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Foreword

This Report is the final outcome of the *Evaluation of grant contracts implemented and financed by IPA and EIDHR*, which was carried out by IBF from 15 September to 4 December 2014.

The Report was revised on the basis of comments and suggestions from the EU Delegation in Serbia and other relevant stakeholders invited to the presentation workshop on 4 December 2014.
1. Executive summary

1.1. Purpose

As part of its regular monitoring & evaluation activities, the EU Delegation in Belgrade has initiated the evaluation of seven ongoing IPA and EIDHR-funded grant schemes:

1. IPA 2012 Support to the reconstruction of flood affected areas in Serbia (Flood Relief);  
3. IPA 2012 Support for improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of Collective Centres (Refugees & IDPs)  
4. IPA 2011 Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness (Mental Health)  
5. IPA 2008-2011 Cross-Border Cooperation Programmes between Croatia and Serbia/Serbia and BiH/Serbia and Montenegro (CBC)  
6. Civil Society Facility Programme under the IPA -Transition Assistance and Institution Building Component for the years 2011 – 2012 (Civil society);  
7. IPA 2012 Strengthening Media Freedom (Media)

The aim of the evaluation is to assess results achieved so far by the various calls of proposals launched under these programmes in order to draw lessons for the future and inform the next programming cycle.

In total, 173 grant projects were funded under the seven programmes covered by the evaluation for a total amount of EUR 57m.

This report (Report I) covers the other six grant scheme programmes included in the evaluation. The evaluation results of the IPA 2012 Support to the reconstruction of flood affected areas in Serbia are presented in a separate report (Report II). In addition, there are separate evaluation reports for each visited project, which can be found in Annexes.

1.2. Evaluation methodology

The grants were evaluated against the five criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC - relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability.

Unlike other evaluations, this is not thematic but is ‘grant scheme specific’. The evaluation outputs will serve to enhance reporting on grant impact to Brussels and therefore focused on the lessons learned from assistance implementation, weaknesses and strengths of delivered assistance, coordination and alignment with on-going reforms, key implementation success factors, most effective types of assistance that provided sustainable results and future needs to be addressed by the new financial perspective 2014-2020.

In accordance with the ToR, the evaluation process was carried out through three phases: 1) Desk Phase, 2) Field Phase and 3) Synthesis Phase. The team carried out field visits to 45 grant projects

---

1 See Report II
2 For the Flood Relief Programme, the evaluation reports are about specific flood-affected municipalities
selected as evaluation sample\(^3\). This represents 26\% of the total number of grant projects covered by this evaluation.

Given that many projects are still ongoing\(^4\), it was not always possible to evaluate sustainability and impact. The evaluators, however, have tried to assess the likelihood of projects achieving sustainability and impact.

### 1.3. Evaluation results\(^5\)

#### 1.3.1. EIDHR

**a) Main findings**

**Relevance** – Projects are highly consistent both with programme objectives and beneficiary needs. They fit well within the main sector issues covered by EU Negotiation Chapters 23 and 24.

**Efficiency** – All projects have maximised the use of resources in achieving their planned activities and outputs. While new grantees needed more time to adapt to the EU specific management rules, overall projects have been well managed. Support from the EUD has been highly useful and appreciated.

**Effectiveness** – Overall, effectiveness was high with most projects achieving their results as intended and making a decisive contribution to the programme’s objectives

**Sustainability** – Sustainability will depend on the extent to which projects are able to transfer their outputs and results to responsible public authorities

**Impact** - Overall impact is mixed, with a higher level achieved in areas of Chapters 23 and 24 where CSOs are well-recognised partners and expert on specific topics.

**b) Main recommendations**

| Recommendation 1. | Continue supporting programme objectives but with emphasis on areas directly linked to key challenges in Negotiation Chapters 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) and 24 (Justice, Freedom and Security) |
| Recommendation 2. | Initiate simplification of application documents and procedures for small grants |
| Recommendation 3. | Small grants lot (10.000-50.000 EUR) should remain an important way to allow for initiative and access to funding by new CSOs |
| Recommendation 4. | Ensure support from the Government (i.e. co-financing) facilitates access to EU grant schemes |
| Recommendation 5. | Synergize approaches, timing, duration, themes and size of grants between EIDHR to IPA CSF |
| Recommendation 6. | Encourage cooperation with independent bodies and mechanisms for protection of citizens and human rights through future calls for proposals |

#### 1.3.2. Refugees & IDPs

**a) Main findings**

**Relevance** – Overall, the projects are very relevant to the needs of beneficiaries and are in line with EU and national strategies

---

\(^3\) The selection of projects was established in order to provide a representative sample based on the location, type of projects and type of grantees. The sample was approved during the Inception phase.

\(^4\) For example, some flood relief grants were signed as late as August 2014

\(^5\) For the evaluation results of the EU Flood Relief Programme, please see Report II


**Efficiency** – The efficiency is varying from lot to lot. Lot 1 (collective centres) is experiencing most of the problems.

**Effectiveness** – Overall, the effectiveness is likely to be satisfactory to good depending on further progress with project activities

**Sustainability** – Prospects for sustainability vary from one lot to another. It is unlikely to be high for lot 3 (local action plans).

**Impact** - Significant impacts are likely for the beneficiaries of the programme but the overall impact on the situation of refugees & IDPs in Serbia is likely to be limited.

b) **Main recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 1.</th>
<th>Further housing support is required for refugees and IDPs living in informal collective centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 1.</td>
<td>With time passing, candidates for returns are likely to be fewer and fewer and the need for additional support limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 2.</td>
<td>Further livelihood and income-generation support is required for refugees and IDPs but will be best delivered as part of broader socio-economic development measures at the local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 3.</td>
<td>Ensure the mainstreaming of refugees and IDPs into the social welfare system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.3. **Mental Health**

a) **Main findings**

**Relevance** – Overall, the relevance level of grant scheme is high. Supported projects are in line with national sector strategies and actions plans, needs of target groups as well as with Serbia’s aspirations for EU membership.

**Efficiency**– The efficiency is high. Until present, the grant scheme is being delivered in a timely and efficient manner.

**Effectiveness** – It is too early to make any definite assessment regarding the effectiveness of the mental health scheme but prospects look promising.

**Sustainability** – Overall, sustainability prospects of the grant scheme are mixed.

**Impact** - If all assumptions materialise and projects manage to achieve all results, the impact for the final beneficiaries will be extremely positive and life changing. However, large-scale impact will depend on government support to deinstitutionalisation and mainstreaming of project results

b) **Main recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 1.</th>
<th>Support the licensing process for CSO social services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 2.</td>
<td>Ensure Government (relevant beneficiary Ministry) commitment and ownership for more effective implementation and sustainability of grant scheme results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 3.</td>
<td>Improve monitoring practices for the grant scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 4.</td>
<td>Encourage and invest in capacities of rural or smaller communities’ CSOs to develop and implement social services for persons with mental illness in their local areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.4. CBC

a) Main findings

Relevance – Projects are relevant to the objectives of the call for proposals and to the needs of the target groups and final beneficiaries.

Efficiency – Overall, the efficiency of the grant scheme was satisfactory.

Effectiveness – Overall, the CBC grant scheme was found to be mostly effective with a few exceptions. In particular, CBC projects have been mostly effective in raising overall technical and human resource capacities.

Sustainability – The sustainability of CBC projects varies depending on the sectors supported and individual projects.

Impact - Overall, impact prospects of CBC projects look promising. Impacts are evident for investment into physical infrastructure.

b) Main recommendations

| Recommendation 5. | Reduce the time for selection of projects and contracting and/or introduce the possibility of adjusting some activities to new context or risk before the start of implementation |
| Recommendation 6. | Continue supporting comprehensive CBC programme to support development of mechanisms for natural disasters |
| Recommendation 7. | Establish the practice of sequencing projects |

1.3.5. Civil society

a) Main findings

Relevance – Overall, projects are relevant with the programme objectives and beneficiaries’ needs.

Efficiency – While projects are still ongoing, the overall level of efficiency is likely to be satisfactory.

Effectiveness – Projects are contributing to programme objectives, but mostly in an indirect way and in the long-run.

Sustainability – Sustainability could be an issue as projects face mixed prospects for institutionalisation and/or further support.

Impact - Primarily focused on civil society development, the programme and grant scheme’s main strength is in facilitating change and creating conditions for positive progress with sector reforms.

b) Main recommendations

| Recommendation 1. | Future grant schemes should address the goals of the Strategy for enabling environment for Civil Social Development and those of the Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020, esp. monitoring, piloting activities by civil society on EE issues part of future grant |
| Recommendation 2. | Consultation with SEKO on the project fiche and programme objectives and modalities of support are performed regularly and consistently |
| Recommendation 3. | Provide strategic civil society sector-oriented, targeted and longer-term support, incl. operating grants, longer-term support to networks/coalitions, sub-grants to grass-root organizations and local level civic initiatives, etc. |
| Recommendation 4. | Synergise approaches, timing, duration, themes and size of grant between EIDHR to IPA CSF |
Recommendation 5. Ensure support from the Government (i.e. co-financing) is maximized.

1.3.6. Media

a) **Main findings**

*Relevance* – Projects are extremely relevant to the objectives of both the programme and the call for proposal.

*Efficiency* – Considering that project funding is relatively new for the media sector, guidance and monitoring from the TA has proved essential in ensuring the smooth management and efficiency of the scheme.

*Effectiveness* – Effectiveness is expected to be high due to the projects’ strong link to the core mission of media.

*Sustainability* – Sustainability is at a critically low level and the grant scheme is the only chance of survival for investigative journalism at present.

*Impact* - Impact of the grant scheme depends on the extent to which individual projects are able to synergise efforts with other actors’ and stakeholders.

b) **Main recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 1.</th>
<th>Provide support in project preparation, especially in elaboration of indicators. Introduce simplified application documents and procedures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 2.</td>
<td>Continue supporting the stated objectives of the programme and the call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 3.</td>
<td>Maintain TA support to grantees as it is essential for smooth project management and administration of grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 4.</td>
<td>Facilitate further cross-fertilisation between EIDHR and IPA CSF grantees and media outlets supported via the Strengthening Media Freedom grant scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 5.</td>
<td>Encourage but do not condition partnership with public institutions, especially independent bodies mandated to protect citizens and human rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 6.</td>
<td>Encourage the use of tools such as websites, social media to help with sustainability and impact of media outputs beyond the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 7.</td>
<td>Consider longer-term support for media to devise financial independence strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 8.</td>
<td>Support media production projects in accessing national and local public broadcasters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Introduction

2.1. Objectives of the evaluation

The overall objective of the evaluation is to maximise the impact of pre-accession assistance in Serbia by ensuring sustainability and impact.

The specific objectives of this evaluation are to:
• Assess the impact, effectiveness, efficiency, visibility and sustainability of a sample of on-going and completed grant contracts financed by the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance IPA and the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)
• Provide lessons learned and recommendations for decision-making on improvements of sustainability of completed projects and lesson learned for the design of future programmes. Propose additional projects and funding to continue activities related to flood relief that will be performed by 2012 National Programme IPA funds
• Propose measurable policy objectives and related measureable indicators for future similar assistance based on the impact results of previous assistance.

2.2. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation covers seven unrelated EU programmes, which share the common feature of being implemented through grants managed by the EU Delegation in Serbia:

1. IPA 2012 Support to the reconstruction of flood affected areas in Serbia (Flood relief)\(^6\)
2. IPA 2012 Support for improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of Collective Centres (Refugees & IDPs)
4. IPA 2011 Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness (Mental health)
5. IPA 2008-2011 Cross-Border Cooperation Programmes between Croatia and Serbia/Serbia and BiH/Serbia and Montenegro (CBC)
6. Civil Society Facility Programme under the IPA -Transition Assistance and Institution Building Component for the years 2011 – 2012 (Civil Society)
7. IPA 2012 Strengthening Media Freedom (Media)

Except for the five flood relief grants awarded without call for proposals, all projects funded under these programmes were selected through open or restricted calls for proposals launched between 2011 and 2013. The table overleaf presents an overview of the calls for proposals launched under the seven programmes and by means of which a total of 173 grant contracts were awarded for a total amount of EUR 57m.

---
\(^6\) See Report II
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Table 1 Evaluated programmes and calls for proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes and calls for proposals</th>
<th>Type of call for proposals / EuropeAid call number</th>
<th>Deadline for submission</th>
<th>Number of grants awarded</th>
<th>Total EU contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPA Flood relief</td>
<td>Direct award</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>€29,880,725.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 UNOPS/IOM - Serbia Floods Rehabilitation Support</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>€14,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 FAO - Agricultural and food security emergency assistance to flood-affected small-scale farmers in Serbia</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>€8,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 ADB - Provision of housing reconstruction and economic revitalisation to most vulnerable flood-affected families in Serbia</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>€2,938,076.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 MRC - Supporting Recovery of Flooded Households and Local Economies in Serbia</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>€2,581,744.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 HELP - EU assistance for flood relief in Serbia</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>€2,900,104.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 IPA Refugees &amp; IDPs</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>€12,071,294.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Support to the improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of collective centres</td>
<td>EuropaAID/134293/L/ACT/RS</td>
<td>27/06/2013</td>
<td>€12,071,294.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 IPA EIDHR</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>€2,165,782.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Country Based Support Scheme (CBSS) 2011 for Serbia</td>
<td>EuropaAID/131648/L/ACT/RS</td>
<td>28/08/2012</td>
<td>€1,988,533.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Country Based Support Scheme (CBSS) 2012 for Serbia</td>
<td>EuropaAID/131292/L/ACT/RS</td>
<td>16/08/2012</td>
<td>€866,248.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 IPA Mental Health</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>€2,428,859.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disableity and mental illness</td>
<td>EuropaAID/131412/L/ACT/RS</td>
<td>31/10/2013</td>
<td>€2,428,859.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 IPA Cross-border cooperation</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>€6,679,237.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2011 Cross-border Programme Serbia-Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>EuropaAID/131735/L/ACT/IPA</td>
<td>09/11/2011</td>
<td>€2,169,604.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 IPA Civil society</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>€1,793,793.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 EU civil society Facility Serbia</td>
<td>EuropaAID/131424/L/ACT/RS</td>
<td>13/09/2013</td>
<td>€1,793,793.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 IPA Media Freedom</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>€7,920,345.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Strengthening media freedom</td>
<td>EuropaAID/131424/L/ACT/RS</td>
<td>13/09/2013</td>
<td>€7,920,345.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>€56,994,938.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Evaluation methodology

3.1. General approach

The methodological approach is positioned within the context of recent EU Delegation sector evaluations plus the Serbian European Integration Office (SEIO) donor assistance sector evaluation (2013) and focuses on capturing policy lessons learned from a selection of grant schemes implemented under IPA and EIDHR 2009-2012.

