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1. **GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AMC | Associations of Municipalities and Cities |
| BIH | Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| CBGI | Strengthening the capacity of government institutions for dialogue with civil society organizations |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisations |
| EC | European Commission |
| FBIH | Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| ILDP | Integrated Local Development Project |
| IPA | Instrument for Pre-Accession |
| KM | Convertible Mark (currency of BiH) |
| LOD | Reinforcement of Local Democracy |
| LSU | Local Self-government Units |
| MCGA | Micro Capital Grant Agreement |
| MIPD | Multi-annual Indicative Planning Document |
| MoU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MTS | Municipal Training System |
| NGO | Non-governmental organisation |
| PAB | Project Advisory Board |
| PB | Project Board |
| PCM | Project Cycle Management |
| PPW | Project Proposal Writing |
| RS | Republika Srpska |
| TACSO | Technical Assistance for Civil Society Organisations  |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Reinforcement of Local Democracy (LOD) is a multiphase project funded by the European Union’s Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) and implemented by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). The overall objective of the project is to contribute to the democratic stabilization, conciliation, and further development of BiH through support to selected municipalities. Premised on this larger objective, LOD project focuses on institutionalizing the principles of good relationships between local authorities and civil society organisations (CSO), raising awareness on the significance of such principles, and strengthening the capacity of different stakeholders to better engage in this relationship. In particular, the project focuses on establishing transparent and consistent funding mechanisms of local self-government units (LSUs) to support implementation of priority projects by involving civil society organisations (CSO) in service delivery activities, and establishing sustainable funding sources for CSO from LSU budgets. Following the successful implementation of the first two project phases (LOD I from 2009-2010 and LOD II from 2011-2012) in the total of 29 partner LSUs, the third phase of project implementation (LOD III) has been implemented from June 1, 2012 until May 31, 2014, involving 11 partner municipalities: Bosanska Krupa, Čapljina, Kozarska Dubica, Livno, Lukavac, Ljubinje, Novi Grad, Srbac, Stari Grad Sarajevo, Teslić and Žepče, as well as 4 municipalities that had participated in previous LOD phases, Banja Luka, Novi Grad Sarajevo, Tešanj and Višegrad.

For the purpose of assessing the overall Reinforcement of Local Democracy III (LOD III) relevance, quality performance and effectiveness of the Project’s endeavours towards achievement of project objectives and results, UNDP has requested a final evaluation to be conducted during the month of May 2014 in order to grasp overall impact of the intervention bearing in mind all external factors and identify key lessons learned and future project ideas to be considered by the implementing partners for purposes of ensuring sustainability.

## Summary conclusions

**The project has adequately responded to the immediate needs of the targeted 15 Local Self Government Units (LSU) and respective Civil Society Organisations (CSO) to become more responsive to local needs by improving accountability for the disbursement and execution of municipal funds in the social sector**. LOD III has focused on three areas: a) building awareness between CSO and LSU of the benefits of mutual cooperation, dialogue and joint action; b) the establishment and institutionalisation of a transparent funding mechanism, LOD methodology, to support the implementation of priority projects by CSO; c) strengthening the technical capacities of CSO and LSU to prepare, select, implement and evaluate projects aimed at results. In order to do so, UNDP has provided specific training on Project Cycle Management and LOD Methodology to 31 LSU officials and 144 CSO representatives; financial support to 76 CSO’ projects selected and co-financed by the LSU on the basis of LOD methodology; and continuous coaching to enhance LSU and CSO communication, coordination and joint cooperation. **This integrated and participatory approach has ensured that allocated funds for CSO projects during LOD III have been used in the most efficient way for implementation goals of local communities, making the best results possible.**

**All the project objectives and the expected results have been achieved and the key indicators have been overreached:** while the original targets of LOD III were to provide support and assistance to up to 10 municipalities (LSU) in order to launch 10 public and competitive calls for CSO projects according to LOD methodology, evaluate 50 CSO project proposals and select and co-fund 20 CSO projects, **LOD III has finally succeeded to provide support to 15 LSU in executing 20 public calls for CSO projects, in accordance to LOD procedures and methods; to evaluate more than 502 project proposals submitted by CSO and to select and co-fund with at least 10% of municipal funds a total of 76 CSO projects linked to municipal development priorities for an approximate total value of 2,7 M KM.**

In addition, **LOD III has achieved important results that go beyond the scope of the initial expectations set up in the LOD original document, such as the greater horizontal and vertical outreach of LOD methodology that has been directly promoted through the strong cooperation forged with the Associations of Municipalities and Cities of FBiH and RS (AMCs).** The support provided to the AMCs through the LOD III project’s lifespan has resulted in the Government of FBiH adopting the LOD methodology for entity, cantonal and municipal level and in the Ministry of Administration and Local Self-Governance of RS recommending the use of LOD methodology to all LSU in RS.

**Visibility has been permanent activity carried out in line with the EU visibility guidelines.** LOD III has remained one of the most visible projects in the UNDP CO BIH.

**The project has been highly appreciated by the LOD targeted groups interviewed:** LSU have considered LOD as an opportunity to improve and institutionalise administrative transparency in their support to CSO, previously scarcely systematised and provided randomly by the local government in place, as well as a chance to initiate closer relations with the civil society sector and to identify future potential partners for development; Local CSO have considered LOD a great opportunity to improve their project development skills and obtain municipal resources based on their proposals in accordance to local service needs and identified priorities; citizens, (especially vulnerable social groups) who have benefited from LOD projects, claim to be very satisfied with the service provided by CSOs with support of the municipality during the LOD project.

**Short–term positive impact in establishing improved relations between local authorities and CSO and in facilitating financing mechanisms for improved service delivery is clearly visible in the municipalities assisted by LOD III. There is widespread evidence for those municipalities that quality and quantity of interactions between LSU/CSO have increased**. Small and medium CSO show improved capacity to formulate and design result-based project proposals in the target municipalities. These skills have already enabled some of them to access different funding sources: international and national. LSUs are more aware of the benefits of establishing a fluent and transparent relation with CSOs to achieve social development and have gained capacity to select and monitor CSO results-based projects linked to strategic priorities of their communities**. Municipalities are now better targeting current municipal funds in line with defined local development priorities.** This is specially visible in LOD III targeted municipalities which had already participated in previous LOD phases and in other UNDP projects such as ILDP. These municipalities, such as Banja Luka, Tesanj and Stari Grad have already used an integrated and participatory approach to the development of their strategic priorities and show better understanding of the use of LOD methodology. They have extended the use of LOD to other CSO sources of funding because they understand that LOD brings efficiency and effectiveness to the use of local resources.

However, **some external constraints such as the complexity of the legislative and institutional environment of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the insufficient political and technical capacity within the municipalities endanger longer term impact and sustainability prospects** needed to substantially alter the development conditions of communities in a meaningful manner.

1. At the State level, the lack of a common framework for the sustainable development of CSOs in BiH perpetuates fragmentation among CSOs and hampers the establishment of standardised requirements for CSO’s service delivery in the social sectors.
2. At the local level, the municipal commitment of assisted LSUs to institutionalise and integrate the LOD methodology has not yet translated into a substantial increase of municipal funds donated to CSO projects (still less than 10% of the total CSO budget). LSUs claim to be still politically unable and technically unprepared to sustain the benefits of LOD and completely transform old practices, such as direct and regular allocation of funding to CSOs with "special interest" for the municipality (mainly sport, war veteran and cultural heritage associations) while supporting other CSOs upon request and with little amounts of funds, into consistent and transparent use of municipal funds for implementation of strategic goals of local communities.

