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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Final Evaluation of the *Improving* *Cultural Understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina* Joint Programme has the following objectives:

* To assess the Joint Programme’s quality and internal and external coherence with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Bosnia and Herzegovina, national development strategies and priorities, the Millennium Development Goals at the local and country level, the level of contribution to the objectives of the Culture for Development thematic window, and find out the degree of local ownership.
* To assess how the Joint Programme operated and what was the efficiency of its management model to guide future joint programming among United Nations agencies.
* To assess the design and relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the programme and the level of achievement of envisaged programme results.
* To assess the quality, results and impact of local programme interventions including the evaluation of co-financing modality and implementation capacities on a local level.
* To assess the programme’s different internal and external monitoring and evaluation systems and tools developed and assess the programme’s communication strategy, outreach activities and impact.
* To identify key recommendations and lessons to be learned.

The intended audience for the report is the United Nations Office of Resident Coordinator, the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund secretariat and donors, the participating United Nations agencies and country team, the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina, entity and municipal authorities, other development agencies, non-governmental organisations, civil society and other beneficiaries.

The methodology adopted was based around desk research, site visits and observational research and consultations over twelve days in-country. The main data sources were programme documents and third party reports and publications. There were no major limitations to the implementation of evaluation, although it was of course only possible to visit a small selection of projects supported limiting to some extent an in-depth comprehension of the complexities of the Joint Programme.

In terms of the key evaluation issues the findings are as follows:

*Relevance and design*

The Joint Programme objectives were relevant to the problems it was supposed to address and to the physical and policy environment within which it operated. It was formulated to meet a real and current need for reconciliation and better intercultural understanding, and the understanding of culture as a wide-ranging and contemporary force in society. In this regard it is in full compliance with the guidelines for the Fund’s Culture and Development thematic window. Consultees were very supportive of the Joint Programme concept, and of the timeliness of the intervention.

The design of the Joint Programme was generally appropriate for reaching its results and outcomes with a strong implementation framework, programme clear and logical monitoring and evaluation matrices and indicators of activity. The use of local monitoring teams which fostered capacity enhancement was particularly innovative. Management arrangements were clearly defined and extensively supported institutional strengthening and local ownership in the cultural and education ministries. The Joint Programme design took into account cross-cutting issues especially in strategy documents and through calls for proposed activities under thematic windows relating to handicrafts design, access to culture, cultural tourism, arts for understanding and schools projects.

*Efficiency*

The Joint Programme has been very dynamic in turning its resources and inputs into important strategic reviews and policy development, especially at state and entity level. It has also supported a prodigious range of cultural activities at municipal level, including some innovative intercultural projects in contemporary arts and education. The Joint Programmes’ financial and personnel resources were managed in a transparent and accountable manner which were generally cost-effective. Persistency was applied in attempting to address difficult problems and this resulted in locally acceptable solutions. The commitment and dedication of United Nations staff and partners shine through.

The different components of the joint programme interrelated well, although grant aid distributed to non-government organisations and municipalities for strengthening the cultural industries sometimes lacked an economic development framework into which they could fit, particularly for cultural tourism and crafts which have considerable economic and job creation potential: These were relatively small intervention areas however.

Work methodologies and financial instruments were shared among agencies, institutions and other Joint Programmes. Other resources were mobilized to contribute to the programme’s outcomes and produce results and impacts.

*Effectiveness*

Progress in achieving the objectives of the development intervention is clearly apparent. The quality of the programme’s key outputs has been mostly good and contributed toward the achievement of key results. More international best practice experiences of public-private partnership in the arts, in marketing and in successful cultural tourism development could perhaps have been drawn upon through United Nations experience in other countries, but it is acknowledged that strong local engagement in the Joint Programme was achieved and contributed to its effectiveness.

*Impact*

The Joint Programme had a significant effect on its operating environment through its work in strategy review for culture, the many educational initiatives which it supported, and the many arts and other activities which it funded at local level. Its impact appears to be more of an organisational impact than an economic impact in the long term, but in the short term economic impact was achieved by the wide dispersal of funds to municipalities, non-governmental organisations and to support schools. Despite delivering training in measuring impact, the Joint Programme itself has difficulty in articulating its economic impact to date. Social impact will come through the Joint Programme’s excellent work in the education area and its support for restoring important cultural symbols: The Joint Programme also brought contemporary culture and the arts to many local communities. The intervention made a significant organisational impact on its key stakeholders: Institutional development, legislative development, and capacity development have all been increased in the areas of culture, heritage and education. The education sector has been positively impacted though greater awareness and deeper understanding of intercultural and inclusive education concepts. Significant efforts were made to foster the Joint Programme’s agenda with the media also and to bring about behavioural change: Impact on the media seems questionable however, although many trainings were undertaken. The issues of gender, youth and social inclusion were raised on decision-makers’ agendas and good governance was positively impacted.

*Sustainability*

It is probable that benefits from the programme will continue after Joint Programme funding ceases. In particular this relates to the enhanced capacities of beneficiaries and the embedding of programme activities in local institutional structures for culture, heritage and education. Uncertain leadership commitment and a possible lack of financial means to continue activities is a sustainability concern. The duration of the intervention was also short in terms of sustainably embedding change.

In overall terms the Joint Programme has been very successful in creating awareness of the value of culture and shared heritage; and in strengthening capacities related to it, and of concepts of intercultural and inclusive education. There is an opportunity for future United Nations interventions to continue to support intercultural education, peace-building and platforms for intercultural dialogue, and in particular a need to focus on the economic development potential of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s cultural industries to create sustainable employment and address poverty issues.

# INTRODUCTION

## Purpose of the evaluation

*Evaluation is about* Are we doing the right thing? *It examples the rationale, the justification of the undertaking, makes a reality check and looks at the satisfaction of intended beneficiaries. Evaluation is also about* Are we doing it right? *It assesses the effectiveness of achieving expected results. It examines the efficiency of the use of inputs to yield results. Finally, evaluation asks* Are there better ways of achieving the results? *Evaluation looks at alternative ways, good practices and lessons learned*. (United Nations Evaluation Group [UNEG]).

The final evaluation of the *Improving Cultural Understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina* Joint Programme was commissioned by the Office of Resident Coordinator (ORC) for the United Nations in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The main purpose of the evaluation is to provide an independent in-depth assessment of the achievements of Joint Programme results and outcomes against the planned results and the implementation modality of the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) *Culture for Development* programme. The Joint Programme is a partnership implemented by three United Nations agencies in Bosnia and Herzegovina: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organisation (UNESCO).The terms of reference for the final evaluation are attached at annex 1. Its objectives are as follows:

* To assess the programme’s quality and internal and external coherence with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Bosnia and Herzegovina, national development strategies and priorities, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) at the local and country level, the level of contribution to the objectives of the MDG-F Culture for Development thematic window, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
* To assess how the Joint Programme operated and what is the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and operational and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and any limitations in inter-agency tasks, collaboration and synergies. It will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Joint Programme modality and make recommendations to guide future joint programming among United Nations agencies in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
* To assess the design and relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the programme and the level of achievement of envisaged programme results and its four outcome areas.
* To assess the quality, results and impact of local programme interventions on municipal and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and on grant projects financed through the programme, including the assessment of co-financing modality and implementation capacities on a local level.
* To assess the programme’s different internal and external monitoring and evaluation systems and tools developed, including data collection, statistics, research and analytical outputs, databases, guidelines, etc. and assess the programme’s communication strategy, outreach activities and impact.
* To identify key recommendations and lessons to be learned.

## Methodology of the evaluation

The methodology approved for the evaluation was outlined in the Inception Report (March 2012). It sought to integrate secondary and primary research, together with observational research of the relevant stakeholders and examined the wider context in which the MDG-F programme is embedded. An extensive programme of consultations was undertaken in country (annex 2). Actual outcomes, global and specific, in the form of key performance indicators (KPIs) were compared and contrasted against the planned outcomes in the Joint Programme Document and results framework, which was updated evaluation (annex 3). The roles of these three implementing agencies, and of partner organizations, and the extent of common coherence and cooperation was reviewed. The extent to which there are commitments to continue initiatives commenced under the Joint Programme with government, the European Union (EU) or other funding was also reviewed. Consultations and site visits were important during a mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## Limitations of the evaluation

The Joint Programme is a complex and extensive undertaking, not entirely complete at the time of the final evaluation. Over 100 individual initiatives were supported in 48 municipalities spread across Bosnia and Herzegovina. An evaluation is not an audit: Financial records and compliance with United Nations tendering, recruitment and sub-contracting procedures have not been examined in detail. The Final Evaluation involved a twelve day in-country mission visiting five municipalities and including both entities (*Federacija Bosna i Hercegovina* [FBiH] and *Repubika Srpska* [RS]). Not all outputs could be reviewed in the evaluation timescale, and many are not written in English (as is appropriate in the Bosnia and Herzegovina context). None-the-less the consultant is satisfied that the Final Evaluation is representative and fair.

## Structure of the evaluation

The Final Evaluation is structured in chapters as follows:

* The Joint Programme and its development context
* Relevance
* Design
* Efficiency
* Effectiveness
* Impact
* Sustainability
* Overall conclusions and recommendations

# THE JOINT PROGRAMME AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

## Programme description

### Background

The Joint Programme *Improving Cultural Understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina* is an $8 million intervention financed under the MDG-F’s ‘Culture and Development’ window. The MDG-F was established in 2006 and is an international cooperation mechanism whose aim is to accelerate progress on MDGs worldwide. Substantial funding comes from the Spanish Government. MDG-F is supporting four programmes in Bosnia and Herzegovina of which the programme now being evaluated (Culture and Development) is the largest. The other three Joint Programmes are as follows:

* Thematic Window: Youth Employment and Migration

Programme title: Support to National Efforts for the Promotion of Youth Employment and Management of Migration

Total Budget: US$6,000,000

* Thematic Window: Environment and Climate Change

Programme title: Mainstreaming environmental governance: linking local and national action in Bosnia ad Herzegovina

Total Budget: US$5,500,000

* Thematic Window: Economic Governance

Programme title: Securing Access to Water through Institutional Development and Infrastructure

Total Budget: US$4,450,000

The programme builds on existing efforts of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in the areas of the protecting and revaluing cultural heritage, inter-ethnic dialogue, tolerance building in education, and human rights-based approaches to programming, including social inclusion.

### Concept note

The Joint Programme’s Concept Note was submitted to the MDG-F Secretariat in New York on 22 June 2007. The areas of focus proposed were the policy/legal framework in the cultural and educational sectors, community-based interventions to increase cross-cultural understanding, promotion of the cultural industry sector, and promoting Bosnia and Herzegovina’s unique multicultural identity. Using a participatory approach to guide interventions at policy and municipal levels, the joint programme intended to maximize the economic and social benefits of cultural development and make a contribution to the reconciliation process. Relevant MDGs that were to be primarily targeted under the Culture and Development Joint Programme are the following: MDG 1 (end extreme poverty and hunger); MDG 2 (universal primary education); MDG 3 (gender equality); and MDG 8 (global partnership).

The Concept Note highlights the necessity of a dynamic interpretation of culture that emphasizes unity and commonalities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, while acknowledging diversity as a key asset. Cultural development is seen as a key ingredient of nation-building (*sic*), recognizing that the unique coexistence of diverse cultures is a comparative advantage and a source of strength.

### Joint Programme Document

The Joint Programme Document is the overall guiding document which sets out the strategic basis and intervention approach. It outlines the activities to be implemented by UNDP, UNICEF and UNESCO and is a binding contract. The document points out that culture was an integral part of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that at the same time, the re-visioning and revival of culture in the country is crucial to its future, including its social, political and economic development.

Culture is defined in the Joint Programming Document as including cultural heritage (the document recognises Bosnia and Herzegovina’s unique ‘east meets west’ history). Cultural tourism is also highlighted and seen as having potential for economic development. In addition to tourism, the cultural industries which have a potential for wealth and job creation are outlined as including publishing, music, cinema, crafts and design.

This strategic approach of simultaneously addressing centralized (top-down) and bottom-up approaches, whilst providing visible and effectively communicated cultural change, was devised to provide a closely coordinated and structured programme to deliver the overall outcome of strengthened cross-cultural understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Culture is recognised both as a value in itself and as a contributor to socio-economic development.

The total approved budget for the Joint Programme is as shown in table 1. This was boosted by contributions in cash and in kind from various partners: These are discussed further at chapter 5.

Four mutually-supportive outcomes in the Joint Programme were designed to achieve the overall goal of strengthening cross-cultural understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina. These are as follows:

1. Improving the cultural policy and legal framework,
2. Improving cross-cultural understanding,
3. Strengthening the cultural industries, and
4. Improving tolerance towards diversity (a more focussed change from the Concept Note where the fourth outcome was referred to as ‘Bosnia and Herzegovina’s unique multicultural identity promoted’).

**Table 1: Joint Programme budget**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Agency** | **US $** | **Percent** |
| UNDP | 4,497,078 | 56.2 |
| UNESCO | 1,792,732 | 22.4 |
| UNICEF | 1,710,190 | 21.4 |
| TOTAL | 8,000,000 | 100.0 |

*Source: MDG-F Joint Programme office*

## Programme duration

The United Nations Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MTDF) advised the ORC of approval of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s Culture for Development Joint Programme on 15 May 2008. The Joint Programming Document was signed by all United Nations parties on 28 October 2008 and activity commenced on 10 December 2008. The three year programme was due to end in December 2011 however in response to the ORC’s request, on 15 November 2011 the MDG-F Secretariat granted a six months’ and twenty days’ no cost extension to the Joint Programme. Programme-funded activity will now end on 30 June 2012. Three detailed Annual Work Plans were drawn up for the Joint Programme, together with a six month plan for the current exit period.

## Problems that the programme seeks to address

The Revised Standard Joint Programming Document points out that since the 1992 to 1995 war, which ended with the Dayton accords[[1]](#footnote-1), Bosnia and Herzegovina has remained deeply divided. During the conflict religious and cultural monuments and buildings were destroyed. The *Strategy for Cultural Policy for Bosnia in Herzegovina* (Bosnia and Herzegovina Council of Ministers, 2005) was seen as a useful document to build on, which required a new and more consensual process to ensure its implementation. The need to broaden cultural policy and to integrate it into other domains, notably education and the media was identified.

The Joint Programme Document notes that entire education system in the country is divided based on ethnic grounds with separate curricula applying, perpetuating and institutionalizing cultural fragmentation. The Joint Programme sought to:

* address respect for diversity in education delivery methods and curriculum content; and
* foster intercultural competence.

In the public sphere the need to develop a better spirit of interculturalism was identified. The joint programme sought to:

* Inculcate a better tolerance and understanding based on positive cultural symbols amongst the media, cultural opinion leaders, and stakeholder groups.

The revitalization of cultural heritage was seen as important in order to:

* help to overcome the painful divisions caused by past events;
* create new openings for local, regional and international enterprise and cooperation; and
* overhaul the legal framework governing heritage.

## Immediate and development objectives

The overall objectives of the Joint Programme was summarised as follows:

Outcome 1 focuses on strengthening the capacity of government and relevant institutions in agenda-setting, policy development and implementation for culture and the culture-focused aspects of education.

Outcome 2 aims to promote cross-cultural understanding by building the municipal level pedagogic and service delivery roles of the public sector and civil society.

Outcome 3 engages the private sector in its role as a driver of growth and economic inclusion[[2]](#footnote-2).

Outcome 4 seeks to catalyze the behavioural change that is necessary to sustain progress in the first three areas (*Revised Standard Joint Programming Document*, 2008).

In terms of cross-cutting issues the Joint Programme highlighted social inclusion, gender and youth-related objectives. Young people were to make up a substantial proportion of the beneficiaries: Modern media, and the design and marketing of neo-traditional crafts in the cultural industries were highlighted.

The activities, roles and outputs of the three United Nations agencies are annexed to the Joint Programme Document. Principal outputs were to be as outlined in table 2.

## Main stakeholders

The lead partner in the Joint Programme is the state-level Ministry for Civil Affairs on behalf of the Council of Ministers. Other government stakeholders involved include the following:

* Agency for Pre-primary, Primary and Secondary Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina
* Agency for Statistics
* FBIH Ministry of Culture and Sports
* Ministry of Education and Culture RS
* FBiH Ministry of Education and Science
* Ministries in charge of education in ten cantons of FBiH
* Pedagogical Institutes
* FBiH Institute for Protection of Cultural Heritage
* Republic Institute for Protection of Cultural-Historical and Natural Heritage RS
* Institute for Statistics FBiH
* Institute for Statistics RS
* Department for Education of the Brcko District Government.

Core municipality–level stakeholders are as follows: Bijeljina, Rudo, Jajce, Prijedor, Bihać, Gradiška, Srebrenik, Novo Sarajevo, Tešanj, Sokolac, Trebinje, Mostar and Ravno. Map 1 shows the total number of municipalities impacted, including core municipalities (blue) and clusters (yellow). Annex 4 summarises the very impressive range of activities undertaken in all these municipalities.

Educational stakeholders involved are universities and all primary schools in ten municipalities. Civil society sector stakeholders are cultural and community centres in ten municipalities and a wide range of NGOs and educational foundations from Bosnia and Herzegovina and abroad, such as the European Training Foundation from Italy (partner in mapping teacher competences for intercultural education), and the Institute for Education from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

**Table 2: Key outputs by agency**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Output area** | **Output** | **Lead agency** |
| *1. Improving the cultural policy and legal framework* | Providing the evidence-base for strategy development in the culture sector | UNDP/UNESCO |
| Facilitating the production of a Bosnia and Herzegovina Cultural Development Strategy through a participatory process*.* | UNDP/UNESCO |
| Improving policies and their implementation to ensure access to quality intercultural education. | UNICEF |
| Supporting the preparation of strategies and legal framework*.* | UNESCO |
| Providing monitoring and evaluation training activities to relevant government agencies | UNDP |
| Developing a system to monitor the implementation of improved educational policies. | UNICEF |
| *2. Improved cross-cultural understanding at the community level.* | Developing community level educational approaches to address ethnically-based inequalities. | UNICEF |
| Analyzing and addressing barriers to cross-cultural tolerance. | UNICEF |
| Supporting community-based creative projects that improve cross-cultural understanding. | UNDP |
| Reinforcing stakeholder capacities in the field of interculturalism. | UNESCO |
| *3. Strengthened cultural industries.* | Supporting artistic-entrepreneurs through strategizing, marketing and vocational training | UNESCO |
| Promoting cultural tourism. | UNDP |
| *4. Improved tolerance towards diversity* | Promote intercultural awareness and sensitivity through media and stakeholder partnerships. | UNDP |
| Promoting intercultural sensitivity in the educational sphere. | UNICEF |
| Rehabilitating and restoring major symbols of interculturalism | UNESCO |

*Source: Joint Programming Document, 2008*

## Inception phase

The Joint Programme’s Inception Report outlines the structures of programme management, the joint communications strategy, how monitoring and evaluation will be delivered and how cross-cutting issues will be addressed. The Inception Phase saw considerable elaboration of the programme’s results framework, targets and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) approach. These issues are discussed further at chapter 3.

## Implementation

Three annual work plans plus a six month plan for the extension period are the detailed planning documents for jointly agreed programme activities. Table 3 illustrates expenditure by agency and year.

**Map 1: MDG-F Culture for Development areas covered**



*Source: MDG-F Joint Programme Office*

*Note: Boundaries and names used in this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.*

**Table 3: Programme expenditure by agency and year (US$)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Final phase** | **Total** |
| UNICEF | 573,344 | 716,309 | 213,777 | 283,175 | 1,786,606 |
| UNESCO | 610,374 | 855,031 | 211,538 | 210,261 | 1,887,204 |
| UNDP | 1,316,610 | 2,033,163 | 910,274 | 138,140 | 4,398,188 |
|  | 2,500,329 | 3,604,503 | 1,335,590 | 631,577 | 8,071,999 |

*Source: MDG-F Joint Programme office*

## Mid term evaluation

The Mid-Term Evaluation Report (Otero, 2010) indicates a well designed programme with strong engagement of governmental partners. Strong teamwork during the implementation phase is reported and good adaptation creativity to the implementation needs. At mid-term stage implementation was seen as progressing well and financial draw-down was on track. The 2010 election process was identified as a risk to continued good implementation however, should there be a hardening of intercultural attitudes.