The ToR recommended the use of the evaluation methodology defined in the DG ELARG Evaluation Guide. In this context, the grants were evaluated against the five criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC - relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability (See Inception Report). All evaluation questions detailed on pages 6/7 of the ToR served as a basis for the evaluation with new questions added to enhance evaluation outputs. Key judgement criteria were utilised to effectively answer the questions in the desk and field phases (see Inception Report).

Unlike other evaluations, this is not thematic but is ‘grant scheme specific’ to determine success and sustainability of outputs. The evaluation outputs will serve to enhance reporting on grant impact to Brussels and therefore focused on the lessons learned from assistance implementation, weaknesses and strengths of delivered assistance, coordination and alignment with on-going reforms, key implementation success factors, most effective types of assistance that provided sustainable results and future needs to be addressed by the new financial perspective 2014-2020.

The methodological approach was designed to

- capture implementation progress/impact lessons through data review and stakeholder interviews to improve the efficiency of grant scheme implementation in the remaining programme period
- Assess the design of planning documents and provide policy recommendations for improving future programme impact.

7 amounts indicated for CBC refer only to Serbian portion of funding
8 http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/index_en.htm
Broadly, the evaluation of selected grants and subsequent policy recommendations was based on:

- How project design and implemented activities to date are realising stated objectives
- The effectiveness of the particular project approach to realise stated objectives
- Impact of external factors on project progress and how the project has adapted accordingly
- The approach and performance of project management/stakeholders/project steering committees in realising project objectives and coordinating with same sector projects.

Due to the importance of emergency flood relief assistance, all five flood relief grants were included in the evaluation sample in line with the Inception Report. The evaluation concentrated on determining whether grants are being implemented in line with their contracts and are addressing the needs of final beneficiaries. The evaluation also analysed additional flood relief needs, which the grants could not cover and would deserve additional support from the EU. It also took into account needs arising from the September floods in Kladovo, Majdanpek and Njegotin. The evaluation determined whether additional funding from IPA 2014 for recovery needs make sense and if so, which of the five grant beneficiaries would be the most suited to implement additional recovery actions.

3.2. Evaluation stages

In accordance with the ToR, the evaluation process was carried out through three phases: 1) Desk Phase, 2) Field Phase and 3) Synthesis Phase (See Inception Report). In addition, a presentation of the draft Evaluation Report will be organised and a discussion will follow in order to capture and incorporate the feedback from the main stakeholders into the Final Report.

In addition to the desk analysis to prepare the Inception Report, analysis of relevant documentation provided by the EU Delegation has been carried out throughout the assignment including programmes, recent sector evaluations, SEIO donor evaluation and on-going CBC evaluations.

The team carried out field visits to 45 grant projects selected as evaluation sample. This represents 26% of the total number of grant projects covered by this evaluation as shown in the summary table below. A detailed list of grant project is presented in Annexes.

---

9 The five flood relief grants were designed to cover approximately 10% of the recovery needs assessed in the Recovery Needs Assessment (RNA) carried out in the aftermath of the floods. Under IPA 2014, another €50m have been earmarked for floods prevention and road networks (3d category roads). It could also include additional funds for recovery actions through a top up to existing floods relief grants, in particular in order to deal with the consequences of the September floods in Kladovo, Majdanpek and Njegotin.
Table 2 Overview of sample projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>Number of grants</th>
<th>Grant sample</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 IPA Flood relief</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 UNOPS/IOM - Serbia Floods Rehabilitation Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 FAO - Agricultural and food security emergency assistance to flood affected small-scale farmers in Serbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 ASB - Provision of housing reconstruction and economic revitalisation to most vulnerable flood-affected families in Serbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 DMC - Supporting Recovery of Floods Affected Households and Local Economies in Serbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 HELP - EU assistance for flood relief in Serbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 IPA Refugees &amp; IDPs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Support to the improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of collective centers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 IPA BIRD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Country Based Support Scheme (CBSS) 2011 for Serbia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Country Based Support Scheme (CBSS) 2012 for Serbia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 IPA Mental Health</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 IPA Cross-border cooperation</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2011 Cross-Border Programme Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2011 Cross-Border Programme Croatia-Serbia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2011 Cross-Border Programme Serbia-Montenegro</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 IPA Civil society facility</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 EU civil society facility Serbia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 IPA Media Freedom</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Strengthening media freedom</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The field phase involved face to face interviews with selected stakeholders and grant beneficiaries. Interviews were conducted on the basis of a questionnaire and a field visit report was completed after each visit (see Annexes).

Interviews with selected projects included grant beneficiaries, final beneficiaries any other relevant stakeholders. This multi-stakeholder approach (“triangulation”) incorporated interview feedback from the main final beneficiaries which was cross-checked with the perspectives of the grant beneficiaries/grant project manager to determine the actual impact of the grant. Although more resource intensive, the value of triangulation is its potential to expose unique differences or meaningful information that may have remain undiscovered with the use of only one approach or data collection technique in the grant scheme evaluation.

The data collected in the field or through the desk research was consolidated and analysed during the synthesis phase. The evaluation questions and judgment criteria (see Inception Report) was used to draw conclusions regarding the performance of each programme (and underlying projects) and make informed policy recommendations for the future.

Given that many projects are still ongoing, it was not always possible to evaluate sustainability and impact. The evaluators, however, have tried to assess the likelihood of projects achieving sustainability and impact.

This report (Report I) covers the other six grant scheme programmes included in the evaluation. The evaluation results of the IPA 2012 Support to the reconstruction of flood affected areas in Serbia are presented in a separate report (Report II). In addition, there are separate evaluation reports for each visited project, which can be found in Annexes.

---

10 For example, some flood relief grants were signed as late as August 2014
11 For the Flood Relief Programme, the evaluation reports are about specific flood-affected municipalities
4. Background and context

4.1. European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)

a) Strategic context

The objective of the EIDHR is to contribute to the development and consolidation of democracy and the rule of law, and promote the respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms. These principles underpin EU external policies.

Serbia is a state party to 7 fundamental international treaties in the area of protection of human rights and has ratified 33 conventions of the Council of Europe (CoE). The legislative and institutional framework for observance of international human rights law is in place, but according to the latest EC Progress Report “sustained efforts are needed from Serbian authorities to ensure its implementation”. Serbia is ranked as Free and Semi-Consolidated Democracy alongside EU Member States and neighbours (Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania) and as EU accession countries like Montenegro. According to international human watchdogs, Serbia has progressed in the track record of respecting human rights and while grave violations related to war and conflicts in 1990s have been addressed to a certain extent, human rights concerns persist. The issues raised in Human Rights Watch World Report 2014 include precarious situation of ethnic minorities, especially for Roma, threats to journalists, weak and overburdened asylum system.

Serbia’s Needs of the Republic of Serbia for International Assistance in the Period 2011-2013 document (NAD) identified the issue of democracy and human rights as an area of importance cutting across three main sectors:

- Rule of law, including justice, security, defence, crime prevention and detection, the fight against corruption and money laundering, border management, and protection of fundamental rights
- Civil society, media and culture, including freedom of expression and the enforcement of cultural rights
- Public administration reform (PAR), including institution-building and Acquis harmonization, central and LSG and public utility companies and the full array of PAR topics including procurement, public finance management, control and audit, decentralization of powers, and e-government

---

17 The reference to 2011-2013 is made due to the fact that this was the period to which the EIDHR programme and grant scheme was addressed and implemented. SEIO, NAD, 2011-2013, http://www.seio.gov.rs/upload/documents/dacu/programiranje_%20medjunarodne_pomoci/needs_of_the_republic_of_serbia_for_international_assistance_in_the_period_2011-2013.pdf
Under the Rule of Law sector, key measures to be addressed included: (1) improvement of overall security and efficiency in fighting crime, corruption and terrorism, (2) enhancement of legal certainty and efficiency of judicial system and (3) improvement of overall status of human and minority rights in Serbia\textsuperscript{18}. More concretely, the key challenges identified included the lack of implementation of, enforcement of existing laws and insufficient capacity of the institutions.

In recent years, Serbia has adopted a number of strategies to guide reforms in these sectors and has established a set of independent institutions\textsuperscript{19} to insure impartiality, transparency and effective progress one these issues.

Although EIDHR programme underpins many of the core issues in the area identified under democracy and human rights, it is not mentioned in the NAD as potential support for addressing bottlenecks and challenges identified in the document, probably due to the fact that EIDHR is not an accession-related instrument.

Serbia qualifies for the Country-based support scheme (CBSS) under Objective 2 of the EIDHR\textsuperscript{20}. In addition, Serbian civil society organisations (CSOs) are eligible to apply for funding under the global calls, which are also managed by the European Commission in Brussels. In contrast to the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA), EIDHR is programmed independently from the government and other public authorities and is managed exclusively by the European Commission or the EU Delegation in the recipient country.

b) Objectives of the programme

The objective of the Country-Based Support Scheme 2011 and 2012 is to strengthen the role of civil society in promoting human rights and democratic reform, in supporting the peaceful conciliation of group interests and consolidating political participation and representation.

The programme is organised around 4 broader sectors/themes:

- Enhancing political representation and participation
- Initiatives to enhance the inclusiveness and pluralism of civil society
- Fostering interethnic, inter-religious and intercultural tolerance and understanding
- Building towards consensus on disputed or controversial areas of policy in deeply divided societies

Different types of eligible activities were defined for each call for proposals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIDHR 2011</th>
<th>EIDHR 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• gender equality</td>
<td>• gender equality (women’s rights, women in decision-making, right to participate in peace-building and reconstruction processes, fight against violence and harmful practices, etc.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• children’s rights</td>
<td>• rights of children and youth;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• political representation of underrepresented groups</td>
<td>• rights of minorities, indigenous peoples, LGBT and other vulnerable groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• disadvantaged peoples’ rights</td>
<td>• rights of persons with disabilities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• rural development, reform of agriculture, food safety</td>
<td>• political representation of underrepresented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• workers’ rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• prevention of torture and ill-treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social programmes and reforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{18} P. 20-26.
\textsuperscript{19} such as Ombudsman, High Judicial Council, State Prosecutorial Council, Anti-Corruption Agency, Equal Rights’ Protection Commissioner, and Committee for Examining Responsibility for Human Rights’ Violation.
\textsuperscript{20} The EIDHR includes global calls, country-based support schemes and targeted calls.
In order to give smaller CSO access to the EIDHR scheme, the programme included two lots. Lot 1 was intended for smaller CSOs and actions with grants ranging from EUR 10,000 to EUR 50,000. Lot 2 was intended for larger CSOs and actions ranging from EUR 50,000 to EUR 100,000.

**c) Results of the call for proposals**

A restricted call for proposals for the 2011 scheme was published on 11th July, 2011 with a deadline for submission of Concept Note on 29th August 2011. The restricted call for proposals for the 2012 scheme was published on 29th June, 2012 with a deadline for submission of Concept Note on 15th August, 2012. Thirty-seven (37) project have been supported, of which 22 smaller (Lot 1) and 15 bigger (Lot 2) for a total amount of EUR 2,165,782.36.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EIDHR 2011</th>
<th></th>
<th>EIDHR 2012</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of grants awarded</td>
<td>Total value of grants</td>
<td>Number of grants awarded</td>
<td>Total value of grants</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>€ 576,572.28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>€ 419,840.60</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>€ 622,961.31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>€ 546,408.17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>€ 1,199,533.59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>€ 966,248.77</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projects awarded covered a big array of issues in the area of democracy and human rights in many cases directly linked to Negotiation Chapter 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) and 24 (Justice, Freedom and Security). The most common areas included children and youth (7 projects), women (6), disabilities (5), Roma (3), while the rest, e.g. anti-discrimination, anti-trafficking, anti-corruption, LGBT etc. only included 1 project (see Figure 1 below).
The evaluation sample included 16 projects out of which 8 from the 2011 call and 8 from the 2012 call.

4.2. Refugees and IDPs

a) Strategic context

According to UNHCR, there were around 43,763 refugees and 204,049 internally displaced persons (IDPs)\textsuperscript{21} in 2014 in Serbia. Serbia has signed readmission agreements with neighbouring countries and the EU and adopted a National Strategy for Resolving the Problems of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (2011 to 2014) in March 2011. The strategy is pursuing two goals. One is to help refugees either to integrate in Serbia or to return to their country of origin if they choose to do so. Another is to ensure the sustainable return of IDPs to Kosovo\textsuperscript{*} improving their living conditions while they are in Serbia.

Serbia, along with Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro, is participating in the Sarajevo Declaration Process, which aims to find sustainable solutions for people who became refugees as a result of the armed conflicts in ex-Yugoslavia during the 1990s. The EU and other international donors are contributing to the process through a Regional Housing Programme (RHP) which aims at providing durable housing solutions to 27,000 households across the region\textsuperscript{22}. As citizens of the Republic of Serbia, the IDPs have the same rights than any other citizen. They are therefore eligible to all services provided by the national social welfare system (including social support, health protection, education) and the national employment system.

In order to protect the refugees, who are not Serbian citizens, the Republic of Serbia established the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration. The Law on refugees provides for social welfare, healthcare, education and unemployment benefits for refugees under the same conditions as for other citizens. The biggest budget line of the Commissariat concerns social services, including cash support and financing accommodation in social institutions (homes for elderly people, social housing in supportive environment, school campus, etc.). After obtaining citizenship and receiving identity documents, the ex-refugees enjoy all the rights granted to any other citizen. The lack of durable housing solution constitutes a major hurdle in securing a permanent address and subsequently identity documents.

The Serbian Commissariat for Refugees and Migration is implementing a range of programmes in order to improve the situation of refugees and IDPs in Serbia with the support from the EU and other international/bilateral agencies.

At the local level, the Commissariat has been supporting the adoption of local action plans to promote the integration of vulnerable migrants group into the broader society. Local action plans are prepared by the local self-governments themselves. 137 municipalities have adopted local action plans, including the allocation of specific municipal budget lines to implement the plans (in addition to the state budget and donors’ funds). Local Councils for Migration Management and Durable Solutions have also been set up in 129 municipalities.

\textsuperscript{21} IDPs are mainly ethnic Serbs and Roma who fled Kosovo\textsuperscript{*} in 1999. Around 24,500 IDPs have returned to Kosovo\textsuperscript{*} since then.

\textsuperscript{*} This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.

\textsuperscript{22} The RHP is implemented by the Council of Europe Development Bank.
The members of the councils are representatives from social welfare, employment, housing, health and educational policy at local level. The goal of those councils is to provide suggestions for integrating migrants’ problems into local strategies and plans.