While the UNDP has already taken some steps to address these challenges through efforts put on vertical and horizontal integration of LOD methodology, **further time and resources need to be allocated to institutionalise LOD at all levels of governance within BiH, as well as to strengthen the commitment of LOD municipalities to substantially increase the proportion of resources deployed for CSO projects through public calls, so that they can provide quality and results driven services that will contribute to community development.**

**Lessons Learnt**

* The project design has been enriched with lessons learnt and recommendations identified through internal and external evaluations held during and after the completion of LOD previous phases of implementation.
* The **participatory approach towards development of project outputs** and the technical and continuous support provided by the **UNDP qualified and experienced project staff** has enhanced project adequate response to local needs and ownership of results from the stakeholders.
* The **project flexible approach** has enabled programme adaptation to changing circumstances and adequate response to potential risks.
* The developed **LOD methodology is considered to be a very comprehensive tool,** easily understandable and applicable by the project stakeholders.
* LOD **financial and technical support to CSO project** proposals has helped enhance the capacities of small and medium CSOs to take, in many cases for the first time, a project approach to their initiatives and to be more accountable for the use of municipal funds.
* **LOD co-led planning, monitoring and evaluation processes** have ensured capacity development of local authorities and community partners.
* **LOD project time constraints and limited resources only allow for short-term impact related to improved relations between local authorities and CSOs in terms of improved communication and a more transparent interaction between these two local actors.** LOD must be seen as a process and a programme to ensure ownership of the LOD idea in the form of sustained commitment and action of local partners. To improve long term impact and sustainability prospects of LOD, its vertical and horizontal promotion should be taken simultaneously.
* **Advocacy at the State and Entity level to push for formal endorsement of the necessary policy reforms**, such as the development of a common strategy for sustainable development of Civil Society in BiH as well as a Central Register of CSO, becomes essential for LOD to be sustained and for the EU to fully rely on the country systems.

**General Recommendations**

a) While the project design is consistent with local needs and the LOD intervention logic has been clearly reflected in a logical framework, the terminology and the different levels of objectives described in the project documents only capture the short-term development results to be produced by the project throughout the project timeframe. In this sense, there is room for improvement and it is recommended that the project team **revisits the results framework so as to define a clear project purpose** (most preferably in the form of an outcome statement) **with smart indicators**, aimed at reflecting **the unified and mid-term vision of intended changes in the institutional performance or behaviour among the target groups, that is to be brought** **by LOD-type projects.** By doing so, all project stakeholders and partners may be able to better understand and assess their initiatives, and it may provide programme managers with a more solid basis to demonstrate and measure the project’s attribution of achievements.

**b) In order to maximise the impact prospects of LOD IV and to better enhance** the LSUs and CSOs’ capacities to embrace **the principle of managing for results**, starting with their own results-oriented strategies and continuing to focus on results at all stages of the development cycle, it is recommended that:

* **LOD IV municipal selection process** **puts a stronger focus on ILDP targeted municipalities,** when this may be feasible and always within the frames of the competitive selection criteria established for this purpose. LOD impact prospects in these municipalities may be greater since they have already showed better understanding of the importance to forge close and collaborative relations with CSOs, gained through the development of municipal strategies in a participatory, inclusive manner, with involvement of CSO representatives and using a results-based approach promoted by ILDP support.
* **LOD IV considers extending the project lifecycle to 36 months**, in order to ensure consultative support from UNDP to LSUs and CSOs’ performance during at least two consecutive Budget exercises and the execution of at least two public calls for CSOs’ projects. A longer timeframe is meant to enhance adequate understanding of LOD principles and strengthen ownership of the methodology by the project counterparts. The extension process may also require to allocate additional funds and resources needed to maintain LOD management and operational structures in place throughout the complete implementation timeframe.
* LOD IV **promotes further commitment from selected municipalities to increase the proportion of resources to be donated to CSOs’ projects through public calls and to make a more efficient use of the LOD Methodology during, at least, two annual budget exercises.** In this sense, the MoUs signed with municipalities could include the following specific obligations for selected LSU:
	+ To allocate at least **20% of the CSO total budget share to CSO projects granted through public calls during at least two annual budget exercises**.
	+ **Public calls launched in at least two consecutive years, to try to be more specific in the definition of priority areas linked with the development strategies that are to be promoted throughout the call for proposals**, instead of using broad definitions of priority areas which may result in spreading efforts too thinly over too many strategic sectors.
	+ **Public calls launched in at least two consecutive years set up a fixed minimum threshold for projects of 10,000 KM** (as it is recommended by LOD), in municipalities where the budget allows for it, so that CSOs make a real effort in proposing results-driven initiatives, the evaluation commissions use the LOD selection criteria based on the quality of project proposals, the monitoring teams use their skills to follow up on achievements made, and the principles of managing for results gain in relevance.
* If LOD IV allows for selection of LSUs that have already participated in previous LOD Phases, **to promote an increase of their co-funding of CSOs’ proposals to at least 40%, and their commitment to maintain a minimum of 30% share of their total CSOs’ budget to be disbursed through public calls and in accordance to LOD methodology in, at least, two consecutive budget exercises**.

**c) In order to further promote LOD’s sustainability and the use of the project’s benefits** beyond the project lifespan, vertically and horizontally, it is recommended:

* To continue increasing the CSO’s project proposal writing, strategic planning, fund-raising, absorption and implementation capacities through training before and after the call for proposals, and to **promote the allocation and use of municipal funds to provide such training to CSOs**.
* To continue the **support provided to the Associations of Municipalities and Cities through further training in communication and budget planning** so they can promote LOD methodology vertically and horizontally in the remaining Municipalities that will not be targeted by LOD IV.

ILDP plans to reach all 10 cantonal governments as participants in a coherent planning system during 2014-2015: In order to further engage into vertical promotion of LOD methodology and support Cantons’ results-oriented implementation of their strategies and priorities, **LOD could test out cooperation in at least two of these Cantons in 2014.** For this purpose, additional funding may be necessary.

* **To develop a standardized training programme on LOD methodology and offer it to all local governments country-wide through the municipal training system structures** which have been institutionalised through entity governments and AMCs.
* To convert and offer **LOD methodology as e-training** so it becomes more accessible to municipalities and CSO.
* To continue the collaboration with TACSO and CBGI making mutual relations greater and the spaces for collaboration stronger to maximize effects.

**Recommendations for further programmatic steps**

**Further up-scaling of harmonised procedures for disbursement of funds to CSOs in accordance with LOD methodology needs to continue, so as to reach the different government levels** and to influence the establishment of a comprehensive institutional framework of cooperation between the government and CSOs. Vertical integration of LOD is essential to address the challenges that are affecting LOD longer term impact and sustainability prospects: lack of a common framework for CSO development at the State level and insufficient political and technical capacity of local authorities to fully integrate LOD into local administrative reforms due to municipal pressing budget shortcomings and pressures from political parties to maintain substantial direct budget support to CSOs of “special interests” (war veterans, recreational and cultural associations, as well as some disability associations, which represent continuity of state-controlled membership-based civic activities inherited from the past). **It is strongly recommended that UNDP/EC allocate time and resources to promote vertical institutionalisation and use of LOD through different levels of government, as well as harmonisation of interests, priorities and procedures to relate with the CSO sector in order to legitimate CSO’s role in social development and contribution to democratic stabilisation.**

For improving fund raising opportunities of LSU and CSO**, there is still a great need to provide support and information to municipalities and CSOs to work together in order to prepare joint proposals and be able to attract donor funding, such as IPA funds and others.** It has been observed that the vast majority of small municipalities and grassroots CSOs targeted by LOD III have scant knowledge and understanding of the EU, the process of European integration and its significance for their work. In general, they seem poorly positioned strategically to participate in the ongoing reform process and to take full advantage of the institutional and financial support available from the EC for the process. **In order to do so AMCs’ capacities could be further enhanced to become key players in assisting municipalities in the identification of needs/ programming, representing local government interests before donors and taking a pro-active role in design of policies/reforms related to local governance in BiH.** In particular, considering their role within the training system for local governments, **the AMCs could focus on enhancing capacities of elected officials in relation to the LOD methodology and LSU/CSO cooperation in general.**  In addition, **UNDP/EC could continue working in close cooperation with ACM to provide them with technical capacity and support to develop a clear long-term development strategy with clear action plans so as to become more outcome oriented** and have a better understanding of what their role should be.

**UNDP could also play a key role in supporting municipalities to better engage with the CSO sector, by reinforcing the capacities of local authorities to better communicate and relate with CSOs**. Policy dialogue between CSOs and all levels of government bodies needs to be improved.

For improving the quality of services provided by CSOs in specific social sectors a set of minimum quality standards should be established by a panel of experts, the Government and active CSOs. **UNDP/EC could engage in the formation and support of such panels to set up minimum standards for service delivery** in social sectors of interest.

Achieving financial viability is the biggest single challenge for CSOs in BiH. CSOs still lack long-term planning skills and adequate fundraising mechanisms in order to reduce their dependency on donors’ aid. **UNDP /EC could work to further activate CSO networking and increase their fundraising skills.** Greater efforts should also be made to encourage leading domestic NGOs and all external assistance projects to mobilise stronger organisations to work with smaller and less developed CSOs – to offer both capacity building assistance and the opportunity to enter into activity-based partnerships.

