects will be a good opportunity to extend the work of the programme in this area |
| Number of peer mediators trained, no. of networks established, no. of cases which have been addressed through peer mediation. | | | | Two trainings have been held for 31 peer mediators.  The peer mediators had an opportunity to have simulations of mediation cases but no real life cases have been addressed. |
| Outcome of Joint Programme: 2. Improved and more equitable access to public services and welfare benefits (including basic registration documentation, health and education) reduce feelings of exclusion and inter-ethnic tension. | | | | | | | | |
| Output | | | Indicator | | Responsibility | | Observation/ Remarks | |
| 2.1. Municipalities have strengthened ability to formulate, implement and monitor policies in relation to public service provision, and in particular, develop an awareness of differential impact of policies on different ethnic groups. | | | Number of learning programmes developed and implemented for municipal staff | | UNICEF  Local Gov  Centres for Social Work  CSOs  Ministry of Education  Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, Public Administration and Local Self-GovernmentSchools  Coordination Body  Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities | | Capacity building activities for municipal representatives organised through Regional Working groups (4 working groups: Gender, Integrated Regional Development, Environment and Waste Management, Migrations). | |
| Number of municipal strategies reviewed in the course of the programme | | N/A | |
| Number of gender equality commissions established | | Local mechanisms for gender equality exist in all 13 PBILD municipalities (Gender Councils or Gender Committees). Only two municipalities (Presevo and Surdulica) have Gender Co-ordinators. | |
| Number of municipalities where a clear linkage is demonstrated between the strategic plan and the annual budget | | N/A. | |
| Number of municipalities with a Devinfo system established | | The first phase in this project component was the assessment of capacities and training needs of municipalities in the area of monitoring and evaluation.  On the basis of the assessment, it was recognised that given the very low level of M&E knowledge and capacity, it will not be sufficient only to install DevInfo databases and expect increase in usage. Instead of that, a few additional support components have been added:  Three-day training on using data in the process of planning, monitoring and evaluation and policy making (Implementing partners: SECONS and Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia-SORS) | |
| Examples of where analysis/information from Devinfo feeds into policy making decisions at the local level | | The examples of feeding information from DevInfo into policy making decision at the local level we will be possible after delivery of the IT equipment to municipalities after October 2011. Higher level of usage of the database is expected as of spring 2012 when municipalities receive a revised database with the set of indicators they indicated as needed | |
| 2.2. Vulnerable and ethnic minority children have improved access to public services and benefits to which they are entitled. | | | Number and percentage of children with required identity documents, and number and percentage of children who have received the required documentation; | | UNICEF  Local Gov  Ministry of Health  Health Care Inst. | | * 100 (18%) children who filed requests for documents; * 78 (78%) of children who received documents; * 459 (82%of adults who filed requests for documents; * 408 (89%) of adults who received documents; * 62 (87%) of children who are not registered in the birth registry books; * 9 (14%) of children whose files are in the procedure of registry; * 9 (13%) of adults who are not registered in the birth registry books; * 0 (0%) of adults whose files are in the procedure of registry. | |
| Number of migrant children identified and provided with adequate services | | UNICEF  Local Governments  Schools  Coordination Body | | There were no registered migrant/returnee children | |
| Number and percentage of children and women included in the health system | | The database has been revised and improved during summer 2011. The data reports will be available by the end of September. | |
| Number of families (children, parents, adolescents) reached with minimum package of preventive/care interventions. | | The health project component aimed at increasing access and quality of services for socially excluded children within the health care system will start its implementation in the field/primary health centres from Sept/Oct 2011. | |
| Citizen satisfaction with public services, by type of service. | | Not available. | |
| 2.3. Improved qualities of public services, especially in those areas that have potential to increase inter-ethnic dialogue and reduce conflict risk. | | | Numbers of teachers trained through in-service trainings | | 84 teachers participated in trainings on active learning methods for teaching Serbian as foreign language. | |