Despite the allocation of specific municipal budget lines for the implementation of the local plans, means available at local level are insufficient in regard to the needs of the population of refugees and IDPs, who continue to experience higher unemployment rate, often lack durable housing solution and are often living in precarious conditions making them particularly vulnerable to poverty and social exclusion. Moreover, the fact that they are cut off from their place of origin where they are deprived of their rights means that these populations are in special need of support.

One of the major issues related to refugees and IDPs in Serbia concerns the closure of collective centres set up to provide temporary accommodation to refugees and IDPs and where some individuals and households are still living since their exile in the nineties. Early in 2003 when the process of closure started, there were 323 centres throughout Serbia accommodating a total of 22,843 refugees and IDPs. Since then, 269 of them have been closed with 18,742 beneficiaries being relocated to new locations. However, in October 2014 there still remained 13 collective centres in Serbia where 268 refugees and 738 IDPs were living. In addition, there are also a number of informal centres across the country not officially recognised where a mix population of disadvantaged people, including refugees and IDPs live in extremely poor and precarious conditions.

Regarding returns of IDPs, the Office for Kosovo and Metohija of the Republic of Serbia has been using its budget to finance the construction of 101 houses and 76 apartments in order to support returns. In addition, the Office has been providing materials for construction and reconstruction of housing facilities to 1,334 families. The Office also administers a monthly financial assistance to some 550 returnee families in Kosovo and Metohija, as well as granting significant number of one-off assistance.IPA 2009 funded the return of 250 families, allegedly with a success rate of 80%. Another 220 families should be supported in their return through the IPA 2012 project (see lot 2 below).

b) Objectives of the programme

The EU Support for improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of Collective Centres is part of the IPA 2012 National Programme for Serbia. With a total allocation of 17.12 million EUR (out of which 15.2 million EUR from IPA), the programme supports Serbia’s efforts in favour of refugees and IDPs and seeks to achieve three results:

1. Remaining collective centres are closed through the provision of housing solutions
2. Implementation of activities related to housing solutions in Serbia
3. Return of 220 IDP families to Kosovo* supported, upon their wish.

The programme is implemented through a grant scheme and service contract to oversee the implementation of the grant scheme. The latter was awarded to Eptisa.

---

23 These were located in the following municipalities: Pancevo, Sabac, Smederevo, Kragujevac, Raca, Jagodina, Kladovo, Zajecar, Gadzin Han, Bela Palanka, Bujanovac, Vranje and Belgrade.
24 There were 45 of them in 2009. 21 informal centres are recorded in Belgrade.
25 In contrast to formal centres, there is no official income to cover basic maintenance and operation costs
c) **Results of the call for proposals**

A restricted call for proposals was published with a total allocation of 14.2 million EU and a deadline for submission on 27 May 2013. The call was supporting two objectives corresponding to the three programme results:

1. To support the closure of all remaining collective centres and improvement of the living conditions of an additional 450 refugees, IDPs and returnees under the Readmission Agreement.
2. To support sustainable return of IDPs to Kosovo*.
3. 

The call was divided into three lots as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot 1 Closure of Collective Centres (EUR 10.6m)</th>
<th>Lot 2 Support to Return (EUR 2.4m)</th>
<th>Lot 3 Support to Local Action Plans (EUR 1.2m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of residential facilities for the most vulnerable categories of refugees and IDPs in the collective centres.</td>
<td>Encouragement and facilitation of sustainable returns to Kosovo*.</td>
<td>Creation of the conditions for the integration of refugees, the improvement of the living conditions of IDPs while they are in displacement and the reintegration of returnees on the basis of the readmission agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 15 projects were selected for a total value of 12.07 million EUR as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Number of awarded grants</th>
<th>Total EU contribution</th>
<th>Grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>€ 9,299,108.54</td>
<td>DRC, Help, Housing Development Centre, UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>€ 2,071,454.08</td>
<td>ASB, DRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>€ 700,732.30</td>
<td>Municipalities of Arilje, Batocina, Bojnik, Kula, Ruma, Sombor, Topola, Vranje, Vrbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>€ 12,071,294.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3. Mental Health**

**a) Strategic context**

The EU Programme and its related grant scheme for: “Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness” offers the opportunity for cooperation between different sectors of society (government, public mental health care institutions and civil society) towards the empowerment of persons with mental health issues and fulfilment of their right to participation in community life through de-institutionalisation and social inclusion.
The Programme directly addresses the strategic objectives of the Serbian social welfare policy, which expresses general orientation towards de-institutionalisation, but does not lay out specific plans for decreasing or ending institutional placement.

The Programme also corresponds to the Strategy for Improving the Position of Persons with Disabilities\textsuperscript{26}, adopted in 2007, and the Strategy for Development of Social Protection\textsuperscript{27} as well as, importantly, the new Law on Social Protection\textsuperscript{28}. This Law and the corresponding Strategy lay out the policy framework for deinstitutionalisation and plans for residential services reform for children and adults with disabilities.

In addition, the Serbian Government adopted the Strategy and Action Plan for Mental Health Protection Development\textsuperscript{29} in 2007. The Strategy seeks to establish services in the community for people with mental disabilities, as well as to decrease the number of beds in big psychiatric hospitals within the process of deinstitutionalisation\textsuperscript{30}. The Action Plan also envisaged a new Law on the Rights of Persons with Mental Difficulties\textsuperscript{31}.

Finally, the Serbian government adopted the Law on Social Welfare, which supports deinstitutionalisation of residential institutions, by promoting the development of community-based services, in particular daily care services and residence in supportive environment and support for independent living. The Republic of Serbia has achieved tangible results in this field (more than 180 community-based services have been developed over the past several years, the majority targeting persons with disabilities).

Despite these efforts and both national and donor support, the coverage of community-based services across the country is still limited, especially among persons with mental disabilities.

Within the social protection system, there are 13 residential care institutions for persons with mental disability and mental illness, 5 large psychiatric hospitals and 46 psychiatric departments in general hospitals as well as outpatient services in 71 municipal health centres. 3,750 persons with mental disability and mental illness have been placed into residential care institutions and homes (1,500 adults and elderly beneficiaries with mental disability and 2,250 adults and elderly with mental illness)\textsuperscript{32}.

In most cases, residential care institutions are overcrowded, accommodating more patients than originally envisaged. Their infrastructure is largely outdated and dilapidated, forcing the residents to live in extremely deplorable conditions, while the quality of services is unbalanced, meaning that adequate support for maintaining the mental and physical potential of beneficiaries to improve the quality of their lives is not always provided.

\textsuperscript{29} http://www.zdravlje.gov.rs/tmpmz-admin/downloads/zakoni1/Strategija%20Razvoja%20Zastite%20Mentalnog%20Zdravlja.pdf
\textsuperscript{30} The deadline to establish services in the community is December 2014 and the deadline to downscale the number of hospital beds in big psychiatric hospital is December 2017
\textsuperscript{32} Decision on the Establishment of the Network of Social Protection Institutions (April 2008)
b) Objectives of the programme

The Programme aims to create the conditions for a successful social inclusion of residential care institutions’ patients into the local community – full or partial, depending on the individual beneficiary’s characteristics – through a system of social and health services. The process is complementary to reforms in the field of mental health and transformation of psychiatric hospitals that aim to promote services in the community which are non-discriminatory, easily accessible and whose work (therapeutic and preventative) is evidence and value based. As the deinstitutionalisation is a highly complex, lengthy and sensitive process, the Programme provides the necessary resources for the gradual and caring integration of previously institutionalised patients into society, so that they can enjoy the full range of human rights to the same extent as the rest of society.

The total budget of the Action is EUR 5.2 million, while EU contribution amounts to 4.7 million EUR. The total amount reserved for grants is EUR 2.6 million, and the guidelines stipulated that grants should be minimum 50,000 EUR and maximum EUR 200,000.

c) Results of the call for proposals

Nineteen grants were selected through a call for proposals funded out of IPA 2011. There are five grants as pilot residential institution projects, two with psychiatric hospitals and twelve with NGOs/municipalities. There is also a Technical Assistance PMU managed by HIFAB. The evaluation included a sample of six projects, in order to assess the contribution of the call to the de-institutionalisation process and the development of community-based services.

4.4. CBC

a) Strategic context

The Cross-border cooperation programmes have been a strong driver for confidence building and reconciliation process in the Western Balkans. Due to the armed conflicts in the 1990s, the strengthening of good neighbourly relations in border areas was seen as an important prerequisite for growth and prosperity for the local region as well as for the countries involved. It was especially important to invest in building trust and bridges between newly independent countries, particularly due to the fact that the conflicts affected negatively the traditional ties between local communities in border areas, which were very close before the break up of former Yugoslavia. Stronger cooperation and improved economic and social ties with neighbouring countries is also important in the perspective of the accession to the European Union.

b) Objectives of the programme

The focus of this evaluation is the CBC Grand Schemes Serbia-Croatia, Serbia-Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia-Montenegro. The primary strategic objective of these programmes is “to bring together the people, communities and economies of the border area to jointly participate in the development of a cooperative area, using its human, natural, cultural and economic resources and advantages.” The overall objectives of the three grant schemes relate to economic and tourism/cultural development and environmental protection of border areas. The specific objectives focus on the establishment of a sound basis for the joint activities in the programme area.
c) Results of the call for proposals

Overall, 55 grants have been distributed through the CBC grant scheme within the IPA 2009-2011, with total value of EUR 6,679,237.59.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>Cross-border cooperation</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2011</td>
<td>Cross-border Programme Serbia-Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>€ 2,169,604.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2011</td>
<td>Cross-Border Programme Croatia-Serbia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>€ 2,671,669.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55  € 6,679,237.59

These projects can be grouped into four categories (1. culture, education & networking; 2. Health & social inclusion, 3. Environment protection; 4. Agriculture & rural development and 5. Economic development & tourism) as shown in Figure 2 below:

![Figure 2 Number of IPA CBC projects under 2008-2011 calls (total 55 grant projects)](image)

Health & social inclusion projects represented more than 27% of all projects followed by environment protection (24%), culture, education & networking (20%), economic development & tourism (14.5%) and agriculture & rural development (14.5%).
4.5. Civil Society

a) Strategic context

Civil society development and civil society dialogue are important priorities of the enlargement process. The area is assessed within the political criteria for accession and progress is monitored every year through the EC Progress Report. In 2012, the EC introduced the term enabling environment for civil society\(^{33}\) to refer to the set of pre-conditions that have to be in place to ensure a functioning civil society. To help accession countries in this area, the EC published a document outlining the enlargement agenda for civil society: the Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020\(^{34}\).

A positive trend of investment into a more structured and systematic development of civil society can be observed in Serbia\(^{35}\). A modern Law on Associations was adopted in July 2009, thus clarifying the legal status of CSOs. A Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society which was set up in 2010 and has since then taken important steps to develop the sector: the improvement of transparency and accountability of state funding to CSOs via the collection and publication of a unified Annual Report, the development of Guidelines for consultation with the public and the drafting of a civil society strategy via a wide consultation process\(^{36}\). The Office has also been facilitating access of CSOs to explanatory screenings\(^{37}\).

The Sector Civil Society Organizations (SEKO) mechanism\(^{38}\) has been established by SEIO as the only formal consultation instrument on IPA funding for the civil society with the initial support from DFID and SIDA in March 2011.

While the EC Progress Reports have praised these positive trends in the development of the strategic and institutional framework for the civil society, they also note a persisting hostile environment for human rights defenders, a lack of visible political commitment to promote a culture of respect and

\(^{34}\) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/tenders/support-for-civil-society/civil-society-facility/index_en.htm, December 2013
\(^{35}\) E.g. USAID Sustainability Index
\(^{36}\) http://strategija.civilnodrustvo.gov.rs/ The Strategy is expected to be adopted in early 2015
\(^{38}\) SECO is composed of 10 thematic networks based on themes identified in NAD and is each lead by 3 to 5 leading CSOs-SECOs. http://www.cdspredlaze.org.rs/
raising awareness. The EC calls for a more vigorous implementation of instruments and mechanisms in favour of civil society development and more transparency over public budget expenditures to the sector\(^{39}\).

The new strategic and institutional framework has not yet fully been reflected on the development of the civil society itself. Civil society in Serbia is very diverse. It includes organisations belonging to different sectors with diverse size, budget, geographic region and years of activity. Overall, the sector is relatively young with the majority of organisations founded after 2000. A high level of technical, administrative and managerial competences as well as capacity for advocacy, social campaigning and policy dialogue is more widespread among CSOs established during the 90’s and in the beginning of the new century\(^{40}\). The Government Office Assessment of civil society carried out in 2011, shows that the majority of organisations (46%) are involved in culture, media and recreation, education and research (42%), social services (40%), environment (28%), fight against corruption (6%).\(^{41}\) However, approximately 6,000 CSOs have registered in the last two years (almost 30% of the total number). Little is known regarding their capacities, structure and areas of interest. According to the Assessment, most CSOs acknowledge the importance of long-term planning and strategic programming to strengthen their organisation. However, CSOs doing it in practice are few. Likewise, monitoring and evaluation is weak across the sector. Sector-wide knowledge and analytical skills are improving but they are mostly developed by professional organisations in the larger towns. In recent years, the capacities of local CSOs have been built through training and small grants. Networking is more evident, with at least 100 functional networks at either national or local levels. Financial stability of CSOs is generally weak\(^{42}\).

In the absence of a national strategy for the sector, NAD 2011-2013 priority, which was relevant at the time of programing the Civil Society Facility programme, is set at establishing a permanent dialogue and partnership between the Government and civil society. Three measures were proposed to implement the priority:

- Creating an enabling environment for the sustainable development of civil society and partnership with the Government
- Further strengthening CSOs’ capacities to participate in decision-making processes, to monitor and evaluate the implementation of policies, strategies and laws
- Strengthening civil society regional and international cooperation and coordination based on national and EU priorities


\(^{40}\) CI & Office for Cooperation with Civil Society (2011): Assessment of the situation in the civil society organisations (CSOs) sector in Serbia, Civic Initiatives in conjunction with the Office for Cooperation with Civil Society of the Government of Serbia.

\(^{41}\) CSOs involved in culture, media and recreation at the same time deal with education and research (44%), as well as international cooperation (30%). Among CSOs dealing with education and research, a large number of CSOs also deals with culture, media and recreation (39%), social services and international cooperation (27% each). CSOs dealing with social services often deal with healthcare as well, and vice versa, while CSOs involved in the field of law, advocacy and politics often deal with human and minority rights (75%) or education and research (55%).

b) Objectives of the programme

The EU 2012 Civil Society Facility (CSF) for Serbia brings together objectives of the IPA Serbia MIPD 2011-2013 and the IPA Multi-beneficiary CSF Programme. Supported with a budget of EUR 2 million, the 2012 CSF Call for Proposal is financed from the IPA 2012 National Programme for Serbia.