## Main component outputs to date

Component outcomes are multiple and wide ranging. Only main outputs are touched on here; annexes 3 and 4 contain more detail at state and municipality level. Under Outcome Area 1an initial overview was undertaken through the mapping the culture and existing statistical data; together with a survey on business entities which relate to cultural industries and a survey on participation in culture. Methodology for collection of data for cultural statistics was prepared and adopted officially. Cultural web-portals (websites) were created through a separate working group in order to be aligned with each other (state and entity level) and relevant for larger audiences. An Action Plan for Implementation of Strategy of Cultural Policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina was also devised and officially adopted by the Council of Ministers, as well as the entity ministries and all cantonal ministries of culture. Extensive capacity development training was undertaken.

An analysis of the existing curricula and school practice from intercultural perspective was undertaken, together with mapping of teachers' competencies for intercultural and inclusive education. UNESCO Conventions ratified by Bosnia and Herzegovina were publicised and a preliminary list of intangible cultural heritage was devised for the first time. The Programme also developed sets of educational materials (manuals and tool kits for intercultural education) for teachers, children, parents, trainers and other publications. Translation of UNESCO Guidelines for Intercultural Education was undertaken and the programme developed and implemented cultural policies and legal frameworks.

Under Outcome Area 2 *o*ver 40 projects were selected to be implemented with the goal to improve cross-cultural understanding in local communities. Pupil exchange between different communities was facilitated and the important KAP benchmarking study was initiated. This Survey started in December 2009, aiming at establishing the situation in terms of knowledge, attitudes and practices in cross-cultural relations and preparing a campaign for changing the mindset which would contribute to improvements in cross-cultural relations in line with methodology applied in many countries with such needs.

Under Outcome Areas 2 and 3 projects were implemented which encourage the role of culture in economic development. In the NGO sector thematic windows included (i) supporting innovation in handicrafts, (ii) improving access to culture, (iii) cultural tourism, and (iv) arts for understanding. Substantial training was given to encourage better projects and to enable sustainability in local civil society organisations and municipalities regarding their local strategies and funding applications[[3]](#footnote-3). In addition a series of trainings were provided with the focus on enhancing capacities of local participants from crafts sector in selected municipalities.

Under Outcome Area 4 the challenging area of improving tolerance for diversity in Bosnia and Herzegovina is addressed. An analysis of media on cultural sensitivity was undertaken and a methodology for media analysis was drawn up. The analysis was seen as a precondition for quality preparation of training for capacity development of media professionals, which will enable government institutions to gain better understanding of cultural sensitivity in reporting and to record changes (and possibly progress) in cultural sensitivity during reporting. A campaign promoting cross-cultural sensitivity in education sphere was also initiated. The goal of this campaign for changing mindsets was to bring about positive changes in cross-cultural understanding. Thirdly important symbols of multiculturalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina were restored. Three were planned within the project, but UNESCO managed to contribute to restoration of eleven monuments and Spanish Square in Mostar. Sites supported included the Ferhadija Mosque in Banja Luka, the Orthodox Cathedral in Mostar, the Monastery Plehan near Derventa, conservation works in Hambarine and Sutjeska, the Mithras Temple in Jajce, the Museum Herzegovina in Trebinje, the Eminagić House (*Eminagića kuća*) in Tešanj, the Orthodox Cathedral in Sarajevo, a tourist Information point at Zavala, and Spanish Square in Mostar.

# RELEVANCE

*Relevance is defined in* *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) guidelines as the appropriateness of the programme objectives to the problems it was supposed to address, and to the physical and policy environment within which it operated.*

## Consistency with government policy

### Culture policies

The Council of Ministers’ *Strategy on Cultural Policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina* (2008) has the following primary strategic goals:

1. Special (strategic) stimulus to protection, reconstruction, restoration, re-cultivation and multi-sector promotion of natural, monumental and architectural heritage in Bosnia and Herzegovina,
2. Special (strategic) stimulus to education (as a response to challenges of post-industrial society),
3. Special (strategic) stimulus to science, also as a response to challenges of post-industrial society), and
4. Special (strategic) stimulus to regional cooperation in culture as fundamental principle of sustainability and creative vitality in Bosnia and Herzegovina culture.

The Joint Programme directly took forward this government policy document, elaborating upon it and developing an Action Plan for its delivery. Many of the goals of the Joint Programme are based upon the Government’s policy on culture and indeed have been elaborated and are now passed back to the Government for action at the end of the intervention. There is a relatively seamless policy fit.

### Education policies

While there is some degree of unanimity regarding cultural policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina (in that a state-level policy exists) research undertaken by UNICEF[[4]](#footnote-4) shows that there are pronounced differences in policy in the country between entities, cantons and municipalities relating to all key issues regarding education. Divided and mono-ethnic schools, multiple curricula, lack of respect for legal safeguards and fears regarding loss of identity in multi-ethnic schools are all highlighted. These are all severe challenges for implementing social inclusion and child protection measures. In this very confused situation ‘consistency with government policy’ is difficult to define. The educational aspects of the Joint Programme were therefore developed and implemented around furthering reform of education and trying to bring about a consistency of approach regarding cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and inclusive education.

### Economic development policies

The OECD has examined economic development policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina and highlights the need to align Government policy with the main objectives of the EU’s Investment Compact for the Balkans Region. Key priorities are to:

* Improve the climate for business and investment.
* Attract and encourage private investment.
* Ensure private sector involvement in the reform process.
* Instigate and monitor the implementation of reform.

The Joint programme’s approach was focussed on state and entity governments, municipalities and NGOs but not on the private sector. Addressing the underlying economic challenge of a disproportionately large public sector and assisting the transition from socialism to private enterprise through creating sustainable private sector employment were not targets of the Joint Programme (*recommendation for future [R]1[[5]](#footnote-5)*). The Action Plan on Culture, and the Government’s Culture Strategy which it builds on, do highlight economic development potential, but both require further commitment by government counterparts on how to deliver it in practical terms (*R2*). It is possible that private sector investment may be attracted to publicly funded projects (an *ex-post* evaluation question) and a study on public-private partnership (PPP) was commissioned.

### Tourism policies

At state level, the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations has a coordinating role in tourism development. Its co-ordination function is executed by a Department of Tourism. The Ministry of Trade and Tourism of RS has direct responsibility for tourism development and promotion in the entity, and drafted the *Tourism Development Strategy for the Republika Srpska 2010-2020*, which has been approved. The plan highlights the cultural heritage of RS as an important tourism asset. The FBiH Ministry of Environment and Tourism also has a draft *Strategy for Development of Tourism* for period 2008 to 2018 which also highlights culture and heritage as tourism assets[[6]](#footnote-6). At a practical level, most tourism promotion is undertaken by Tourism Associations which are quasi-autonomous bodies operating at local government levels and collectively.

## Assisting European Union accession

Bosnia and Herzegovina has been a potential candidate country for EU accession since 2003. Priorities under the Thessaloniki Agenda include actions on good governance, culture and education, all areas which the Joint Programme sought to address. In the area of education in particular major measures to resolve fragmentation of the educational system and the overlap of functions between different levels of organisation are constitutional issues which the Joint programme could not address.

Many of the Joint Programme’s activities in relation to international conventions, rights of women and children, social inclusion and social protection, social dialogue, assisting people with disability, discouraging segregation in education, addressing broadcasting reform and improving statistics are highly relevant to furthering Bosnia and Herzegovina’s agenda for EU accession. For example the *Culture for Better Tomorrow* project for persons with disabilities ran a series of organised workshops (Darovnice and Maštovnice) and cultural events, seven concerts and seven exhibitions were held (Derventa).

## Compliance with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) lays out an action-oriented roadmap to improve the quality of aid and its impact on development. The Paris Declaration outlines the following five fundamental principles for making aid more effective: Ownership, alignment, harmonisation, results, and mutual accountability: Donors and partners are accountable for development results. The Accra Agenda (2008) sees to strengthen and deepen implementation of the Paris Declaration and takes stock of progress and sets the agenda for accelerated advancement towards the Paris targets. It gives added emphasis to capacity enhancement.

It is clear from both the Joint Programme Document and the Inception Report that the concept of local ownership, partnership, results measurement and capacity development are fundamental principles of the Joint Programme, so activities planned were clearly in line with these joint-donor agreements.

## Relevance to Millennium Development Goals

The report Progress towards the Realization of the Millennium Development Goals in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Ministry of Finance and Treasury and UNCT, 2010) examines in detail the importance of the MDGs to Bosnia and Herzegovina. Annex 5 outlines progress expected towards MDGs achievement in Bosnia and Herzegovina by 2015. The Joint Programme Document highlighted the following MDGs as being relevant to its proposed activities:

MDG 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger;

MDG 2: Achieve universal primary education;

MDG 3: Promote gender equality and empower women; and

MDG 8: Develop a global partnership for development.

The Joint Programme’s relationship to MDG 1 is based around the need to build inclusive, culturally diverse society in order to address poverty in a rural society with high unemployment. Social inclusion was highlighted as a cross-cutting issue. In relation to MDG 2 the Joint Programming document highlights youth as being a particular group which could benefit from development of the cultural industries and they are the target for educational advancement. It points out that further detailed analysis is needed to examine the extent of (cultural) segregation and discrimination in schools; it also recommends a shift towards addressing higher levels of education and linkages with the labour market. Reform of education to meet EU standards is suggested. Regarding MDG 3, the Joint Programme was set within a cross-cutting focus on gender equality across ethnicities and cultures. Under MDG 8 the MDG progress report the importance of inter-agency and inter-governmental cooperation is highlighted, and the need to develop a more information technology (IT) focussed society.

## Relevance to the MDG-F Culture and Development window

The MDG-F Culture and Development Window comprises eighteen joint programmes that promote culture as a vehicle for social and economic development and political participation. The main interventions focus on cultural rights, social inclusion and increasing the cultural heritage and tourism potential of countries with the aim of reducing poverty, increasing employment and improving socio-economic opportunities for the marginalized segments of the population. The fund sought applications which addressed the following:

* Design, implement, and evaluate public policies that facilitate the political participation and protect the rights of groups excluded on cultural grounds. *These initiatives would support the formulation of inclusive policies, laws and regulations which protect cultural rights, respect intercultural relations, increase political participation, facilitate the representation of excluded groups, reduce discrimination, and promote equal opportunities;*
* Promote cultural and creative industries as drivers of economic and social development and means for expanding people’s opportunities; *and/or*
* Develop institutional capacity to generate useful and accurate information monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of cultural policies. (2007:5)

The Joint Programme followed closely MDG-F’s examples of areas that proposals might cover. Bosnia and Herzegovina is specifically mentioned as a target country for this MDG-F thematic window:

in countries driven? with deep-rooted conflict, greater tolerance of cultural diversity, trust, and inter-cultural dialogue, both among and within nation-states, and the creation of power-sharing institutions, also facilitates peace-building and the conditions for lasting recovery. Conflicts arising within plural societies divided by linguistic, religious and ethnic cultural identities have been at the forefront of UN recovery and peace-building activities, notably in the Palestinian Territories, Lebanon, the DR Congo, Iraq or Bosnia-Herzegovina (*sic*) [2007:3].

The Joint Programme very significantly addressed dialogue although not ‘the creation of power-sharing institutions’ for culture: This would have required much greater consensus and a willingness to consider constitutional reform, for which there appears little appetite at present despite probable economic benefits from closer cooperation..

In terms of economic benefits that could flow from greater cooperation, the general introduction to the MDG-F guidelines stress culture’s job creation potential, which is an urgent need in Bosnia and Herzegovina:

culture can clearly facilitate economic growth through job creation, tourism and the cultural industries (i.e. culture as an economic sector for production, consumption, and access)[2007:2]).

They also call for action against poverty:

The fight against poverty from a cultural standpoint has to go hand-in-hand with other cooperation for development actions [2007:3]

These opportunities were not this particular to Bosnia and Herzegovina Joint Programme’s main focus however, as the emphases was on building greater tolerance of cultural diversity, trust, and inter-cultural dialogue.

## Addressing the needs of identified target groups

The Joint Programme Document variously identified beneficiaries as follows:

* Communities and citizens at ground level
* Local level decision-makers who manage cultural diversity in their communities
* Community-based organisations
* Universities and civil society
* Non-profit organizations (including municipalities, public institutions, commissions, institutes, organizations and associations)

The group of beneficiaries for this initiative is therefore very broad. Indirect beneficiaries mentioned included both national and international tourists who should benefit from improved cultural tourism products.

## The extent to which the objectives of the programme still valid

The Joint Programme was designed through 2008 and commenced in December of that year. Since 2008 the country has experienced the negative effects of global recession and a continuing fragile social compact. Foreign investment has dropped off sharply and the slow pace of reform is a contributory factor. Government spending, at roughly 50 percent of GDP, remains very high due to the size of the public sector. Privatization of state enterprises has been slow, and political division between parties and entities makes agreement on economic policy difficult. A sizeable current account deficit and high unemployment rate remain serious macroeconomic problems although tourism continues to grow slowly: In 2011 Bosnia and Herzegovina had 686,148 tourists, a 4.5 percent increase on 2010.

The importance of the media in influencing attitudes to multiculturalism and helping to improve tolerance towards diversity is noted in the Joint Programme document. Despite the liberalisation of press legislation the main question in relation to press freedom in Bosnia and Herzegovina is not so much about freedom to operate and report, but more about ethnic and political bias in the media. The independence of the media has shown considerable decline[[7]](#footnote-7) and consultees during the evaluation also noted that divisions are intensifying. Freedom House points out that overtly critical media outlets tend to have increasing difficulty attracting advertising revenue, and this has led to increasing self-censorship. As a result there is a low level of serious investigative journalism in the country and the overall picture of the media environment is that it has been backsliding over the past few years. The Joint Programme’s objectives are therefore still entirely valid, and perhaps even more challenging today than when it commenced:

The Joint Programme has been a bright light in a darkening political landscape (Government employee).

## Local engagement in the design stage

The extent of local engagement in the design process of the programme was very favourably commented on during the final evaluation:

Inclusion in the inception phase was particularly appreciated (Ministry employee)

The formulation of the Joint Programme Document was undertaken in a highly participatory manner in which a broad range of stakeholders was consulted at both state and entity level. The team who undertook the mission was comprised of five international culture sector experts assisted by a UNCT Working Group. Further feedback on the design of the programme was obtained from international agencies working in the field of culture and development, including the Embassy of Spain, other embassies, the EC, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the World Bank. Design also related directly to the *UNDAF 2005-2008* which was extended to 2009.

## Timeliness

The Joint Programme is attempting to further the agenda of cooperation and mutual respect at a time which is not characterized by political dialogue and progress towards consensus. In this regard it is timely.

In terms of the scheduling of activities the process of planning and strategic research taking place at the start of the Joint Programme, followed by tenders for third party activity in years two and three was well applied in all four components.

## Problems identified

The problems identified by the Joint Programme, as outlined in the Programme Document, are as follows:

* The breakdown of shared identity in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with divisions considerably deepened by war.
* Lack of understanding of cultural policy as a medium for government and stakeholder action.
* Lack of cultural understanding in the education sector
* Lack of cultural understanding in the media.
* Lack of cultural pluralism in education policies
* Lack of cultural pluralism governance structures.
* The need for a more integrated relationship between the cultural/creative sector and the education sector to ensure that cultural understanding and intercultural dialogue are part of the curriculum.
* The need to recognize the cultural sector as a crucial sector for job-creation.
* The need to align and enhance the legal framework in relation to the ratification of relevant instruments and conventions.
* The need to build intercultural capacities at all levels, including teachers, decision-makers, and community-based organizations.
* The challenge of encouraging the media to promote social cohesion, cross-cultural exchanges, tolerance and understanding based on positive cultural symbols or initiatives identified through participatory processes.
* The need to identify and restore major tangible symbols of interculturalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina that can foster a stronger sense of shared heritage.
* The need to make a direct contribution to sustainable development through building upon and extending existing strengths in the areas of cultural heritage and cultural industries, and linking these two areas directly to cultural tourism.

The problems and challenge that the Joint Programmes ought to address are therefore significant and wide ranging.

## Relevance of the four individual components (outcome areas)

### Developed and implemented cultural policies and legal frameworks

The relevance of Outcome Area 1is very clear. The need for practical cultural policies and legal frameworks that can be implemented is obvious in a situation where unresolved political divisions are undermining economic potential and the potential for peace-building. Developing an Action Plan for the implementation of the existing Strategy of Cultural Policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina was the most relevant means of addressing these issues. A detailed study of the cultural industries was also undertaken, providing seminal information on their reach; a web framework was drawn up and an industry survey undertaken. A study on PPP, cultural sector reviews and reviews of existing curricula regarding interculturalism and monitoring were all very relevant.

Movement towards reform of existing curricula and school practice from intercultural perspective is clearly needed and so was a very relevant intervention as well as improving teachers' competencies for intercultural and inclusive education through training and dissemination of educative materials. Heritage and conservation conventions ratified by Bosnia and Herzegovina needed to be moved forward also..

### Improved cross-cultural understanding at the community level

Improving cross-cultural understanding at community level, with a special emphasis on young people, is also a very relevant and important area for intervention in the context of the problems which the Joint Programme seeks to address. The process of selecting genuinely intercultural projects in a collective manner and hence facilitating inter-entity cooperation was challenging and highly relevant. Likewise encouraging teacher participation and encouraging pupil exchange between different communities was a difficult but very relevant challenge. Encouraging collective pride in shared heritage was also very important, as was a campaign for changing mindsets to improve cross-cultural relations.

### Strengthened cultural industries

Outcome area 3 is similar to section 3.11.2 above, but lays greater on the role of culture in economic development. Supporting artistic-entrepreneurs through strategizing, marketing and vocational training was very relevant. The potential of tourism for Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in particular cultural tourism, has been recognised by various donors and international organisations and the Project Document rightly highlights this. Strengthening the cultural industry that surrounds conservation and restoration was also very relevant, with the development of a tentative list of intangible heritage and guidelines. Assisting Municipalities to identify different funding possibilities and increasing their capacities in relation to the preparation of funding applications will also strengthen the industry downstream. The first ever survey of cultural industries is also an important step forward. The area of economic development and full time job creation through culture and heritage was highlighted as relevant, although the project did not engage with regional economic development agencies (other than municipalities and entity governments) [*R3*].

### Improved tolerance levels towards diversity

The relevance of promoting intercultural awareness and sensitivity through media and stakeholder partnerships is very clear, but also very challenging. Promoting intercultural sensitivity in the educational sphere is critically important for the future in Bosnia and Herzegovina’s post war situation. Rehabilitating and restoring major symbols of interculturalism is also highly relevant.

## Conclusion

The Joint Programme objectives were very relevant to the problems it was planned to address and to the physical and policy environment within which it operated in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Consultees were very supportive of the Joint Programme concept, and of the timeliness of the intervention. It was also relevant to the Accra Agenda and assisting the process of reconciliation and movement towards EU accession.

# DESIGN

*The evaluation of design entails an assessment of the quality of programme preparation and design: this refers to the logic and completeness of the planning process and the internal logic and coherence of programme design*

## Appropriateness of design to achieving outcomes

The Joint Programme design centres around four outcome areas:

* [Developed and implemented cultural policies and legal frameworks](#_Toc321895896)
* [Improved cross-cultural understanding at the community level](#_Toc321895897)
* [Strengthened cultural industries](#_Toc321895898)
* [Improved tolerance levels towards diversity](#_Toc321895899)

Within these four areas the three United Nations agencies were working jointly using their comparative advantages complemented each other where separate initiatives were undertaken, while a lot of work was joint in terms of selection of partners and contribution to joint overall objectives for all partners.

The special importance of building intercultural tolerance amongst youth (the post war generation) and through education was highlighted in the Joint Programming Document. Programme design constantly stresses these themes, and they are very apparent in the selection criteria for projects annexed to the Joint Programming Document. For example, when choosing community-based projects to support selection criteria outlined the following considerations by which projects were to be judged:

* improve cross-cultural understanding at the community level;
* result from a local consensus-building process;
* be directly linked to ongoing municipal strategic planning processes;
* contribute to the economic development of the locality;
* be cost-efficient and economically sustainable;
* be able to demonstrate municipal ownership through a cost-sharing agreement;
* be implemented through partnerships with local non-profit organizations.

(Joint Programming Document)

In terms of overall design, the Joint Programme has very clearly followed MDG-Fs *Implementation Guidelines for MDG Achievement Fund Joint Programmes* (2009), and has almost done so to the letter. The Joint Programme is very clearly structured based on these principles, with adherence to the suggested structures and procedures suggested by MDG-F.