| Percentage of minority children enrolled in preschool and school programmes | | N/A. | |
| Number of migrant children enrolled and provided with education opportunities | | N/A. | |
| Number of schools in rural areas involved in a School as a Centre for Community Development Programme | | N/A. PBILD does not directly support development of schools from rural areas as centres for community development. | |
| Specific education events targeted at improving Albanian children’s Serbian language skills | | Active learning methods for teaching Serbian as foreign language for Teachers of Serbian language (Albanian, Bulgarian and Serbian nationality) have been organised for 17 schools and 84 teachers. | |
| Specific education events targeted at improving migrant children Serbian language skills | | See above. | |
| 2.4  Support to capacity development and awareness raising of the role of Ombudspersons Outreach Office in South Serbia | | | Number of Registered cases | | UNDP  Ombudspersons Office  Municipalities  Coordination Body | | Total of 105 cases were registered at Ombudsperson’s outreach office in municipalities of Bujanovac, Presevo and Medvedja until September 6, 2011. | |
| Number of cases resolved | | Number of resolved cases in 2010 was 58, and in 2011 there was 13 resolved cases. The total until September 2011 amounts to 71 resolved cases. | |
| Number of trainings for staff | | THE PBILD supported 21 mentor visits (one mentor visit per month), and the Ombudsperson office staff had 17 days of various trainings. | |
| Outcome of Joint Programme: 3. Increased overall economic prosperity of the region, and reduced discrepancies in wealth and employment between municipalities, between ethnic groups and between women and men. | | | | | | | | |
| Output | | Indicators | | Responsibility | | | | Observation/ Remarks |
| 3.1. The labour market disadvantage of population groups and geographical areas (i.e. municipalities) reduced through more and better access to targeted active labour market programmes that respond to labour market requirements | | Number of employers’ and skills survey conducted in the timeframe of the programme | | ILO  National Employment Service (NES)  Local Gov  Ministry of Economy and Reg. Development  Ministry of Education | | | | The Occupation and Skills Survey was commissioned in February 2011 to the Statistical Office of Serbia. It surveyed a total of 666 enterprises and 487 entrepreneurs (i.e. unincorporated businesses). The aim was to identify enterprises, occupations and skills most likely to create jobs in the short to medium term. The research was jointly financed by the PBILD Programme and by the joint programme on *Youth employment and migration* (YEM) financed by the Millennium Development Goals Fund. It is part of the activities aimed at building the capacity to collect and analyse data on labour supply and demand.  Part of the questionnaire administered during the Occupation and Skills Survey was aimed at identifying the skills needs of enterprises in the short (12 months) and medium term (3-5 years). The research also detected prevailing practices in workers’ recruitment, on-the-job-training and willingness to collaborate with the National Employment services (NES) |
| Number of occupations identified that are included in competency-based training | | Yes. The occupations that are expected to create more jobs in the short to mid-term are (ISCO 2008 codes in brackets)  - Shop sales assistants (ISCO Code 5223);  - General office clerks (4109);  - Bakers, pastry-cooks and confectionery makers (7512);  - Food and related products machine operators (8160);  - Woodworking-machine tool setters and operators (7523);  - Metal working machine tool setters and operators (7223).  The preparatory work leading to the design and testing of competency-based curricula is underway. Such task will be conducted in collaboration with the practitioners of the Regional Adult Training Centres of the Ministry of Education to build their capacity in competency-based training curriculum development. |
| Number of disadvantaged individuals (by type of disadvantage and or risk of migration) covered by employment services and active labour market programmes (by type of programmes and individual characteristics) | | The active labour market measures designed under the aegis of the PBILD started at the beginning of September, so it is currently not possible to say with certainty how many individuals have benefitted. |
| Number of previously inactive individuals registered with the employment services and covered with individualized services | | See above. |
| Percentage of students receiving career information and guidance | | See above. |
| Percentage of disadvantaged individuals achieving a recognized qualifications through CBT | | Currently none, as the work on CBT development has just been initiated. |