In 2011, CSF activities were brought under a single Commission Financing Decision with the aim “to improve efficiency, effectiveness, coherence and ultimately the achievement of sustainable results in the Commission’s support to civil society in the IPA Beneficiaries.” The Financing Decision combined both Multi-beneficiary and Country Programmes into a three-year programming cycle allowing for a long-term effort and broadening the set of methods and funding instruments available for civil society support.

The purpose of the CSF Serbia programme is to support sustainable development of civil society and partnership with the government and to enhance active civil society participation in Serbia’s EU integration process. The objectives of the call for proposal, which were developed in consultation with CSOs, are to strengthen the participation of CSOs in public administration reform in Serbia at all levels; to encourage CSOs initiatives promoting cultural diversity and regional reconciliations and to foster civic and capacity building initiatives aimed at reinforcing the role of civil society in community development. Expected results of the call for proposal are to:

The call was divided into three themes as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1: Public administration reform</th>
<th>Theme 2: Cultural diversity</th>
<th>Theme 3: Development of CSOs at the local level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Enhance transparency, efficiency and service orientation of public administration with special focus on public funds;</td>
<td>i. Support cultural initiatives that promote values of equality, non-violence and non-discrimination;</td>
<td>i. Capacitate community-based organisations to provide services to citizens at the local level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Promote high standards and effective implementation of legal framework for the prevention of conflict of interest of elected state officials and public servants;</td>
<td>ii. Promote cultural diversity in the fields of culture and education;</td>
<td>ii. Support grassroots initiatives of small CSOs with focus on specific local needs in areas such as local governance and tolerance through operational and action grants;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Promote efficient, service oriented cooperation between republican, provincial and local administration;</td>
<td>iii. Increase the intercultural dialogue among different ethnic and religious communities;</td>
<td>iii. Promote the knowledge and understanding of the general public on civic initiatives through public events and communication grants to CSOs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Enhance information on public administration services.</td>
<td>iv. Contribute to regional reconciliation by exploring common values and issues of concern.</td>
<td>iv. Enhance networking of CSOs at local and regional levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

43 including strengthening the rule of law and public administration, overcoming the economic crisis and improving competitiveness and social inclusion and reconciliation

44 “To contribute to anchoring democratic values and structures, human rights, social inclusion and the rule of law”
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The Programme is implemented through a grant scheme managed by the EU Delegation in Serbia and supported by the Technical Assistance Support to the Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society managed by SIPU International. Additional grant scheme currently under consideration is envisaged under the Programme bringing its total value to 5 million EUR.

**c) Results of the call for proposals**

A restricted call for proposals was published on 28th March 2013 with a total allocation of EUR 2 million and a deadline for submission of Concept Notes on 13th May 2013. Twenty-three (23) grants were awarded for a total amount of 1,978,793.89 EUR. This was the only call covered under the Programme as part of this evaluation. Due to focus on flood-relief and EIDHR programme, the evaluation sample included only **three ongoing grant projects**, including a project involving administration of sub-grants scheme.

Awarded projects offer an interesting array of interventions linked to all three themes of the call for proposal. Most common areas included education, minorities, youth and cultural diversity (6 projects), public administration reform (4), social services and social policies (3), rule of law, corruption (2) (see Figure 3 below).

![Figure 3 CSF Awarded grants under 2012 Civil Society Facility call](image)

4.6. Media

**a) Strategic context**

Media are considered a cross-cutting issue that contributes to the overall democratisation of Serbia, supports freedom of expression and media professionalism. The EC Country Progress Reports have consistently been critical on the **situation of media freedom in Serbia**. EC Progress Report in 2012 noted the insufficiently balanced and analytical media reporting linking it to media ownership and
identified the need to bring state financing for media in line with EU Acquis\textsuperscript{46}. EC Progress Report in 2013 additionally highlighted that threats and violence against journalists remain a significant factor in self-censorship and that Media Strategy implementation needs to stepped up.\textsuperscript{47} It was only EC Progress Report 2014 that noted legislative improvements via the adoption of the three laws\textsuperscript{48}, in line with the 2011 Media strategy, and EU legal framework in this area. However, persistence of other challenges identified in the past remained.

Serbia is ranked as a “partly free country” in the Freedom House Freedom of the Press index 2013\textsuperscript{49}. According to the SEE Observatory 2012 study based on Council of Europe’s indicators for the assessment of media freedoms, Serbian media are economically less developed and score low on independence from political influences and journalists’ labour rights and safety.\textsuperscript{50} According to the EC commissioned study\textsuperscript{51}, there is “only one private national broadcaster in Serbia [that] invests in investigative reporting thus exercising the high quality journalism that should actually be among the prime tasks of public service broadcasting.”

Serbia has adopted a Media Strategy\textsuperscript{52}, which defines the most important development directions for the public information system with the overall aim of strengthening media freedom and media market as essential pillars of Serbian democracy. The key institution involved is the Ministry of Culture and Information.

In 2013, the EC developed Guidelines for EU Support to Media Freedom and Media Integrity in Enlargement Countries for the period 2014-2020, a document defining expectations towards accession countries to be fulfilled and thus addressing it as a direct intervention area\textsuperscript{53}.

NAD priorities for 2011-2013, when the programme was being planned, were set at creating new opportunities for improvement and diversity of media environment that will further strengthen protection of human rights and democratic values. It consists of three underlying measures:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Empowering all relevant institutions, regulatory bodies and self-regulation within the media industry
  \item Contributing to a more inclusive society through media pluralism and diversity
  \item Developing the digital environment
\end{itemize}

Freedom of expression and professionalisation of the media is also identified as a cross-cutting intervention in all targeted support under MIPD 2011-2012.

---

\textsuperscript{48} The Law on Public Information and Media, the Law on Electronic Media and the Law on Public Service Broadcasting.
\textsuperscript{49} https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/Global%20and%20regional%20tables.pdf
\textsuperscript{50} SEE Media Observatory, http://mediaobservatory.net/radar/flash-report-3-serbia
\textsuperscript{52} Strategy for Public Information System Development in the Republic of Serbia by 2016
d) Objectives of the programme

The IPA 2012 Strengthening Media Freedom is a stand-alone project fiche. It includes a technical assistance component focusing on aligning national media legislation with EU Directives and a grant scheme to support independence and increase professionalism of journalists and other media professionals.

The aim of the project fiche is to support the implementation of the Media Strategy and to increase the professionalism of journalists and media professionals. The project fiche is particularly welcome in the current economic context when most media outlets are struggling to survive and to provide quality outputs to their audience/readership. In particular, the sector is faced with limited resources to produce investigative reporting programmes, especially in EU accession-related issues.

In this context, a call for proposals was launched under the project to enhance investigative reporting through support of quality media productions in the area of rule of law. The call targeted specific themes and sectors such as:

- Independence, transparency and efficiency in administration of justice and work of the judiciary;
- Law enforcement and fight against all forms of crime, including organised crime and cross-border crime;
- Border management;
- Support for refugees, IDPs and asylum seekers;
- Fight against corruption, abuse of position and office;
- Protection of media freedoms;
- Reconciliation, regional cooperation and good neighbouring relations in the area of rule of law;
- War crimes investigations and trials.

The size of grant ranged from EUR 50,000 to EUR 150,000 with a duration comprised between 6 to 18 months.

e) Results of the call for proposals

A restricted call for proposals was published on 30th April, 2013 with a deadline for submission of Concept Notes on 20th June, 2013 and with a total allocation of EUR 1.8 million. Nineteen (19) grants were awarded for a total amount of EUR 1,790,245.21. This was the only call for proposals included into this evaluation. The evaluation sample consisted of only three ongoing grant projects corresponding to the 3 types of media supported, i.e. radio-broadcasting, newspaper, and documentary production, respectively, due to focus on flood-relief and EIDHR programme. The grant scheme is benefiting from a Technical Assistance to Strengthening Media Freedom project managed by EPTISA, which has as one of its components support to managing and monitoring of the grant scheme.

Awarded projects are very much focused on key issues covered by Negotiation Chapter 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) and 24 (Justice, Freedom and Security). Most common areas of support included rule of law and corruption (5 projects), war crimes (2), while other issues include human rights, judiciary, media freedom (see Figure 4).
Figure 4: Awarded projects – IPA 2012 Strengthening Media Freedom

5. Evaluation results

5.1. EIDHR

a) Relevance

Projects are highly consistent both with programme objectives and beneficiary needs. They fit well within the main sector issues covered by EU Negotiation Chapters 23 and 24.

While EIDHR CBSS is intended to support improvement in democracy and human rights, given Serbia’s ongoing negotiations for EU membership, the scheme is inevitably geared towards the adoption of Negotiation Chapters 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) and 24 (Justice, Freedom and Security). This makes the programme and the grant scheme extremely relevant and complementary to national reforms in the area of democracy strengthening and implementation of human rights standards.

The grant scheme is also very relevant from the perspective of CSOs, strengthening their capacities and providing the resources required for their activities. In particular, the grant scheme helps to strengthen the independence and autonomy of the more critical organisations, the so-called “watchdogs”, which perform a crucial monitoring role over the implementation of key EU acquis legislation as well as propose concrete measures for its improvement. Here, however, projects reflect more the supply side (i.e. capacities and focus of civil society work), rather than the demand side (i.e. some issues like corruption, which are very prominent in Chapter 23 are under-represented in the selected projects). Project design and LFAs are usually well written and articulated with in most cases a set of realistic, achievable, targeted quantitative and qualitative indicators. In their individual sectors, the projects are in line with the overall aim of empowering the civil society to become an effective force for dialogue and reform.
b) Efficiency

All projects have maximised the use of resources in achieving their planned activities and outputs. While new grantees needed more time to adapt to the EU specific management rules, overall projects have been well managed. Support from the EUD has been highly useful and appreciated.

All projects have been finished since 12 to 3 months at the time of the evaluation. Activities have been implemented in line with the proposal’s action plan. There were several cases of projects, which have outperformed in terms of delivering more activities and outputs than planned. Some projects have undergone changes in activities during implementation with the approval of the EUD to be able to adapt to specific needs of beneficiaries or addressing changes in the context. All projects have had reported, documented extensive outreach and visibility, especially with local media or quality media outlets. Worth mentioning is the cross-fertilisation with media outlets projects supported by the IPA Strengthening Media Freedom grant scheme (e.g. Danas, Radio 021, Radio OK Vranje). Nevertheless, short projects of up to 12 months mostly struggled in achieving results during their lifetime and frequently needed extension as the focus was mostly on delivering outputs and activities and not achievements and results.

Overall, projects were well managed, although some CSOs managing for the first time an EU project have encountered minor difficulties (e.g. type of costs per budget heading) or have been too optimistic with the timeline, thus needing to secure non-cost extensions. In some cases, staff was overstretched as it strove to achieve the desired outputs and comply with the timeline. As a result, it was often necessary to use time allocations from other projects or voluntary work. Grantees agreed that the EUD support was timely, responsive, and effective. The “human” and direct contacts which were established with responsible EUD staff was highly appreciated. Furthermore, while no EU monitoring visits or on-the-spot checks were reported, the presence and participation of EUD staff in project events demonstrated the partnership-like approach, which grantees expect from a donor.

Co-financing is reported as an issue for almost half of the grantees included in the sample and especially for newcomers. EIDHR grantees are not eligible to receive State budget co-financing offered by the Office for Cooperation with Civil Society for IPA CSF and Europe for Citizens projects managed by CSOs. This is despite the fact that in most cases EIDHR projects are very similar or identical in nature to those co-financed under IPA CSF (e.g. Asylum Protection Center and Atina project related to issues of migrants and asylum seekers). Examples of support from the State (SIPRU to project on Elderly by Amity) and Local-Self Governments (City of Vranje to project managed by Generator) demonstrate the level of recognition achieved by civil society and the useful contribution the latter makes to the strengthening of democracy and human rights.

c) Effectiveness

Overall, effectiveness was high with most projects achieving their results as intended and making a decisive contribution to the programme’s objectives

Given that the majority of funded projects were of short duration (i.e. 12-18 months) and that two-thirds of them had a budget equal or lower than EUR 50,000, the achievement and contribution to the programme objectives and results can be considered considerable.

Projects funded fall broadly within 3 types of support:
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- **Coalition- and network-building** (e.g. human rights of elderly-Amity, research and advocacy on gender-based violence (GBV), economic and social rights (ESR)-AWC, prison reform-CHR Nis, CSO advocacy on discrimination-Association of Prosecutors) via capacity-building for monitoring of specific issues related to human rights and advocacy on their improvement;

- **Service provision** improvement or piloting of services to marginalised groups (e.g. psychotherapeutical support to victims of trafficking of human beings (THB) -Astra, social cooperative in Pozega-Sandzak Committee for human rights), with the intention that the State or LSG recognizes and continues supporting either at instutitionalising the service or outsourcing and funding it to a CSO or private provider;

- **Awareness-raising and sensitizing public**, institutions on challenges/issues and in some cases agenda-setting (e.g. special needs children on the move-Redd Barna).

In some cases, projects combined several aspects and this was especially so in cases of more developed and experienced organisations working on an issue for several years or even decades. When projects ended, very concrete results on individual and local level could be observed, ranging from strengthened capacities of CSOs, local institutions (e.g. municipality services, center for social care), empowered marginalised groups (e.g. women in rural Sandzak area, Roma women victims of domestic violence) or individuals (e.g. whistleblowers reporting corruption in prisons).

There were also cases of projects influencing improvement (e.g. CHR-Nis on prison reform) and enforcement of legislation (e.g AWC project in GBV and ESR) or both (e.g. setting up standards of care in elderly residential homes by Amity) as well as capacities of institutions at the national level to deliver these (e.g. training social workers in child-center assessment (ROD) for identification of developmental, emotional and behavioural difficulties).

It is interesting to observe that many projects did not include partners. It was often the case of organisations that managed their first EU grant. However, considering that grants were small and that many in fact focused on working with and developing capacities of local CSOs, this did not have an adverse effect on the effectiveness of the projects.
The same grantees appeared in several projects with their role often interchanged on related or similar issue within EIDHR (e.g. AWC led a project on gender-based violence (GBV) and economic and social rights (ESR) of women and was partner to Amity project on HR of elderly, Sandzak Committee of Human Rights lead a project on women political empowerment and participated as part of Coalition for prison reform in CHR-Nis project on prison reform) or with IPA CSF scheme (e.g. APC led an EIDHR project on capacity building of local CSO and advocacy on asylum seekers rights and is partner on on-going IPA CSF project by Atina on building capacities of local CSO and services to illegal immigrants and asylum seekers as potential victims of THB). In such cases, projects acted in complementarity and provided a follow-up to activities and results.

d) Sustainability

*Sustainability will depend on the extent to which projects are able to transfer their outputs and results to responsible public authorities*

Projects have been closed only recently, i.e. between 12 to 3 months before evaluation. Therefore, outputs and results are still very much visible and tangible. Since all projects are being implemented by CSOs who mainly depend on project funding, issue of sufficient resources to carry on activities and maintain results on the same level is very problematic.