## Design of the four individual components (outcome areas)

### Developed and implemented cultural policies and legal frameworks

In terms of Outcome 1 there was a very strong emphasis in programme design and in project implementation on policy review and legal conventions. In addition meticulous records have been kept of project selection criteria and of project selection meetings giving emphasis to fostering good governance and a goal partnership for development (MDG 8). A very strong emphasis was also put on transparent M&E procedures and participants were given extensive training in M&E. Improved cross-cultural understanding at the community level

### Cross-cultural understanding

Outcome 2 relates to building cross-cultural understanding at community level and here the interventions related to education and enhanced local initiatives building positive cross-community messages. In particular the Joint Programme initiated a multi-faceted Behaviour Change Campaign (BCC) including initiatives specifically designed to change the attitudes of youth. Joint Programme design addressed MDG 2 (universal primary education) by seeking to address social exclusion of minorities within schools. A wide range of positive message-building projects were sought through government, non-government and non-profit organizations. Outcome 2 interventions seem well designed to achieve their objectives.

### Strengthened cultural industries

The design for Outcome 3 (strengthening the cultural industries) sought to bring about increased employment and profitability through supporting artistic-entrepreneurs through strategizing, marketing and vocational training, and through funding contemporary craft design projects, cultural tourism and arts initiatives*.*

4.2.4. Improved tolerance levels towards diversity

Outcome 4 sought increased positive public discourses on interculturalism. Joint Programme design involved media monitoring and analysis, an information campaign on cultural diversity tolerance and understanding, promoting intercultural understanding in education, and rehabilitating symbols of interculturalism. As with component 3 a wide variety of initiatives were sought.

## Quality of implementation framework

In terms of the implementation framework, MDG-F lists the following key principles for the relationship between United Nations agencies and Government[[8]](#footnote-8):

* The achievement of the MDGs, fulfilment of human rights, United Nations conferences and summits
* Strong alignment with national priorities and country processes
* Building on experience of previous programmes
* To meet objectives of greater coherence and coordination between the United Nations agencies
* Ensure alignment with current trends in the aid environment;
* To foster constructive partnerships with civil society and non‐governmental sector

The Joint Programme was working towards these principles. It fostered constructive partnerships with the NGO sector and civil society through grant aid and restoration projects. Collective strengthening NGO consortiums or regional groupings of civil society related to the arts was not really a Joint Programme activity however, other than through joint trainings which are generally funding-dependent. The Joint Programme’s main focus in terms of sub-committees and working groups was on getting the various levels of Government working together more effectively for inclusive culture, heritage and education, rather than on strengthening cultural organizations outside of Government.

The Joint Programme has followed closely the implementation guidelines of MDG-F (2009) in terms of its overall management framework. For example, a coordination and decision-making body was set up during the early stages of the programme; advisory boards were created for different elements (culture, education, M&E); interventions were widely shared with all the relevant stakeholders; donor coordination efforts were made; results groups were established. United Nations agencies involved met and coordinated regularly. A well organized and well structured database was created. All of this data management very valuable in the coordination of a very wide ranging programme.

The MDG project office was responsible for overall project management including the following:

* disbursing approved resources to the participating United Nations agencies;
* compiling financial and other reports received from participating organizations progress reports
* streamlining the reporting systems and harmonizing reporting formats based on joint programming best practices;
* facilitating the work of the participating United Nations organizations to ensure adherence to a results- based reporting structure around outcomes and outputs;
* assisting working groups in the selection of projects and providing ongoing support;
* ensuring that fund management requirements are adhered to.

The appraiser ranks the quality of the Joint Programme’s implementation framework very highly indeed: It provides models for United Nations project management that should be replicated elsewhere, both in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in other countries (*R4*).

## Quality of M&E matrices and indicators

As discussed in the Inception Report, the original M&E matrices and indicators in the Joint Programme Document (dated 18 March 2008) are somewhat sparse. Many baseline figures were reported as being unavailable and targets were sometimes general.

Considerable improvements were however made to the matrices and indicators at Inception Phase, and as the Joint Programme progressed. Many baselines were put in place. A change from the explicit linkage with the overall MDF indicators originally selected in the Concept Note is evident, i.e.

*MDG Indicator 2.* Poverty gap ratio [incidence x depth of poverty].

*MDG Indicator 6*. Net enrolment ratio in primary education.

*MDG Indicator 7*. Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach grade 5.

*MDG Indicator 45*. Unemployment rate of young people aged 15-24 years, each sex and total.

*(Concept Note)*

The Joint Programme indicators devised are outlined at annex 4 and changes noted. Most indicators are very helpful and relevant. However as with many development projects there was a tendency to opt for activity-based monitoring rather than results-based monitoring (*i.e.* the numbers of people trained rather than the effectiveness and actual results brought about by the training). For example a KPI indicates that 219 trainings/workshops on took place in on maximising culture potential for economic development of their community involving 7,038 beneficiaries: An impressive result in numbers terms. A better designed KPI would however examine how effective was this training and what results in terms of new local economic initiatives can be seen at Joint Programme close. Similarly the development of websites (however useful and challenging) is less relevant than the number of hits they receive and the average length of time spent on each page [*R5*].

Very detailed annual work plans were produced. Annual reviews of each year’s work plan were implemented collectively by national partners and participating United Nations organisations. Independent media monitoring was also undertaken for media related activities. There is however an absence of significant web presence for the Joint Programme on United Nations agency websites, and no specific programme website (*R6*).

An important element of the M&E in the Joint Programme is the extensive development of collective, collaborative monitoring, which was very favorably commented on by consultees. Participants were given detailed training in M&E techniques and actively involved in monitoring each others’ projects. This had the multiple advantages of increasing capacities, sharing ideas, building networks cross-entity and ensuring local ownership of Joint Programme results. This is also an important area that can be replicated across other United Nations programmes and projects (*R7*).

## Risks and assumptions

Three key areas of risk were identified at the start of the Joint Programme:

* *Constitutional reform that could transfer responsibilities between entity and state level*

No constitutional reform took place during the programme, and in fact unwillingness to compromise probably hardened during the Joint Programme’s life. The Joint Programme did very well to achieve the extent of compromise and progress that it did in the circumstances that pertained.

* *The highly decentralized nature of the political-administrative structure in the country*

This risk related to a perception that the government partners might have difficulty in having the authority to fulfil the roles the programme wished them to undertake. While in general and in the area of cultural policy in particular there was considerable success, in some instances this risk did result in non-achievement of objectives, for example the educational steering group felt it was ‘beyond their mandate’ to recommend the changes in curricula that the research regarding interculturalism highlighted. Similarly a working group balked at the prospect of regional literature, which was unfortunate as such initiatives would have benefited everyone, instead regional information was merged into a Bosnia and Herzegovina tourism magazine (*R8*).

*The sensitivity of culture, in terms of its link to identity, ethnicity and religion, as an inherent risk*

This risk was very well handled by broadening of the notion of culture and the culture sector to highlight less politicized aspects; also the fusion of the modern and traditional was highlighted as an approach to dealing with more sensitive issues of crafts and heritage.

## . Inception phase

The Joint Programme made very good use of the inception phase to refine the programme to what was likely to be achievable, and to strengthen the M&E indicators. The Joint Programme was originally designed in line with the UNDAF 2005-2008 (extended to 2009). During the Inception Phase a new UNDAF was adopted for the period 2010-2014 (signed March 2009), the MDG-F Joint Programme was realigned to fit in with the new UNDAF. The MDG-F Culture and Development programme falls under the UNDAF Outcome 2 on Social Inclusion:

By 2014, Government develops and implements policies and practices to ensure inclusive and quality health, education, housing and social protection, and employment services. (UNDAF, 2009)

The following aspects of inclusion were to be given additional emphasis: gender, cultural sensitivity and inclusion of different cultural groups (including minorities), children and youth and other particularly vulnerable groups in target communities. During the inception phase Joint Programme targets and monitoring indicators were elaborated and realigned to ensure that they could realistically be achieved, and to enhance linkges between the United Nations agencies and components.

Based on the consultant’s review, the main changes in emphasis during inception phase appear to be as follows:

* The addition of the development of a cultural web portal and Internet framework under output 1.
* The addition of comprehensive culture sector mapping, work on cultural statistics, new definition of cultural industries, etc. etc
* The development of an Action Plan rather than a Strategy for Culture, because the state-level strategy was already agreed by the start of the Joint Programme; and a greater emphasis on capacity building trainings for government counterparts.
* The establishment of a Working Group on interculturalism and curriculum development and the need to map teachers’ competencies in intercultural and inclusive education.
* The proposal to review the legal framework for cultural heritage, leading to a Bosnia and Herzegovina Law on Cultural Heritage.
* Greater emphasis to fostering cooperation between different levels of government.
* The decision by the United Nations agencies to focus the Joint Programme on ten of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s 142 municipalities, with spill-over benefit to adjoining municipalities, to be selected through an open call for projects, and to focus education activities on these core municipalities also.
* A broadening of the scope of the KAP survey, focused on the ten municipalities chosen and five others as benchmarks.
* An expansion of the listing of cultural heritage to include intangible heritage.
* The expansion of the restoration of monuments of symbolic cultural value from five flagships to include other projects in the ten selected municipalities.
* Changes to education indicators (annex 3)

## Coordination, management and financing arrangements

The management and coordination arrangements for the Joint Programme followed the guidelines in the *Operational Guidance Note for the Participating UN Organizations* (2008). Oversight and strategic guidance were to be provided through the National Steering Committee of the MDG-F United Nations Joint Programme, consisting of representatives of the Government, a representative from Government of Spain, and the United Nations Resident Coordinator, however this was not continued. Instead a Programme Management Committee (PMC), chaired by UNESCO, provided operational coordination to ensure the coordinated achievement of results. The PMC was also directly responsible for making all major operational decisions for the programme. Each of the participating United Nations agencies was substantively and financially accountable for the activities designated to it in this Joint Programme. The participating agencies were individually responsible for: ensuring and quality controlling the professional and timely implementation of activities and delivery of the reports and other outputs identified in this document. The UNESCO component was assisted by the UNESCO Venice Office Regional Bureau for Science and Culture in Europe (BRESCE).

The Joint Programme Coordinator was appointed by UNDP, in consultation with UNESCO and UNICEF. The Joint Programme Coordinator had three key functions:

* to directly manage and implement UNDP programme activities;
* reporting to the PMC; and
* ensuring that the activities of the three agencies were complementary and mutually supportive.

UNDP was the Administrative Agent for disbursing funds, accountable to the MDTF Office Executive Coordinator in New York. Responsibility for the funds disbursed by UNDP to UNESCO and UNICEF came under standard United Nations procedures. Quarterly monitoring was originally required by the MDG-F Secretariat, but this did not prove practical across all projects globally. Annual financial reporting with half-yearly progress reporting was agreed upon.

## Institutional strengthening and local ownership

There is very strong evidence of institutional strengthening and good local ownership of projects assisted under the Joint Programme. This is evidenced by numerous minutes of meetings, participation in training programmes and through training feedback forms. This applies particularly to those institutions on the various programme management committees. Very favourable comments were made by consultees:

I learnt a lot from the programme monitoring and other projects (Local government employee)

The programme helped to re-establish relationships and learn about each others’ culture. It helped to enlarge existing cooperation and open doors (Education agency employee)

## Cross-cutting issues

Gender, youth and social inclusion were identified as key cross-cutting issues in this Joint Programme. All were clearly part of the selection process for projects to be supported. The Joint Programme addressed youth particularly through the education components. Also many of the programme’s activities were designed with young people in mind, for example, through an emphases modern media and new cultural expression. It was foreseen by the design team that young people would make up a substantial proportion of the beneficiaries of the joint programme. . Social inclusion was also an important consideration in selecting projects for support, and many projects had specific inclusiveness objectives, for example the education project in Gradiška which was aimed at students mothers who come from different background (Roma, returnees, children with special needs, low income). Also, assisting the restoration of iconic ‘minority’ symbols in key locations, such as Mostar and Banja Luka, centred on encouraging social inclusion. Overall the project emphasised gender, youth and social inclusion.

## MDG-F Secretariat contribution

The MDG-F Secretariat’s Review Committee approved the original Concept Note for the Joint Programme and advised the project team as the Joint Programme Document and Inception Phase progressed. At programme approval stage, more emphasis could perhaps have been given to requesting more direct focus on MDG1 issues (targeting extreme poverty) [*R9*]. The Bosnia and Herzegovina Culture and Development Joint Programme shows extensive consultation and good engagement with the MDG-F Secretariat in New York. Programme roll-out was faster than for many other MDG-F programmes and the adherence of this programme to MDG-F recommendations regarding coordination and M&E was seen as very positive. The MDG-F Secretariat engaged in monitoring missions to Bosnia and Herzegovina and commissioned the mid term evaluation. Recommendations made by the MDG-F Secretariat were fully considered and generally acted upon. The MDG-F Secretariat recognised the need for a no-cost extension and has positive views of the Joint Programme’s management approach and commitment.

## Conclusions

The design of the Joint Programme was generally appropriate for reaching its results and outcomes with a strong implementation framework, programme clear and logical M&E matrices and well designed indicators. The use of collaborative monitoring was particularly innovative. Changes made during the inception phase lead to design refinements seeking to ensure that results and targets would be achievable. Management arrangements were clearly defined and extensively supported institutional strengthening and local ownership in the cultural and education ministries. The Joint Programme took into account cross-cutting issues and specific interests of women, minorities, people with disabilities and socially excluded groups, especially through calls for proposed activities.

***Case study: Relevance***

***Action Plan for Culture***

*The Joint Programme successfully brought forward Government policy on culture by assisting in the drafting of a detailed Action Plan for Culture through a working group.*

*The working group was made up of representatives from state, entity and ministry levels as well as other key players. It worked closely with the United Nations agencies and consultants to produce a detailed, action plan.The action plan covers the following:*

* *Capacity strengthening of the Ministry of Civil Affairs and Ministries of Culture at all levels in the field of coordination, strategic planning, and international cooperation. This includes developing cooperation between ministries of culture and other relevant ministries in charge of education, communication, trade, finance, etc.*
* *Improving cooperation among the public and civil sectors, leading to increased quality of cultural projects.*
* *Promoting culture leading to an increase in the number of visitors and participants in cultural events.*
* *Aligning of laws and procedures with ratified international conventions, declarations, and EU directives*
* *Improving statistical information system in the field of culture*
* *Increased participation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in international cultural programs and initiatives and an increase in number of projects supported from international sources*
* *Strengthening of cultural industries sector and an established Cultural Industries Cluster*
* *Strengthening capacities in the field of cultural tourism.*
* *Strengthening capacities of cultural institutions*
* *Affirmation of talents and improving of artists’ mobility*
* *Increasing participation and access to culture, funds for culture and increases in attendance in cultural institutions and cultural events*
* *Promoting of cultural values and activities through an educational system and media, including an increase in the number of museums with a custodian and pedagogue employed, and increase in the number of cultural animators in primary and secondary schools, and an increase in number of cultural broadcasts/minutes of broadcasting at public TV stations and articles in newspapers.*

*The Action Plan provides a measurable means of moving forward culture in Bosnia and Herzegovina and helped to significantly improve participants’ capacities in addressing cultural issues.*

# EFFICIENCY

*Programme efficiency examines the extent to which resources and inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results and considers their quality.*

## Management model

The Joint Programme’s management model is considered to have been very effective. There was a very dedicated staff in place in all three agencies, and relatively little staff turnover. The resources of the three agencies were made available to the Joint Programme and there was a very good reporting system established which allowed clear and regular information flow. Possibly the only area where there was significant pressure on time available appears to have been PR due to competing needs on limited resources.

## Coordination and participatory roles

There was a high degree of coordination between United Nations agencies in this Joint Programme, aided by the decision to establish a Programme Coordination Office and appoint a Joint Programme Manager (many other United Nations Joint Programmes do not do this). The active involvement of successive United Nations Resident Coordinators in the programme undoubtedly helped the decision-making processes, as did the decision to base the M&E function at RCO level. Coordination with the chosen ministries was excellent from the very start of the Joint Programme, and was very favourably commented on by consultees. As discussed above the target population for this Joint Programme is somewhat nebulously defined, so coordination with this constituency is likewise quite general, but it is clear that wide consultation did take place. A very high sense of ownership of the Joint Programme was brought about by the involvement of municipalities and Government representatives in the various selection forums and training programmes, and this was a key success of the Joint Programme. The nature of the projects supported also encouraged wide participation.

## Financial transparency and cost-effectiveness

The Joint Programme strives to gain additional resources by not duplicating activities amongst United Nations agencies. Joint events are organised, and the joint use of communications services was initiated. Events, travelling, and day to day activities that could be incorporated into one or other agency’s activity plan and not duplicated are also savings, and the Programme Coordination Office worked to maximise these opportunities. All three agencies and the MDG-F Joint Programme office were subject to internal United Nations audit procedures, as well as MDG-F Secretariat monitoring.

In terms of cost effectiveness, the mandatory use of United Nations tendering procedures helped to ensure value for money. A great many projects have been supported in multiple locations in both entities, certainly giving value for money in many cases at local level. Obviously events which are repeated give better long term value for money than one-off events, and the Joint Programme included both. Expenditure on policy development and improving statistical competencies seems to have been very effective.

A strategic decision was made to give opportunity for municipalities to be creative in their perceptions of culture and culture content in their communities and to present their respective proposals through open call. In terms of answering the inevitable evaluation question ‘could moneys have been spent more effectively in different ways?’ An alternative approach (suggested by a consultee) would have been to focus on larger, strategic interventions, such as the enhancement of cultural facilities as neutral spaces, rather than being dispersed to a very wide selection of small projects (*R10*).

. Some very high quality outputs were undoubtedly delivered, particularly in the areas of education and cultural reviews, statistical guidelines and through many NGO and school projects. Some weaknesses were observed in directly commissioned terms of reference (for example a tender for cultural tourism publications which did not specify the overall print runs required or sufficiently examine existing, very similar, initiatives; and which ultimately resulted in very different outputs from those commissioned) but in overall terms the outputs illustrate very good value for money in terms of the very high volume of initiatives supported. Annex 3 illustrates the very extensive range of projects supported in municipalities by thematic window.

## Activity scheduling and financial draw-down

Activity scheduling and financial draw-down in this Joint Programme have been timely and largely in accordance to plan. A six month extension was required, but given the complexity and relatively short timescale of the programme, this is not an issue. This aspect of the Joint Programme again reinforces the effectiveness of its management.

At the end of the Joint Programme unallocated moneys were committed to some additional large projects, such as the development of Spanish Square in Mostar and the development of a joint Sarajevo-Banja Luka arts programme. In some ways these are perhaps the type of larger strategic project that were missing when there was a much smaller grant ceiling (up to US$ 80,000) for earlier activities.

## Monitoring tools and mechanisms

The effectiveness of monitoring tools and mechanisms ultimately can be judged by their ability to address the following issues at Joint Programme end:

* Economic impact (the number of jobs created and additional income generated)
* Institutional impact (improved intuitional capacity, improved organization and numbers of staff effectively trained)
* Social impact (for example changes noted in the KAP studies, or the establishment of effective and ongoing social dialogue mechanisms)
* Network impact (new networks organized or formalized, new organizations/events created or expanded).

A great deal of effort went into M&E in this Joint Programme and a great deal of data has been collected. In some the MDG-F was a minor (although valued) partner in initiatives supported and this needs to be kept in mind. The Joint Programme had difficulty in assessing its economic impact.

## Flexibility

As noted above, financial draw-down has been efficient, and to some extent this is as a result of flexibility regarding activities being undertaken. Flexibility can both positive (adapting to changed circumstances) and negative (allowing changes to approved contracts and allocated tenders, for example).

## Cross-component inter-relationships

The three United Nations organisations implementing the Joint Programme are seen as building on their key strengths:

* UNICEF is a key player in terms of the development of models for the promotion of social inclusion and promoting intercultural, peace-building and inclusive approaches to education through the ‘child-friendly schools’ model. Upstream-downstream linkage was seen as critical in Bosnia ad Herzegovina due to the decentralized nature of the administrative structure and weak vertical communications channels.
* The design and implementation of the Joint Programme also reflects a number of lessons learned from UNESCO, as well as its past experience working in the field of culture and development in the region. This includes the restoration/rehabilitation of various monuments of state importance, the safeguarding of intangible heritage, the promotion of traditional and contemporary arts, the promotion of common heritage as the building blocks towards a shared future, and the promotion of culture as a vehicle for further development.
* UNDP’s approach also addresses the importance of creating strong up/down-stream linkages, in order to promote change in an environment with a complex governance structure. UNDP is undoubtedly one of the strongest agencies working at the municipal level with municipal administration and civil society in Bosnia and Herzegovina. UNDP built upon these networks to ensure the productivity of the joint programme, especially in terms of the selection of key municipalities, delivering joint impact at local level and strengthening relationships between municipal administrations and civil society organisations.