| Percentage of disadvantaged individuals employed in decent work 6 month after participation to active labour market programmes | | Not available yet. |
| 3.2. Increased funding for regional and municipal level infrastructure projects that will impact upon job creation. | | Technically stronger staff in the RDA | | UNDP  Regional Development Agency (RDA)  Ministry of Economy and Regional development  Coordination Body | | | | The PBILD Programme coordinates with RDA on the needs of its staff and capacity building support. |
| Number of pipeline of future projects for region developed | | N/A |
| Number of key infrastructure projects implemented | | N/A |
| 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 | | On-going. |
| Outcome of Joint Program 4. Migration Management : Migrants in South Serbia are provided with appropriate support to participate in the social and economic life of the region. | | | | | | | | |
| Output | | | Indicators | Responsibility | | Observation/ Remarks | | |
| 4.1. Municipal Administrative Services Better Meet the needs of Migrants | | | Number of Bureaux established that provide advice and legal support to migrants | UNDP  Municipal Government  Commissariat for Refugees | | Revised in accordance with revisions to original activities approved at October PMC – establishment of two Citizen’s Advisory Bureaus changed to provision of citizen’s advisory services through PBILD Social Partnership Grants scheme.  PBILD Social Partnership Projects have two lots:   * Initiating Citizen Advisory Services (8 projects) * Initiating/Improving direct support services (5 projects)   The eligible Lead Applicants were 13 local self-governments that are included in the PBILD program. The local self-government (the Lead Applicant) is responsible for the implementation of that project. Partnership was mandatory for both lots. Local institutions and/or civil society organisations as additional (optional) partners. | | |
| CSW outreach services developed | Yes, in: Vladicin Han, Vlasotince, Bojnik, Leskovac, Trgoviste (home care service)   * Crna Trava (improving of services for gaining self-reliance and permanent employment) * Bosliegrad (combination of home care and reconstruction/building of temporary shelter) * Vranje (vocational trainings) | | |
| CACs develop services that cater for the needs of migrants | No CAC, but Citizens Advisory Services (5 municipalities).   * Vladicin Han, citizens’ advisory service desk and mobile team. Part of the Citizens assistance centre (CAC) in V Han, 3 days office work, 2 days field visits (mobile team) * Vranje, citizens’ advisory service part of the Centre for Social Work * Medvedja, citizens’ advisory service, part of the CAC and field work as well * Leskovac, citizens advisory services provided through 3 info stands, public campaign, training. * Bujanovac, citizens’ advisory service, part of the CAC, advisory desk, registry book digitalization team, and field team. | | |
| Number of strategies adapted to meet the needs of migrants | 12 Social Protection Strategies analysed by the PBILD, in terms of their compliance and response to the needs of migrants.  The Strategy revision process that will be based on the analyses produced by PBILD, will be led by the Municipalities and will include public hearings. The Public hearings are also assured also through Social Partnership Projects as one of the activities. The revised strategies will include migrants as one of the target groups.  One (1) new Social Protection Strategy and Action Plan was designed in Presevo and adopted by the Municipal assembly. | | |
| 4.2. Capacity Development to Manage Migration Issues. | | | Reviews of existing data and identification of data gaps | UNDP  Municipal Government  Commissariat for Refugees | | The Survey on Migrations was conducted in the first year of the Programme implementation. | | |
| Migration issues incorporated into Municipal Plans | The Social Protection Strategy adopted in Presevo already incorporates migration issues. In other municipalities, the revision is underway. | | |
| Local level policies developed that have a positive impact upon migrants at the local level | Most municipalities are either in the process of designing or have designed Local Action Plans for Migration Management, besides the Social Protection Strategies. These Action Plans are being developed by Local Migration Boards with assistance of IOM and Capacity Building for Migration Management (CBMM) project. | | |
| Number of training events and seminars held at both the local and national level | 2 regional round tables (February and July 2011)  1 training  45 working meetings in 13 municipalities with representatives of Local Authorities, CSOs, trustees, Roma coordinators, Centres for Social work, to promote outreach services, raise level of knowledge on the readmission process, migration in general, its effects, causes and possible actions to tackle the problems. | | |