**MAIN REPORT**

* 1. **Introduction**
		1. **Background**

This report describes the Evaluation results of the assistance delivered under the Contract Reinforcement of Local Democracy III (hereinafter LOD III) No. 2012/293-657 signed in June 2012 with the EU Delegation of the European Commission (EC) and implemented by UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina from June 1, 2012 to May 31, 2014. The total cost of the action has been EUR 2,066,600 with an EC contribution of EUR 2,000,000 (96.77%).

At the stage of the Final Evaluation, all project activities had been executed in accordance with the work plan and the project partners had provided great support and excellent collaboration.

The LOD III started immediately after the operational completion the LOD II, in June 2012. During the inception phase, a competitive process for the selection of LOD III municipalities was launched. From the 29 municipalities which expressed interest for participation, LOD III selected 11 partner local self-government units (LSU): Bosanska Krupa, Čapljina, Kozarska Dubica, Livno, Lukavac, Ljubinje, Novi Grad, Srbac, Stari Grad Sarajevo, Teslić and Žepče, most of the, being small and medium size municipalities with a relatively limited level of development of a civil sector and absorption capacities related to available funding. In addition, the project selected four additional partner municipalities from the previous two project phases also through a competitive process launched in February 2013, in order to reinforce and deepen their collaboration with civil society and show good examples in transparency in funding of CSOs: Banja Luka, Novi Grad Sarajevo, Tešanj and Višegrad.

LOD III worked on the institutionalization of the LOD methodology in the selected municipalities by providing direct support and tailored assistance to Local self-government Units (LSU) and CSOs to develop internal capacities, change old-fashioned practices with civil sector and steer its focus on citizens and real needs. As a result of project activities, by the end of the project **all 15 partner municipalities had formally institutionalized the LOD methodology** by municipal council decisions.

**The capacity development package for LSUs, developed through a participatory approach and a training needs assessment**, included five training modules in project cycle management for municipal administration, including one specific module focused on the implementation of the LOD methodology, an additional element introduced in this project phase. In total, 31 LSU representatives attended the training programme (including ACM representatives). After the completion of the training modules, practical execution of the calls for CSO proposals was initiated. All 11 project partners entered the process of preparation of Calls. In line with the project document, social inclusion was also introduced as a focus theme of the calls and CSO activities. Practical application of the LOD methodology in partner municipalities included activities starting from consideration of priorities as defined in local development strategies to public hearings with local CSOs with intention to further specify priority intervention areas for the calls. All partner municipalities actively engaged in this process, and provided assistance to CSOs in selecting their representatives in evaluation commissions.

In order to further support CSOs, **LOD III offered specific training and assistance in project proposal writing to maximize their participation in the public call for proposals.** Trainings for CSOs were organized in partnership with the Technical Assistance for Civil Society BIH (TACSO BIH) Project. A total of 144 representatives from 113 CSOs attended these trainings.

Public calls for project proposals according to LOD methodology were launched in January 2013 in 11 municipalities. Five out of 11 calls were re-launched in March and April 2013, mostly in smaller LSUs (Bosanska Krupa, Capljina, Livno, Ljubinje, Zepce) with less developed CSOs and continuous assistance was provided to CSOs and LSUs through open days and field visits, until the successful closing of all calls in all partner municipalities. As a result, LOD III awarded 56 project proposals, while 412 proposals had been submitted. Micro Capital Grant Agreements (MCGA) were signed with each awarded CSO. Selected projects were mainly tackling Social Inclusion, Environment, Gender/Poverty Reduction and Youth and the timeframe for implementation varied from 6 to 12 months. In the 4 previous LOD beneficiary municipalities, call for proposals were launched in June 2013, and out of 90 project proposals, 20 projects were finally selected. **All in all, LOD III finally granted through municipal co-funding and supported the implementation of 76 CSO’ projects. The monitoring teams established within each municipality regularly monitored these projects through field visits and regular reporting. The monitoring capacities of local officials and CSO staff were strengthened with the aim to progressively adopt the principle of managing for results and improving accountability for the use of municipal funds.**

**LOD III also carried out greater cooperation with the entity Associations of Municipalities and Cities** to provide greater horizontal outreach of the methodology, but also to initiate scaling up and ultimately get recommendations from the entity governments.

**Mainstreaming gender equality was an important approach in project implementation, especially encouraging participation of women in all activities and objectives of the LOD III project**. All project activities during the implementation period focused on encouraging gender balance. Gender mainstreaming was emphasized throughout the LOD III campaigns for Public Calls for Municipalities, and contained within the Application Form as additional criteria. Special focus on gender mainstreaming and gender equality was given during the selection of partner municipalities, where the need to properly address gender equality issues was an integral part of the selection and evaluation process.

**Visibility was permanent activity carried out in line with the EU visibility guidelines.** LOD III remained one of the most visible projects in the UNDP CO BIH with two articles/stories published (on average) on a weekly basis. In addition, activities aimed at even greater promotion of the European Union, as a main partner and a donor of the intervention, were focused on preparation of the exhibition of promotional material that had been produced by civil society over the course of previous project phases.

* + 1. **Objective and Scope of the Evaluation**

For the purpose of assessing the overall Reinforcement of Local Democracy III (LOD III) relevance, quality performance and effectiveness of the Project’s endeavours towards achievement of project objectives and results, UNDP has requested a final evaluation to be conducted during the month of May 2014 in order to grasp overall impact of the intervention bearing in mind all external factors and identify key lessons learned and future project ideas to be considered by the implementing partners for purposes of ensuring sustainability.

The main objective of the evaluation has been to provide UNDP and the EU Delegation to BiH with an objective analysis of the project’s achievements. It has been aimed at answering questions and providing recommendations that will assist in maximizing LOD’s performance and further improve its efficiency and effectiveness. The evaluator has taken a broad overview of the project area by gathering gender sensitive perceptions, aspirations, feedback and data from relevant partners and stakeholders, in order to make objective analysis.

The Consultancy has assessed the influence of assumptions, risks and preconditions recorded in logical framework and other project management tools.

The evaluation relates both to the municipal level and civil society activities, financed under LOD, and results in a substantive study of the effectiveness of the project approach. More precisely, the consultancy has reviewed and made recommendations towards the implementation of the LOD III activities within 15 partner local self-government units (LSUs): Bosanska Krupa, Banja Luka, Čapljina, Kozarska Dubica, Livno, Lukavac, Ljubinje, Novi Grad, Novi Grad Sarajevo, Srbac, Stari Grad Sarajevo, Teslić, Tešanj, Višegrad and Žepče.

In order to determine the project’s achievements, constrains, performance, results, relevance, sustainability and impact the main questions that have been indirectly addressed and responded are:

* To what extent has the project created partnership between CSOs and local authorities?
* To what extent are unified and transparent mechanisms for disbursing municipal funds foreseen for CSOs project-based activities in accordance with local service needs generated?
* How much are CSOs encouraged to specialize/professionalize their services?
* What have been the most effective mechanisms to encourage and support the project implementation?
* Project alignment with key stakeholders and if the project’s actions lead to achieve quality, effective and efficient outputs.
* What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the project’s interventions?
* Explain the impact of awarded CSOs projects in local communities?
* To what extent are the results sustainable?
* Will the outputs lead to potential actions beyond the lifespan of the project? To present findings and recommendations.

The review has taken a look to underline the key factors that have either facilitated or impeded project implementation in a post-conflict situation; the appropriateness of skill sets among project participants and the continued need for knowledge transfer and skills to maintain the momentum of activities already set in motion. To this end, the review has examined the overall performance and impact of project components.

* + 1. **Methodology**

The project evaluation methodology has focused on analysing and understanding the achievements of the project through its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The methodology applied in the process of the evaluation has enabled recognition of potential areas to be of special interest for future LOD and UNDP initiatives. The whole evaluation process has been held in May 2014.