## Sharing with other Joint Programmes

Bosnia and Herzegovina is one of nine countries selected by the MDG-F Secretariat for country-wide Joint Programme evaluation. This evaluation is currently underway, so is not considered in detail here. In Ravno however (one of the very poor municipalities being supported) a synergy of two programmes (MDG F Culture and MDG F Environment) can be seen. This UNESCO action relates to strengthening management structures at the national monuments Vjetrenica Cave and Zavala Monastery. The total investment was *circa* US$ 75.000 (US$ 10,000 from MDG-F Culture and Development and US$ 60.000 from MDG-F Environment).

In terms of other Joint Programmes in the region, there is much that can be learned from sharing approaches, however the very short timescale of the MDG-F overall meant that individual programmes, by the time they had been approved and got up and running, did not have much time for comparative analysis with parallel programmes in neighbouring or other countries: Albania’s programme for example is highlighted by MDG-F Secretariat as a good example of seeking to address economic development through the international marketing of key cultural heritage assets, for example. This limited inter-country cooperation is perhaps an overall weakness in the current MDG-F process (*R11*).

## Additionality

Additionality refers to the Joint Programme’s ability to lever additional funding from other sources. Most projects levered additional resources of 20 to 30 percent as a contribution towards project costs: In many cases (particularly NGOs), this was a contribution in kind rather than cash. In some cases the Joint Programme’s leverage was very high. Overall the Joint Programme is reported to have achieved 12 per cent additionality ($1 million on a MDG-F contribution of $8 million).

An avenue which needs to be explored further in terms of additionality and future sustainability is the pairing of United Nations support with other funders’ activities, for example EU support for tourism, education or for the restoration of cultural heritage. At present for example you have a situation where the MDG-F has supported one regional NGO-led marketing initiative in Mostar (‘Heart of Herzegovina’) and the EU is supporting a different one (through the regional economic development agency). Uncoordinated, parallel marketing regional initiatives for the same destination are not unheard of, but they are confusing for the consumer, not good practice and not the best use of limited resources (*R12*). Best practice is to have one collective brand image for a destination. It is noted however that MDG-F funding was added to other funders’ contributions in many cases, for example in the area of crafts initiatives which are also being supported by USAID, the EU and other donors.

## Efficiency of the four individual components (outcome areas)

### Developed and implemented cultural policies and legal frameworks

Outcome 1 was very efficiently addressed through working groups dealing with each of the policy areas examined. In the area of education a number of consultees did suggest that the Joint Programme might have been more efficient had there been more formal engagement with Ministries of Education as full PMC members from the start of the programme[[9]](#footnote-9), rather than as observers. In overall terms however the policy and legal review process was very efficient.

### Improved cross-cultural understanding at the community level

Outcome 2 also seems to have been very efficient due to the very strong emphasis on cultural dialogue and bottom-up funding processes. In addition the high quality of some of UNICEF’s consultants’ inputs was favourably commented upon by consultees. The BCC was well researched and professionally. Some members of the education working group felt there would have been even more efficiency had they been involved in review of the early M&E reports

### Strengthened cultural industries

The efficiency of Outcome 3 could perhaps have been improved with more strategic focus on linking projects by theme and with the market. Perhaps more efficiency might have resulted from learning more from successful examples of how cultural industries have been strengthened in other countries economic development and job creation strategies, for example Scotland and the Czech Republic. It is recognised however that a number of study trips were undertaken and that those experiences may embed lessons learned in participants more effectively than commissioning international consultancy reports. Here and under Outcome 2, open calls for tenders resulted in a very interesting and wide-ranging selection of small projects, but there was no detailed strategic economic development framework into which the intervention proposals could fit (other than the Cultural Strategy itself)[[10]](#footnote-10).

The Concept Note and Joint Project Document both refer to the need to link culture with economic development in Bosnia and Herzegovina:

the three areas of cultural heritage, cultural tourism and cultural industries need to be more closely interlinked in Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to realize their economic potential (Joint Programming Document).

Given this emphasis in the Joint Project Document on economic development, engagement with economic development agencies at this point (including regional development boards and tourism associations) would have made sense (*R16*). A small number of crafts projects were supported and seem to have positive impact. Many arts initiatives were funded including film-making and contemporary drama. These initiatives were strengthened while funding was available. Longer-term business planning was not an intervention area although selection processes did consider some business issues.

UNDP did commission some further research into possible tourism initiatives but many of these could not be taken forward or were too contentious (even heritage trails and regional brochures could not be agreed). As a result the potential to release economic potential through significant linkage at state or inter-entity level was not realised in this area.

A robust, holistic approach is essential if the economic development potential of culture and heritage is to be maximised. Overall however the consultant suggests that the efficiency of component 3 was compromised by a lack of robust economic development frameworks. More analysis of relevant international examples of best practice into which local projects selected could fit would have helped [*R16*]. Better international marketing of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s rich cultural heritage and crafts industries is also an obvious need, if the development potential of culture is to be strengthened (*R14*). There were some marketing interventions relative to economic development including websites, trainings on marketing, exhibitions, many new craft product lines, some regional initiatives and a tourism magazine, but overall these are not maximised due to the absence of a both a cultural marketing strategy, a crafts marketing strategy and integration with tourism and crafts marketing networks (public and private) particularly at state level. Marketing interventions relating to changing domestic attitudes to interculturalism did however receive significant attention in the Joint Programme and while it was difficult to achieve positive results, the approach adopted was both strategic and research-based. This illustrates a more effective emphasis on fostering interculturalism (‘culture’) than on economic development (‘development’) in this Culture *and* Development Joint Programme, and there has been limited attention to analysis of the Joint Programme’s actual economic impact to date, possibly because economic development was not seen as a prime objective.

### Improved tolerance levels towards diversity

Outcome 4 was operating in a difficult environment and the efficiency of the approach demanded continual review to address a media environment which was probably deteriorating, and this was done. Possibly more emphasis to these significant challenges should have been given in the mid-term review, and additional resources allocated given the critical role of the media in influencing public opinion, especially at entity level [*R15*]. The decision to increase the number of restoration projects being supported was positive and will help improve tolerance towards diversity, if the various restoration projects can be made economically viable once completed and linked in to regional development policies.

## Conclusions

The Joint Programme has been very dynamic in turning its resources and inputs into multiple intercultural activities at municipal level and into important strategic reviews and policy development, especially at state and entity level. A very extensive range of activity at municipal level was stimulated including innovative projects in culture and education Its management model was one of best practice for MDG-F and the ‘One UN’ approach. The three United Nations agencies coordinated very well with each other and with Government. The commitment, dedication and persistency of United Nations staff and partners shine through. An exceptionally high degree of local ownership was brought about, with the various working groups taking an extremely active role in the Joint Programme decision-making processes.

The Joint Programmes’ financial and personnel resources were managed in a transparent and accountable manner which were generally cost-effective, although the quality of outputs was variable, many were excellent. Activities were generally implemented as scheduled and with the planned financial resources. There was extensive use of collaborative monitoring involving bringing partners together (municipalities, civil society and United Nations staff). This approach led to excellent capacity enhancement towards good governance and strong local ownership. The different components of the joint programme interrelated well, although component 3 (strengthening cultural industries) lacked a robust economic development framework into which it could fit and there was limited attention to marketing. Other resources were mobilized to contribute to the programme’s outcomes and produce results and impacts. The Joint Programme was clearly managed efficiently within the context in which it was designed.

***Case study: Efficiency***

***Joint Programme database***

*The Joint Programme developed an Access Database system for managing and monitoring the multiple activities which the MDG-F was funding. Over 100 organisations were grant aided to develop individual projects in over 45 municipalities in both entities. The database is designed to provide management information, and to prompt when management intervention is required. The entries for each project relate to the following:*

* *Contact information*
* *Application history and approval details*
* *Costs and contractual information*
* *Timelines*
* *Targets and KPIs*
* *Knowledge Management Products*
* *Monitoring information*
* *Progress reports*
* *Media coverage*
* *Sustainability*
* *Outreach*

*The management system has helped to keep the Joint Programme on course and to enable prompt follow-up when projects fall behind. It has also proved very valuable in allowing comparison of data between projects for monitoring and planning purposes.*

# EFFECTIVENESS

*Effectiveness* *examines the extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance. It examines how well the Joint Programme’s results contribute to the achievement of programme’s objectives.*

## Quality of the programme’s key outputs and products

### Developed and implemented cultural policies and legal frameworks

The quality of outputs under Outcome 1 is generally very high and very much focussed on the realities of the policy environment in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and on what could realistically be achieved. Strong international expertise was brought in to advice on areas like intercultural education, world heritage conventions, cultural statistics and cultural management and there was very strong engagement with local partners to ensure the practicality and applicability of outputs. The roadmap for preparing cultural statistics was very effective and considerable high quality work regarding statistical coordination was undertaken to good effect. The methodology for collection of cultural statistics data in line with statistical office of the EU (Eurostat) guidelines and UNESCO cultural frameworks was produced and officially adopted by the State Agency for Statistics. UNESCO’s cultural indicator suite was introduced. New data on cultural industries in Bosnia and Herzegovina was produced. The *Joint Action Plan on the Bosnia and Herzegovina Culture Strategy* was endorsed by its adoption. A *Standard Operations Manual* was produced and given to municipalities and other beneficiaries has clearly been useful and of the right quality. The *Monitoring Manual* at national level for monitoring government grants is also one of the valuable knowledge management products that is very likely to be used by governmental partners in their future work.

### Improved cross-cultural understanding at the community level

There were multiple outputs under Outcome 2, so the appraiser has difficulty in assessing their quality given their wide geographic dispersal and wide variety. The primary school module on interculturalism and the teacher training and teaching tool kits received favourable comment during the evaluation process: It was suggested they should be extended and made longer (*R16*). The BCC and the KAP study which evaluates its effect (together with that of other interventions) were professionally undertaken. Trainings on cultural diversity run by UNESCO seem to have been well received, as were teachers’ and parents’ manuals on interculturalism (UNICEF). The public call for primary schools in the ten core municipalities to submit project proposals for enhancing intercultural teaching was well managed as was UNDP’s calls for projects from NGOs and civil society organisations. Training in cultural identity with the Joint Programme’s partnership with the British Council also got good feedback. Travelling theatre and music performances and festivals brought contemporary culture to some remote areas, although on a short term basis. Training for selected participants from municipalities on different funding possibilities and increasing their capacities in relation to the preparation of funding applications (UNESCO) seems to have been of good quality in that it has resulted in additional funding applications. The cultural tourism marketing materials developed ended up being very different from what was commissioned, and are not in format generally used for cultural tourism promotion, although the ultimate magazine produced is high quality: The related website is not however, and is obscurely hosted.

### Strengthened cultural industries

The quality of Outcome 3 was enhanced by the participatory evaluation of cultural heritage which was undertaken by UNESCO. This resulted in a strong sense of ownership of local projects. Trainings for municipalities on different funding possibilities and increasing capacities in relation to the preparation of funding applications seems to have been very effective, in that an increased number of funding applications to the Ministry of Culture and donors is reported to have increased. The effectiveness of trainings to manage and promote cultural tourism remains to be seen, as many projects are in their early stages of operation. Training in participatory evaluation seems to have been very effective with strong participation. There is probably still a scarcity of skilled labour to undertake conservation and restoration projects (*R17*) although restorations such as the Ferhadija Mosque (supported by UNESCO) are clearly being undertaken to the highest international standard and with superb attention to historical detail.

### Improved tolerance levels towards diversity

Outcome 4 saw high quality professional analyses of media coverage of culture and development. The *Behaviour Change Conceptual Study* was well developed to build on findings from the KAP study. Media productions on interculturalism were supported and restoration projects on significant cultural sites were commenced: these appear to be high quality. Trainings for journalists, utilising the high quality professional expertise that exists in Sarajevo’s Media Centre and other experts, and documentaries and feature films on intercultural understanding, seem to be of high quality also. The Behaviour Change Campaign was professionally commissioned. Workshops with parents, teachers, students, local authorities, media and public in ten municipalities to develop multi-cultural messages for parents, teachers, pedagogues and school principles all have received mostly positive feedback through M&E.

## Achievement of results

### Developed and implemented cultural policies and legal frameworks

Outcome 1 focused on strengthening the capacity of government and relevant institutions in agenda-setting, policy development and implementation for culture and the culture-focused aspects of education. There is no doubt that excellent progress has been made in these areas. For example, the mapping and sector analysis of culture was conducted, the classification of cultural industries initiated and a system for the collection of cultural statistics developed. A Culture Development Action Plan was elaborated and agreed and more than 30 priorities have been actioned. In the area of education a detailed report on existing curricula and school practises from an intercultural perspective was drafted and modules for intercultural education were developed and elaborated through five sub-manuals. Cultural heritage conventions commitments were reviewed and a monitoring system to track conventions implementation was developed. All relevant international cultural heritage conventions were ratified.

### Improved cross-cultural understanding at the community level

Outcome 2 aimed to promote cross-cultural understanding by building the municipal level pedagogic and service delivery roles of the public sector and civil society. Trainings on cultural diversity for selected local decision makers and NGOs also helped to improve cultural understanding at community level. Over 30,000 beneficiaries were recipients of this outcome, with increased access to culture for rural and marginalized groups and targeted projects with themes directed at strengthening interculturalism. Ethics and other training were provided to parents, schools and teachers, a ‘Child-Friendly Schools’ model was introduced and intercultural tool-kits for teachers and non-formal educational interventions were initiated. In addition the behavioural change campaign sought results in this area.

### Strengthened cultural industries

This outcome sought to engage the private sector in its role as a driver of growth and economic inclusion, but in fact worked almost exclusively (with some commissioned exceptions) through NGOs, schools and municipalities to strengthen the cultural industries. Progress was guided by the Action Plan for Culture which was also being developed, and the findings of educational studies and UNESCO audits. The cultural industries have certainly been strengthened through the injection of MDG-F funding for activities and individual initiatives, as illustrated in annexes 2 and 3. The study on PPP could have benefited for drawing on international examples of PPP in the cultural industries (*R18*)

Consultees expressed some concern as to what happens next, now that MDG-F finance is coming to an end. As noted above there was probably scope to strengthen the effectiveness and sustainability of results in the cultural industries area by working more with regional development agencies and existing tourism organizations to encourage them to take the cultural projects being supported on board, and support their future marketing and development. None the less some good results were achieved, for example the various municipal evaluations of cultural heritage which identify assets for future cultural development, and some interesting enhanced visitor attractions in potential cultural tourism locations, such in Tešanj, Jajce, Srebrenik, Ravno, and elsewhere.

### Improved tolerance levels towards diversity

Outcome 4 sought to catalyze the behavioural change that is necessary to sustain progress in the first three areas. This result has probably achieved amongst those who were directly involved in working closest with the Joint Programme (selected ministry staff, municipality staff, teachers and other beneficiaries), so should indeed bring about continued progress. Amongst the media and the wider public however it is difficult to prove that results have been achieved. Ongoing media monitoring does not show significant change and a deteriorating culture of dialogue between political parties and centers of power is reported. However a repeat of the KAP survey would provide an important post programme benchmark and it is understood that one will take place (*R19*).

## Contribution to Millennium Development Goals

The Ministry of Finance and Treasury and the UNCT is involved in detailed tracking of progress towards MDGs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The latest report on progress covers the periods to 2010. As all United Nations agencies are supporting progress towards MDGs it is very difficult to attribute progress to one particular intervention, particularly a relatively short intervention such as that now being appraised. However some contribution was definitely made.

In relation to MDG goal 1 the Joint Programme has had impact through some initiatives in poorer parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, such as the rural tourism initiative in the Kozara Mountains; and schools projects which target disadvantaged groups (such as a project aimed at students‘mothers who come from different backgrounds in Gradiska primary school), or the provision of a better cultural tourism offer in Jajce. These projects illustrate that initiatives and interventions in poor areas can especially contribute to MDG 1 by being specifically pro-poor. For example in Rudo Municipality (one of the poorest in the country), funds were invested as follows:

* US$ 60,000 for school reconstruction, renovation and provision of necessary equipment for intercultural camp as well as transport of children, food, trainings , teachers etc for seven one week programmes.
* Trainings for teachers in all schools undertaken by UNICEF (US$ 3,000) and US$ 1,300 given for a school’s project.
* In addition UNESCO invested in inviting municipal representative for each of their set of trainings focusing on enhancement of cultural industries.
* $10.000 support was also given to Primary School

It is also noted that benefits did flow to other municipalities, some of which were poorer than the applicant municipality. There was however an opportunity to target even more support to poorer areas, and to mainstream pro-poor policies into the various strategy documents which the Joint Programme devised, but it is recognized that targeting poverty was not identified as a specific objective under this MDG-F Joint Programme as approved (*R20*).

For MDG 2, the Joint Programme’s strong educational focus and the expertise of UNICEF and UNESCO in the educational area helped ensure that contributions to this MDG were made. The main theme from an MDG perspective was furthering the inclusiveness of access to primary and quality education for all.

MDG 3 relating to gender was taken into account as a cross-cutting theme rather than as a specific intervention area. The awareness that traditional culture can play a gender-stereotyping role was probably increased through Joint Programme activities. Some activities were specifically aimed at supporting women, such as crafts projects and selected initiatives in municipalities where such needs were recognized (Bijeljina and Srebrenik for example). Each project had to target women and Joint Programme statistics estimate that 60 per cent of beneficiaries were women.

It is probable that a positive contribution came through the many Joint Programme activities that related to MDG 8, good governance, in the target municipalities and in the participating government agencies at state and entity levels.

## Contribution to the objectives set by the MDG-F thematic window

The Terms of Reference for the MDG-F Culture and Development thematic window do not state specific objectives. These were left to UNCT’s to put forward. The window seeks

to support countries in the design, implementation and evaluation of effective public policies that promote social and cultural inclusion, and facilitate political participation and the protection of rights. The Fund also seeks to support efforts to promote cultural and creative industries and to generate the data and information necessary for the effective formulation and monitoring of policies on diversity, culture and development (2007:1).

The MDG-F sought funding applications that aimed to:

* Design, implement, and evaluate public policies that facilitate the political participation and protect the rights of groups excluded on cultural grounds.
* Promote cultural and creative industries as drivers of economic and social development and means for expanding people’s opportunities; and/or
* Develop institutional capacity to generate useful and accurate information monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of cultural policies.

These guidelines have been followed.

.

## Contributing factors

The main positive contributing factors to the Joint Programme’s many successes included the following:

* The extensive emphasis on engagement with participants in decision-making and the selection of projects for support.
* The commitment of virtually all partners to the Joint Programme.
* The commitment of the United Nations agencies and the interest of the Resident Representatives in the Joint Programme.
* The existence of a Programme Management Office (not always done in MDG-F programmes) and the commitment of the Joint Programme team
* Regular consultation with MDG-F Secretariat and adherence to procedural guidelines.
* The open calls for tenders and transparent assessment procedures.
* Consideration of the track record of municipalities and NGOs selected in undertaking similar projects.
* The engagement of mostly high quality consultants through tender procedures.
* The establishment of an M&E function independent of Joint Programme management and located in the Resident Coordinator’s office and the strong emphasis given to wide-ranging M&E.
* Very close budgetary monitoring of projects and regular programme draw-downs.

The contributing factors which made progress more difficult were as follows:

* Limited research on *releasing the economic potential* of the cultural industries specific to Bosnia and Herzegovina or through other country approaches,
* Limited research on the market for Bosnia and Herzegovina’s cultural industries.
* Limited collaboration with development agencies outside the PMC (for example in tourism).
* Lack of consensus on releasing economic potential through some cross-entity projects (such as regional promotion).
* Lack of consensus on mandate for initiating actual curriculum reform.

The increasing influence of various centres of power on the media in Bosnia and Herzegovina; and increasing polarisation between centres of power causing polarization within the media and possibly resulting in more by emphasis on cultural difference in a negative sense, rather than promoting cultural diversity and innovative measures for problem-solving.

A weak private sector which was not actively engaged.

The Joint Programme showed great persistency in attempting to address difficult problems and its persistency generally resulted in locally acceptable solutions. Maximising the opportunities for contact and relationship-building was a central approach.