Several organisations indicated that they secured a follow-up grant to continue or build on results achieved in the project (e.g. APC, AWC), which means continuation for a certain period of time only.

Only in few cases, organisations have been able to embed their project results in a national policy or institutional framework ensuring sustainability with the state or local authorities responsible for funding or taking over activities (e.g. Famila ROD assessment certified training as part of pool of official training to social workers).

Many project results are designed to facilitate sustainability with easy- or wholly-adaptable outputs and products which only requires authorities to recognise and use them.

Again, partnerships are crucial to achieve sustainability, both with other CSOs in coalitions or networks and with public authorities. The grant scheme gives some positive examples of the former, which is more natural. As for partnership with public authorities, while it is the best way to provide long-term sustainability, it might prove problematic and encroach on independence of action, especially where CSO performed vital monitoring in areas of basic human rights and democracy strengthening, e.g. corruption. Thus, requesting it as a criterion in the call for proposals might be counter-productive.

e) Impact

*Overall impact is mixed, with a higher level achieved in areas of Chapters 23 and 24 where CSOs are well-recognised partners and expert on specific topics.*

Activities and outputs would rarely be produced without the projects. Considering concrete results achieved in terms of instigating positive change, this would in many cases take considerably more time and in a much lesser extent and scattered manner, undermining the impact a specific project was able to achieve.

Given the short implementation period, size of grant and ambitious objectives (e.g. change of legislation, enforcement, practice or value change in society) it is not realistic to expect that projects would be able to contribute significantly or bring about major socio economic/environmental
benefits. What can be recognised is that in many cases projects helped organisation tackle a specific issue in a comprehensive and consolidated manner thus putting in place a solid base for potential impact. There, were however, several projects which demonstrated impact and embedded measure in terms of legislation, enforcement or capacity building of institutions in a manner that gives a high probability for irreversible change to occur in a given policy sector. In such cases common “success” factors observed are: mature organisation with previous project experience and management of international funded projects, organisation is recognised for its work by the state or local institutions, available specific expertise and previous work on the problem being addressed in the project.

As already indicated in the Effectiveness section, it is not uncommon that the project synergises or builds on previous work of the organisation of the coalition or network. This can especially be observed for monitoring and advocacy projects. When the projects were about developing or piloting a service to tackle a specific issue related to a marginalised group, it is more frequent that they acted as a start-up or a laboratory to experiment and promote the service before it can be taken over by the State or local authorities.

It has been only in several cases that new, extra funding has been secured during or immediately after the project ended. The issue of follow-up, especially for projects with such small funding and short implementation period is crucial in securing any possibility of impact. Other two enabling factors contributing to the prospect of impact are firstly, access to funding which is very problematic—especially for organisation located outside of Belgrade as they cannot be in daily contact with national level institutions, donors and partners and secondly, participation or membership in a coalition or network, which considerably enhances access to information, knowledge and impact and helped in many cases to overcome the lack of funding.
5.2. Refugees & IDPs

a) Relevance

Overall, the projects are very relevant to the needs of beneficiaries and are in line with EU and national strategies.

Lot 1 is very relevant as it addresses the burning issue of the 13 remaining collective centres. The grant scheme is providing resources and expertise to ensure that all remaining occupants in collective centres will be provided with an appropriate housing solution corresponding to their needs (i.e. pre-fabricated housing unit or social housing unit in sheltered environment). More generally, the lot is contributing to improve the situation of refugees and IDPs in Serbia. Lot 2 is consistent with the policy of facilitating the return of IDPs to their place of origin contributing to the fulfillment of their basic human rights. It offers relevant support/advice and much-needed resources for returning IDPs. Lot 3 is consistent with the Commissariat for Refugees & Migration’s policy of strengthening the capacity of municipalities to improve the situation of refugees and IDPs through local action plans.

b) Efficiency

The efficiency is varying from lot to lot. Lot 1 is experiencing most of the problems.

Efficiency under lot 1 is mixed. Given that the situation with collective centres evolves rapidly, solutions designed by applicants were in excess of needs when projects started. This is due to the fact that some occupants left the centre and therefore the need for housing solutions had to be adjusted downwards. As a result, it was necessary to refocus the activities of two applicants after selection.

In order not to jeopardise funding, it was agreed that projects could also address the needs of refugees and IDPs outside the collective centres, in particular of those living in informal centres.

Another major issue is related to the lack of responsiveness from some municipalities in providing plots for the construction of housing units when these are not available from beneficiaries. As a result, it is still not clear whether grantees will be able to provide housing solutions for all the needs identified.

In addition to these problems, all projects are dealing with the time-consuming and cumbersome process of selecting beneficiaries (including assisting them in fulfilling all the legal/formal conditions necessary for their participation in the programme) and resolving all the issues linked to permits/technical requirements for each housing unit in cooperation with the municipalities.

Nonetheless, progress is being made with housing solutions related to the collective centres covered by the programme although there are major problems in Kragujevac and some in Belgrade.

The efficiency under lot 2 has been good. The two projects selected under this lot are progressing well. The grantees have gained considerable experience in implementing similar projects under IPA 2009. They have established a good working relationship with the Serbian Office for Kosovo* and Metohija and with the Ministry of Community and Return in Kosovo*. The methodology tested...
under IPA 2009 has been refined\textsuperscript{59}. The selection of families for the return assistance packages is completed while the selection of communities to receive income-generation support is ongoing\textsuperscript{60}. The efficiency of projects is always at risk of obstacles\textsuperscript{61} related to the political situation.

Overall, the efficiency under lot 3 has been satisfactory, especially taking into accounts the limited capacities of grantees. All projects have set up selection committees, adopted Rule Books and completed the preliminary selection participants through public calls for both components (reconstruction materials and income-generation grants)\textsuperscript{62}. After working with potential beneficiaries to define their needs and gather all the necessary documentation in support of their application, most projects are moving on to the delivery stage of the assistance to final beneficiaries. There are delays however compared to the original implementation plans and some projects will need a no-cost extension to complete all their activities.

There was an issue regarding the inclusion of refugees into the programme. The guidelines for applicants clearly indicated that lot 3 was only targeting IDPs. However, some municipalities with a small number of IDPs disregarded this information when preparing their project and then faced problems in selecting beneficiaries later on\textsuperscript{63}. It was subsequently agreed that refugees could be selected as beneficiaries for income-generation grants provided that needs of all IDPs on the territory of the municipality were first covered. Although the approach is practical and makes sense, it is a departure from the guidelines for applicants.

c) Effectiveness

Overall, the effectiveness is likely to be satisfactory to good depending on further progress with project activities

It is difficult to assess the overall effectiveness across all lots considering that many projects are only half-way in their implementation and did not achieve all their results. However, some conclusions can be drawn already at this stage on the basis of the progress made so far:

Regarding lot 1, it is likely that results regarding the closure of collective centres will be achieved (i.e. all remaining centres will be closed as expected) albeit with a lower number of households supported tham initially planned. This is due to the fact that the population in centres shrank faster than expected. It remains to be seen whether the programme will be successful in reaching its targets for housing units by implementing replacement housing solutions for other refugees and IDPs (in particular from informal collective centres) given that time is fast running out and many hurdles need to be overcome before viable solutions can be agreed with the municipalities and the beneficiaries themselves.

Regarding lot 2, both projects are making good progress towards their results and the effectiveness is likely to be good. Regarding income-generation support, the quality of the consultancy advising local

\textsuperscript{59} The major difference compared to IPA 2009 projects is that income-generation grants are targeting communities instead of families. This approach was advocated by the Office for Kosovo* and Metohija which considers necessary to strengthen existing communities in order to create the conditions for further returns (families are unlikely to return to isolated locations).
\textsuperscript{60} It is almost completed for ASB
\textsuperscript{61} in particular stemming from the fact that activities are funded under Serbian IPA funds but implemented in Kosovo*. An example of this concerns VAT and custom duties: in order for goods purchased in Serbia to be imported free of VAT and custom duties, a modicum of cooperation between Serbian and Kosovar administration is necessary. For the time being, the latter has been forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{62} The municipality of Vranje is also building pre-fabricated houses
\textsuperscript{63} in particular municipalities in Vojvodina and the North-East of Serbia where the number of IDPs is insignificant
communities with the design and implementation of business plans will be crucial to ensure that the latter are turned into successful ventures. Overall, the project will be instrumental in creating the conditions for sustainable returns to Kosovo* for the targeted households and communities. Without this support, it is highly unlikely that many families would choose to return or be able to stay.

Regarding **lot 3**, effective housing and economic support is very likely to reach the targeted population contributing to improved living conditions for the targeted refugees and IDPs in the nine participating municipalities. From this point of view, the effectiveness is likely to be good. However, it is difficult to measure the extent to which projects have contributed to the objectives of local action plans as the latter are not effectively used as monitoring tools\(^6^4\).

d) **Sustainability**

*Prospects for sustainability vary from one lot to another. It is unlikely to be high for lot 3.*

Regarding **lot 1**, housing solutions are likely to be sustainable given the emphasis laid on tailoring them to the needs of targeted refugees and IDPs. Social housing units in sheltered environment are conceived to ensure that beneficiaries adapt well to their new living conditions. Likewise, support from the Centres for Social Work is foreseen for the occupants of pre-fabricated houses. While decent living conditions are a major pre-condition for their integration into society, beneficiaries will nonetheless remain very vulnerable to poverty and social exclusion unless adequate social support and employment opportunities are also available.

Regarding **lot 2**, judging from the success rates achieved under IPA 2009\(^6^5\), there is reasonable hope for the projects to achieve sustainable returns. However, any achieved result is likely to remain fragile given the uncertainties about the political and economic situation\(^6^6\). The main risk is that families return to Serbia because there are not enough opportunities for them to earn a living in the long-run. The income-generation can make a difference in this respect although a lot depends on the general economic environment in Kosovo*. Moreover, over the years beneficiaries have created links with Serbia which are likely to endure and might eventually pull them back there.

The sustainability of **lot 3** is likely to be low. The support with reconstruction materials is short-lived by nature. New housing needs will appear over time and unless refugees and IDPs become more self-sufficient, additional support will be required. As time goes by, continuing support for refugees and IDPs could be resented by the local population which is facing similar economic hardships without receiving any assistance. This would undermine the overall goal of integrating refugees and IDPs into the society.

e) **Impact**

*Significant impacts are likely for the beneficiaries of the programme but the overall impact on the situation of refugees & IDPs in Serbia is likely to be limited.*

As for effectiveness, it is very early to assess the aggregated impact of projects across the three lots given that implementation is still ongoing and most results have not yet been achieved.

---

\(^{6^4}\) Municipalities were not able to link the outputs of their projects to (often missing) targets in the local action plan

\(^{6^5}\) According to an evaluation carried out by the grantee, 80% of returnees supported through the project were still living in Kosovo* six months after the end of activities.

\(^{6^6}\) There has been progress in recent months however. Serbs in Kosovo participated both in local and general elections and efforts are being made to integrate the Serbian community in central and local structures. These developments contribute to the stability of the region and create conditions for economic development.
However, the following conclusions can be already drawn on the basis of the design of the programme and the progress made so far:

Regarding **lot 1**, the impact is likely to be high from the narrow perspective of collective centres, which should be all closed by the end of the programme. However, the impact is likely to be limited when looking at the overall situation of refugees and IDPs in Serbia where needs are still considerable and in particular, regarding the existence of many informal collective centres across the country with a mix population of refugees and IDPs and other disadvantaged groups.

Regarding **lot 2**, given that the number of returns achieved through the projects is small and that their sustainability is opened to question, the impact of the programme will be low. This is even more so when looking at the prospects for further returns in the future, which remain uncertain given circumstances on the ground and the lapse of time.

Regarding **lot 3**, the impact is likely to be very low given that projects are improving the living conditions of refugees and IDPs only marginally and temporarily. In most cases, the support consists of minor repairs to buildings and housing solutions are not comprehensive and durable. If successful, income-generation grants can make a greater impact on an individual basis but given the amount of funds allocated to this component, the impact at the level of the overall objective will be negligible.

### 5.3. Mental Health

a) **Relevance**

*Overall, the relevance level of grant scheme is high. Supported projects are in line with national sector strategies and actions plans, needs of target groups as well as with Serbia’s aspirations for EU membership.*

The Grant Scheme for Mental health is consistent with the priorities set in the European Partnership, under the Political Criteria. Moreover, the project links to the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020. The Grant scheme is also contributing to the Serbian strategies for mental health and social welfare. Priorities defined in the Needs Assessment Document 2011-2013 provide a strong basis for the assistance to the mental health and particularly to de-institutionalisation and social inclusion.

The grant scheme is extremely relevant to the needs of final beneficiaries, persons with mental disability as it enables these groups to integrate into society with assistance from professional caregivers. Interventions implemented with support from the grant scheme respond to the need to provide an opportunity to target groups to thrive in an environment where they are valued, where they partake in the everyday life of their surrounding community, where their autonomy is nurtured and they are given choices.

b) **Efficiency**

*The efficiency is high. Until present, the grant scheme is being delivered in a timely and efficient manner.*

The projects within this grant scheme have only started in summer 2014. Projects are building upon past experience, lessons learned and tested models, and many are implemented jointly with public institutions. Most projects have only completed their inception phase - setting up teams; negotiating
with local governments on locations/space for housing/day care for persons with mental disabilities; organising tenders and starting the initial works on the housing.

Some projects in the sample have advanced in faster pace than others. For example, the project Srce u Jabuci is in the process of finalising works on houses where they will accommodate the selected candidates for deinstitutionalisation. The beneficiaries are at the moment accommodated in the transitional accommodation within the institution to start accommodating to the idea of independent living.

Some projects focus on developing/maintaining daily centre activities or Mental Health Centres outside of institutions/clinics.

The main issue with efficiency so far is to find and get the location/space for centres/housing in cooperation with municipal authorities. So far, municipalities have been responsive to the requests and this is not seen as a potential threat to the projects.

Some projects are advancing more quickly as they already had a space available before starting. An example is KEC in Belgrade, which already had premises where to carry out daily centre activities. The project aims at expanding the size and number of services and people to be reached by the services. Caritas Šabac has been working on the finalisation of the location arrangements for the Centre at the moment of the evaluation.