# Annex 3. Summary of Results Framework – MDG-F

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UNDAF Outcome 3.1: Sustainable Development Plans that Effectively Respond to the Need of People, Communities and Promote Rural Development** | | | | | | | | |
| **Joint Programme Outcome 1: Communities in South Serbia are stronger, more integrated and better able to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict risk** | | | | | | | | |
| **JP Outputs** | **SMART Output** | **Responsible UN Agency** | **Implementing Partner** | **Indicative Activities for each Output** | **Resource Allocation and Indicative Time Frame** | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** | **Total** |
| 1.1 Provide support to institutional strengthening of the governance structures in South Serbia to facilitate participation of women and ethnic minorities in policy and decision-making processes  Indicators   * Number of representatives of all ethnic groups, including women from each ethnic group, participate actively in local political life * % of local policies developed taking into consideration the needs of marginalised groups; women and men * Number of articles published/broadcasted through local/national media affirming the gender, social inclusion issues and easing the inter-ethnic tensions * Number civil servants trained, by gender * Level of citizens satisfaction on local media reporting, by gender * Number of strategic documents selected for revision * Number of CSOs supported * Number of editors and journalists trained, by sex   % of population willing to vote (disaggregated by gender and ethnicity)  Baseline   * Weak confidence in local institutions and non-balanced inter-ethnic and gender representation in local institutions and political life * Low level of women representation in municipal bodies ; only 4/100 are Presidents and 27/100 are local board members * Low level of professional media reporting as a mean for reducing inter-ethnic tensions | **1.1a** By the end of the first 6 months of the JP, baseline on political participation of women and minority ethnic groups established | UNDP  UNDP | Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self Government  Ministry of Labour and Social Policy / Gender Equality Directorate  Ministry of Human and Minority Rights  Municipal Governments  Coordination Body | 1.1.1 Develop and carry out gender and minority ethnic groups based assessment on position of women and men in social, political, economic and cultural life at local level  1.1.2 Based on the findings, develop recommendations for achieving more inclusive participation at the local level  1.1.3. Produce a brochure "Women and men in South Serbia" and support to institutions in collecting gender and ethnic disaggregated data | **83,460**  5,000  5,000  10,000 | **130,540** | **80,250** | **294,250** |
| **1.1b** At least 40 civil servants from 13 municipalities (min. 2/municipality) and representatives from Coordination Body trained to  formulate, implement and monitor gender and human rights responsive policies | MPALSG  MoLSP/GED  MoHMR  SCTM  Coordination Body  Municipal Governments | 1.1.4. Develop gender awareness training curricula for civil servants  1.1.5 Conduct gender awareness trainings for civil servants and follow on the training (support for establishing local gender equality mechanisms)  1.1.6 Support for regional gender thematic group  1.1.7 Develop training curricula and conducting training sessions for formulation, implementation and monitoring of gender and human rights responsive policies  1.1.8 Capacity development for Coordination Body to inform policy making on central level, taking into account conflict resolution needs from South Serbia actors | 1,000  13,000  4,000  4,000 | 13,000  4,000  15,000  4,000 | 4,000  4,000 |  |
| **1.1c** By the end of first 18 months of the JP, representatives of main political parties trained to formulate and advocate for inclusive development policies | UNDP | MPALSG  MoLSP/GED  MoHMR  SCTM  Coordination Body  Municipal Governments | 1.1.9 Organise gender awareness workshops for local political parties leadership  1.1.10 Support political participation of women and men from all ethnic groups on the local level through capacity development workshops | 5,000  6,000 | 5,000  15,000 | 5,000  15,000 |  |
| **1.1d** By the end of JP, at least 5 CSOs supported in development, implementation and monitoring of gender/inter ethnic related projects | UNDP  UNDP  UNDP  UNDP  UNDP | MPALSG  MoLSP/GED  MoHMR  SCTM  Coordination Body  Municipal Governments | 1.1.11 Mapping of CSOs and their needs in 13 municipalities  1.1.12 Support to CSOs through mentoring  1.1.13 Grants to CSOs for gender/inter ethic related projects | 1,000  2,000  12,000 | 4,000  19,000 | 2,000  19,000 |  |
| **1.1e** At least one strategic document in at least 3 selected municipalities revised to reflect particular needs of women and minorities | Municipal Governments | 1.1.14 Organize consultations to select the most appropriate strategic document |  | 2,000 | 2,000 |  |