## Good practices, successful experiences and transferable examples

There are many examples of good practice and successful experiences in this Joint Programme and some of them should be transferred. These include the following:

* The establishment of NGO-municipality partnerships to guide projects (for example between Banja Luka municipality and Kozara; between Gradiska and local arts organisations; between Tesanj and community groups. By contrast some other projects just involving NGOs have struggled.
* The pairing of strong urban arts organisations with rural initiatives (if these can be made permanent), for example the Roses for Maria Therese project led from Sarajevo and presented in ten core localities.
* The development of a strong project database.
* Innovative monitoring procedures.
* Local monitoring teams formed from municipal administration and NGO sector at community level.
* Clear and transparent project selection criteria and procedures for operation.
* Ethical codes drawn up and adopted, for example for teachers and journalists.
* Cultural statistics collection procedures (if these can be sustained).
* Five children’s parliaments were established on the basis of agreement with municipalities
* 9,285 copies of publication *Learning to Live Together* were translated into three official languages and distributed to Pedagogical Institutes

## Access to programme results

Access to programme results could be improved through the following:

* A dedicated Joint Programme website either under a United Nations Bosnia and Herzegovina site or stand-alone[[11]](#footnote-11)..
* Enhancement of ministry and entity websites to include dedicated Joint Programme results pages and all commissioned consultancy material (one website was not operational during the evaluation).
* The wider publication and dissemination of consultancy reports commissioned (R23) including the passing of all Joint Programme materials to the UNESCO library and database or some other secure collection
* The continued participation of the ORC in more MDG-F Secretariat country, thematic and global evaluations.

## Quality of local interventions and results achieved at local level

Much emphasis was put in the Joint Programme on local interventions as the programme sought to combine top-down strategy development with bottom-up municipal and educational project development support. Consultees noted that the quality of local interventions, while generally very good, did vary based on the extent of development of the particular municipality or school. Overall however the range, variety and creativity of projects supported (outlined in annex 3) is impressive. Results achieved at local levels were probably significant while funding was available from the Joint Programme and some of these results are outlined in the annex.

## Conclusions

Progress in achieving the objectives of the development intervention is apparent. The quality of the programme’s key outputs has been generally good and contributed toward the achievement of key results in most areas. The main contribution to MDGs at local and country levels were in the areas of fostering inclusive and intercultural primary education and furthering good governance. The programme also contributed to MDG-F goals in particular good governance. The programme resulted in many examples of good practice which should be transferred, and a stronger web presence on Joint Programme methods, outputs and results would help this.

# IMPACT

***Case study: Effectiveness***

***Developing community-level approaches to address ethnically-based inequalities***

*The NGO Educational Center for Democracy and Human Rights (CIVITAS) was commissioned to develop educational modules to address inequality in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The following activities were undertaken*

* *A working group comprising Government and educational institution representatives, together with experts in interculturalism, history, democracy and human rights was brought together.*
* *Educational modules were developed including the following: trainers’ materials, teachers’ material, student textbook., parents’ brochure, an interactive game and other publications.*
* *16 trainers and 213 teachers were introduced to the teaching materials*
* *225 students were engaged in an intercultural festival covering ten municipalities: This received extensive publicity in electronic and print media*
* *Intercultural homestays were organised amongst ten municipalities involving 29 teachers and 62 students.*
* *The webpage <www.interculturalizam.com> was created with a social networking theme.*
* *Based on the module UNICEF subsequently organised training in intercultural and inclusive education for overt 3,000 teachers who also received copies of the Teacher’ Manual.*
* *Set of manuals were also distributed to local level via competent education authorities*

*Impact refers to effect of the programme on its environment. The evaluation looks at the positive and negative changes produced by the Joint Programme directly or indirectly, intended and unintended.*

## Differences made to programme stakeholders

The Joint Programme’s impact on stakeholders can be considered in four ways as follows:

* economic impact;
* institutional impact (including legislative impact);
* social impact; and
* network impact.

The Joint Programme involved an US$ 8 million investment in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and while some of this money inevitably leaked out of the country through consultancy fees, overseas missions and administration charges, the vast majority stayed in Bosnia and Herzegovina and a very significant amount was spent at local level. This had significant economic impact while the Joint Programme was in operation through the following activities:

* Funding local NGOs, municipalities and schools
* Organizing festivals and exhibitions (mostly under $100,000 contributions)
* Running trainings and field visits to relevant projects as part of capacity enhancement.
* Funding campaigns, such as the BCC.
* Financing construction projects (mostly under $100,000 contributions, except for three key intercultural sites totalling to $600,000 and Spanish Square, Mostar).
* Engaging local consultants, etc.

Economic impact in the longer term relates to such issues as the number of additional jobs created and additional income being generated annually by enterprises established or expanded. The extent to which this is due to Joint Programme activity is quite difficult to quantify. Most interventions were small scale. The programme’s M&E system indicates that some 770 jobs have been ‘supported’ by the Joint Programme. Despite extensive training to beneficiaries on how to measure economic impact, the Joint Programme’s own measurements of its economic impacts are not well articulated at present. For example one KPI was to be ‘additional income created’ by the project, and another ‘improvement of artisans’ business and entrepreneurial skills that result in greater income generation’. Additional income figures are not available at the time of the Final Evaluation, partly due to the short implementation period of the programme. Data on increased visitor numbers at heritage sites supported or additional visitor expenditure is not available for the same reason (projects are only just completed, or not yet completed); enhanced promotion of art and culture industry products was also an activity supported but data on additional sales and economic returns may be lacking. This is an area where an *ex-post* appraisal might revisit (*R8*)

Probably ongoing, directly increased economic impact as a result of the Joint Programme is smaller than it might have been because the scale of most local interventions was small (less than $100,000), the projects are very diverse and generally not marketed jointly. There were no large flagship capital projects apart from Spanish Square (Mostar) at Joint Programme end. Other potential flagships (such as the reconstructions of minority religious symbols Banja Luka Mostar and Derventa) are symbolically important but incomplete, with small relative contributions (but none-the-less very important contributions) from the Joint Programme towards total project costs. The Joint Programme contribution is however helping to attract other funding from various Government levels. Additional funding amounting US$ 1.8 million is provided by the FBiH Government for key project restorations. In addition the important Mitras Temple project in Jajce attracted additional funding of US$ 50.000 with the Joint Project’s US$ 140,000 contribution. It is also important to acknowledge that a much greater recognition of the economic value of culture to the economy has been brought about by the Joint Programme in governments, and this may bring about future initiatives to stimulate economic impact.

Under outcome 3 the Joint Programme Document highlighted the private sector as a driver of growth and economic inclusion. Its importance to delivering development effectively was later highlighted in an internal UNDP consultancy on how to make UNDP’s Joint Programme activities effective. The Joint Programme’s guidelines did allow for NGOs to partner with private sector in their applications, however this did not happen to any great extent, a reflection of a private sector which remains under-developed. The programme’s approach was also to work with municipal projects (public investments) that could lay foundations for attracting private sector to 'jump in' afterwards: For instance, restoration of bridge in Srebrenik and establishments of souvenir shops was planned to attract private local entrepreneurs to run tourism activities. Lessons from other countries indicate that successful private sector participation (PSP) requires engagement and negotiation with potential private sector operators from the outset of project design, and robust consideration of the economic viability of retail sites to be let, concessioned or privatized. The assumption that the private sector will be willing to ‘jump in’, or facilitated by municipalities to do so, is not a sufficient intervention approach to ensure economic development. An *ex-post* review would be helpful to examine this.

Institutional impact on the other hand in terms of improved institutional capacity and the numbers of staff and teachers trained is likely to have been very significant as the emphasis of the Joint Programme was centered around raising awareness of intercultural issues and facilitating dialogue towards shared goals and on producing high quality new policy documents and teaching materials. Over 7,000 people took part in trainings plus a further 1,000 in workshops, and in total over 200 capacity development events are recorded. A wide range of legal instruments were updated for heritage and culture. Social impact, including the retained impact of the BCC, has not yet been studied in detail by programme monitoring, and the planned repeat of the KAP study to provide a final *ex-post* benchmark will be very helpful.

The Joint Programme team viewed social and network impact mainly through trying to ensure the sustainability of joint mechanisms. The thrust of the Joint Programme has been to work through the existing culture and education ministries and strengthen their outward networking. These organizations have been facilitated to develop better relationships with cultural organizations and have been assisted to develop online communications. A number of functional mechanisms for networking and continuous dialogue mechanisms were established through the Joint Programme, for example the educational working group which was established, a Facebook page, and a network of UNESCO’s cultural industries were established. Ties and connections have been built up which should enable new relationships to continue and allow for smoother future initiatives where many partners need to agree on a subject.

## Target groups and direct and indirect beneficiaries

The number of direct and indirect beneficiaries as the Joint Programme-end approaches is estimated by the programme team to be 63,472. Over one million indirect beneficiaries are reported, 72,608 of whom are children. These are impressive figures. The extent to which these groups have benefited of course varies very significantly: Some attended short trainings, others were the subject of specific initiatives or attended cultural events. The extent of impact some categories (such as ‘youth’ and ‘communities at ground level’ of the specific programme interventions) cannot be fully measured without scientific surveying of these wide constituencies and the planned KAP survey should assist this process. It is however heartening to note that there have already been over 1,500 downloads of the educational Internet game ‘Search for Bosnia and Herzegovina Treasure’ developed by the Joint Programme.

## Impact on targeted sectors

The Joint Programme was targeting the cultural sector (broadly defined to include literature, contemporary arts, tourism, sports, design, digital media, digitalization of libraries in selected municipalities and other cultural activities), heritage and education. The programme had a significant short term impact by significantly increasing educational initiatives at school level, festivals and events during the Joint Programme’s life. Some of these events are on-going so the benefit of the expanded activity in 2010 and 2011 should continue. It also had a significant long term impact through the development of strategic reviews and the culture action plan, and in particular through an extensive emphasis on capacity development for municipality employees, employees of ministries of education and culture at entity and national level, NGOs, teachers and other beneficiaries. The tourism and local museums sectors were also helped through the restoration of some heritage sites and some other initiatives.

## Impact on cultural institutions, municipal administrations, and local communities

In terms of cultural institutions, the Joint Programme did not target the main national cultural institutions as is generally understood: The national museum, national gallery, national theatres and national libraries. This is in contrast with the MDG-F Culture for Development programme in Albania which had more of a cultural tourism focus. The Joint Programme targeted instead ministries at national and entity level, and municipalities at micro-level. The ministries at state and entity level benefited from significant organisational impact from the Joint Programme, and this was extensively reflected in feedback obtained from ministry staff at various levels during the final evaluation mission:

“It was an excellent well-organized project with high participation”

` “Inclusion in the inception phase was particularly appreciated”

Municipal administrations were also greatly impacted in terms of capacity development:

“I learnt a lot from the programme monitoring and other projects”

“The programme helped to re-establish relationships and learn about each others’ culture. It helped to enlarge existing cooperation and open doors”

The Joint Programme targeted core municipalities for support in both the educational and cultural fields and these were linked to other municipalities for certain events and initiatives (annex 4). 2,643 industry professionals and artists are reported as having taken part in trainings.

Impact on local communities came through education, festival and events and other initiatives organized by both municipalities themselves and NGOs. This was an economic impact during the events themselves, and an institutional impact on schools and the hosting municipalities. Some social impact also came to the audiences attending. The media was targeted as a means of ultimately influencing local communities, but it proved difficult to achieve significant results here. The Joint Programme office estimates over one million indirect beneficiaries. Many remote rural communities in particular benefited through exposure to contemporary culture.

## Cross-cutting issues

Gender, youth and social inclusion were all impacted to some degree in the short term through their consideration as scoring criteria for projects being put forward for funding. Consequently projects selected addressed these cross-cutting issues. In the longer term impact on gender, youth and social inclusion issues will come as a result of

1. the capacity development training that has been given to teachers and to decision-makers at municipal levels, and to NGOs; and
2. the considerable emphasis that has been given to these areas in strategic and policy documents developed by the Joint Programme for culture, heritage and education.
3. Gender trainings for cultural workers were organised by gender centres in Bosnia and Herzegovina combining the use of external experts and local resources to maximise local ownership.
4. The choice of media to be targeted and used by the Joint Programme sometimes favoured younger audiences.

In overall terms 53 percent of Joint Programme beneficiaries are reported as female (33,655), implying that in terms of participants the Joint Programme was gender-neutral. However given that the female percentage of the national non-agricultural workforce is 34.9 percent (Ministry of Treasury and Finance and UNCT, 2010), this is progress, and exceeds the original Joint Programme target.

## Good governance

Good governance was significantly impacted by the Joint Programme, both through its example and the trainings which it funded. The M&E trainings were particularly useful in this regards, together with the way in which the Joint Programme firstly addressed policy issues and then sought to work them through in funded activity. Good governance also addressed international law and conventions, for example by bringing the country’s statistical measurement systems for culture into line with Europe, and by integrating international heritage conventions with Bosnia and Herzegovina law.

## Contribution to the promotion of human rights

Article 27 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights[[12]](#footnote-12) of the United Nations General Assembly is about the right to access to culture. Article 26 relates to education. The greatest impact on the promotion of human rights probably came through the educational components where an Action Plan for introduction of a system for monitoring education quality with accompanying sets of documents (such as a code of ethics, intercultural indicators, and instruments for school self-evaluation). These have been approved by the Bosnia and Herzegovina Agency for Pre-primary, Primary and Secondary Education regarding how to treat monitories was adopted by the Pedagogical Institute and rolled out through teacher trainings. In addition the work undertaken suggesting areas where curriculum reform is needed also addressed human rights issues. The reconstruction of selected symbols of culture also aims at supporting the return of displaced persons and furthering their rights (Articles 17 and 18).

## Influence on public policy framework

The Joint Programme had a significant influence on the public policy framework for culture and heritage and cultural industries, as evidenced by the action plan and major policy documents adopted. It also had influence on the educational policy framework, although this sector is highly fragmented and difficult to influence overall: The Joint Programme has done well to achieve the progress in education. In the area of economic development the programme also commissioned a study on PPP and some local framework studies on cultural tourism which have been adopted.

A significant success for the Joint Programme regarding public policy (which hopefully will be sustained) was bringing all parties together to agree many public policy frameworks on culture, heritage and education.

## Factors influencing the spirit of Joint Programme delivery

The spirit of joint programme delivery was one of cooperation, thoroughness and practicality. It may not have successfully addressed all challenges, but it has made very significant progress. The factors influencing this included the following:

* The availability of significant funding to be spent in the selected municipalities, and collective responsibility for allocating funds.
* Commitment from PMC members and partner organisations and a willingness to compromise to keep the programme moving forward.
* Confidence in the transparency and fairness of selection procedures.
* The strong commitment of United Nations agencies and staff.

## Conclusions

In terms of impact, the Joint Programme had a significant effect on its operating environment. This appears to be more of an organisational impact than an economic impact in the long term, but in the short term significant economic impact may have been achieved by the equitable dispersal of funds across ten and more municipalities. Economic impact is not well articulated at present however, partly because many projects are only just completed. Social impact should come through the Joint Programme’s excellent work in the education area and its efforts to bring about behaviour change. The Joint Programme intervention made a significant organisational impact on its key stakeholders and had a very positive effect on the cultural and heritage sectors: Institutional development, legislative development, and capacity development have all been significantly increased in the areas of culture, heritage and education. The Joint Programme has also had a significant impact on ministries and municipal administrations, and brought contemporary culture and the arts to selected local communities. The education sector has been positively impacted though greater awareness of interculturalism and significant efforts were made to foster this agenda with the media also: Impact on the media also seems questionable however, although many trainings were undertaken. The issues of gender, youth and social inclusion were raised on decision-makers’ agendas and good governance in particular was very positively impacted.

***Case study: Impact***

***Kozara ethnic tourism***

*The development of cultural tourism based around folk culture and folk dance has long been a traditional tourism product of the region. However there is a great deal of it, often of mediocre quality and not meeting the needs of today’s international tourism market. As a result many rural tourism initiatives based around ethno-cultural tourism fail.*

*In Kozara however NGO activity has been closely supported by the Tourism Association of Banja Luka to develop a market-oriented cultural tourism offer, based on the needs of tour operators and directly marketed to them. In addition an existing festival is being supported to boost local domestic tourism. There is a strong emphasis in the project on ensuring high quality product standards, on continuous training, and on market research regarding visitor satisfaction. As a result of this integrated and market-orientated approach involving NGOs, municipalities and the local Tourism Association (not always evident in other projects supported) good results are being achieved: Over 1,000 visitors have been attracted to a very remote rural area, and booking are continuing aided by a good on-line presence. The product appears sustainable.*

# PROGRAMME SUSTAINABILITY

*Programme sustainability relates to the probability of the benefits of the programme continuing in the long term.*

## Likelihood of benefits continuing in the four output areas

### Developed and implemented cultural policies and legal frameworks

There is a very high likelihood of benefits continuing in Outcome Area 1. Practical cultural policies and legal frameworks have been put in place and an Action Plan for the implementation of the existing Strategy of Cultural Policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina drawn up. Statistical systems have been strengthened also. Extensive capacity development training has taken place. Movement towards reform of existing curricula and school practice from intercultural perspective has taken place so might be carried forward; and teachers' competencies for intercultural and inclusive education have been improved. Heritage and conservation conventions ratified by Bosnia and Herzegovina have been moved forward and are now adopted for the future. As one consultee stated:

“The project was using culture to look to the future, rather than looking to the past”

A concern stated by consultees (especially NGOs) is the ability of the Government parties to fund future cultural events which were established or supported under the Joint Programme.

### Improved cross-cultural understanding at the community level

The process of selecting genuinely cross-cultural projects in a collective manner and hence facilitating inter-entity cooperation was challenging. Likewise encouraging teacher participation and encouraging pupil exchange between different communities was a difficult challenge, but successfully overcome. The continuation of such progress is dependent on the evolving political situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the willingness to cooperate on interculturalism: One consultee pointed out that

It is easy to rebuild a bridge: It takes a lot longer to rebuild bridges between people” (Ministry employee)

Encouraging collective pride in shared heritage was also a very important aspect of the Joint Programme, and these interventions do appear sustainable. An important campaign for changing mindsets to improve cross-cultural relations was undertaken: There is clearly a need for more such campaigns, as to be effective BCCs need to be continued over very long periods, but there does not appear to be future plans by Government to fund a repeat BCC. This is a significant issue.

### Strengthened cultural industries

Outcome Area 3 lays greater on the role of culture in economic development, supporting artistic-entrepreneurs through strategizing, marketing and vocational training. Enhanced cultural tourism sites are assets for the future (but sites will deteriorate over time if they become a drain on public resources and do not attract revenue). Many projects supported were NGO-based and some stated they will end when Joint Programme funding ends. On the other hand trainees of UNESCO courses continue to network and further trainings by local community representatives are being organized in their municipalities.

Physical interventions (such as improving disabled access and securing monuments) are clearly sustainable, but there are questions about the sustainability of the enterprise-related interventions of the project which must now either sink or swim. Some will undoubtedly survive, particularly in the crafts area. The extent to which festivals and events initiated by the Joint Programme will continue is difficult to judge at this point, but assets like the grand piano purchased for concert performances in Gradiška could continue to be played for many generations.

### Improved tolerance levels towards diversity

Some progress has hopefully been made with the 10,000 direct beneficiaries of trainings under this programme, and hopefully they in turn can influence others making this outcome sustainable. At the present time however it is difficult to find comprehensive evidence of improved tolerance towards diversity in Bosnia and Herzegovina, other than the lengthening continuation of peace. The reconstruction of selected symbols of culture aims at supporting the return of displaced persons and the restoration of these monuments will enhance social inclusion, reconciliation and respect of different in selected municipalities.

“The project has been a bright light in a darkening political scenario” Media expert

## Extent of embedding in institutional structures

The Joint Programme has concentrated on embedding its activities in the ministries for education and culture at state and entity level, in educational agencies and universities, and in municipalities. It is likely that this embedding has been successful. For example in accordance with action plan for introduction of a system for monitoring quality of primary schools developed under the Joint Programme, the Agency for Pre-primary, Primary and Secondary Education and pedagogical institutes and schools continue to use material developed. Similarly cultural ministries are using assessment methodologies devised under the Joint Programme in 2012.

## Technical capacity and leadership commitment to continuation

Technical capacity has undoubtedly been strengthened by the Joint Programme, especially in the areas of policy development for the culture sector including the use of data, understanding of culture, contemporary culture and interculturalism. Pedagogical understanding has also been increased, together with the understanding of heritage and conservation. It is likely that this improved technical capacity will benefit Bosnia and Herzegovina for many years to come.

Leadership commitment generally lies at a political level in Bosnia and Herzegovina. There is some evidence that funding challenges mean that the ability to continue with initiatives such as statistical research, pairing of schools and restoration projects (such as the Ferhadija Mosque) is constrained. Leaders have been engaged in trainings, but leadership commitment may be a risk to future sustainability.