The projects are closely monitored by the PMU office monitoring team, which also includes officials from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the Inspectorate for Social Protection. Monitoring visits are organised frequently and provide the floor for acquiring necessary information on a range of issues for both sides (including inputs for licencing process, outreach, technical questions regarding project, etc.). Interviews conducted within the framework of this evaluation show that a majority of grant beneficiaries consider these monitoring visits were conducted in a manner that was intimidating for them, creating unnecessary pressure, at times leaving them with more questions on procedures and approaches than answers.

The implementation of projects has not been so far affected by any management or procurement issues. The majority of projects have clear logframes and articulated project documents which assist in understanding the project logic. In addition, the sampled projects show pretty good linkages with other related projects which have been implemented either before, building upon the experience, lessons learned and tested models, or in parallel for attaining common objectives.

\[d) \textbf{Effectiveness}\]

It is too early to make any definite assessment regarding the effectiveness of the mental health scheme but prospects look promising.

Effectiveness will depend on the extent to which projects are able to cooperate successfully with public institutions (primarily mental health clinics). So far, projects partners cooperate well and the partnership is elaborated in Memorandums of Understanding. Interviews conducted for the purpose of this evaluation show that the partner institutions are willing to contribute to project activities although it requires sometimes efforts. For example, one project\(^{67}\) had a difficult start with their partner institution, but those challenges were overcome during project implementation. A good

\(^{67}\) KEC
selection of beneficiaries to be de-institutionalised and their careful transition from institution to their own houses (i.e. units where they will be accommodated once deinstitutionalised) is critical to the success of projects. The selection stage for beneficiaries to move out of institutions. In parallel, work has started on putting standards and procedures in place and licensing services to ensure quality of care and sustainability through government mechanisms. Licensing is a complex and long process that entails a lot of preparation and procedures development for the organisations. It is expected to be a major challenge, especially for grant beneficiaries from the civil society sector.

There are good foundations for the achievement of expected results at the level of the scheme: grant beneficiaries are experienced and renowned in the sector (e.g. SAPI, CARITAS Šabac, KEC; etc.). All of them have experience in cooperating with public mental health institutions and the necessary approvals regarding the new housing and the rehabilitation of existing ones are secured.

Another important effectiveness factor is the level of cooperation with Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and local governments. Interviews with grantees show that cooperation with local governments is generally good and the local authorities are responsive to the needs of the grantees in terms of enabling space/locations for services.

A total of 874 persons will directly benefit from services funded under the Grant scheme, out of which, 341 persons will be deinstitutionalised or in transition towards deinstitutionalisation (see Figure 5 below). This means that around 9% of all 3,750 persons with mental disability and mental illness who have been placed into residential care institutions and homes will benefit from the grant scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Beneficiaries to be deinstitutionalised</th>
<th>Number of people being prepared for deinstitutionalisation (without repetition)</th>
<th>Number of people from the community to receive services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5 Estimated number of people to benefit from the Grant Scheme*

e) Sustainability

Overall, sustainability prospects of the grant scheme are mixed.

Projects have established strong foundations for the deinstitutionalisation of beneficiaries by securing locations and in most cases financial resources from local-self governments to cover running costs. The infrastructure component of projects is useful to raise the prospects of sustainability. However, it is not yet clear whether there will always be sufficient financial resources to cover the entire costs of de/institutionalisation. In this regard, mechanisms to ensure that “money follows the
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68 data from the Decision on the Establishment of the Network of Social Protection Institutions, April 2008
69 data from Mental Health PMU
beneficiary\textsuperscript{70} are still not in place even though the legislative framework recognised the latter as critical pillars of successful deinstitutionalisation.

\textbf{f) Impact}

\textit{If all assumptions materialise and projects manage to achieve all results, the impact for the final beneficiaries will be extremely positive and life changing. However, large-scale impact will depend on government support to deinstitutionalisation and mainstreaming of project results.}

During the evaluation process, focus group discussions with persons with mental health were conducted and they confirmed great appreciation of the opportunity to live outside of institutions. Focus group participants confirm that living independently and opportunity they get to earn income through jobs empowers them, makes them feel integrated and self-confident.

Community-based systems of independent and supported living, when properly set up and managed, deliver better outcomes for the people that use them: improved quality of life, better health and the ability to contribute to society. Investment in such services therefore makes better use of taxpayers’ money. Another possible impact is that the community-based services are likely to be replicated/mainstreamed through the system. This will depend primarily on the success of the programme to push through reforms in financing social services and de-institutionalisation. At the moment, the EUD and the PMU, together with grant beneficiaries lobby the ministries (Ministry of Health and Ministry of Labour and Social Policy) to establish mechanisms for financing social services, which is a good measure to contribute to mainstreaming of community based services.

\textbf{5.4. CBC}

\textbf{a) Relevance}

\textit{Projects are relevant to the objectives of the call for proposals and to the needs of the target groups and final beneficiaries.}

The CBC programmes are relevant as they have a clear focus on the promotion of sustainable economic and social development in the region and are in line with the objectives of respective CBC programmes. As the countries of the region have been facing fundamental challenges in this regard (not only since the beginning of the world economic crisis in 2007) such a focus is very much needed. Furthermore, the CBC Programmes intend to create cooperative areas between countries, where people, communities and economies use all the human, natural, cultural and economic resources and advantages in order to improve the situation within the national state and between two states.

\textbf{b) Efficiency}

\textit{Overall, the efficiency of the grant scheme was satisfactory.}

With few exceptions (e.g. project “Through Geographic Information System Towards Better Cross-Border Flood Risk Management in the Lim River Basin” implemented by Srbijavode (hereinafter:

\textsuperscript{70} The term “money follows beneficiary” refers to the financing model based on the principle of costing of medical services per beneficiary. In the mental health system, it means that the beneficiary may use the allocated funds for their costs of medical service directly when they begin living in deinstitutionalised settings. Such principle of “money following beneficiary” allows for fairer and improved allocation of funds to mental health services.
Srbijavode), which suffered from delays from the start, generated by insufficient project staff and other arising priorities, like floods), projects have been delivered in a timely and efficient manner. Selection of projects has been good and there are examples of projects whose support was continuous through subsequent CBC grants (e.g. Lim Biathlon project). The assessment of the project sample shows that projects succeed to produce all planned outputs with satisfactory quality as per work plan.

Funds have been spent in a generally cost-effective manner, creating new infrastructure or mechanisms that are taken over by local governments and citizens for further use (examples may be found, but not limited to, rehabilitation of the water and wastewater supply infrastructure, technical equipment for environment, tourism, emergency response, etc.; certified trainings and institutional building; etc).

Grants are generally implemented by capable local teams while cooperation between communities has been positive and mutually reinforcing.

In some cases, a long period of time elapsed between the call for proposals and the start of project implementation, which affected the envisaged timeframe for project implementation but these issues were generally overcome by the grant beneficiaries (e.g., Project implemented by Tourist Organisation in Priboj). Support and guidance from EUD/Contracting Authorities was adequate, while there was one case of delayed final payment reported.

The most important factor that contributes to efficiency of the CBC projects is the Joint Technical Secretariat established for each cooperation scheme. The evaluation process showed the positive example of Joint Technical Secretariat for CBC Serbia – Montenegro, which provides ongoing mentoring, advisory and management oversight of projects. The day-to-day contacts with projects, particularly with partners who do not have experience in implementing EU funded projects are positive input that contributes to increased efficiency.

c) Effectiveness

Overall, the CBC grant scheme was found to be mostly effective with a few exceptions.

The evaluation sample substantiates this assessment. To gain a better insight into the effectiveness of CBC projects, the evaluation conducted a detailed assessment based on the evaluation sample. Each intervention in the sample was assessed against (a) its expected results as defined in the project documentation and (b) the status of these expected results at the end of implementation, as reported in final reports, ROM reports or other sources.

Investments, especially in technical equipment and infrastructure, have generally delivered their planned results. A number of good examples of CBC investment support were identified in the evaluation sample. The combination of well-targeted assistance and a beneficiary with commitment and capacity to absorb the CBC support resulted in a series of successful interventions that addressed an acute need and which delivered wider sustained impacts. This is underpinned by documentary evidence and feedback from stakeholders on the ground.

Support to environment (water treatment and supply, waste management; environment protection, etc.) delivered results across a wide range of areas. For example the project of Public Utility company
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in Novi Pazar and the Djunis project contributed to improved water supply network and increased the capacities for maintenance of the infrastructure. The Living Danube project resulted in the introduction and adaptation of EU standards and practices in nature conservation and environment protection (e.g. EC Danube Strategy, Water Directive). Investment in development of tourist infrastructure and diversification of offer has also given positive results. Another example of worthwhile project, the Lim Biathlon project resulted in improved tourist infrastructure and safety which contributed to more attractive tourist potential for the region of South West Serbia.

**CBC has mixed results in creating or strengthening the institutional capacities for response to emergency situations.** The grant scheme helped the grant beneficiaries to achieve results and make positive steps forward in developing mechanisms and capacities to respond to natural hazards. Assessment of project implemented by Ministry of Interior of Republic of Serbia dealing with flood relief and response show that institutional capacities have improved and the response to floods is now more organized and structured. Thanks to the project, local Units of the Ministry’s Department for Emergency has been capacitated and equipped to respond to floods but also other emergencies that may arise. On the other hand, the Srbijavode Project has encountered a number of delays and management issues that prevented full achievement of results to date.

**CBC projects have been effective in raising overall technical and human resource capacities.** A strong pillar of the CBC scheme is the investment in building capacities and networks between partners. The assessment shows that the educational activities, exchanges, partnerships and joint actions have brought results and created stronger knowledge base across the projects. Interviews and assessment of other projects in the sample show positive experiences and results of the capacity building components of projects, particularly in cases where project beneficiaries had an opportunity to take part in certified trainings on technical subjects abroad and bring back new capacities and knowledge that will contribute to local development. For example, certified trainings on safety and organization of sports activities (e.g. Lim Biathlon project) or water and/or waste management (Djunis Project, Project by Novi Pazar Public Utility Company), nature conservation and protection (Living Danube Project, UNECO Project) have brought positive results.

More examples can be found in the Evaluation Reports of individual projects (see Annexes).

**d) Sustainability**

The sustainability of CBC projects varies depending on the sectors supported and individual projects.

For the most part, project results were found to be sustainable. Investments in improvement of infrastructure and technical capacities are found to be sustainable where provisions for operation and maintenance are in place. The assessment of projects in the evaluation sample shows that this is usually the case. For example, water supply infrastructure, technical equipment and related material all appeared to be sustainable with public enterprises or local authorities taking responsibility to cover operational costs and maintenance of equipment and infrastructure. This ensures that the supply systems or equipment can be operated until their decommissioning.

The sustainability of environmental interventions was less clear. Interventions for environment protection were reported as being on the one hand absolutely necessary, but at the same time extremely expensive to operate and maintain. For example, while investment in the Nature Reserve has proved to be a good input for increasing tourist offer and natural resources protection, the
sustainability at the policy and institutional level of the Living Danube Project is under question, due to continuous lack of policy and financial support for similar type of interventions, placing viability almost exclusively under local context, and support of the local government. The budget necessary goes way beyond the affordable costs for local government, while national government is not able to cover these costs. This issue may be a good example how good interventions may come to have a high threat for sustainability.

**Sustainability of institution and capacity building support is very mixed.** In some projects, the picture was fairly positive. The project implemented by the Ministry of Interior (and partner in Montenegro) shows positive trends of shifting the approach to emergency situations as a result of the project implemented. The Department for Emergency situations of the Ministry reported that the Ministry is initiating important discussions internally on how to further sustain and replicate positive models and experiences gained thanks to the project. This sheds positive light into the sustainability of results. Investment in capacity building of professionals in public enterprises, CSOs, etc. has positive sustainability prospects at the moment, yet the long term sustainability depends on a range of factors, including but not limited to personal choices, career change, support by peers and superiors.

**Partnerships have been strengthened and likely to continue.** Interviews confirm that partnership was going to continue as partners have ideas for other collaboration initiatives, and many said that they were already working on new projects together. For example, the Lim Biathlon Project forged partnerships at many levels: between municipal authorities across borders (Priboj - Rudo); between local authorities and CSOs (e.g. Priboj municipality – Tourist organization Priboj and CSO Eco-Lim). On the other hand, there are project where beneficiaries only meet a few times, if at all, so it is doubtful if such partnerships will continue at this level.

e) **Impact**

**Overall, impact prospects of CBC projects look promising.**

The assessment of the evaluation sample shows that a majority of projects already contributed to improving the life of citizens of targeted areas, particularly vulnerable groups through improved technical and institutional capacities and services in local communities, as well as increased security and economic investment opportunities.

**Impacts are evident for investment into physical infrastructure.** Rehabilitations of water and wastewater infrastructure are enhancing living conditions for the citizens of the target regions. For example, results of the Project implemented by the Public Utility Enterprise "Vodovod i kanalizacija" Novi Pazar improved access to quality water for over 30,000 citizens, thus improving livelihood and economic opportunities of local population. Similarly, the Djunis project resulted in improvement of livelihood of around 30,000 citizens of the Ub region, who benefit from access to more safe and healthy water, and better efficiency of utilizing natural resources (drinking water). The ratio between invoiced and delivered water has at the end of the project decreased in water loss by 18.6%.

Improved tourist infrastructure impacts the underdeveloped regions by increased profits and cultural exchange that would otherwise not be possible to be achieved to such extent (e.g. the Lim Biathlon Project in Priboj, Living Danube project, etc.).

**Improvement of human resources and technical capacities bring positive impacts on safety and healthy livelihoods of citizens.** Capacity building of a wide range of professionals from different areas of public life and service provision bring positive impacts on citizens through improvement of
services and efficient response to the needs arising. For example, the Project implemented by Ministry of Interior has had immediate demonstration of positive impacts of the project interventions. In response to floods, the Ministry was able to organize instant mobilisation of 6 trained officers in the specific rescuing operations in the endangered municipalities. This was rated as extremely valuable in the rescue/relief operations as the team was independent, proactive and highly efficient. Their contribution in rescuing missions only during the first day resulted in saving more than 70 people in flood affected areas. Investment in capacity building of professionals dealing with water supply and wastewater management results in effective management of the systems thus impacting positively entire populations of the targeted areas (Djunis Project, Public Utility Enterprise "Vodovod i kanalizacija" Novi Pazar). Certification of professional tourist guides and sports activities leaders impacts positively the safety of sports and tourist activities, which in turn positively affect the attractiveness and turn out to such events (e.g. Lim Biathlon project). Improved capacities for environment protection and nature conservation impact positively the environment and improve livelihoods of citizens.