| **1.1f** - By the end of the first 6 months of the JP, assessment conducted of conflict-, gender- and minority-sensitivity of local media reporting | Municipal Governments  Coordination Body | **1.1.15 Conduct review of media communities in South Serbia to perform quantitative and qualitative analysis of media reporting on gender and ethnic sensitive issues in conflict prevention framework** | 4,000 |  |  |  |
| **1.1g** By the end of JP, national and especially local broadcast and print media offer increased production of news, information and entertainment in local languages which is gender- and conflict-sensitive, thereby contributing to peace-building | Municipal Governments  CSOs | 1.1.16 Organise gender awareness training for local media journalists and editors  1.1.17 Organise workshops (including development of curricula) and mentoring to raise local media awareness of and capacity for gender- and minority rights-sensitive and conflict-sensitive reporting  1.1.18 Support for production of TV, print or radio format on the above mentioned topics (see 1.1.17)  1.1.19 Establish partnerships between local and national media stakeholders to facilitate collaborative approaches for supporting conflict sensitive local media coverage  1.1.20 Establish awards and recognition mechanism for local media for conflict-sensitive report and/or best media report on a sensitive or controversial gender of inter-ethnic theme | 4,000  2,000 | 5,000  9,000  25,000  2,000 | 7,000  2,000  15,000 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.2 Inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration among both young men and young women of different ethnicities strengthened  Indicators   * Attitudes and experience of young men and women in relation to inter-ethnic collaboration * No of young men and women from each ethnic group, participating actively in programme events   Baseline  To be defined. | **1.2a.** Institutional mechanisms for participation and development of young men and women (of different ethnic background) are strengthened in three selected municipalities | UNICEF | MoYS, Youth Offices& municipalities | 1.2.1 Advocate and contribute that three 2-4 Youth offices have secured funding i.e. are integrated within municipal structures and plans from 2010 onwards.  1.2.2 Contribute to capacity of Youth office staff and partners to manage programmes for youth that focus on the interethnic understanding and collaboration  1.2.3 Based on the local capacities support availability of space/Youth Centre in selected municipalities for youth programmes for all youth. | **68,494**  11,400  9,500  24,000 | **119,198**  5,200  4,000  24,200 | **94,588**  4,000  2,000 | **282,280** |
| **1.2b** At least 600 young men and women are engaged in programmes that increase inter-ethnic understanding and collaboration and benefit from them | UNICEF | Youth offices with selected Youth groups and NGOs & other partners | 1.2.4 Field assessment among young men and women and within local community members to identify their attitudes, values, risks, interests, life priorities and triggers and agents for change etc.  1.2.5 Support youth groups and partners to develop programmes of interest and run by young men and women that increase social cohesion, participation of young men and women and produce social change (peer education programmes around conflict prevention, child/human rights, gender equality of other interest and priorities for youth etc; including and youth led activist programmes for local change)  1.2.6. Support quality implementation of programmes and their monitoring by the Youth offices | 12,000  11,594 | 27,000  58,798 | 18,000  70,588 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.3 Strengthening capacities of local self governments, institutions and civil society to engage on conflict/violence prevention planning through participation, dialogue and partnerships for improved safety in municipalities  Indicators   * Peoples perception of conflict / violence risk, feelings of belonging / integration * Representatives of all ethnic groups, including migrants from each ethnic group, participate actively in implementing programme components * Number of municipal staff and civil society organizations representatives from all ethnic groups trained on conflict and violence prevention and participatory planning for improved municipal safety * Number of Municipalities engaged in inclusive and participatory planning for improved inter-ethnic dialogue and municipal safety * Number of safety strategies and action plans formulated through inclusive participatory process and adopted by Municipalities * Number of local partnerships involving different ethnic groups actively engaged in safety and conflict prevention pilot initiatives * Number of officials included in the training on violence against women (MDG 3,Target 4)   Baseline  To be defined through