## Exit strategy

The Joint Programme positioned its implementation to embed its operations in the governmental procedures. The Joint Programme’s final Workplan is concerned with completing unfinished business and reallocating unspent moneys. In some cases it is clear that municipalities themselves are taking responsibility for the exit of the Joint Programme, and some are looking to future expansions through EU and other funding sources. It is understood that an Exit Strategy to consider how projects supported will continue after MDG-F funding ends will be prepared before the closure of the Joint Programme (*R21*).

## Duration of the programme

In terms of the length of the intervention, there is widespread consensus that the intervention was probably too short to maximize its effect on cultural understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina, to bring about major change and to sustain its benefits. Some trainings were considered too short or too one-off:

“It is very difficult to change the prejudices of a lifetime in a two day training” Teacher.

## United Nations reform and future joint programme planning and implementation

The Joint Programme has demonstrated very good practice in terms of the ‘One UN’ approach and does provide models for future Joint Programme planning. If the databases systems, M&E systems and general management systems developed for a highly complex and multi-facited programme can be reviewed with a view to developing training programmes to enable them to be replicated elsewhere, the processes developed here can be made sustainable. It will be interesting to benchmark the approaches applied here against other Joint Programmes in other countries and see what lessons can be learned, and it is expected that MDG-F Secretariat inter-country *ex-post* evaluations will do this.

## Adherence to principles of aid effectiveness

Because the Joint Programme has achieved strong local ownership and used in-country systems for project delivery, there is a high adherence to the principles of aid effectiveness, as discussed at section3.3.

## Possible additional measures

As the Joint Programme is nearing completion there are limited opportunities for additional measures at this stage. Continued liaison with other donors to make them more aware of projects which have been established or may need assistance to be carried forward is recommended.

## Conclusion

In terms of sustainability there is a high probability that benefits from the programme will continue after MDG-F funding ceases. In particular this relates to the enhanced capacities of beneficiaries and the embedding of programme activities in local institutional structures for culture, heritage and education. Uncertain leadership commitment and a possible lack of financial means to continue activities, particularly campaigns regarding behaviour change, is also a concern. The duration of the Joint Programme was short in terms of sustainably embedding change. The financial viability of some supported projects and their dependence on Government funding to continue is a sustainability concern: Some NGO projects will not continue.

***Case study: Sustainability***

***Restoring cultural heritage***

*Reconstructing heritage assets damaged during the war or otherwise neglected has been a key aspect of interculturalism supported by the Joint Programme. Examples include the following:*

* *The Ethnographic Museum in Jajce*
* *Cultural centres in Rudo and Sokolac*
* *Rebuilding a bridge to the mediaeval fortress in Srebrenik*
* *Reconstruction of parts of the Ottoman Castle in Tesanj*
* *Fully equipping the ethno-museum Eminagica House in Tesanj with articrafts, hand-made furniture and equipment in style of Ottoman era*
* *The complete reconstruction of Spanish Square in Mostar*
* *Assisting the reconstruction and restoration of the Ferhadija Mosque in Banja Luka, the Orthodox Cathedral in Mostar, the Monastery Plehan near Derventa*
* *Conservation works in Hambarine and Sutjeska, the Mithras Temple in Jajce and the Museum Herzegovina in Trebinje*

*These reconstructions provide sustainable assets for future cultural development and education on Bosnia and Herzegovina. Ensuring their financial sustainability as assets for cultural tourism and other purposes will be challenging.*

# OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Overall conclusion

In terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact, the Joint Programme has been extremely sound. In terms of sustainability, the programme appears to be sustainable, especially in terms of institutional sustainability. It was an excellent example of a ‘One UN’ approach with very strong engagement with state entity and municipal governments and the NGO sector. Close alignment with the MDG-F thematic window for Culture and Development was observed.

There is a need to continue the Joint Programme’s activities in fostering education on interculturalism and dialogue, to build of strategic cultural and educational policies put in place, and to give greater attention to peace-building through releasing the economic development potential of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s very rich and unique shared cultural heritage (*R22*).

## Overall rating of implementation

The overall rating of the Joint Programme’s implementation is as follows:

**Table 6: Rating of evaluation criteria**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Rating (Excellent, Good, Moderate. Fair. Poor)** |
| 1 Relevance | Good |
| 2 Effectiveness | Excellent |
| 3. Efficiency | Good |
| 4. Impact | Good |
| 5 Sustainability | Good (institutional sustainability); moderate (economic, social and networking sustainability) |

## Recommendations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R1 | In order to stimulate economic development through culture, there needs to be a greater focus on fostering private enterprise, particularly in a post-socialist economy still dominated by a very large public sector[[13]](#footnote-13). The MDG-F Culture for Development Programme in Turkey had a focus on private sector development[[14]](#footnote-14) and there may be opportunities to compare approaches and lessons learnt in future United Nations activity. |
| R2 | It is recommended that future interventions related to the cultural industries in Bosnia and Herzegovina give specific attention to sustainable job creation opportunities (outside of the public sector). |
| R3 | In future interventions it is recommended that attention is given to investigating and embedding the economic development potential of culture in economic development strategies by all relevant development agencies and government departments. |
| R4 | The Joint Programme’s database systems and implementation frameworks should be carried forward into other United Nations projects. |
| R5 | Key indicators need to be more closely related to the achievement of results rather than the monitoring of activity as it takes place and more attention needs to be paid to estimating economic impact. Using more conventional project management cycle logframes which tie activities more closely to objectives, objectively verifiable indicators and results would assist this |
| R6 | To further United Nations transparency and accountability, it is recommended that in future Joint Programme webpages should be hosted on all participating United Nations agency websites in addition to beneficiary webpage placement. As a knowledge-sharing initiative consultancy and other reports should be made widely available through publication and/or placement on a wide range of appropriate Internet sites (including relevant United Nations sites and research libraries). |
| R7 | The monitoring processes developed under this Joint Programme are worthy of consideration for replication in other projects. |
| R8 | International examples of reconciliation through a recognition of economic development opportunities (such as in Northern Ireland) might be drawn upon to help achieve greater progress in the area of inter-entity marketing of the cultural industries and crafts. |
| R9 | It is recommended that close attention be paid to ensuring that the specific needs of the extreme poor are comprehensively addressed when approving MDG or similar poverty-related projects. |
| R10a | It is recommended that future interventions consider supporting fewer, larger strategic interventions to maximise long term economic impact[[15]](#footnote-15). |
| R10b | It is recommended that a future intervention consider supporting the enhancement of cultural facilities, including national cultural institutions, as important neutral spaces in a divided society. |
| R11 | If a similar multi-country support mechanism is initiated, it is suggested attention should be paid in the inception period for comparison of United Nations country approaches to common problems, to identifying more regional/international specialist expertise and to developing more regular inter-programme dialogue mechanisms. |
| R12 | It is recommended that donor coordination be given more attention to ensure the optimum use of aid and possible future additional intervention where needed. |
| R13 | It is recommended that future cultural tourism-related interventions engage with tourism authorities and tour operators in designing and implementing tourism interventions. |
| R14 | Without effective international marketing, the development potential of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s cultural heritage cannot be maximised. The Joint Programme’s successes in achieving inter-entity consensus need to be built upon and applied to international marketing, if the economic development potential and job creation potential of the cultural and crafts industries is to be realised. |
| R15 | Given the critical role of the media in forming cultural consciousness, it is recommended that further attention and resources are given to seeking effective ways of fostering interculturalism and responsible reporting in the media. |
| R16 | It is recommended that future support programmes provide for an extension and up-scaling to all municipalities of the teaching modules developed in relation to interculturalism, children’s parliaments and other innovative educational projects initiated, and that consideration be given to extending the length/frequency of teacher trainings. |
| R17 | Weakness in linking vocational training in Bosnia and Herzegovina to current and future labour market needs has been noted by the United Nations and other development agencies. Shortage of skilled staff in some cultural industry sectors is currently apparent, and in other areas re-training and greater awareness of market trends needs to be developed (as this programme recognised). It is recommended that future support programmes give consideration to this by addressing the strategic development of vocational training provision. |
| R18 | A holistic approach to studying local economic potential and PPP should be applied, drawing on relevant case studies and examples of international best practice to assess and guide the development potential of culture in Bosnia and Herzegovina. |
| R19 | It is recommended that changes in attitudes (positive or negative) recorded in the final KAP survey be incorporated into agencies’ internal *ex-post* evaluation and reporting mechanisms. It is also recommended that the *ex-post* evaluation estimate the Joint Programme’s specific economic impact and which initiatives supported under the various windows have subsequently sustained growth. |
| R20 | It is recommended that future programmes related to addressing poverty give attention to mainstreaming pro-poor policies into state, entity, municipal and other regional development strategies. |
| R21 | Future programmes should develop exit strategies which consider in detail how individual projects supported will fare in the future, after the United Nations intervention ends. |
| R22 | It is recommended that future United Nations development support build on the progress achieved in this Joint Programme by continuing to support education on interculturalism, media responsibility and dialogue, while also focussing on the economic development potential of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s very rich and unique cultural heritage as a peace-building measure.  A natural follow-up to the Joint Programme, building on cooperation achieved would be to target joint economic development initiatives for cultural heritage. For example the development of linked clusters of crafts, cultural tourism trails (such as the *Via Dinarica*, festivals, museums or castles), arts festivals and literary summer schools could be supported.  Inclusive education to provide skills to meet the needs of future markets will remain a critical priority.  Bosnia and Herzegovina’s crafts have considerable employment potential, if the can be effectively matched to market needs and then marketed.  The strengthening of responsible tourism and enterprise around candidate and enlisted World Heritage Sites and national cultural institutions also needs to be strengthened, and the development of selected municipalities as Heritage Towns in both entities could be explored.  The United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (UNPBF) should be approached with a view to building on the excellent groundwork by this programme, and to build on the lessons learned[[16]](#footnote-16). |
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# Annex 1: Terms of reference

|  |
| --- |
| **Title:** External EvaluationConsultant (International/National) – Final evaluation of the MDG-F Programme Improving Cultural Understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina (MDG-F Culture for Development Joint Programme)  **Cluster:** Office of the Resident Coordinator  **Reporting to: Office of the Resident Coordinator / Development, Research and M&E Specialist**  **Duty Station:** Sarajevo  **Contract Type:** Individual Contract  **Duration:** 30 expert days (in the period 1 March 2012 – 30 April 2012)  **Background**  Global Context: The MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) and Culture and Development Window  The MDG Achievement Fund is an international cooperation mechanism whose aim is to accelerate progress on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) worldwide. Established in December 2006 with a generous contribution of €528 million Euros ($US710M) from the Spanish Government to the United Nations system, the MDG-F supports national governments, local authorities and citizen organizations in their efforts to tackle poverty and inequality. An additional €90M were contributed by Spain in 2008 mainly towards child nutrition and food security, conflict prevention and private sector and development. Overall, 85% of resources goes to financing 128 joint programmes in eight programmatic areas/windows linked to the MDGs. Programmes are implemented in 49 countries from five regions around the world.  The Culture and Development Window comprises 18 joint programmes that promote culture as a vehicle for social and economic development. The main interventions focus on cultural rights, social inclusion and increasing the cultural heritage and tourism potential of countries with the aim of reducing poverty, increasing employment and improving socio-economic opportunities for the marginalized segments of the population.  Country Context: MDG-F Programme Improving Cultural Understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina (MDG-F Culture for Development Joint Programme)  Culture for Development is a partnership programme implemented by three United Nations agencies in Bosnia and Herzegovina, namely the UNDP, UNICEF and UNESCO, in close collaboration with the national Ministry of Civil Affairs, entity Ministries of Culture and Education, as well as other institutions responsible for education and culture in the country. The overall budget of the 3.5 year Joint Programme (JP) foreseen to end in June 2012 is USD 8,000,000. The JP is funded through MDG-F thematic window for Culture and Development and through its implementation considerable co-financing by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been secured.  Relevant MDGs that are being primarily targeted are MDG’s 1, 2, 3 and 8. The programme builds on existing efforts of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) BiH in the areas of the protecting and revaluing cultural heritage, inter-ethnic dialogue, tolerance building in education, and human rights-based approaches to programming, including social inclusion. Programme formulation focused on identifying the strengths and comparative advantages of the UN agencies, and ensuring strong links with existing programmes, including those managed by other donors.  Key programme outcomes are:  • Improvement of the cultural policy and legal framework  • Improvement of cross-cultural understanding  • Strengthening the cultural industries, and  • Improvement of tolerance towards diversity  The key partners to the implementation of MDGF Programme are: BiH Ministry of Civil Affairs, FBiH Ministry of Culture and Sports, RS Ministry of Education and Culture, BiH Ministry of Education and Science, Department for Education of Brcko District, Government Agency for Pre-primary, Primary and Secondary Education, Pedagogical Institutes, 10 core localities (municipalities), schools, Media representatives, Artists and culture workers. The programme is well distributed across the country. Equal representation of both entities has been taken into consideration during the process of approval of criteria for selection of core localities.  The programme works within four distinct programmatic components that address evidence-based policy making (strategic policy documents; policy research and improved methodology for statistics), improved cultural understanding at local level (local municipal and NGO projects that address issues of intercultural understanding , improved culture tourism and culture industry potentials (local and umbrella projects focused on improved conditions for and improved tolerance for diversity (media, documentaries and culture workers). |
| **The evaluation scope, purpose and objectives:**  Under the direct guidance and supervision of the UN RCO Development, Research and M&E Specialist and MDG-F Culture for Development management team consisted of representatives of UNDP, UNICEF and UNESCO, the Evaluation Consultant is going to provide evaluation services ensuring high quality, accuracy and consistency of work. The Evaluation Consultant will demonstrate a client-oriented approach and should meet the standards outlined in the Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System.The evaluation will also be based on a stakeholder approach, where all groups and individuals, who affect and/or are affected by the achievement of the programme results and outcomes, are involved in the analysis. Moreover, the evaluation will take into consideration the institutional, political and economic context, which affected the programme during its implementation. Evaluation Consultant will work in close collaboration with the MDG-F Culture for Development Programme Manager, participating agencies, programme staff and key programme stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries.  The main purpose of the evaluation is to provide an independent in-depth assessment of the achievements of programme results and outcomes against the planned results and the implementation modality of the MDG-F Culture for Development Joint Programme. The final evaluation will be a systematic exercise, thorough analysis of the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: programme design and relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, based on the scope and criteria as defined in this ToR. Anticipated approaches to be used for data collection and analysis by the evaluator are desk review, interviews with key stakeholders, field visits, questionnaires and participatory techniques. The entire evaluation process including reporting and preparation of conclusions and recommendations for the Joint Programme is to be completed within a period of maximum 2 months / 30 expert days.  Objectives of the final evaluation are:   * Assessment of the programme’s quality and internal coherence (needs and problems it aimed to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, national development strategies and priorities, the Millennium Development Goals at the local and country level, the level of contribution to the objectives of the MDG-F Culture for Development Thematic Window and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action; * Assessment on how the joint programme operated and what is the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and operational and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks, collaboration and synergies and will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the JP modality and make recommendations to guide future joint programming among UN agencies in BiH; * Assessment of design and relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the programme and the level of achievement of envisaged programme results and outcomes (thorough assessment of all four programme components is required); * Assessment of quality, results and impact of local programme interventions (municipal and NGO)/grant projects financed through the programme, including the assessment of co-financing modality and implementation capacities on a local level; * Assessment of programme’s different internal and external M&E systems and tools developed including data collection, statistics, research and analytical outputs, databases, guidelines, etc. and assessment of programme’s communication strategy, outreach activities and impact * Identification of key recommendations and lessons learned through the evaluation process of the JP   **Evaluation questions**  The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them.  **Programme Relevance and Design:** The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention address the real problems and the needs and interest of its target groups, country priorities, the Millennium Development Goals, associated national policies and donor priorities. ***Guiding questions:*** ***Relevance:*** a) Are the Joint Programme objectives and outcomes consistent and supportive of Partner Government policies, sectoral priorities, EU accession agenda, Paris Declaration, MDGs, MDG-F Development Window, Accra Agenda for Action? b) Does the programme respond to the needs of identified target groups? c) To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid? d) To what extent have the country’s national and local authorities and social stakeholders been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the development intervention? e) Was the programme timely and well identified given the developmental and sectoral context of the country? f) Is the identification of the problems, inequalities and gaps, with their respective causes, clear in the Joint Programme? ***Design:*** a) Was the design of the Joint Programme appropriate for reaching its results and outcomes? b) What is the quality of the programme’s implementation framework, are results and outcomes defined in the programme clear and logical? c) What is the quality of programmes’ results and M&E matrices, are indicators well defined and SMART? d) Were risks and assumptions well identified? e) Were changes made to the programme design during the inception phase? If yes, did they lead to significant design improvements? f) Were coordination, management and financing arrangements clearly defined and did they support institutional strengthening and local ownership? g) Does the Joint Programme take into account cross-cutting issues and specific interests of women, minorities, people with disabilities and ethnic groups in the areas of intervention? h) To what extent has the MDG-F Secretariat contributed to raising the quality of the design of the joint programme?  **Programme Efficiency (processes):** Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results and what is their quality. ***Guiding questions:*** a) 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) contributed to obtaining the envisaged outputs and results? b) To what extent participating UN agencies have coordinated with each other and with the government and with civil society? To what extent have the target population and participants made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation have taken place? c) Were programmes’ financial and personnel resources managed in a transparent and accountable manner and were they cost-effective? d) To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled and with the planned financial resources? e) What monitoring tools and mechanisms were used by the programme management? f) If applicable, how flexible and responsive was the programme in adapting to changing needs? g) How do the different components of the joint programme interrelate? h) Were work methodologies, financial instruments, etc. shared among agencies, institutions, other Joint Programmes? i) To what extent have public/private national resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme’s outcomes and produce results and impacts?  **Programme Effectiveness (results):** Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance. How well programme’s results contribute to the achievement of programme’s objectives? ***Guiding questions:*** a) What was the quality of the programme’s key outputs and/or products (per component)? b) To what extent were the key programme results achieved (per component)? c) To what extent and in what ways the joint programme contributed to the Millennium Development Goals on a local level and the country level? d) To what extent and in what ways the joint programme contributed to the objectives set by the MDG-F thematic window on Culture and Development? e) What factors contributed to progress or delay in the achievement of products and results? f) In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving? g) What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified? h) Did all planned target groups had access/used programme results? i) What is the quality of local interventions and results achieved on a local level?  **Programme Impact:** The effect of the programme on its environment - the positive and negative changes produced by the Joint Programme (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended). ***Guiding questions:*** a) What difference the programme intervention made to programme stakeholders? b) Which target groups and how many direct and indirect beneficiaries were affected by the programme? c) What impact has been made in the targeted sectors in terms of institutional development, legislative development, capacity development? d) What impact has been made through the programme on cultural institutions, municipal administrations, local communities? e) Were cross-cutting issues taken into account? f) Was good governance mainstreamed in the programme? g) How did the programme contributed to the promotion of Human Rights? h) To what extent joint programme helped to influence the country's public policy framework? i) What factors favorably or adversely affected the spirit of Joint Programme delivery and approach?  **Programme Sustainability:** Probability of the benefits of the programme continuing in the long term. ***Guiding questions:*** a) To what extent will the benefits of a programme continue after activities have ceased? b) How well is the programme embedded in institutional structures (national and local) that will survive beyond the life of the programme? c) Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to continue working in the development direction set by programme and to continue using results and applying good practices? d) Is there an exit strategy or a follow up action/intervention planned after the programme ends? e) Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme? f) Was the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure sustainability of the interventions? g) What lessons learned or good transferable practices to other programmes or countries have been observed during the evaluation analysis? h) To what extent and in what ways are the joint programmes contributed to progress towards United Nations reform and future joint programme planning and implementation? i) How are the principles of aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, management for development results and mutual responsibility) being applied in the joint programmes? j) What additional measures (if any) could have improved the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact or sustainability of the Joint Programme?  **Support of the Joint Programme to the evaluation process**  The MDG-F Culture for Development Programme Manager and Coordinator will support the Evaluation Consultant with the following:  - Appointment of a focal person in the programme that will support the consultant for the duration of the evaluation process  - Securing relevant background documentation required for a comprehensive desk review  - Provision of list of contacts in advance and additional upon request  - Provision of vehicle and driver for field visits  - Organisation of group consultative meetings, briefing and debriefing sessions  - Provision of office/working space during the assignment. The consultant will however have to use his/her own computer/laptop  **Deliverables and timeline**  **Evaluation Process**  The evaluation process is expected to contain three phases: inception, data collection and field visit; and analysis and reporting.   * **Inception Phase (7 days)** - the Evaluation Consultant will review documentation, agree on the meetings and field visit locations with the Programme Coordinator, and produce Evaluation Inception Report (which includes a clear evaluation work plan and tools). * **Data Collection and Field Visit (10 days)** – the Evaluation Consultant will gather data through group and individual interviews and field visit to at least three municipal locations outside Sarajevo; at the end of the mission, presentation with preliminary findings and recommendations will be presented to the programme team/Evaluation Reference Group * **Analysis and Reporting (10 days for draft report and additional 3 days for final report/incorporation of comments)** – the Evaluation Consultant will prepare the draft evaluation report based on the analysis of findings, and will submit the report to the Evaluation Reference Group for factual review and comments. Opportunity to comment on the draft report will be open to Reference group for a maximum of 10 working days. After this process ends, the Evaluation Consultant will proceed with production of the final evaluation report.   **Evaluation Deliverables**  The Evaluation Consultant will be accountable for producing the following products/deliverables:   * Inception Report * Presentation of initial findings and provisional recommendations * Draft Evaluation Report * Final Report   The inception report should detail the evaluator’s understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables.  Presentation of initial findings and provisional recommendations- at the end of the field work, the Evaluation Consultant will present his/her draft findings and provisional recommendations through a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the main findings recommendations and lessons learned and conclusions.  Draft report for comments by stakeholders should incorporate (as a minimum): Title and opening pages; Table of Contents; List of acronyms and abbreviations; An Executive Summary; Introduction; Scope of Evaluation; Evaluation Methodology and Guiding Principles; Details of the JP activities and desired key results; Programme Analysis (per component); Findings; Lessons Learned; Recommendations; Methodological constraints; Additional background data-Annexes (including interview list, data collection instruments, key documents consulted, ToR). A draft report should be at least 40-50 pages of length containing unique narrative analysis.  A final evaluation report, will encompass all key sections required in the draft report and will include additional stakeholder feedback. The final report needs to be clear, understandable to the intended audience and logically organized based on the comments received from stakeholders. The final evaluation report should be presented in a solid, concise and readable form and be structured around the issues in the Terms of Reference (ToR). The consultant should refer to annex 7 of the UNDP Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation handbook for details on reporting template. The Evaluation Consultant is responsible for editing and quality control and the final report that should be presented in a way that directly enables publication.  **Timeframe**  **Action/Deliverable No of Expert Days Time period**  Inception Phase/Inception Report 7 days 1st half March 2012  Data Collection, field visit / Presentation  with key findings 10 days 2nd half of March 2012  Analysis and Reporting / Draft Evaluation Report 10 days 1st half of April 2012  Analysis and Reporting / Final Evaluation Report 3 days 2nd half of April 2012 |
| **Remuneration and Terms of Payment**  The Evaluation Consultant will be paid based on milestones accomplished:- 20% after the Inception Report is submitted and agreed, and 80% after submission of a satisfactory Final Evaluation Report |
| **Competencies:**   * Shares knowledge and experience and provides helpful feedback and advice; * Conceptualizes and analyzes problems to identify key issues, underlying problems, and how they relate; * Ability to identify beneficiaries’ needs, and to match them with appropriate solutions; * Excellent communication and interview skills * Excellent report writing skills * Responds positively to critical feedback and differing points of view; * Ability to handle a large volume of work possibly under time constraints; * Strong IT skills * Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback; * Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude; * Remains calm, in control and good humored even under pressure. |
| **Minimum Requirements:**   * Advanced University degree in international development, evaluation, social sciences, culture, education or related field; * A minimum of 10 years of professional experience specifically in the area of evaluation of international development initiatives and development organizations; * Substantial international track record of conducting different types of evaluations, including process, outcome and impact evaluations in different countries and organizations; * Knowledge and experience of the UN System and the UN Reform process; * Understanding of the development context and working experience in Bosnia and Herzegovina is an asset; * Fluency in spoken and written English; knowledge of Bosnian, Croatian and/or Serbian language is considered to be an asset. |