The evaluation has consisted of three phases and the development of four tasks, as specified in the ToR:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PHASE** | **TASK** | **DELIVERABLE** | **# of days** | **Deadline** |
| Desk review | Assessment of project relevance, approach and set-up | * Consultancy work plan
* Initial findings on project relevance, approach and set-up shared with UNDP
 | 3 days | May 05, 2014 |
| Field Phase | Review of project performance | * Initial findings on project performance and feedback from field research
 | 8 days | May 14, 2014 |
| Evaluation report | Submission of an evaluation report draft | * Draft report
 | 4 days | May 19, 2014 |
| Preparation of a final evaluation report and presentation of findings and recommendations | * Presentation of findings/ report
* Submission of final report
 | 3 days | May 22, 2014 |

**Desk Review:** Assessment of project relevance, approach and set-up

The evaluation undertook a review process, which included the review of UNDP evaluation standards and guidelines, the UNDP guidelines for outcome-evaluation; strategic documents and laws in BiH; the UNDP/LOD III Project Document, logical framework and Inception report, LOD III annual progress reports, the drafted final report; other internal and/or external reports, such as the “Analysis of application of LOD methodology in LOD III Project partner municipalities” by Zuhra Osmanovic-Pasic, October 2013; the Mid-Term/ Final Evaluation of Selected IPA projects in Bosnia and Herzegovina by EPRD Consortium, October 2012; and the External Final Evaluation Report of LOD II, prepared by Tihomir Knezicek in March 2012. In addition, key project deliverables, such as meeting minutes and other relevant project documentation, such as examples of Memorandums of Understanding and Micro Capital Grant Agreements, were as well consulted.

Through consultations with the UNDP Country Office (CO) a consistent work plan and agenda of meetings with LOD III key Partners and stakeholders was established and prepared and the methods and approaches to be utilized in evaluating LOD III Project were set out. (for further details on work plan and scheduled meetings and interviews see Annex 3). This task was implemented in three days.

**Field Phase:** Review of project performance

The evaluation conducted interviews with relevant UNDP personnel, stakeholders and the LOD Project team, both female and male, to reflect on their experiences and practices in the day-to-day implementation of the project.

During the field visits held from 5-14 May, 2014 to the UNDP and EU Delegation Headquarters in Sarajevo, and to the municipalities of Stari Grad Sarajevo, Teslic; Tesanj, Banja Luka, Ljubinje, Capljina and Novi Grad, meetings have been conducted with representatives of various UNDP/LOD partner municipalities, civil society organizations, final beneficiaries and all other stakeholders has been carried out.

Semi structured and open question interviews (individual, in pairs, focus groups or in small groups) have been conducted with the UNDP Deputy Resident Coordinator, UNDP Rural and regional Sector Coordinator, UNDP LOD III Project Manager and Project team, BIH Ministry of Justice, representatives of the Delegation of the European Union to BIH, representatives from TACSO and CBGI EU-funded projects; LOD Coordinators of the 7 visited municipalities; representatives from CSOs granted under the LOD scheme, such as Edus, Roda, OOST, HO Partner, OKC, OCKI, DON, JoM, URDOPP, Tajna Prirode and Link and final Project beneficiaries

LOD team has provided transport, translation and support during the trips. This task lasted for 8 days, in accordance with the ToR requirements.

**Evaluation report:** Preparation of evaluation report and presentation of findings and recommendations

The Final External Evaluation Report captures feedback, observations and conclusions in conjunction with the relevant stakeholders in a concise and comprehensive way. This report is expected to yield a number of key ideas for future actions by the LOD project, in conjunction with the relevant stakeholders of the project area to ensure effective and efficient utilization of LOD project funds for the project duration and beyond. Besides recommendations for improvements of the Project’s overall efficiency, recommendations that can usefully be applied to other projects are emphasized within report. This task has not exceed seven days.

* + 1. **Structure of Evaluation Report**

The Final External Evaluation Report includes:

* executive summary;
* description of the intervention;
* review scope and objectives;
* evaluation approach and methods;
* findings and conclusions ;
* lessons learned;
* recommendations for the formulation of potential forward-looking interventions
	1. **Response to the Evaluation Questions**
		1. **Relevance and Quality of Design**
* LOD has been clearly embedded in the EU strategy, broadly aligned with the UNDP BiH country programme and adequately responding to aid effectiveness commitments.
* LOD III has been very relevant to respond to the immediate needs of selected LSUs and respective CSOs in order to improve their relationship. The UNDP integrated approach- capacity building, grants support, and technical coaching- provided to project beneficiaries has been essential for improving accountability and transparency in the use of municipal funds for CSO projects in the social sector.
* LOD quality of design has built on lessons learnt and recommendations identified in previous LOD phases, and its flexibility and participatory approach towards preparation of project outputs and activities has enabled full adaptation of the programme to local needs.
* LOD intervention logic has been clearly reflected in a logical framework; however, the terminology and the different levels of objectives described only capture the short-term development results to be produced by the project throughout the project timeframe. In this sense, there is room for improvement and the logical framework could be further completed by the definition of a clear project purpose (most preferably in the form of an outcome statement) aimed at reflecting the mid/long-term vision of intended changes in the institutional performance or behaviour among the target groups, that is to be brought by LOD-type projects.
	+ 1. **Efficiency**
* LOD has been efficiently implemented and managed by a qualified and experienced UNDP team and clear coordination and management procedures that have enabled the timely execution of the activity plan and the adequate and cost-efficient use of the project resources.
* Project outputs, such as trainings for partner municipalities and CSOs, open days and support provided throughout the LOD public calls to LSUs and CSOs have been highly appreciated and very positively assessed by the beneficiaries.
* Participation of local stakeholders has been ensured at all levels of project implementation, and inter-institutional management structures have guaranteed adequate coordination among partners and donors.
	+ 1. **Effectiveness**
* LOD has achieved all the expected results, with most of its indicators being overreached. Through LOD III, 15 LSUs (11 newly selected LSUs+ 4 LSUs from previous LOD phases) have received technical and financial support to institutionalise the LOD methodology as the CSO funding mechanism. As a result, all targeted LSUs have consolidated their commitment to comply with the cooperation agreements that they had signed with CSOs; they have officially adopted the LOD methodology and have launched 20 public calls for proposals in accordance with LOD rules and procedures in the budget exercise of 2013. In addition, LOD III has provided technical support to CSOs to increase their capacity to formulate and develop quality project proposals and show accountability of results. LOD III has supported the selection and implementation of 76 CSO projects directly linked to the priority development sectors identified in each of the targeted municipalities.
* Synergy between local governance programmes and projects funded by the EU -TACSO and CBGI- has been adequately promoted to consolidate achievement of LOD results and objectives in the targeted municipalities.

In addition, LOD has been adequately integrated as part of the broader UNDP Local Governance Programme, together with the ILDP and MTS, to ensure closer interaction and synergetic effects in particular when working with same partners. As an example, support to AMCs by all three interventions has been combined as a joint assistance package to ensure better results in terms of their capacity development and positioning as Local Governance advocates.