However, CBC probably has little significant impact on economic growth, while there is evidence of impacts of social inclusion. This is due to limited amounts of funds provided to the grant beneficiaries and thus targeted regions, the relatively short timeframe over which the interventions are delivered, the apparently weak linkage between the legal and institutional framework and economic growth as well as wider macroeconomic factors beyond the programme’s control. The sample of projects implemented within the CBC grant scheme does not provide evidence of significant positive impacts on economic growth of the area as a whole. On the other hand, some projects do record positive impacts on social development. For example, the spin off of the Lim Biathlon project focused on organizing sports activities (rafting) to persons with special needs in the region. Such activities were of excellent value for this population, which is generally characterized by being isolated in homes without much access to majority of public events. Such activity changed lives of this group in Priboj and provided positive experience and empowered them to take more active role in the society. Also, access to safe water and improvement of mechanisms for environment and natural resources protection affect positively social development of the society.

Impacts on improved cooperation between partners are visible but depend on the type of project and extent of joint actions. All CBC projects include components of general exchange of knowledge, connection between organisations and institutions, and networking. These activities have been integral part of the interventions, and were happening across projects. Still, some projects resulted in better regional links, networks and partnerships (e.g. Lim Biathlon, Living Danube) while others remained at a level of project-related partnership (e.g. project implemented by Novi Pazar Public Utility company).

Impact is visible in individual projects on the level of integration of services across borders. For example, the Lim Biathlon project created strong foundations for improved tourist offer located in border regions between Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina (Priboj- Rudo) with integrated tourist services, shared tourist, safety and sports equipment and joint planning of tourist and sports manifestations. Another example of improved integration of services is the Project implemented by the Ministry of Interior of Serbia, whereby police units in Serbia and Montenegro have been jointly trained on rescue operations, emergency relief interventions, etc. There have been cases where these units worked together in relief and rescue operations (e.g. floods in Serbia or traffic accident in Montenegro where the teams worked together).
5.5. Civil Society

a) Relevance

Overall, projects are relevant with the programme objectives and beneficiaries’ needs.

Sample projects are well designed and well-articulated. Logical frameworks have a concrete set of both quantitative and quality OViS. In the absence of a concrete strategy at the EC and national level, the programme and the call has been organised around 3 themes/sectors identified in consultation with beneficiaries (CSOs). Sample projects all have overarching capacity-development component for local CSOs working on the main theme of the particular project.

b) Efficiency

While projects are still ongoing, the overall level of efficiency is likely to be satisfactory.

Selected projects are still ongoing with some of them in the final phase of implementation. There have been some delays in the implementation of activities and delivery of outputs, due to either too ambitious project design, excessive number of activities planned or in one case unexpected event (i.e. May floods). Nevertheless, all projects are likely to deliver results in line with their implementation plan and to finalise activities on time.

Selected grant beneficiaries are well experienced in management of EU-funded projects, the implementation and management is smooth and efficient. All projects appreciated the help from the Technical Assistance managed by SIPU International, which was instrumental in solving smaller management issues and ensuring timely response from the Contracting Authority whenever required. All projects were monitored by the TA. Some project staff reported being understaffed and thus the organisation overstretched itself in achieving the desired outputs and complying with the timeline. As a result, time allocations from other projects or voluntary work were used.

While detailed date on information activities were not available from project, monitoring documentation or interviews, the level of outreach and visibility appears good. Projects rely on press releases, press conferences, workshops and round tables to exchange and disseminate information about activities. Project-related websites are very important tools to spread information and preserve capacity-building outputs and methodologies beyond the project.

c) Effectiveness

Projects are contributing to the programme objectives, but mostly in an indirect way and in the long-run.

Selected projects have already delivered their intended outputs and are on track of reaching their planned results. When projects are building up on previous EU-funded projects (e.g. Atina project Opening Dialog within Local Communities, BAZAART project ISLANDS), the results are much clearer and concrete. Through the programme, selected CSOs have been engaged in capacity development activities aimed at achieving more effective civic participation at all levels of governance. Such
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activities take time and results for targeted groups and areas are mostly **indirect and long-term.** From this point of view, the short implementation duration is a weakness.

One project included a sub-granting component co-financed by LSGs, thus incentivizing and demonstrating to LSGs the value of inclusion and cooperation with civil society. However, it is too early to assess the effectiveness of the sub-grant scheme as the sub-grant beneficiaries have only started implementation a month or several weeks before this evaluation commencement.

d) **Sustainability**

**Sustainability could be an issue as projects face mixed prospects for institutionalisation and/or further support.**

Selected projects being still ongoing, they are at early stage to be able to assess their sustainability conclusively. So far, no new or extra funding has been reported by grantees, who claim that it is harder to secure support for capacity development than direct actions. Some of the results will not achieve full impact without a certain degree of institutionalisation i.e. project results must be accepted/adopted by the responsible public institutions in the sector. For example, Atina’s project aim is to pilot cultural mediators and promote them towards institutions (e.g. police) to use them in identifying THB, violence and other risks faced by illegal migrants and asylum seekers. Like similar projects supported under previous IPA CSF calls, BAZAART ISLAND’s projects aim is to introduce intercultural drama into the education curriculum and this project key added-value was in bringing together individual elements/efforts into one comprehensive programme in support of teachers and pedagogues introduction of new teaching methods in schools. Finally, ReForce project in short aims at improving cooperation between LSG and CSOs. The sustainability of results means that cooperation activities established through the project must become part of their regular functioning. Commitment for institutionalisation is realistic in only one project (e.g. BOS REforce). A **strong partnership** component (e.g. BAZZART, BoS project) is essential especially in cases where public institutions are not interested in cooperation with civil society. Given that domestic resources for civil society development (either state, local, private or individual) are not yet available and fundraising with citizens is still limited, the programme has serious **sustainability issues.**

e) **Impact**

**Primarily focused on civil society development, the programme and grant scheme’s main strength is in facilitating change and creating conditions for positive progress with sector reforms.**

Significant changes are only visible when selected projects follow up or continue previous work carried out by the organization. In such cases, they acted as **catalyst** to take stock and building upon identified issues to be tackled (e.g. Atina project) or to ensure sustainability of results where there is lack of will on the part of institutions for changes to be introduced (e.g. BAZAART project on introducing new participative methodologies as part of the school curricula). Since the programme is mainly aimed at **facilitating change and providing conditions** for reforms to take place in line with the requirements of the EU **acquis,** the real impact at programme level can only be expected in the mid-long term as progress is made with EU-related reforms. In this respect, the programme would benefit from more **strategic and longer-term projects** able to tackle key conditions for building a strong civil society such as promoting culture of tolerance, transparency and accountability of public institutions etc., some of which are part of the call of proposal part of this evaluation.
Changes would most likely not take place, or would have been less structured without the call for proposals. Major socio-economic or environmental benefits are likely to be less tangible and felt on the long-run. Some of the projects are addressed to concrete sector national policies and strategies such as Public administration reform, Anti-trafficking strategy, education reform, but all are contributing to the issues identified to be tackled by the Strategy for enabling environment for Civil Society Development to be adopted in early 2015.

In ensuring impact, synergizing with and connecting to local and national level networks working on issues in the same sector is essential for projects to be able to achieve results targeted by the programme in the mid-long term. Synergising with interventions financed by the EIDHR are most obvious and there are several examples where both programmes have complemented each other.

5.6. Media

a) Relevance

Projects are extremely relevant to the objectives of both the programme and the call for proposal.

Projects were in line with the objectives of informing and empowering citizens on specific issues (Judiciary and Human Rights) and addressing relevant institutions (e.g. Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, Ombudsman) to act upon identified issues related to the rule of law and Negotiation Chapter 23. Selected projects are contributing to the call for proposals’ specific objective of enhancing investigative reporting through support of quality media productions in the area of the rule of law. In this respect, it can be said that the call for proposals corresponded well to the specific media situation in Serbia reported by grantees such as political pressure, difficult cooperation with public institutions and decision-makers, difficult financial situation of quality media outlets.

While worthwhile, sample projects were are not always well-designed and this affects the implementation. This is particularly visible from the definition of indicators, which are not SMART. As per analysis of sample projects, media outlets have limited experience in writing project proposals.

b) Efficiency

Considering that project funding is still relatively new for the media sector, guidance and monitoring from the TA has proved essential in ensuring the smooth management and efficiency of the scheme.

Selected projects are still ongoing. Most of them are midway through or at the end of implementation. There have been some delays in implementing activities, due to either internal (e.g. staff member absence, too ambitious project design) or external factors (e.g. non-responsive institutions due to floods or uncooperativeness). As a result, some projects have been extended.

All project managers reported having previous experience in managing EU-funded projects and overall management techniques and tools are being properly and consistently applied. Nevertheless, since project financing and management is relatively new to media outlets, TA to the grant scheme was crucial in supporting the smooth processing of management issues and requests to the EUD. This has been greatly appreciated by the grantees.

Since all selected projects are outreach and visibility intensive, this is so far, on high and expected level. Websites as well as social media have become extremely valuable tools for ensuring wider
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outreach, sharing, re-use, re-broadcast of free-of-charge contents and other outputs from the projects (e.g. Radio 021 website, Justice Danas sub-website), thus increasing the lasting effects of the project and their further use for follow-up, education and awareness-raising purposes.

c) **Effectiveness**

*Effectiveness is expected to be high due to the projects' strong link to the core mission of media.*

Selected projects have already delivered some of their intended outputs and they are on track to reach planned results. Sample projects are building on previous EU-funded projects and de facto enable all types of media (including production) to be true to their mission, i.e. produce high-quality media contents in various formats dealing with wider societal issues and with the aim of defending public interest. At this mid-term stage, projects were able to show concrete results regarding public information for citizens especially on judiciary-related issues and the situation with human rights. **Cross-fertilization** and cooperation with many CSOs projects funded through EIDHR grant schemes has been documented during evaluation.

While results are real, it is hard to measure effects on citizens, which will become visible only in the **long-run**, i.e. as Serbia makes progress with the reforms and the EU integration process.

d) **Sustainability**

*Sustainability is at a critically low level and the grant scheme is the only chance of survival for investigative journalism at present.*

Projects are ongoing, either mid through or at the end of implementation. Issue of sustainability is **the main concern** and is an even more pronounced problem than for civil society projects (EIDHR, IPA CSF etc.).

Financially, the sampled media and production outlets are not able to sustain their operations in the short- to mid-term without grants and are either facing closure or a radical change in editorial policy to adopt a more commercialized, sensational-style media output. The positive element is the **increased use of website and social media** which enables greater outreach, re-use, re-broadcast and availability of the content free-of-charge and easy to access after the end of the project.

Change in the media and economic situation can only be expected over the mid to long-term. Therefore, partnerships with interested actors are important not only for impact, but for sustainability. Long term support for media outlets devoted to investigative journalism and quality socially-engaged production is crucially needed.

e) **Impact**

*Impact of the grant scheme depends on the extent to which individual projects are able to synergise efforts with other actors’ and stakeholders.*

The full extent of the impact can only be assessed after selected projects are completed. Media contents and outputs would rarely have been produced without the grant or would have been developed with much less intensity and quality.

Since the programme’s objectives are **targeting key principles** underlying societal changes and ongoing democratic processes, individual media projects will achieve their full impact only if they are **synergized** with efforts from other actors and stakeholders and if this is done on a large scale and over a long period of time. Again, while individual projects are able to contribute to particular sector
or policy impact and produce cases of success, longer-term and sustained impact will depend on the sustainability of the media outlets themselves, which at this moment is extremely fragile as they are not able to survive with non-profit projects.

There was only one media project with a strong partnership component, i.e. network of local radios in Vojvodina lead by Radio 021. What was also significant is that the partnership involved a public institution mandated to take action and investigate the issue about which the media reported. This coalition based on the recognition of joint interest and needs is a good example of how future projects could engage with public institutions, especially independent bodies tasked to oversee specific domains under Chapters 23 and 24. It might be too challenging (e.g. the Monte Royal project on drug awareness docudrama) to develop direct partnership in projects with institutions mandated to enforcement with Chapter 23 and 24 issues (e.g. Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice).

All projects are setting examples and demonstrating that capacities exist for high quality investigative journalism which funding and support can help realize. In this respect, they are contributing to the implementation of the Media Strategy as well as to particular sector strategies, mostly judiciary, fundamental rights, justice, freedom, security-related policies.

Media outputs have in many cases relied on the ground work of CSOs in identifying the issue, key concern and possible practical and policy solutions. While this coalition is natural and can produce impact for both, its effectiveness will depend whether it is ad-hoc or based on a potential for longer-term cooperation and support of each other’s work.

6. Recommendations

6.1. EIDHR

**Recommendation 1.** Continue supporting programme objective but with emphasis on areas directly linked to key challenges in Negotiation Chapters 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) and 24 (Justice, Freedom and Security)

It is recommended to continue supporting programme objectives and themes but identify priority topics for future calls for proposals among the key issues identified in Chapters 23 and 24. Corruption, for example, which was addressed directly only by one project, would deserve to feature more prominently among priority topics.

While the scheme should remain loose in defined sectors and themes to stay true to its objective and allow for initiative of grantees, the linkage to Chapter 23 and 24 would enhance prospects for impact and sustainability.

**Recommendation 2.** Initiate simplification of application documents and procedures for smaller grants

Small grants allow grantees to address very specific issues or tackle problems from a particular perspective. They facilitate access to EU-funding for CSOs that work beyond traditional topics of democracy and human rights and give the applicant an opportunity to learn how to manage an EU grant. In this context, adjustments to the proposals should be allowed at the beginning of the implementation, especially if there has been considerable time between the submission deadline and
the project’s implementation starting date. Lighter application documentation or at least access of the General Conditions in the national language would facilitate the participation of a wider variety of CSOs in EIDHR grant scheme.

**Recommendation 3. Small grants lot should remain an important way to allow for initiative and access to funding by new CSOs**

While small grants by default have lesser chances of bringing about any significant effect and impact, they are nevertheless an important instrument for even mature and developed CSOs to advance and pursue issue of their interest under the broad spectrum of topics of Negotiation Chapters 23 and 24 (as well as other, e.g. Chapter 19 (Social policy and Employment). It allows access for more specific topics (e.g. anti-trafficking) and new CSO who are managing EU grants for the first time. Small grants should be further used in 2 cases where such small budgets are most likely to achieve some effect and impact: 1) Service provision improvement or piloting of services to marginalized groups and 2) Small-scale action at the local level including monitoring and advocacy on Chapter 23, 24 etc.