# Annex 2: Consultations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organization** | **Consultee** |
| Secondary School for Agriculture , Banja Luka | Prof Ljubisa Rokic |
| Fancy Crochetng | Ms Mirela Gacic |
| Association 'Good Bear' | Ms Tatjana Kuruzovic |
| Citizen Association 'European Connections' | Ms Zorica Malesevic,  Ms Tijana Samardzic |
| NGO FEED, Banja Luka | Mrs Lidija Markovic |
| KUD Piskavica | Mr Arambasic Mirko |
| BiH Agency for Preschool, Primary and Secondary School Education | Ms Branka Popic |
| BiH Ministry of Civil Affairs | Ms Biljana Camur |
| Bosnian Carpet (*Bosanski Cilim*) | Prof Amila Smajlovic |
| British Council | Ms. Amila Lagumdzija |
| Center World Music | Ms Aleksandra Savic |
| City of Mostar | Ms Sanela Mesic,  Ms Senada Sakic |
| Cultural Center Gradiska - Piano project | Mr Miroslav Vukovic |
| East - West Center | Mr Haris Pasovic,  Mr Ismar Hadziabdic |
| EU-BiH Tourism Project | Ms Mary McKeon |
| Federal Ministry of Education and Science | Ms Angela Petrovic |
| FBiHl Ministry of Education and Science | Ms Jasmina Oruc |
| FBiH Ministry of Sport and Culture | Ms Negra Selimbegovic |
| NGO FENIX ART - Visual Arts Association | Mr Goran Dujakovic |
| Ferhadija Mosque | Prof. Muhamed Hamidovic, |
| Green Visions | Mr Tim Clancy |
| Institute of Pedagogy, RS | Ms Mira Grbic |
| MDG-F Culture for Development Programme | Ms Renata Radeka  Ms Nedzada Faginovic  Ms Amela Gačanović-Tutnjević |
| MDG-F Secretariat, New York | Ms Paula Pelaez  Mr Adan Ruiz |
| Meeting with BHAS (BiH Statistics Agency) | Ms Vedrana Veljo-Djeric |
| Minster Church Mostar (Saborna Crkva Mostar) | Reverend Marko Gacic  Reverend Branimir Borovčanin |
| Mosque Ferhadija | Mr Djindo Armin |
| Municipality Administration, Tesanj (Eminagica Kuca, Gradina) | Ms Ismar Alagic |
| Municipality of Gradiska | Ms Brankica Brkic |
| Municipality of Novo Sarajevo | Mr Faruk Prses |
| National Theater Mostar | Mr Serif Aljic |
| OKC Abrasevic | Ms Mela Zuljevic |
| Primary School Gradiska, Nova Topola | Ms Rajna Soldat |
| ORC, Bosnia and Herzegovina | Mr Yuri Afanasiev (Resident Representative)  Ms Envesa Hodzic-Kovac  Ms Emina Durmo |
| Primary School Resad Kadic, Tesanj | Ms Berina Merdic |
| Primary School Velesicki Heroji, Novo Sarajevo | Ms Jasna Niksic |
| RS Institute of Statistics | Ms Bogdana Radic |
| Ministry of Education and Culture, RS | Ms Irena Soldat-Vujanovic,  Ms Slavica Kupresanin |
| Sarajevo Film Festival (SFF) | Mr Mirsad Purivatra  Ms Ivan Pekusic |
| UN Communications Office | Mr Pavle Banjac |
| UNDP | Mr Armin Sirco,  Ms Klelija Balta,  Ms Mirela Ibrahimovic, |
| UNDP representative, Embassy of the Kingdom of Spain | Ms Azra Dzigal |
| UNESCO | Dr Francesco Bandarin  Mr Sinisa Sesum,  Ms Amila Terzimehic |
| UNICEF | Ms Anne-Claire Duffay  Ms Sanja Kabil, |
| University of Sarajevo, Faculty of Philosophy | Prof. Adila Pasalic-Kreso |
| UNRCO | Ms Envesa Hodzic-Kovac,  Ms Emina Durmo. |
| USAID FIRMA Project | Ms Snjezana Derviskadic |
| VizArt - Visual Arts Association | Mr Zoran Galic |

# Annex 3: Updated monitoring indicators

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Original indicator proposed (Concept Note)** | **Approved indicator (Joint Programme Document at inception)** | **Achievement** |
| ***Outcome 1: Cultural policy and legal framework developed and implemented***  *Expected results*:   * Improved policies & legal frameworks in culture and education sectors*.* * Strengthened capacities of state and entity-level Governments in monitoring and evaluation of cultural development. | | |
| National Cultural Strategy developed.  Measurement:  Strategy document approved by stakeholders. | Culture Sector mapped, including detailed analysis of culture public sector (legislative, financial, infrastructure and human resources analysis), new classification of cultural industries and comprehensive culture sector research. | Culture mapping and sector analysis conducted (2009), classification of cultural industries prepared (2009), system for collection of cultural statistics developed (2010), assessment of culture industries and culture participation completed (2010)  Comprehensive BiH Culture Development Action Plan elaborated and agreed (2010). Priorities identified in Culture Development Action Plan addressed in institutional annual Action Plans (2010 and 2011 |
|  | Cultural web framework developed following the pre-approval of the conceptual framework. | Institutional web-framework with aggregate information from the level of entity and state ministries presented on user-friendly and modern web platform |
|  | Cross-cutting issues: Gender, Youth and Social Inclusion in the Culture Sector addressed in the BiH Action Plan based on National Cultural Development Strategy. | Done |
|  | Evidence-based research (KAP study) conducted in select municipalities to ensure greater understanding of perceptions of intercultural understanding and the importance of social inclusion (2009 and 2011) | Done |
|  | # of activities/issues identified in the BiH Action Plan based on National Cultural Development Strategy, jointly addressed by institutional partners (2011). | 31 activities from the Action Plan have been supported**.** |
|  | # of policy recommendations from the Cultural Mapping included in the Culture Strategy Action Plan (2011) | All policy recommendations were taken forward |
|  | Institutional capacities in planning and management for the culture sector improved | Best practices in culture sector introduced by the programme (2010) and used by the institutional partners (2010 and 2011). Needs-based training delivery provided by the programmethrough workshops, study-tours, exchange of best practices, provision of guidelines and management tools and ongoing mentoring and internal consultations (2009-2011) |
| Policies and guidelines for improving access to quality multi-cultural education created – yes/no  Measurement: Education policies and guidelines development | Report on existing curricula from the perspective of intercultural understanding prepared through the MoE Working Group (2009) | The context of interculturalism (including cultural skills, respect for diversity and cultural understanding) explored and translated into concrete recommendations for improvement (2009) |
| Number of educational guidelines for implementation of Laws and Strategies developed  Measurement: Gazette and legal review. | Contribution to positive assessment of education sector of BiH (2011)  *This indicator was dropped at Inception Phase.* |  |
| Number of relevant educational policy recommendations incorporated into Ministry’s plans.  Measurement: Ministry Plans | *This indicator was refined to create the tools of intercultural tool kits and Action plan for implementation of the new approach in intercultural education.* |  |
|  | Improved modalities for accessing and enhancing in-service teachers’ competences for intercultural and inclusive education | Mapping of teacher’s competences, developed recommendations and modules developed comprising of:   * Teacher Manual, Trainer Manual, Parents Manual, Student Manual, Cultural Reader |
|  | Number of junior lectures accomplished study program and enhanced their knowledge, skills and competences didactics and teaching methods for intercultural education | 24 junior lectures were trained from three universities(Banja Luka, Mostar, Sarajevo) |
| Supported preparation of state law on protection of cultural heritage.  Measurement: Delivered set of recommendations to government counterparts. |  | Done., new state law, 2011 |
| Assisted in ratification and implementation of applicable international conventions.  Measurement: Final ratification and proof of becoming state party of the Convention. | Publication with all conventions to which BiH is a State Party produced. (2009) | Conventions implementation in BiH Analysis Report (2009), monitoring system to track conventions implementation developed and used by MoCA (2010)  All relevant UNESCO conventions now ratified. |
|  | The initiatives for adjusting existing legal frameworks (on protection of cultural and natural heritage) of BiH to UNESCO Conventions, Council of Europe Conventions as well as European Union directives launched | Done |
| Built capacity of government agents to undertake monitoring and evaluation of cultural development progress, specifically with respect to the strategic plan. Measurement: Number of trainings organized. |  | Done: Development of M&E guidelines, provision of training (2010), elaboration of M&E tools and institutions introduce M&E function (2011) |
| Number of government’s monitoring and documenting improvements in implementation of educational policies on access and quality in education.  Measurement: Government and agency reports. | One operational and accessible monitoring system for cultural development indicators for policy development in education (2011). | M&E system and cultural indicators developed for monitoring of educational policy (2010), monitoring, reporting and advocacy capacities of BiH Agency for pre-school, primary and secondary education developed (2011) |
|  | Self Evaluation Reports from selected PS in partner municipalities | Set of instruments with defined indicators developed. |
|  | Number of cultural workers between Sarajevo and Banja Luka exchanged and produced joint activities | 53 cultural workers have been involved in joint activities |
|  | Good practice community projects with replicable potential documented and promoted widely, and experiences from the field level provided to policy makers as valuable inputs for policy debate (2011) | Done |
|  | Strengthened local capacities in management of cultural diversity and promotion of interculturalism  # of local decision makers and NGO actors participated in public debates and trainings on promotion of interculturalism (2009-2011). | 4,235 decision-makers and NGO actors took part |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Original indicator proposed (Concept Note)** | **Approved indicator (Joint ProgrammeDocument at inception)** | | | **Achievement** |
| ***Outcome 2: Cross-cultural understanding at community level improved***  **Expected results:**   * **Promoted models of social inclusion in primary schools of project target communities.** * **Enhanced local initiatives delivering positive cross-cultural messages.** | | | | |
| Restored major symbols of cultural heritage.  Measurement: Number of restorations. | | *Moved to outcome area 4* |  | |
| Supported selected community-based projects.  Measurement: Number of projects and number of municipalities. | | Targeted educational interventions for improvement of school practices in setting intercultural and inclusive attitudes and practices delivered in up to 10 target communities (2011). | Ethics and other training provided to parents, schools and teachers in 84 primary schools and 6 high schools across 13 core municipalities and 5 others.  Also Behaviour Change Campaign whose methodology was inclusive of schooling system | |
| Number of schools and communities engaged in development of strategies and approaches to address issues of culturally-based exclusion in education.  Measurement: Partner progress reports. | | *Indicator not taken forward* | Ethics and other training provided to parents, schools and teachers in 84 primary schools and 6 high schools across 13 core municipalities and 5 others. | |
| Number of schools and communities engaged in development of strategies and approaches to address issues of culturally-based exclusion in education with full participation of children and young people.  Measurement: Partner progress reports. | | *Indicator not taken forward at Inception Phase* |  | |
| Number of children and adolescents in primary schools actively involved and participating in creation of protective environments in their schools and communities.  Measurement: Records (survey, evaluation and other document) about parent, student and community. | | *Indicator not taken forward at Inception Phase* |  | |
| Number of recommendations for improved educational inclusion reflected in school plans.  Measurement: School plans. | | # of recommendations implemented from the Report on existing Curricula from an Intercultural Prespecitve and from the Mapping of Teacher's Competencies for intercultural and inclusive education (2011) | BCC designed (2010) and implemented (2011) in accordance with baseline findings:   * 3072 teachers from 84 primary schools in partner municipalities improved skills and comptences for intercultural education * 5000 copies of Module for Intercultural Education distributed to Pedagogical Institutes and primary schools * 5 Children Parliaments established on the basis of Agreement with Municipality * 9285 copies of publication Learning to Live Together translated into three BiH official languages and distributed to Pedagogical Institutes | |
| Cross-cultural tolerance improved.  Measurement: Analysis performed, and report with recommended strategies produced. | | Evidence-based research conducted in select municipalities (KAP Study) to ensure greater understanding of individual perceptions of pupils, parents teachers on cross-cultural understanding and importance of social inclusion (2009 and 2011) | Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) Study implemented in 2009 and repeated in 2011 in order to to measure changes and trends against set KAP indicators in 2009  To be repeated in 2012 to show final results | |
| Cross-cultural tolerance improved.  Measurement: Number of strategies implemented. | | Positive feedback from education authorities, schools, universities, local communities presented at the final event | Final event to obtain feedback taking place on May 30, 2012 | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Original indicator proposed (Concept Note)** | **Approved indicator (Joint Programme Document at inception)** | **Achievement** |
| ***Outcome 3: BiH’s Cultural Industry Sector strengthened***  Expected results:   * **Increased employment and profitability levels within the cultural industries.** | | |
| Financial support of cultural industry development.  Measurement: Number of grants/concession loans applied for and distributed. | # of community based culture projects implemented, cross-cultural issues addressed at the local level and impact achieved by the end of the project  #o f intercultural projects supported specifically at community level | Project management, monitoring and cross-cultural skills at the local level improved, culture life and content at community level increased, public debates and focus groups facilitated dialogue of understanding and tolerance, cross-cultural understanding trends to be measured in repeat KAP study  In total 152 local projects were implemented of which:   * 34 local cultural projects , and * 53 intercultural projects – this total excludes projects that are of pure educational nature and are at policy level or are targeting media. * out of remaining 65 projects at least about 30 % of outputs are overlapping with this indicator and are directly contributing to local projects addressing cross cultural issues |
| Basic business skills offered.  Measurement: Number of training sessions offered. | At least 80 artisans and culture sector subject trained. | Completed/additional training also provided due to he interest by cultural industry workers   * 160 people received training: |
|  | A number of managers and representatives of different institutions, organizations and associations trained how to prepare projects and apply for EU and other funds the realization of these projects | 450 representatives were trained |
| Generated employment.  Measurement: Number of short-term jobs directly created. . | Observing job creation and new economic value generated by projects by 2011. | 776 jobs ‘supported’ |
|  | Improvement of artisans’ business and entrepreneurial skills that result in greater income generation (2011) | *Data not available yet*  A web-platform for the improvement of networks and retention of new skills developed was created |
| Promoted cultural tourism.  Measurement: Number of advertising campaigns. | *Indicator refined below* |  |
|  | Up to 30 local cultural industry, including tourism, projects implemented (2011).  No of artisans/culture workers benefiting directly through implementation of cultural tourism projects with support of MDG-F Culture (2011) | 34 local cultural projects , and 53 intercultural projects were implemented  258 artisans, 571 artists, 94 entrepreneurs and 340 tourism beneficiaries were engaged. |
|  | No. of targeted trainings organised at a local level for future culture managers, tourist guides, municipal officials in maximising culture potential for economic development of their community (2011) | 219 trainings /workshops in total involving 7,038 beneficiaries |
|  | Enhanced promotion of art and culture industry products and strengthening professional and business networks through culture portal (2011) | 3 cultural webportals that previously did not exist developed  network of crafts established through UNESCO trainings |
|  | Culture portal developed (2010) | Done |
|  | Tentative List\* of Intangible Cultural Heritage, and inventory of cultural products of BiH prepared and utilised for training purposes in year III. \* according to the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage | Tentative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage, and inventory of cultural products of BiH prepared and utilised for training purposes in year III. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Original indicator proposed (Concept Note)** | **Approved indicator (Joint Programme Document at inception)** | **Achievement** |
| ***Outcome 4: Bosnia and Herzegovina’s unique multicultural identity promoted***. **Changed to: *Improved tolerance levels towards diversity***  Expected results*:*   * **Increased number of positive public discourses on interculturalism.** | | |
| Successful and continual nation-wide media campaign using different forums.  Measurement: Number of campaigns | Increased dissemination of positive and affirmative messages that promote cultural understanding and contribute to social cohesion, greater tolerance and appreciation of cultural diversity in BiH (2011) | 134 positive messages reported in the span of monitoring media report. |
| Number of communication and information approaches to address issues of culturally-based social exclusion in education with full participation of children and young people developed and implemented.  Measurement: Partner progress reports | # of recommendations implemented from the Report on existing Curricula from an Intercultural Perspective by 2011. | Behavioural Change Campaign (BCC) designed (2010) and implemented (2011) in accordance with baseline findings. 3 BCC projects implemented targeting population of 13 partner municipalities:   * 111 children and 52 parents in partner municipalities involved in BCC projects * 10 cross-cultural messages developed by children and disseminated in 10 partner municipalities * 1500 downloads of web based game ‘search for BiH Treasure’ by May 7, the game was launched in mid of April 2012 |
| Improved the multicultural sensitivity of media providers.  Measurement: Number of workshops/training sessions | Improved capacity of media professionals in delivering messages in a culturally and gender sensitive manner through trainings | Capacity building and training of 40 media, journalists and students on culturally sensitive reporting (2009-2010  *Final KAP study to determine effects of capacity changes (if any)* |
|  | Increased cultural understanding, tolerance and appreciation of cultural diversity in programme’s focus communities (2011)  # of documented cases with change in behavour towards differences in cultural background | 60 children from 6 municipalities showed increased positive attitudes towards interculturalism |
|  | # of documentary films promoted intercultural understanding. | 22 in total   * 12 through UNICEF * 9 documentaries UNDP+   1 promotional video on MDGF |
|  | Communications strategy developed and implementated in coordination with media representatives, cultural opinion leaders and stakeholder groups (2010). | Done |
|  | Behavioural Change Campaign (BCC) designed (2010) and implemented (2011) in accordance with baseline findings. | Done |
|  | Rehabilitation of important symbols/tangible heritage in BiH continued  Baseline: restoration of tangible symbols supported | 11 completed/underway |
|  | Increasing awareness and appreciation of heritage and symbols which are common good and priceless heritage of BiH and the world at large symbols/tangible heritage which are common good of BiH. | Exhibitions of old towns in BiH, in cooperation with ICOMOS  Over 300 articles and interviews performed by United Nations staff, each contains the positive appreciation of cultural heritage, plus BCC campaign.  *Awareness to be measured in final KAP survey* |

# Annex 4: Overview of selected activities funded in municipalities

**Thematic Window 1: Innovative Design of Handicrafts**

*1****. Association for protection of Bosnian carpet*** *–* ***in Sarajevo*** *Project "Poetry of Pattern":* 14 motifs and their symbols from Bosnia and Herzegovina carpets were preserved through their research and incorporation into newly-designed products. There are 8 newly designed types of products with the above motifs applied (rug, bag, laptop case, brush-holder, pillow, tapestry, catchet and *zeh* jewellery). Products were manufactured by 7 women employed for a period of 10 months. 18 women in total were trained in weaving and felting techniques.