* + 1. **Impact**
* Visible impact to date mainly relates to improved capacity of small and medium CSOs to formulate and design result-based project proposals that has enabled some of them to access other funding sources: international and national. (for Success stories such as EDUS from Stari Grad Sarajevo, DON from Novi Grad municipality please refer to Annex 4).
* Impact in the municipalities that had already participated in previous LOD phases ((Banja Luka, Tesanj[[1]](#footnote-1)) and in other UNDP projects such as ILDP (Ljubinje, Srbac) seems more significant, since they show better understanding of the use of LOD methodology, which they consider an asset to identify reliable CSO partners to provide social services related to the strategic needs and municipal priorities in an accountable manner. Some of these municipalities have extended the use of LOD to other CSO sources of funding because they understand that LOD brings efficiency and effectiveness on the use of local resources.
* However, the overall LOD III assessment shows that despite the formal adoption of LOD in all targeted LSUs, their political commitment to use this methodology beyond the project is still weak and is not still proportionally reflected in current budget allocations to CSO initiatives through public calls. Most of the partner LSUs have only deployed approx 10% of its available resources for CSOs through public calls planned in 2014, the definition of priority areas linked to strategic priorities to be supported by the call for proposals is too broad and in some municipalities no specific min-max threshold for project proposals has been set. This scenario may indicate that most municipalities intend to continue funding many recipients but in relatively low amounts without substantial use of quality selection criteria, therefore hindering quality of civil society initiatives.
* An unexpected positive impact is that some municipalities that have not been part of any LOD programmes have adopted the LOD methodology under their own initiative, such as Visoko, because they consider it to be a clear and simplified form for transparent fund disbursement to CSOs. This is also an immediate impact of involving the AMCs in the promotion of LOD vertically and horizontally.
* A potential negative impact is that for those CSOs which capacity has been effectively increased through LOD III in order to design and implement bigger and better projects aimed at results in the social field, expectations to get substantial co-funding from municipalities to replicate similar LOD projects will probably be frustrated due to low prospects for CSO funding through public calls in 2014. While some of these CSOs are already focused on submission of proposals to international donors, the ones that still apply for municipal grants are thinking to propose activity led projects that will have little impact for the communities.
	+ 1. **Sustainability**
* **LSUs and CSOs have been strongly involved in all stages of implementation**. Ownership has been promoted by LOD III through signing MoU with the 15 partner municipalities, the establishment of a minimum co-funding of the total costs of the CSO projects by the targeted LSUs, regular consultations with project stakeholders to identify training needs; the establishment of LOD evaluation committees formed by representatives of the municipalities and CSOs; the signing of 76 Micro Capital Grant Agreements with awarded CSOs and the involvement of the Associations of Municipalities and Cities (AMCs) of both entities in the Project Advisory Board and the LOD training modules.
* **The project partners’ capacities (LSUs, CSOs, AMCs) have been properly developed** (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project’s benefits.
* **Policy sustainability at the local level has been ensured by adoption of LOD methodology and protocols on cooperation with CSOs by all 15 targeted municipalities**.
* Regarding financial sustainability, at the local level, **the funding for continuation of project activities (as promoted by LOD) remains insufficient**; as previously mentioned, observed budget allocations of LSUs to own public calls for CSO project proposals in 2014 remain low (less than 10% of the overall resources allocated to CSOs)[[2]](#footnote-2). In this sense, active CSOs with sufficient capacity to develop project proposals, gained or reinforced through participation in LOD capacity building programmes mainly look at International donors as their main source of funding; otherwise, if they look for local funding they are forced to reduce their actions to low cost/affordable activity-led initiatives that ultimately have little impact on their communities. On the other hand **the growing number of skilled CSOs may turn into the driving force to push municipality for change**.
* At the country level, sustainable continuity and accessibility of LOD benefits in the long run is still hampered by the lack of harmonised policies for CSO registry, development and standardisation of services at the State level, as well as the lack of harmonised strategies and procedures on CSO fund disbursement and quality selection criteria for projects at the different levels of governance (State, Entity, Canton, Municipality). However, **LOD III efforts to ensure vertical and horizontal promotion of LOD methodology through entering into a more substantial cooperation with the entity AMCs have successfully resulted in the formal adoption of LOD methodology by the Federation of BiH in April 2014 and in the Ministry of Administration and Local Self-Governance of RS recommending the use of LOD methodology to all LSUs in RS.**
	1. **Lessons Learnt**
* Involving project stakeholders in the planning, monitoring and evaluation processes has ensured appropriation of outputs and results during the project lifespan. The project stakeholders have been able to highlight their needs in terms of capacity building support, and the training modules have been tailored and adjusted to their local needs.
* The detail activity and resource schedule used by UNDP has allowed adequate assessment of project progress against benchmarks or milestones identified. No substantial deviations from the activity schedule have been reported. Annual work plans have been produced and quarterly reporting and monitoring visits have been established to support local teams in achievement of project results.
* UNDP extensive experience in dealing with public institutions, political bodies and CSOs has ensured appropriate technical assistance provided at all levels and adjusted to local needs and capacities. The support provided by the project staff, who is highly qualified and strongly committed to the project to the different project stakeholders and targeted groups has been highly appreciated by all the actors interviewed during the field research.
* While LOD III seems to have had short –term impact, external constraints such as the complexity of the legislative and political environment and the lack of sufficient capacity within the municipalities are still hampering longer term impact and sustainability prospects needed to alter the development conditions of communities in a meaningful manner.
* Municipalities still need to embrace the principle of managing for results, starting with their own results-oriented strategies and continuing to focus on results at all stages of the development cycle for planning through implementation to evaluation.
* Ownership in the form of sustainable commitment and action of partners needs to be further encouraged and pushed forward.
	1. **Recommendations**
		1. **Recommendations on Relevance and Quality of Design**

In order to improve the quality of LOD IV project design, it is recommended that:

* To the extent possible at this stage of LOD IV planning, the project team revisits the results framework reflected in the logframe, and completes it with a **definition of a clear project purpose (most preferably in the form of an outcome statement[[3]](#footnote-3)) with adequate and measurable smart indicators of performance, aimed at capturing the unified and mid/long-term vision of the intended changes that are to be brought by LOD and which relate to changes in the institutional performance or behaviour among the target groups.** By doing so, all project stakeholders and partners may be able to better understand and assess their initiatives more easily, and it also may provide programme managers with a strong basis to demonstrate their achievements**.**
	+ 1. **Recommendations on Impact**

**In order to maximise the impact prospects of LOD IV and to better enhance** the LSU and CSO capacities to embrace **the principle of managing for results**, starting with their own results-oriented strategies and continuing to focus on results at all stages of the development cycle, it is recommended that:

* **LOD IV municipal selection process** **puts a stronger focus on ILDP targeted municipalities,** when this may be feasible and always within the frames of the competitive selection requirements established by LOD for this purpose. LOD impact prospects in these municipalities may be greater since they have already shown better understanding of the importance to forge close and collaborative relations with CSOs, gained through the development of municipal strategies in a participatory, inclusive manner, with involvement of CSO representatives and using a results-based approach promoted by ILDP support.
* **LOD IV considers extending the project lifecycle to 36 months**, in order to ensure consultative support from UNDP to LSUs and CSOs’ performance during at least two consecutive Budget exercises and the execution of at least two public calls for CSO projects. A longer timeframe is meant to enhance adequate understanding of LOD principles and strengthen ownership of the methodology by the project counterparts. **The extension process may also require to allocate additional funds and resources needed to maintain LOD management and operational structures in place** throughout the complete implementation timeframe.
* LOD IV **promotes further commitment from selected municipalities to increase the proportion of resources to be donated to CSOs’ projects through public calls and to make a more efficient use of the LOD Methodology during the whole lifespan of the project.** In this sense, the MoUs signed with municipalities could include the following specific obligations for selected LSU:
	+ To allocate at least **20% of the CSO total budget share to CSO projects granted through public calls**.
	+ **Public calls to try to be more specific in the definition of priority areas linked with the development strategies that are to be promoted throughout the call for proposals**, instead of using broad definitions of priority areas which may results in spreading efforts too thinly over too many strategic sectors.
	+ **Public calls** **to set up a fixed minimum threshold for projects of 10,000 KM** (as it is recommended by LOD), in municipalities where the budget allows for it, so that CSOs make a real effort in proposing results-driven initiatives, the evaluation commissions use the LOD selection criteria based on the quality of project proposals, the monitoring teams use their skills to follow up on achievements made, and the principles of managing for results gain in relevance.
* If LOD IV allows for selection of LSUs that have already participated in previous LOD Phases, **to promote an increase of their co-funding of CSO proposals to at least 40%, and their commitment to maintain a minimum of 30% share of their total CSO budget to be disbursed through public calls and in accordance to LOD methodology in, at least, two consecutive budget exercises**.
	+ 1. **Recommendations on Sustainability**

For the promotion of LOD benefits beyond the project lifespan, vertically and horizontally, it is recommended**,**

* To continue increasing the CSO project proposal writing, strategic planning, fund-raising, absorption and implementation capacities through training before and after the call for proposals, and to **promote the allocation and use of municipal funds to provide such training to CSOs**.
* To continue the **support provided to the Associations of Municipalities and Cities through further training in communication and budget planning** so they can promote LOD methodology vertically and horizontally in the remaining Municipalities that will not be targeted by LOD IV.
* ILDP plans to reach all 10 cantonal governments as participants in a coherent planning system during 2014-2015: In order to further engage into vertical promotion of LOD methodology and support Cantons’ results-oriented implementation of their strategies and priorities, **LOD could test out cooperation in at least two of these Cantons in 2014.** For this purpose, additional funding may be necessary.
* **To develop a standardized training programme on LOD methodology and offer it to all local governments country-wide through the municipal training system structures** which have been institutionalised through entity governments and AMCs.
* To convert and offer **LOD methodology as e-training** so it becomes more accessible to municipalities and CSOs.
* To continue the collaboration with TACSO and CBGI making mutual relations greater and the spaces for collaboration stronger to maximize effects.
	+ 1. **Recommendations on further programmatic steps**

**Further up-scaling of harmonised procedures for disbursement of funds to CSOs in accordance with LOD methodology needs to continue, so as to reach the different government levels** and to influence the establishment of a comprehensive institutional framework of cooperation between the government and CSOs. Vertical integration of LOD is essential to address the challenges that are affecting LOD longer term impact and sustainability prospects: lack of a common framework for CSO development at the State level and insufficient political and technical capacity of local authorities to fully integrate LOD into local administrative reforms due to municipal pressing budget shortcomings and pressures from political parties to maintain substantial direct budget support to CSOs of “special interests” (war veterans, recreational and cultural associations, as well as some disability associations, which represent continuity of state-controlled membership-based civic activities inherited from the past). **It is strongly recommended that UNDP/EC allocate time and resources to promote vertical institutionalisation and use of LOD through different levels of government, as well as harmonisation of interests, priorities and procedures to relate with the CSO sector in order to legitimate CSO’s role in social development and contribution to democratic stabilisation.**