the baseline safety diagnosis/assessment   * Negative perception of safety and personal security among local population * Low level of trust in local government institutions and police in providing appropriate mechanisms to address conflicts and improve multi-ethnic dialogue and representation * Violence and crime rates * Inequalities in accessing basic services, education and employment * Physical and spatial organization of communities, preventing dialogue, integration and equal access to services * Only 50 officials included in training on violence against women in 2006 (MDG 3 baseline year, target is 1,000) | 1.3a By the end of the first 6 months of the JP baseline safety diagnosis have been carried out in 13 municipalities | UN  HABITAT | | Local Self Governments (LSG)  Local Police offices  Municipal Safety Councils/Boards  Center for Social Works (CSW)  NGOs |  | **293,876** | **356,473** | **0** | **650,349** |
| 1.3.1 Carry out a baseline safety diagnosis in each selected municipality | 26,000 |  |  |  |
| 1.3.2 Organize inclusive restitution workshops with the communities in each selected municipality to enhance ownership of results | 30,000 |
| 1.3.3 Dissemination through the development of appropriate communication tools | 5,500 |
| 1.3b By the end of the JP partnerships have been established among key local partners, LSGs, safety boards, local police, CSWs and CSOs, to improve community safety and interethnic dialogue through joint actions | UN  HABITAT | | Local Self Governments (LSG)  Local Police offices  Municipal Safety Councils/Boards  Center for Social Works (CSW)  NGOs | 1.3.4 Design capacity building programmes to improve awareness and skills of local self governments in participatory planning, good governance and leadership for improved municipal safety and prevention of violence | 30,500 |  |  |  |
| 1.3.5 Deliver 2 Training of Trainers targeting local partners to be engaged in facilitating and support the establishment of partnerships and planning processes for improved safety | 40,000 |  |
| 1.3.6 Conduct Training Cycles in the selected municipalities | 17,500 | 15,000 |
| 1.3.7 Monitor supervise and coach the replication of the training cycles in the selected municipalities | 15,000 | 14,000 |
| 1.3.8 Organize workshops, seminars and round tables to support local-to-local dialogues and the development of safety partnerships at community level in the selected municipalities | 20,000 | 20,000 |  |  |
| 1.3.9 Organize workshops and seminars to exchange experiences and good practices between neighbouring municipalities, and with national and international partners | 30,000 | 20,000 |
| 1.3.10 Develop adequate communication and dissemination tools to facilitate and support local-to-local dialogues and local safety partnerships | 15,150 | 12,152 |
| 1.3c By the end of the JP LSGs have engaged in participatory planning processes and developed institutional mechanisms, instruments and tools (diagnosis, strategies and/or action plans, projects) to address community safety, conflict and violence prevention and integration | | UN  HABITAT | Local Self Governments (LSG)  Local Police offices  Municipal Safety Councils/Boards  Center for Social Works (CSW)  NGOs | 1.3.11 Support municipal participatory planning processes and mobilization of key local stakeholders through appropriate communication, campaigns, events, round tables | 10,000 | 10,000 |  |  |
| 1.3.12 Organization of workshops and round tables for the formulation of local safety strategies and action plans with full participation and inclusion of the community | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| 1.3.13 Formulation of local safety strategies and action plans in the selected municipalities |  | 15,000 |
| 1.3.14 Support the implementation of pilot initiatives (through grants to institutions) informed by the key priority areas identified in each municipality through safety diagnosis |  | 162,000 |  |  |
| 1.3.15 Monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Pilot Initiatives | 30,000 |
| **1.3d** At least 30 local professionals trained in conflict mediation approach  **1.3e** Increased capacities of at least 10 PBILD staff engaged in South Serbia | | IOM |  | 1.3.16 Design and implement conflict prevention capacity building programme (conflict mediation skills and techniques) targeting local professionals from different ethnic groups working in local institutions and civil society organisations  1.3.17. - Monitor and supervise the replication of the conflict prevention CB program in the target area  1.3.18. - Carry out 3 sets of conflict awareness and mediation seminars for PBILD staff | **78,671**  39,697  38,974 | **125,455**  125,455 | **0** | **204,126** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.4 Reduced risk of inter-ethnic tensions through multi-faceted dialogue; improved living conditions for IDPs (especially female IDPs);  **Indicators**   * Sustainable livelihood solutions provided to IDPs in South Serbia. * Necessary documentation / legal counselling provided to IDPs * Dignified housing solutions provided to IDPs.   **Baseline**   * Living conditions in CCs are far from dignified; hosted people are usually the ones who have not so far succeeded in finding an alternate solution to the CC, or they had found the solution but not the support they needed for its realization. * IDPs are in need of free legal assistance with regard to local integration: access to basic socio-economic and property rights, problems with personal documentation and other unresolved legal issues. * IDP LSMS findings show that housing is one of the most pressing concerns. More than 10%of IDP households live in dwellings that are not intended for housing and housing conditions are at a basic level. | 1.4.a Provide legal assistance to IDPs  1.4.b – Provide sustainable accommodation solutions to support IDPs leaving CCs or living in sub-standard private accommodation | UNHCR | NGOs, Local Government | Activity 1.4.1 - Automatisation of dislocated registry books from the Kosovo municipalities (Gnjilane, Vitina, Kosovska Kamenica, Novo Brdo) are automated.  Activity 1.4.2 - 2,000 IDPs informed and counselled on documentation and property issues; 1,500 requests for obtaining documents submitted to the registry offices and the land cadastre in Southern Serbia; 30 cases of subsequent registration/re-registration into registry books dislocated from Kosovo to Serbia initiated.  Activity 1.4.3 - About 80 IDPs supported in leaving the CCs to enter private accommodation by the end of the project.  Activity 1.4.4 - 33 IDP families reach an acceptable standard of living and accommodated through Partial Self Help.  Activity 1.4.5 - 19 IDP families moved from CCs/ private accommodation to village houses and provided with Dependency Reduction Grant. | **541,197**  67,706  49,132  25,091  113,763  131,613 | **231,808**  0  26,000  0  64,718  133,448 | **0**  0  0  0  0  0 | **773,005**  67,706  75,132  25,091  178,481  265,061 |
| **Outcome 1 Subtotal** |  |  |  |  | **1,065,698** | **963,474** | **174,838** | **2,204,010** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Joint Programme Management, Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation** | | | | | | | | |
| JP Monitoring and Evaluation System  **(including lessons learned and dissemination of results)** | A system of monitoring and evaluation is developed and used to assess the performance of the JP in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact by the end of the JP | UNDP | MPALSG | a) Design the monitoring and evaluation system for each outcome of the JP  b) Conduct regular monitoring of the performance of the JP to measure relevance and efficiency and feed findings into the JP implementation system  c) Conduct final evaluation of the JP | **0** | **26,750** | **26,750** | **53,500** |
| JP Management & Coordination | A functioning and coordinated Programme Implementation Unit (PIU) established and operating throughout the life of the JP | UNDP | MPALSG | a) Establish a Programme Implementation Unit (PIU) under the direction of a Programme Manager  b) Perform capacity assessment of participating institutions  c) Develop capacity development programmes addressing the needs of the partnering institutions  d) Perform functional analysis of the institutions involved, estimation of the financing needs and recommendation for the sources of financing to be used for the following mid-term period  e) Preparation of the handover plan | **80,830** | **80,830** | **80,830** | **242,490** |
| **PIU Subtotal** |  | | | | **80,830** | **107,580** | **107,580** | **295,990** |
| **OUTCOME 1 with PIU Subtotal** |  | | | | **1,146,528** | **1,071,054** | **282,418** | **2,500,000** |

# Annex 4. List of Interviews

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Commissariat for Refugees | Ljiljana Rakic | 06/09/2011 |
| Centre for Development of Jablanica and Pcinja Districts | Biljana Stankovic | 08/09/2011 |
| Centre for Development of Jablanica and Pcinja Districts | Tatjana Panic-Zivkovic | 08/09/2011 |
| Coordination Body | Danijela Nenadic | 05/09/2011 |
| Coordination Body | Milica Rodic | 05/09/2011 |
| CSO Ruza | Aleksandra Ristic-Stosic | 09/09/2011 |
| CSO Youth Centre | Jovana Mihalovic-Mijovic | 13/09/2011 |
| Gender Regional Working Group | Valentina VUkosavljevic-Pavlovic | 08/09/2011 |
| ILO | Jovan Protic | 05/09/2011 |
| Independent Expert | Vladimir Jovanovic | 12/09/2011 |
| IOM | Jelena Vlajic-Mitric | 07/09/2011 |
| IOM | Lidija Markovic | 07/09/2011 |
| Embassy of the Kingdom of Spain | Manuel Selas | 23/09/2011 |
| Ministry of Economy and Regional Development | Jovanka Vukmirovic | 06/09/2011 |
| Ministry of Education/Education Forum | Sasa Glamocak | 07/09/2011 |
| Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, Public Administration and Local Self-Government | Dusko Radakovic | 15/09/2011 |
| Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, Public Administration and Local Self-Government | Branka Grban | 15/09/2011 |
| Ministry of Health | Vladimir Kacarevic | 06/09/2011 |
| Ministry of Labour and Social Policy | Jasna Vujacic | 07/09/2011 |
| Ministry of Youth and Sports | Zorica Labudovic | 06/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Leskovac | Milorad Mladenovic | 08/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Leskovac | Predrag Jovic | 08/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Lebane | Mica Stankovic | 09/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Lebane | Nenad Jovanovic | 09/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Lebane | Nenad Zagorac | 09/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Lebane | Sasa Pesic | 09/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Presevo | Besim Abduli | 14/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Presevo | Fatmir Azizi | 14/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Presevo | Muhamed Abdulahi | 14/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Presevo – Youth Office | Avni Aliti | 14/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vranje | Tijana Milovanovic | 12/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vranje | Jasmina Petrovic | 12/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vranje | Maja Jovic | 12/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vranje | Nebojsa Ljubic | 12/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vranje | Zorica Pesic | 12/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vranje | Branimir Stojancic | 12/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vranje – Youth Office | Milica Andjelkovic-Jovanovic | 14/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vladicin Han | Nenad Mitrovic | 13/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vladicin Han | Slovenka Stojkovic | 13/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vladicin Han | Miroslav Vuckovic | 13/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vladicin Han | Milan Vuckovic | 13/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vladicin Han | Marija Janjic | 13/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vladicin Han | Dejan Nikolic | 13/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vladicin Han | Janus Kurtic | 13/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Vladicin Han – Youth Office | Milos Jovanovic | 14/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Surdulica | Dusica Stankovic | 13/09/2011 |
| Municipality of Surdulica – Police | Vladica Stankovic | 13/09/2011 |
| National Employment Service | Zoran Antic | 12/09/2011 |
| Ombudsperson’s office | Mina Rolovic-Jocic | 07/09/2011 |
| Ombudsperson’s office | Daliborka Nikodimovic | 07/09/2011 |
| Ombudsperson’s office | Radenka Grubacic | 07/09/2011 |
| PRAXIS | Ivana Stankovic | 06/09/2011 |
| Primary School “Sami Frasheri” Bujanovac | Iliriana Ibrahimi | 14/09/2011 |
| Primary School “Sami Frasheri” Bujanovac | Genci Djumsiti | 14/09/2011 |
| Primary School “Sami Frasheri” Bujanovac | Mustof Redjepi | 14/09/2011 |
| Republic Statistical Office | Vladica Jankovic | 05/09/2011 |
| Safer Cities Trainer | Jelena Visic | 08/09/2011 |
| Swedish International Development Agency | Snezana Nenadovic | 05/09/2011 |
| Swiss Development Cooperation | Beatrice Meyer | 02/09/2011 |
| Swiss Development Cooperation | Petar Vasilev | 02/09/2011 |
| UNDP | Juerg Staudenman | 07/09/2011 |
| UNDP | Milena Isakovic | 07/09/2011 |
| UNHCR | Milos Terzan | 16/09/2011 |
| UNICEF | Aleksandra Jovic | 02/09/2011 |
| UNICEF | Jelena Zajeganovic | 02/09/2011 |
| 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 |

1. The Survey shows that 70% of Bulgarians; 75% of Albanians and 50% of Roma voted in the last local elections in 2008. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The rating is as follows: 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest rating of trust. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Human Development Report for Serbia (2005); Human Development Index rankings where for the total 25 Districts of Serbia Jablanica and Pcinja are ranked 21st and 25th respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Republic Statistical Office, *Living Standard Measurement Study Serbia 2002–2007,* Belgrade, 2008. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Not including UNMIK Kosovo [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. SMART stands for Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound criteria [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. National Strategies may be found at: <http://www.srbija.gov.rs/vesti/dokumenti_sekcija.php?id=45678> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The European Commission (2011); Multiannual Indicative Planning Document 2011-2013, <http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/how-does-it-work/financial-assistance/planning-ipa_en.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)