***2. BH CRAFTS*** *- project "Handicraft as a source of income and promoter of cultural heritage“ in* ***Tuzla****.* Tourist offer was enriched by designing and manufacturing two new lines of souvenirs, 36 new products in total (some of them felted dolls in traditional costumes, ball point pens with felted cap, weaved and crochet made wallets, weaved key chains, weaved and crochet made book marks, crochet made pencil cases, felted picture postcards, etc). A new technique, felting was introduced, while traditional techniques of knitting, crochet and weaving were additionally promoted as one of the ways for income generation. 22 women in total were trained in felting and 10 of them were employed by BH CRAFTS in felting department.

***3. UHAKUD (Association of Croatian Amateurish Cultural Clubs)*** *- project "Preservation of Traditional Wood-carving from Konjic".* The project promoted and branded the art of Konjic wood-carving as intangible asset from Konjic region. A basis was created for manufacturing of innovational, new products of **Konjic** wood-carving, including the design of 17 new pieces of furniture which were promoted through a published catalogue and visits to fairs. In one such fair in Cologne, table "Daisy", designed through this project, was awarded for best design. 5 new types of souvenirs were also designed by young designers/students.

***4. Positive play –*** *project "Production of innovational traditional fashion and concept design in BiH".* The approach to traditional design of textile and jewellery was modified and modernised through focus workshops in 6 targeted municipalities: **Sokolac, Trebinje, Srebrenik, Jajce, Stolac and Bihać.** Designers and persons working with handicrafts were present at workshops, 31 in total. Workshops resulted with 20 conceptual products (mainly clothes and decorative objects) made by traditional weaving, knitting, embroidering etc. techniques which comprise a portfolio and a specific travelling exhibition visiting cities in Germany during the first months of 2012.

**Thematic Window 2: Improved Access to Culture**

***1. Aparat theatre –*** *project "Pinocchio in trouble".* Access to culture improved in 21 municipalities in BiH by the production of a new play for children "Pinocchio in trouble". Municipalities where the play was performed are: **Centar, Stari Grad, N.Sarajevo, N.Grad, Ilidža, Hadžići, Bihać, Bijeljina, Gradiška, Jajce, Prijedor, Rudo, Sokolac, Srebrenik, Tešanj, Mostar, Čapljina, Banja Luka, Brčko, Zenica, and Tuzla.** The evaluation of the play indicates that children recognised the themes of the play: children's rights, manipulation, drugs, paedophilia, violence, etc.

***2. Association of Citizens Evropske konekcije (European Connections)*** *- project "Black sheep – a Guide for Urban Culture and Arts“.* The total number of 12 Black sheep Guides was issued with significantly extended contents and involved 13 towns throughout BiH: **Sarajevo, Mostar, Zenica, Tuzla, Prijedor, Bihać, Bijeljina, Brčko, Gradiška, Srbac, Trebinje, Doboj, Jajce** as well as Banja Luka at which the Guide was initially focused. Success of the Guide was reported among broader population, and increasing interest among youth.

***3. AC Dobri medo (Good Bear) –*** *project "Rural Places have the right to Culture and Arts".* Access to culture and arts improved in 8 rural areas of BiH (**Nozicko (Srbac municipality), Jajce, Kozarac (Prijedor), Krupa na Vrbasu (Banja Luka), Bjelajci (Mrkonjić Grad), Šipovo, Ribnik and Kneževo)** by organising projections, photography schools and painting workshops. Project ended with an exhibition and awards to best works of the pupils. The pupils also designed picture postcards which were sent to addresses of different ministries appealing for improved access to culture in rural areas.

***4. East West Centre*** *- project "Roses for Ana Teresa – The Football Stories".* Access to culture and theatre programme improved in 11 municipalities through production and performance of the play "Roses for Ana Teresa – The Football Stories". The play was performed in **Zenica, Sarajevo, Bihać, Derventa, Gradiška, Jajce, Prijedor, Rudo, Sokolac, Srebrenik and Tešanj.** After the play, workshops were organised in 8 municipalities where the issues of culture and interculturalism were discussed with the audience.

***5. Biosplus -*** *project "Culture for Better Tomorrow“.* Access to culture improved for persons with disabilities through a series of organised workshops (Darovnice and Maštovnice) and cultural events, concerts and exhibitions (7 exhibitions and 7 concert held) in Derventa. The exchange of cultural contents also increased among targeted municipalities: **N. Sarajevo, Tešanj, Srebrenik, Bijeljina, Prijedor, Gradiška, Banja Luka, Tuzla, Doboj and Derventa,** and the project resulted in signing the Memorandum on Further Cultural Cooperation.

***6. Musicians without frontiers -*** *project "Connecting Differences through Culture".* Project improved access to cultural contents in 8 municipalities through workshops in music, choir singing and dance. The total number of held workshops was 228 for 1,167 beneficiaries in the following municipalities: **Konjic, Novo Sarajevo, Jajce, Mostar, Prijedor, Srebrenica, Sokolac and Rudo.**

**Thematic Window 3: Cultural Tourism**

***1. Centar World Music*** *- project "Heart of Herzegovina.* Project sought to improve cultural tourism in Herzegovina by creating a new tourist route focused on writers, poets and authors from Herzegovina. The route includes locations in municipalities of **Mostar, Čapljina, Konjic, Stolac and Trebinje[[17]](#footnote-17).**

***2. Cultural Club Piskavica – project "Kozara – Ethno-cultural Tourism as a Solution against Desertion of Rural Areas" in Kozarska Dubica.*** Project contributed to preservation of local life and traditions in the village of Piskavica in the mountain of Kozara, and improvement in tourist offer of the village. Three seminars for Piskavica villagers were organised in sustainable development, rural tourism and preservation use of traditional values, including legislation pertaining to this issue. Tourist offer in Piskavica is now developed in a form of tour of the ethno-house, demonstration of one traditional custom, and traditional cuisine. The Kozara Ethno Festival was also supported which, in 2011, was visited by 400 guests from 6 European countries. Excellent linkage between NGO and supporting municipality.

**Thematic Window 4: Arts for Understanding**

***1. Town tamburitza orchestra -*** *project "With* tamburitza *through Bosnia and Herzegovina“* Project contributed to establishing and strengthening of cooperation among 9 *tamburitza* orchestras in Bosnia and Herzegovina through joint concerts in targeted municipalities of **Cazin, Tuzla, Prijedor, Brčko, Trebinje, Jelah, Gradiška, Konjic and i Banja Luka**. *Tamburitza* as an instrument was promoted among youth and the partner orchestras were trained to start *tamburitza* schools. The total number of 80 new *tamburitza* school students were included throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, while the organisational and artistic capacities of local orchestras for promotion of *tramburitza* music were strengthened.

***3. Vizart-****project "Synergy of multicultural arts, reconciliation and tolerance".* Project contributed to creating an atmosphere for intercultural activities and exchange of cultural contents among local communities through travelling theatre Taster Fest in five municipalities: **Bijeljina, Tešanj,** **Srbac, Prijedor, and** **Bihać.** Taster fest, in addition to plays performed by the host theatre, also involved plays of travelling theatres from targeted municipalities, as well as workshops for actors and round tables on the theme "Amateur theatre – strengths and weaknesses". The Festival was visited by 3,000 people.

***4. Proni-*** *project “Through culture to respecting diversity“* The project established a youth base for promotion of intercultural understanding through workshops held on the themes of interculturalism, preservation of environment and workshops for actors in five targeted communities: **Brčko, Bijeljina, Bratunac, Vlasenica and Živinice.** 78 young people were trained in total. Web site for cultural events was designed in these communities with the title PopArt, and remarkable success achieved in involvement of Roma population in the workshops in Živinice.

***5. YCC Abrašević -*** *project“Re-collecting* ***Mostar****"* Project contributed to re-appropriation of public space and public memory on once popular public gathering places in Mostar. All public places which were popular before the war, memories to those places, current perceptions of young people regarding those places, etc. were mapped using topographic and artistic maps, which were all compiled to the experimental depot and exhibited on the web platform <www.abart.ba>.

***6. Fenix Art -*** *project "International festival of animated movies“.* Project contributed to promotion of animated movies among school children and youth by projections of animated movies organised in primary and secondary schools in **Banja Luka, Bosanski Petrovac, Bihać, and Sanski Most** (participated 340 students). There were also workshops organised for students of the Academy of Arts and Graphic Design in Banja Luka (63 students), and workshops with children with disabilities in the Institute Mladen Zotović in Banja Luka, and Memorandum of Long-term Cooperation was signed with this Institute. The festival Anima Fest was also organised within the project, with 34 movie projections in Banja Luka and 26 in locations of **Sarajevo, Mrkonjić Grad, Gradiška, Bijeljina i Trebinje**.

***7. Deblokada -*** *project“Summer Academy Stolac“.* Project improved the image of Stolac and promoted Stolac as a place of positive events. The project enabled positive exchange of creative ideas, thoughts and interventions from Bosnia and Herzegovina and neighbouring countries through four workshops held in **Stolac:** Acting, screenplay, music and narration, and cultural management. All workshops were visited by prominent cultural professionals, what contributed to promotion of Stolac as a positive place.

***8. Viva Ustiprača –*** *project "Respect culture of differences – it connects us, it enriches us“.*  Project contributed to improvements in cooperation in respecting and promoting cultural differences in 5 municipalities in the region of the Upper - Drina (**Višegrad, Goražde, Čajniče**, **Rogatica and Novo Goražde**) through organisation of a series of workshops and round tables on the themes of interculturalism and tolerance. There were 50 round tables, 10 workshops and 15 street campaigns in total. These efforts resulted in signing the Memorandum of Cooperation in the domain of exchange of cultural contents among the above mentioned 5 municipalities.

**School projects in municipalities**

* Primary school (PS) "Branko Ćopić“ Prijedor: inter-school visits to schools in Trnopolje and **Sanski Most,** participation in the event Cultural Summer in Prijedor
* PS „Kozarska djeca“ **Gradiška**: equipped "school living room", workshops with students, workshops with parents, visits to schools in Tuzla, Jajce, and Gradiška, preparation and publishing of the brochure 'Cup of Diversity'
* PS „Ćirilo I Metodije“ **Prijedor:** organised exhibition of students arts, implemented project on national minorities "Variety is our future", established cooperation with the association of the Ukrainian minority "Cossack"; participation in cultural-artistic programme devoted to Human Rights Day
* PS „Gornje Prekounje**“ Ripač (Bihac):** workshops for students, inter-school visits
* PS „Vuk Karaždić“ **Bijeljina**: teacher training, workshop for parents "How to live with others", inter-school visits
* PS „Velešički heroji „**Novo Sarajevo**: joint workshops with students from PS 'Aleksa Šantić' from Istočno Sarajevo, joint day-trip to Jahorina, joint visit to the Zoo Pionirska dolina, a two-day visit to Šabići
* PS „Rapatnica“ **Srebrenik**: meetings of students, concert, workshop for parents
* PS „Sokolac“ **Sokolac:** event 'Primary school students to the town of Sokolac', event "Day of students' achievements'
* PS „Rudo“ **Rudo:** performance of folklore clubs
* PS „Rešad Kadić“ **Tešanj**: performance at the event "Days of municipality of Tešanj'
* PS „Špionica“ **Srebrenik**: training of teachers, training of parents, training of students, school events, exhibitions of arts and essays on the theme of interculturalism, visit to events "Days of bread" and "Harvest"
* PS „Petar Kočić“ **Topola:** training of parents
* PS „Veljko Čubrilović“ **Lopare**: opened multimedia library
* PS „19. April“ **Derventa**: implementation of activities with children "A child's smile"
* PS „Grbavica 1“ **Novo Sarajevo:** training workshops for teachers, training workshops for students, creative workshops with children, exhibition of arts and essays on the theme "Holidays"

**Restoration/conservation projects in municipalities**

* The Ethnographic Museum in **Jajce**.
* Cultural centres in **Rudo** and **Sokolac**
* Rebuilding a bridge to the mediaeval fortress in **Srebrenik**
* Reconstruction of parts of the Ottoman Castle in **Tesanj**
* Fully equipping the ethno-museum Eminagica House in **Tesanj** with articrafts, hand-made furniture and equipment in style of Ottoman era
* The complete reconstruction of Spanish Square in **Mostar**
* Assisting the reconstruction and restoration of the Ferhadija Mosque in **Banja Luka**, the Orthodox Cathedral in **Mostar**, the Monastery Plehan near **Derventa**
* Conservation works in **Hambarine** and **Sutjeska**, the Mithras Temple in **Jajce** and the Museum Herzegovina in **Trebinje**

*Source: MDG-F project office* (edited)

# Annex 5: Bosnia and Herzegovina progress towards MDGs (2007-2015)

**Overview of selected key MDG indicators (2007) and likely progress**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **2007 data** | **MDG target (2015)** | **Likelihood of achievement (2010 estimate)** |
| ***MDG1: Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger*** | | | |
| Percentage of population livng below the absolute poverty line | 14% | 9% | Likey |
| Unemployment | 44.1%[[18]](#footnote-18) | 30% | Unlikely |
| Youth unemployment rate (15-24 years) | 58.4% | 12% | Unlikely |
| ***MDG 2: To achieve universal primary education*** | | | |
| Primary school net enrolment rate | 98.3% (male); 98.6%(female) | 100% | Potentially likely |
| ***MDG 3: Promote gender equality and empower women*** | | | |
| Share of women in waged employment in the non-agricultural sector | 33.8% | 45% | Unlikely |
| Percentage of women representatives in parliament | 10.5% | 24% | Potentially likely |
| ***MDG 8: A global partnership for development*** | | | |
| Official assistance for development as a % of gross domestic production (GDP) | 2.97 | 1.0 | Likely |
| Personal computers per 100 poulation | 6.4 | 12 | Potentially likely |
| Phone lines per 100 population | 28.2 | 26 | Achieved |
|  |  |  |  |

*Source:* Progress towards the Realization of the Millennium Development Goals in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Ministry of Finance and Treasury and UNCT, 2010*

# Annex 6: DAC project summary

*Subject of the Evaluation*

The *Improving Cultural Understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina* Joint Programme has a MDG-F budget of US$8 million under the Culture and Development thematic window, and a planned duration of 36 months from December 2009 to December 2011. The MDG-F approved a six month extensions (no cost) of the programme to the end of June 2012.

*Evaluation Description*

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the relevance, design, effectiveness, efficiency impact and sustainability of the expenditure of €8 million over a period of three and a half years in the areas of culture, heritage and education. A 30 day assignment was involved, including a twelve day mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina, to determine whether the project met the requirements of the financing agreement and whether it was compliant with its objectives and purpose. The evaluation was carried out through a combination of desk research and field interviews.

*Main Findings*

Each element of the project is compliant with its original aims and objectives and with the MDG-F thematic window for Culture and Development. In most areas it is an exceptionally well implemented, relevant and effective project with excellent ‘One UN’ management. In terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact, the project has been extremely sound. Questions arise over the economic impact as there was more emphasis on Government and NGO support rather than the private sector. In terms of sustainability, the project appears to be sustainable, especially in terms of institutional sustainability. The extent of pro-poor targeting in the design phase (MDG 1) could have been strengthened, but project design was approved by the MDG-F secretariat, and professionally implemented as approved.

*Feedback*

The draft evaluation findings were discussed with the ORC, United Nations senior staff and working group members on 30 March 2012. Feedback received was incorporated into the evaluation report. A draft report was submitted on 17 April and further feedback was received for the final report.

**DAC format evaluation summary: Improving Cultural Understanding in Bosnia and Herzegovina (2009-2012)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Donor: MDG-F, Kingdom of Spain | Region: South East Europe | | | | DAC sector : Other social infrastructure and services | |
| Evaluation type: Efficiency, effectiveness and impact. | Date of report: May 2012 | | | | Subject of evaluation : Culture and Development, Bosnia and Herzegovina | |
| Language : English | N° vol./pages : 54 | | | | Author: Robert Travers | |
| Type of evaluation : | | ( ) ex ante | | (x ) intermediate / ongoing | | ( ) ex post | |
| Timing : March-May 2012 | | Start date : 1 March 2012 | | | Completion date : 14 June 2012 | | |
| Contact person: Envesa Hodzic-Kovac  United Nations Resident Coordinator’s Office, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina | | | Author : Robert Travers | | | | |
| Steering group : Yes | | | | |

1. The Dayton Proximity Talks culminated in the initialling of a General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina in November 1995. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The annex in the Joint Programme refers to engaging with NGOs rather than with the private sector. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The public call for NGOs was spread over component 2 and component 3: Windows 2 and 4 belong to component 2, while windows 1 and 3 belong to component 3.Window 5 is about enhancing Herzegovina’s participation no matter which thematic window (from 1 to 4 ) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Divided Schools in BiH [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Recommendations are outlined at section 9.3 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Brčko District's administrative capacity reflects the population that it serves and there is not a particular emphasis on the tourism sector. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Freedom House (2012) *Nations in Transit* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Source: *UNDAF Action Plan Guidance Draft*, UN DOCO 2009 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Members from Education sector joined the PMC in year 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. UNDP did commission some further study into possible thematic intervention areas, but consensus was not achieved on how to bring the more strategic elements of these proposals forward. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. For an example of a transparent project website displaying results and all commissioned project outputs, see the Asian Development Bank’s $10 million intervention on sustainable tourism at <www.stdplaos.com> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The United Nations Secretary General’s guidelines for the private sector (2009) together with UNDP policy and procedures for private sector engagement (2009) provide a comprehensive step by step management framework on how to identify, plan and enter into collaborative relationships with private sector companies. Such interventions are a critical complement to the UNDP programming framework in supporting the development of the arts, crafts and cultural tourism. This is particularly important in Bosnia and Herzegovina where there is an unsustainably large public sector. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. It seeks to do this through building the capacities of managers of cultural assets, local authorities and civil society in Eastern Anatolia to protect heritage, while also benefiting from it in sustainable tourism practices through provision of pro-poor tourism business development services at various sectors [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. It is recognised that larger cultural projects will involve greater risk, and that more detailed feasibility analyses will be required. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. UNPBF will target activities undertaken in support of efforts to revitalize the economy and generate immediate peace dividends for the population at large. The Fund’s Priority Area 2 supports projects that bolster good governance and promote dialogue and reconciliation. Priority Area 3 supports projects that stimulate economic revitalization to general peace dividends. Activities include strengthening economic governance through the promotion of *partnerships with the private sector*, the *development of micro-enterprises*, *youth* *employment schemes* and the *management of natural resources*. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The consultant notes that the market, funding and business plan for this project are very unclear [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Registered unemployed [↑](#footnote-ref-18)