For improving fund raising opportunities of LSUs and CSOs**, there is still a great need to provide support and information to municipalities and CSOs to work together in order to prepare joint proposals and be able to attract donor funding, such as IPA funds and others.** It has been observed that the vast majority of small municipalities and grassroots CSOs targeted by LOD III have scant knowledge and understanding of the EU, the process of European integration and its significance for their work. In general, they seem poorly positioned strategically to participate in the ongoing reform process and to take full advantage of the institutional and financial support available from the EC for the process. **In order to do so AMCs’ capacities could be further enhanced to become key players in assisting municipalities in the identification of needs/ programming, representing local government interests before donors and taking a pro-active role in design of policies/reforms related to local governance in BiH.** In particular, considering their role within the training system for local governments, **the AMCs could focus on enhancing capacities of elected officials in relation to the LOD methodology and LSU/CSO cooperation in general.**  In addition, **UNDP/EC could continue working in close cooperation with ACM to provide them with technical capacity and support to develop a clear long-term development strategy with clear action plans so as to become more outcome oriented** and have a better understanding of what their role should be.

**UNDP could also play a key role in supporting municipalities to better engage with the CSO sector, by reinforcing the capacities of local authorities to better communicate and relate with CSOs**. Policy dialogue between CSOs and all levels of government bodies needs to be improved.

For improving the quality of services provided by CSOs in specific social sectors a set of minimum quality standards should be established by a panel of experts, the Government and active CSOs. **UNDP/EC could engage in the formation and support of such panels to set up minimum standards for service delivery** in social sectors of interest.

Achieving financial viability is the biggest single challenge for CSOs in BiH. CSOs still lack long-term planning skills and adequate fundraising mechanisms in order to reduce their dependency on donors’ aid. **UNDP /EC could work to further activate CSO networking and increase their fundraising skills.** Greater efforts should also be made to encourage leading domestic NGOs and all external assistance projects to mobilise stronger organisations to work with smaller and less developed CSOs – to offer both capacity building assistance and the opportunity to enter into activity-based partnerships.
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**Annex 1. Details on the Project Evaluation**

| **Log frame element** | **Observations/ Remarks** |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall objective**To contribute to democratic stabilization, conciliation and further development of Bosnia and Herzegovina through support to select municipalities in establishing improved local authority/civil society relations and facilitating financing mechanisms for improved service delivery. | The LOD III results and impacts directly and positively contribute to achieving this overall objective. However, impact is hindered by lack of policy endorsement at state and entity level and by limited commitment from LSUSs to sustain the benefits of LOD by allocating substantial amounts of CSO funds to public call for proposals (still less than 10% of their resources). The tendency is to go back to the “old ways” of supporting CSOs. CSOs with capacity to develop a results based approach are forced to look for international funding (donor driven) or to reduce their projects to activity-led initiatives with little impact in their communities |
| **OVI*** Improved quality of civil society initiatives in target municipalities,
* Increased proportion of resources deployed for CSOS initiatives.
 | * In municipalities targeted by LOD III there seems to be an increase in quality and quantity of interactions between local authorities and supported CSOs ;
* While there is an increase of prospects for municipal funding to be donated to CSOs projects in 2014, the allocation rates envisaged are still really low ( less than 10% of the CSOs total allocations to be disbursed through local calls in most of the municipalities visited); foreseen public calls observed target many areas of intervention, and the min-max threshold per project is set up from 4,000KM up to 10,000 KM, which may indicate that municipalities intend to support many recipients with small amounts of funds. During LOD III partner municipalities have contributed 10-15% of CSOs project value in their respective community. For repeating LOD municipalities the contributions have been of a minimum of 20%.
 |
| **Project purpose (specific objective)**To facilitate permanent partnerships between CSOs and local authorities by building awareness on a mutual beneficial cooperation and encouraging sustainable dialogue. | The project purpose has been achieved in those municipalities targeted by LOD III. |
| **OVI*** Number of documents of cooperation between municipalities and CSOs
* Municipalities increase the proportion of resources deployed for the project based funding approach CSO
* Number of communications established between CSOs and municipalities through LOD project efforts.
 | * In total 15 cooperation documents were signed and consequently implemented;
* There is not sufficient evidence to confirm a substantial increase of municipal funds donated to CSO projects;
* In total 76 agreements were signed and then implemented. Increased proportion of number of meetings, trainings and correspondences between LSUs and CSOs reported.
 |
| **Project purpose (specific objective)**To generate unified and transparent mechanisms for disbursing municipal funds foreseen for CSO project-based activities in accordance with local service needs, and identified priorities;. | This project purpose has been achieved in those municipalities targeted by LOD III. There are good prospects that municipal CSO funding might become more sustainable in the near future for certain CSO activities. However, pressing budget shortcomings remain in all LOD assisted municipalities. |
| **OVI*** 10 municipalities introduced unified and transparent mechanism for disbursement of funds foreseen for CSOs and their activities based on the project approach
* 10 municipalities institutionalised transparent mechanism for monitoring/ evaluation of project activities and results implemented by CSOs.
* Number of projects corresponded to development strategy of the municipality
 | * All 15 municipalities have formally adopted the LOD methodology and institutionalised monitoring/evaluation mechanisms of project activities;
* Rule books for funding CSOs have been already revised in many municipalities; some municipalities also reported that job descriptions for staff dealing with CSOs have been revised in order to include also monitoring as a part of their systematised tasks.
* All 76 projects are linked with priority areas of the development strategies of the LOD municipalities
 |
| **Project purpose (specific objective)**To encourage NGOs/CSOs to specialize/professionalise their activities – to adopt a longer-term planning perspective, to become more responsive to local needs and less dependent on current donor priorities. | This project purpose has been achieved in almost all CSO projects supported by LOD III. |
| **OVI*** At least 10 CSO applications received,
* Number of problems in local community successfully addressed by CSO projects,
* CSOs identify their own visions and strategies,
* Assessment of local needs in community.
 | * 15 calls were launched in 15 partner municipalities; 76 CSO project proposals were selected;
* The CSO projects funded by LOD III addressed a great variety of local and municipal problems, namely those related to social inclusion, youth, environment, gender and culture;
* As from the sample of CSOs visited, there is evidence that many CSOs have increased their professionalism in terms of strategic planning, fund-raising, absorption and implementation capacity;
* Many CSO projects directly respond to given local development strategies; municipalities increasingly used CSOSs as an effective instrument for targeting and addressing local development needs.
 |

**Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix**

| **Overall evaluation question** | **Key****question** | **Proposed****sub-question** | **Data****sources** | **Data collection method** | **Indicators/ success standards** | **Methods****for data analysis** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EQ 1 –** **Quality of the project design** | ***How well was the project identified and formulated?*** | Is the identification of the problems, inequalities and gaps, with their respective causes, clear in the project? | Project documentation;Progress/ monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Clarity of objectives and prioritisation;Quality of strategic planning documentation; Consistency of objectives with policy/ programme/ sector goals;Availability of adequate needs and risk assessments;Objectives are operationally practical | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Does the project take into account the particularities and specific interests of beneficiaries in the areas of intervention?  | Project documentation;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Quality of strategic planning documentation;Consistency of objectives with country/ programme/ sector goals;Availability of adequate needs assessment | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent has the intervention strategy been adapted to the areas of intervention in which it is being implemented? What actions does the project envisage to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural context? | Project documentation;Progress/ monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Identification of project obstacles and related corrective actions  | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Are the project indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure outputs, results and impacts (SMART indicators)? | Project documentation; | Desk study | Quality of strategic planning documentation and indicators of achievement | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent do the project objectives and strategies of the project respond to EU, national and regional plans and programmes, identified needs, and to the operational context of national politics? | Project documentation;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Consistency of objectives with country programme/ sector goals | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent have the country’s national and local authorities been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the project? | Project documentation;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Whether stakeholders were consulted;Degree of consultation | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| **EQ2 - Performance of the project** | ***How well is the project doing or did according to the five criteria?*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Relevance (current validity of the project)* | To what extent have the target population and the participants made the project their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation have taken place? | Project documentation;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Actual involvement of beneficiaries in implementation | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent have national public/ private resources and/ or counterparts been mobilised to contribute to the project’s objectives and produce results and impacts?  | Project documentation;Progress/ monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Identification of resources and counterparts engaged in implementation | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| *Effectiveness (ability of the project to meet its objectives)* | To what extent have the operational objectives ofthe programmes/projects been achieved or are in theprocess of being achieved? | Project documentation;Progress/ monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Project outputs contribute directly to the overall objectives Project outputs are being implemented/ used asintended/ planned | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Do the outputs produced meet the required high quality? | Progress/ monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Quality of outputs producedActual outputs correspond to planned outputs | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| In what way has the project come up with innovative measures for problem-solving? | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Identified innovative measures and concepts | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Is the project providing coverage to beneficiaries as planned? | Project documentation;Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Extent of beneficiary coverage | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified? | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Identified good practice | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| *Efficiency ( adequacy of the resources used to the results achieved)* | Is the project making progress towards achieving the stipulated results? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs?  | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Timeliness of outputs produced;Conformity with project schedule (time and financial performance); Factors contributing to efficiency/ inefficiency | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that prevent implementers and beneficiaries from becoming overloaded? | Project documentation;Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Quality of structured coordination process;Clear allocation of the roles and responsibilities within and between implementing partners;Availability of procedures and guidelines | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Does the pace of implementing outputs ensure the completeness of the desired project’s results? | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Quantitative/ qualitative measure of outputs;Quantitative/ qualitative description of tools/ activities/ resources;Unused resources/ excess resources provided;Factors that contribute to completing/ non-completing outputs | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Have efficient (sensitive) and appropriate implementation measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural context identified? | Project documentation;Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Identification of project obstacles and related corrective actions | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Could the desired project outputs have been better achieved otherwise (value for money)? | Project documentation;Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Identifiable alternatives producing the same or better outputs more (cost)effectively | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| *Impact (project contribution to its overall goal)* | To what extent have the planned overall objectives been achieved/ are being achieved, and how far was this directly due to the project? | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Prevailing observed changes in political/ administrative behaviour, procedures, structures | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent have enhanced economic and social development and or political and administrative improvements resulted from improved institutional capabilities, investments and communications? | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Identifiable benefits for society or the economy | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Are there any unplanned (positive/ negative) impacts? How strongly/to what extent have these affected the overall project impact? | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Identifiable unplanned impacts and extent of their influence | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Where appropriate, what were the gender-related, environmental and poverty-related impacts? | Project documentation;Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | The issues were directly or indirectly included in projectsIdentifiable (cross-cutting) benefits (planned and unplanned) | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| *Sustainability (likelihood of project achievements to last beyond project closure)* | Are the necessary requirements occurring to ensure the sustainability of the impacts of the project? * Is the project supported by national and/or local institutions?
* Do these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the project and to expand/ repeat it?
* Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national and local partners?
* Do the beneficiaries have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the project?
* Is the duration of the project sufficient to ensure a cycle that will ensure the sustainability of the interventions?
 | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Availability of financial/ human means and networks for continuation of activities and further improvements;Outputs contribute to achievement of the strategic objectives;Horizontal public administration and national/ regional cooperation systems stable and adequate;On-going national finance available for maintenance, insurance, replacements, consumables, etc.;Secured provisions in place for on-going staffing, staff replacement and training;Procedures and systems fully documented, with defined responsibility for updating | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| To what extent are the visions and actions of partners consistent with or divergent with regard to the project? | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Interviews | Consistency of visions/ actions with agreed measures;Ownership is demonstrated by managers responsible for onward strategic implementation of project outputs | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| In what ways can project aspects be improved so that the project has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability? | Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Interviews | Identification of programme measures for increased strengthening of sustainability | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| **EQ 3 – Project Management** | ***How well is the project being handled or was handled?*** | How well does the project management – including its tools, financial resources, human resources, technical resources, organisational structure, information flows and management decision-making – contribute to obtaining the predicted outputs and results? | Project documentation;Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Managerial and administrative capacities;Quality of management/ monitoring process;Clear allocation of the roles and responsibilities within and between implementing partners;Availability of procedures and guidelines | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |
| Does the project have adequate follow-up mechanisms (to verify the quality of the products, punctuality of delivery, etc.) to measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results? | Project documentation;Monitoring/ contractor reports;Stakeholder opinion | Desk studyinterviews | Identification of planned/ realised follow up mechanisms | Qualitative analysis of data;Interpretation of interviews and observations |

**Annex 3. Agenda of Meetings with LOD III Partners and beneficiaries**

|  |
| --- |
| DAY 1 – 5th May 2014 (Monday)Arrival to the UNDP CO ZmajaodBosne bb, Sarajevo |
| **Meeting with** | **Time** | **Location** | **Present** | **Comments** |
| 1. Briefing with UNDP R&R Development Sector
 | 09:00-09:30 | UNDP BiH | Mr. Edis Arifagić, Rural and Regional Sector coordinator  |  |
| 1. Briefing with UNDP Senior Management
 | 09:30-10:00 | UNDP BiH | Ms. Zahira Virani, Deputy Resident Representative |  |
| 1. Introduction meeting with the LOD III management
 | 10:15-11:30 | UNDP BiH | Mr. Samir Omerefendić, LOD III Project ManagerMr. Edis Arifagić, Rural and Regional Sector coordinator a.i. |  |
| 1. LOD III Project team
 | 11:45-13:30 | UNDP BiH | LOD III Project Team |  |
| Lunch break from 13:30 to 14:15 |
| 1. Ministry of Justice BiH
 | 14:30-15:30 | Trg BiH 1, SarajevoPhone: 033 281 585 | Ms. Slavka Alagić, Head of Department for registrations of Associations and Foundations | With Mr. Samir Omerefendić, LOD III Project Manager |
| 1. The EU Delegation to BiH
 |  16:00-17:00 | EU Delegation to BiHSkenderija 3a, Sarajevo | Mr. Džemal Hodžić, Task Manager for the Civil Society  | With Mr. Samir Omerefendić, LOD III Project Manager |
| **DAY 2 – 6th May 2014 (Tuesday)** |
| 1. LOD III Project Advisory Board
 | morning(09:30-10:30) | UNDP BiHZmaja od Bosne bb, Sarajevo2nd floor conference room | Ms. Elvira Imširović-Bolić, Senior Legal Advisor, FBiH Association of Municipalities and Cities. Mr. Goran Rakić, RS Association of Municipalities and Cities | With Mr. Samir Omerefendić, LOD III Project Manager |
| 1. Stari Grad Sarajevo, LOD III partner LSUS
 | morning(11:00-12:00) | Zelenih beretki br. 4 SarajevoPhone: 033 282 300 | Ms. Amina Deljković, Assistant Mayor for education, culture, sport and local development Ms. Enida Osmanagić, Associate at Department for education, culture, sport and local development in Municipality Stari Grad Sarajevo (Municipal Coordinator for LOD III) | With LOD III Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator |
| Lunch break from 12:00 to 13:30 |
| 1. EDUS, Asocijacija XY and RODA, partner CSOSs from Stari Grad Sarajevo
 | 13:30-14:30 | UNDP BiHZmaja od Bosne bb, Sarajevo2nd floor conference room | Ms. Nirvana Pištoljević, EDUS directorMs. Dajana Cvjetković, XY Project CoordinatorMs. Nataša Prodanović, RODA Director | With LOD III Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator |
| 1. LOD III Project team
 | 15:00-16:00 | UNDP BiHZmaja od Bosne bb, Sarajevo | LOD III Project Team |  |
| **DAY 3– 7th May 2014 (Wednesday)** |
| Departure from Sarajevo for municipality Teslić , 08.30 – 12:00 (Briefing on the Teslić municipality )Lunch break from 12:00 to 13:00 |
| 1. Municipality of Teslić, LOD III partner LSUS
 | morning(13:30 - 14:30) | Karađorđeva 6,74270 Teslić(municipal building)Phone: 053 411 510 | Mr. Dragan Mišić, Head of development department in Municipality Teslić (Municipal Coordinator for LOD III) | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| 1. Opštinskaorganizacijaslijepihislabovidnih OOST and Udruženjedistrofičara
 | morning (15:00– 16:00) | Aleksandra Rajkovića 7, 74270 Teslić | Gradimir Kragić, OOST President  | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| Departure from Teslić to Banja Luka, 16:00 – 17:00 (Briefing on City of BanjaLuka ) Overnight in Banja Luka |
| **DAY 4 – 8th May 2014 (Thursday)** |
| 1. City of Banja Luka, LOD I partner LSUS and LOD III additionally selected partner LSUS
 |  (08:30 – 09:30) | Trg srpskih vladara 1, 78000 Banja Luka (building of city administration | Ms. Ljubinka Dragojevic, Associate for science and education (Municipal Coordinator for LOD III) | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| 1. HO Partner
 |  (10:00 – 10:30) | Srđe Zlopogleđe 55, 78000 Banja Luka | Vanja Čolić, President of CSOS | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| 1. Omladinskikomunikativnicentar OKC
 |  (10:45 – 11:15) | Lazarička 2, 78000 Banja Luka | Ante Jurić, CoordinatorPhone:066 538 030 |  |
| Departure from Banja Luka to Novi Grad, 11:15 – 14:00, including lunch break (Briefing on Novi Grad municipality) |
| 1. Municipality of Novi Grad (LOD III partner LSUS)
 | morning(14:00 – 15:00) | Petra Kočića 2, 79220 Novi Grad(municipal building)Phone: 065-695924 | Saša Mirić, Associate for development and projects (Municipal Coordinator for LOD III) | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| 1. CSOSs OCKI and DON
 | afternoon(15:15 – 15:45) | Karađorđa Petrovića 44, 79220 Novi Grad | Duško Damjanić, OCKI - Association presidentŽeljko Marić, DON – Project manager | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| Departure from Novi Grad to Banja Luka, 15:45 – 17:15. Overnight in Banja Luka.  |
| **DAY 5 – 9th May 2014 (Friday)** |
| Departure from Banja Luka to Tešanj, 09:00:00 – 10:30 (Briefing on the Tešanj),  |
| 1. Municipality of Tešanj, LOD II partner LSUS and LOD III additionally selected partner LSUS
 | afternoon (11:00-12:00) | AlijeIzet begovića 11, Tesanj(municipal building)Phone: 032 650 022 | Mr. Suad Huskić, Mayor of Tešanj MunicpalityMr. Mirnes Dedukić (Municipal Coordinator for LOD III) | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| 1. Udruženjeroditelja, djeceiomladinesaposbenimpotrebama, URDOPP and JedinstvenaorganizacijaMladih JOM
 | afternoon(12:30-13:30) | Hajrudina Hajdića bb, 74260 Tešanj | Miralem Mulabdić, PresidentPhone: 061 402 346Almir Ramić, ConsultantPhone: 062 589 929 | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| Lunch break and departure from Tešanj to Sarajevo, 14:30-19:00 |
| **DAY 6 – 12th May 2014 (Monday)** |
| Departure from Sarajevo to Ljubinje, 09:00 – 14:00 including lunch (Briefing on the Ljubinje during travel), |
| 1. Municipality of Ljubinje, LOD III partner LSUS
 | 14:00-15:00 | Svetosavska 2, 88380 LjubinjePhone:059 630 280 | Vitomir Vojičić(Municipal Coordinator for LOD III) | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| 1. CSOS. MojaHercegovinaandZračak
 | 15:00-16:00 | .Svetosavska 2, 88380 Ljubinje(meeting at Zracak office) | Dragisa Sikimic, president of CSO Moja HercegovinaPhone:065 632 235Slavica Turanjanin, president of CSO Zračak | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| Departure from LjubinjetoČapljina, 16:00 – 17:30, Overnight in Čapljina, suggested logging Mogorjelo (Kraljice Katarine, 88300 Čapljina, BosnaiHercegovina 036 810 815) |
| **DAY 7 – 13th May 2014 (Tuesday)** |
| 1. Municipality of Čapljina, LOD III partner LSUS
 | morning(09:00-10:00) | Trg Kralja Tomislava, 88300 CapljinaPhone:036 805 052 | Dalibor Milinkovic(Municipal Coordinator for LOD III) | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| 1. CSOSTajnaPrirode
 | morning (10:30 – 11:00) | Ante Starcevica 12, Čapljina | Stanko ZlopasaPhone:063 350 534 | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| Departure from Čapljina to Mostar, 11:00 – 11:30, Lunch break in Mostar (11:30-12:30) |
| 1. CSOS LINK
 | afternoon(12:30 – 13:00) | Adema Buce 32, 88000 Mostar | Mirela Juric, Project manager Phone:036 580 151 | With LOD III Monitoring Coordinator |
| Departure from Mostrato Sarajevo, 13:00 – 15:00  |
| **DAY 8 – 14th May 2014 (Wednesday)** |
| Departure from Sarajevo to Visoko, 08:00 – 09:00  |
| 1. Municipality Visoko
 | morning(09:00-10:00) | AlijeIzetbegovića 12A, 71300 Visoko | Amra Babić, Municipal Mayor Amra Omerbegović, Assistant Mayor  | With LOD III Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator |
| Departure from Visokoto Sarajevo and lunch break, 10:30 – 12:00  |
| 1. Technical Assistance for Civil Society Organizations (TACSOS)
 | Morning(12:00-12:30) | Obala 2/1, 71000 Sarajevo | Ms. Slavica Drašković, Resident Advisor | With Mr. Samir Omerefendić, LOD III Project Manager |
| 1. Debriefing with UNDP Senior Management and R&RD Sector
 | afternoon(15:30-16:00) | UNDP BiHZmaja od Bosne bb, Sarajevo2nd floor conference room | Zahira Virani, Deputy Resident Representative (DRR). Mr. Edis Arifagić, Rural and Regional Sector coordinator a.i. | With Mr. Samir Omerefendić, LOD III Project Manager. |
| **DAY 9 – 15th May 2014 (Wednesday)** |
| 1. UNDP LOD III team and EU Task Manager
 | morning(09:00-11:00) | UNDP BiH |  |  |

**Annex 4- Success stories of two CSOs funded by LOD III**

EDUS – Education for all is a not-for-profit organization registered in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, with a vision to achieve a full learning potential of each child, with or without developmental delays. Since the foundation in 2010, we were focused on providing multidisciplinary, evidence-based approach to teaching children with developmental disorders- children that otherwise would have little or no opportunity for education, as well as children with difficulties in the mainstream schools. So far, there were at least 250 children that have been using EDUS’ services. EDUS is one of the key providers of early intervention, and the first one in the country for early intervention in Autistic Spectrum Disorders. The founders of EDUS work with these children, together with professionals and parents who strive for the best and most advanced practices, proven by the continuous and measured progress of each child. EDUS has benefited from LOD II in LSU City of Sarajevo and LOD III in Stari Grad Sarajevo, with funding resources for the development of projects related to support for children with and without disabilities, and the capacity development program offered in the two phases of LOD: since its participation in LOD phases, EDUS have raised their project proposal writing skills and the development of a result based approach to projects and strategic planning and budgeting, which have allow them to submit quality proposals to other international and local donors such as The Ministry of Health of FBIH, the US Embassy in Sarajevo, the Australian Embassy Vienna, UNWG Vienna; UNICEF and other private donors. <http://edusbih.org/en/>.

UG DON Prijedor has also received financial and technical support through LOD III to develop and implement the project “Liderstvom do Zaposljavanja” aimed at empowering a group of unemployed women. The project has supported these woken to raise their skills and find employment opportunities ( 9 out of 16 women found a job after the project) as well as to organise themselves to create a handcraft organisation called “Golden Hands”.DON highly appreciates the technical support provided by the LOD program which has enabled them to forge close partnerships with local institutions ( The Social Welfare Centre and local Hospital in Novi Grad) as well as to enhance their skills to submit project proposals together with these two local institutions to international ( Canadian development Agency) and local donors ( Ministries of Health). http://donprijedor.com/

1. Tesanj has also planned to support and finance a “CSO training for Sports and Culture associations” to be held in 2014 and focused on Project Cycle Management and Project writing skills [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Allocated funds to CSO public calls already launched in 2014: Srbac ( 15,000KM); Lukavac (3,000 KM), Kozarska Dubica (32,000KM), Teslic ( 90,000KM); Ljubinje ( 10,000KM). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. **Outcome statements** reflect the medium term change or strategic high level results expected from the cooperation between UNDP, the local authorities and the civil society. An outcome statement should ideally use a verb expressed in the past tense, such as “improved”, “strengthened” or increased” in relation to global, regional, national or local process or institution, it communicates what has changed, for whom and by when. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)