**Recommendation 4. Ensure support from the Government (i.e. co-financing) facilitates access to EU grant schemes via 1. Government Office for Coop with CS initiates introduction of EIDHR funded projects as eligible for co-financing support, 2. EUD and Government Office for Coop synchronize calls and deadlines as much as possible given state and EU budget cycles and 3. Grantees utilize public calls for financing by Ministries and LSGs for co-financing purposes**

It is recommended that state funding from the Office for Cooperation for Civil Society should be extended to EIDHR grant schemes as projects and activities supported are contributing to similar if not identical types of beneficiaries and issues that other civil society development programmes. Furthermore, co-financing should also be possible from other Ministries (e.g. Ministry of Education, Ministry of Information and Culture) and LSGs. This is a best practice which has ensured sustainability of actions and the absorption capacity of CSOs in new EU member states such as Croatia.

**Recommendation 5. Synergize approaches, timing, duration, themes and size of grants between EIDHR to IPA CSF**

It would be useful for the EIDHR and IPA CSF programmes to offer different but complementary types of support in terms of duration, volume of grant, co-financing etc. (e.g. piloting services via short-term projects of 12-18 months and strategic core projects with up to 48 months duration). While EIDHR could focus on tackling concrete interventions on behalf of CSOs in specific sectors, especially in Negotiation Chapters 23 and 24, IPA CSF could focus on capacity development of CSOs and networks and activities linked to the enabling environment for CSDev.

**Recommendation 6. Encourage cooperation with independent bodies and mechanisms for protection of citizens and human rights through future calls for proposals**

It is recommended that projects identifying concrete, targeted approaches, actions etc. towards public institutions should be more encouraged. Likewise, future calls for proposals should promote cooperation between independent bodies and mechanisms for protection of citizens and human rights. This will allow for greater sustainability of funded projects.
6.2. Refugees & IDPs

**Recommendation 1.** Further housing support is required for refugees and IDPs living in informal collective centres

While the problem of collective centres is likely to be resolved thanks to assistance from IPA 2012, there are still an undetermined number of informal centres in operation across Serbia with substantial populations of refugees and IDPs, including Roma people. Given the extremely poor living conditions in informal centres, housing solutions are urgently required for them. Further support from IPA would be welcomed in this respect in particular targeting IDPs since the needs of refugees can be met through the ongoing Regional Housing Programme. However, it will be first necessary to get a clear understanding of the extent of the problem and a more accurate picture of needs to be covered. This is especially required in order to avoid any overlap with housing solutions implemented by the RHP.

**Recommendation 2.** With time passing, candidates for returns are likely to be fewer and fewer and the need for additional support limited. However, ongoing efforts to improve the conditions for returns of IDPs to Kosovo* and the need to contribute to further stabilisation of the region may provide the rationale for further assistance under IPA.

The number of families interested in returning to Kosovo* is already low at present and without the efforts deployed by the IPA 2012 projects, it would have been still smaller. The reality is that there are no obvious candidates for return. In these circumstances, it will become increasingly difficult for new projects to achieve sufficient results to make them worthwhile. However, considering that such project can help improve the stability of the region, it is recommended that the EU should explore the need for further support, which in any case must be closely linked to housing programme implemented in Kosovo*.

**Recommendation 3.** Further livelihood and income-generation support is required for refugees and IDPs but will be best delivered as part of broader socio-economic development measures at the local level

---

75 A list of informal centres was established in 2009
76 The latter is not covering IDPs
77 Information about the informal centres and its occupants is sparse and often unreliable. The fact that the population of these centres is in a constant state of flux means that needs assessment are particularly challenging.
78 Following the 2014 OESCE assessment of the current status of voluntary return, a high-level conference was organised by the OSCE Mission in Kosovo with the aim of facilitating institutional co-operation for achieving durable solutions. The Conference was held on 27–28 November 2014, and brought together representatives from Ministry for Communities and Return (Pristina), the Office for Kosovo and Metohija and Commissariat for Refugees and Migration (Belgrade), the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (Skopje), and the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (Podgorica), as well as representatives of the UNHCR, European Union, and OSCE field operations in the region. Participants strongly demonstrated willingness to deepen co-operation. Delegations agreed to establish a High-level Forum for Durable Solutions for Displaced Persons from Kosovo that would meet periodically to review the progress made at the technical level, and to provide further guidance and political support. In addition, the delegations agreed to establish a Technical Working Group for Durable Solutions for Displaced Persons from Kosovo, whose members will meet monthly to address specific issues identified, on a topic by topic basis. Issues determined to require inter-governmental co-operation included: property rights, security, land allocation, access to services and civil documentation, housing issues, and modalities for information exchange.
79 The majority of households involved in the IPA 2012 projects expressed their worry about the lack of security and economic opportunities in Kosovo*. In that sense, the support from IPA is central to their decision to return.
With considerable investment into housing through the RHP and IPA, the emphasis at the local level should be laid on helping refugees and IDPs attain self-sufficiency through livelihood and income-generation initiatives. This is necessary to ensure that housing solutions are sustainable. However, these efforts are unlikely to succeed unless conditions for economic development are in place at the local level. Therefore, livelihood and income-generation initiatives should be part of broader socio-economic development measures to develop the local economy. Moreover, instead of targeting only refugees and IDPs, support should be made available to all categories of disadvantaged and vulnerable citizens. This would ultimately contribute to a better integration of refugees and IDPs into the society.

**Recommendation 4. Improve the mainstreaming of refugees and IDPs into the social welfare system**

Support in favour of refugees and IDPs has been numerous and varied. However, the fact that it often consisted in short-term donor-funded initiatives implemented in isolation from each other means that the overall impact is weakened. Durable results can only be achieved by a more proactive approach by the social welfare system, in terms of access to employment, training, education and welfare support. This requires a national budget commitment and a policy of mainstreaming the needs of refugees and IDPs into the national system.

### 6.3. Mental Health

**Recommendation 1. Support the licensing process for CSO social services.**

Licensing process for CSOs providing social services should be supported throughout the project implementation in order to ensure sustainability of new services put in place thanks to the projects.

**Recommendation 2. Ensure Government (relevant beneficiary Ministry) commitment and ownership for more effective implementation and sustainability of grant scheme results**

Evidences from this evaluation show that projects struggle to achieve planned results and ensure sustainability of efforts due to a lack of commitment by government institutions. Systematically devoting enough time and efforts in securing not only the consent but also the firm commitment from government stakeholders and formalising this commitment should be an integral part of mental health projects as it is an imperative in the complex political and administrative environment of Serbia. The primary focus of advocacy activities should be to lobby and put pressure on the Government to establish financing mechanisms for deinstitutionalisation and related social services for persons with mental disabilities. The main message of such efforts should be that “money follows beneficiary”, particularly those who are deinstitutionalised.

**Recommendation 3. Ensure long-term commitment and involvement of EU (and other donors) for this thematic area.**

Support to deinstitutionalisation of persons with mental illness is a long-term investment bringing positive impacts on people’s wellbeing, their empowerment and fulfilment of their fundamental rights. However, de-institutionalisation is a long-term process, which demands structural changes in the approaches and mechanisms of government, but also of society as a whole. That is why; the donor(s) should ensure that investment in this area is long term. So far, the EUD plans to support this thematic area (including other groups of persons with disabilities) in the IPA 2012 and 2013.
However, it is not sure if the following IPA schemes will continue, and this is the critical issue to be considered within IPA programming.

**Recommendation 4. Improve monitoring practices for the grant scheme.**

While monitoring visits are useful in the opinion of the beneficiaries’ themselves and necessary for ensuring accountability, the approach and the tone of monitoring visits should be more constructive and conducted in an empowering manner with more practical guidance and support, which beneficiaries need more than anything else.

**Recommendation 5. Encourage and invest in capacities of rural or smaller communities’ CSOs to develop and implement social services for persons with mental illness in their local areas.**

Service provision by local CSOs in rural areas and particularly in South West and South East Serbia to persons with mental illness is practically non-existent. That is why, the grant scheme only involved organisations from Central Serbia and Vojvodina. The Programme should invest in awareness raising on positive results of the CSOs work with persons with mental illness and experiences gained through implementation of projects to encourage CSOs in other regions to initiate pilot projects for such services. This could be done through reaching out to CSOs across the country through networks, events, meetings, etc.

### 6.4. CBC

**Recommendation 1. Continue supporting comprehensive CBC programme to support development of mechanisms for natural disasters**

In light of the recent floods that affected a large part of CBC programming areas, it is recommended that comprehensive CBC programmes for the prevention and management of natural disasters should continue to be supported by the countries of the region. Actions related to natural disasters are introduced and integrated in each Operational Programme for financial perspective 2014-2020. Also, 3rd CfPs for CRO-SRB and SRB-BIH are targeted calls focused on flood prevention, recovery operations and emergency response. Such good practice should be continued, and EU and national governments’ should take into account best practices and lessons learned from past projects implemented in this field. Eligible support should continue including institutional capacity building, infrastructure and technical equipment.

**Recommendation 2. Establish the practice of sequencing projects.**

During the evaluation, examples were noted of stronger results for projects benefiting from more than one round of assistance over a long period. For areas where support is needed on the long-term to achieve the expected impact (flood protection and relief, environment and natural resources preservation and protection, tourism development, etc.) and which would exceed a usual project cycle, it is suggested to set a project document with overview of the overall needs for support in order to provide a holistic view of what is required to achieve the more sustainable and wider envisaged impacts. Ideally, this would be followed by the preparation of a pipeline of well-sequenced project interventions.

---

80 The IPA CBC Serbia-Montenegro offers a good example of such project: 2012/298-351 Cross-border Flood Protection and Rescue
Another approach to ensuring sequencing of projects falling within different categories/sectors of interventions would be to emphasise the added value section of the proposal format to discuss more in details the a) multiplier effect and b) continuous partnership and its strengthening.

**Recommendation 3.** *Reduce the time for selection of projects and contracting and/or introduce the possibility of adjusting some activities to new context or risk before the start of implementation*

Grant beneficiaries regularly complain about the huge time gap between the call for proposals and the start of project implementation. As situations and contexts change, the implementation of activities is put at risk or do not exactly correspond to needs. Some projects revolving around specific events are particularly affected by delays in the selection and contracting process since results can only be partially achieved or are achieved prior to the project with less means and resources and eventually reduced impact. \[81\]

---

\[81\] The Lim Biathlon includes a Tourist event that happens in August. The project was planned to start at the beginning of the year to allow sufficient time to implement all activities that would improve the manifestation. However, the project itself started in June, which meant that the planned activities were moved and the activities were prepared ahead of the manifestation taking place one year ahead.
**Recommendation 4. Enable mutual learning and sharing best practices and models**

Joint technical Secretariats for CBC have extensive knowledge and experience in managing and coordinating projects implemented with support of EU. Sharing this knowledge with other relevant EU IPA Units in Ministries and CFU would be critical investment in strengthening their practices and approaches to increasingly relevant role in implementation of future IPA assistance. Knowledge sharing could be organised through a range of meetings, workshops, exchange of knowledge events, etc.

### 6.5. Civil society

**Recommendation 1. Future grant schemes should address the goals of the Strategy for enabling environment for Civil Social Development and those of the Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020, esp. monitoring, piloting activities by civil society on EE issues part of future grant schemes**

The grant scheme is aimed at developing capacities with projects whose support ranges between 12-24 months and up to EUR 100,000 budget, making it a small-scale intervention. This inevitably hinders its effectiveness and impact. The EU is the biggest foreign donor for civil society in Serbia. It should use its support in a strategic manner to achieve tangible results and impact. Future calls for proposals should have priorities directly linked to the strategic EU framework (Guidelines for EU support to Civil Society) and the national Strategy, which is currently underpinned only by a Technical Assistance support. This would allow for greater impact on improving enabling environment for CSDev and initiatives of CSOs to *monitoring* specific issues (e.g. tax environment improvement, social service provision, state budget Line 481 funding transparency and accountability) and *piloting activities* by civil society on EE issues part of future grant schemes esp. at local level).

**Recommendation 2. Consultation with SEKO on the project fiche and programme objectives and modalities of support are performed regularly and consistently**

SEKO (Sector civil society organizations) mechanism established in March 2011 by SEIO with support of DFID and SIDA should be further utilized to identify gaps and concrete needs for future specific themes and modalities for support under the grant scheme. As a mechanism developed to enable more systematic and structured inclusion of CSOs in IPA programming and bringing together variety of CSOs working throughout Serbia, this mechanism is best poised to bring together needs of diversified sector and allow CSOs from non-urban areas to have their needs proposed.

**Recommendation 3. Provide strategic civil society sector-oriented, targeted and longer-term support, incl. operating grants, longer-term support to networks/coalitions, sub-grants to grass-root organizations and local level civic initiatives, etc.**

One of key challenges for grantees working on monitoring and policy area is the short timeframe and in many cases limited budgets. Cost-effectiveness driven evaluations put pressure on grantees to present many activities and outputs. Properly designed, implemented projects need beyond 24 months implementation period to be able to produce impact and provide for possibility of sustainability especially in watchdog and policy area interventions and ideally their intervention should focus on impact, not only results and outputs. PRAG rules allow for more flexible approach in
funding and IPA CSF 2011-2012 has identified flexibility in approach as a way to make the support to civil society useful and effective.

Strategic partnerships with network coalitions in areas linked to CSDev or other reform issues of concern to civil society (e.g. education, social services, democracy promotion, civic participation) especially those supporting or including local CSOs (SEKO and other existing ones), should be supported via networking grants with a duration of up to 48 months (24+24 moth) modelled after IPA CSF MB) to achieve results and impact at the national level or operation grants with more advanced (registered) networks. Sub-granting can be an option (but not a must) in cases where this is an instrument useful for achieving the proposed results and impact.

The following are modalities that can be used per current PRAG:

1) **Operating grants** or **support to networks and coalitions** via 24+24 (or 48) month grants measure for advocacy and monitoring networks and coalitions on EE issues

2) **Single call for sub-granting** to support capacity-development of **grass-root organizations** and **local level civic activism** (optionally combined with IPA CSF Multi-beneficiary measure)

3) **Short-term project calls** (12-18 months) for piloting and improving services of state institutions and LSGs related to areas of interest to CSOs/grantees

**Recommendation 4. Synergise in approaches, timing, duration, themes and size of grant between EIDHR to IPA CSF**

It would be useful for the EIDHR and IPA CSF programmes to offer different but complementary types of support in terms of duration, volume of grant, co-financing etc. (e.g. piloting services via short-term projects of 12-18 months and strategic core projects with up to 48 months duration). While EIDHR could focus on tackling concrete interventions on behalf of CSOs in specific sectors, especially in Negotiation Chapters 23 and 24, IPA CSF could focus on capacity development of CSOs and networks and activities linked to the enabling environment for civil society development.

**Recommendation 5. Ensure support from the Government (i.e. co-financing) is maximized**

This should be done in two aspects:

1) EUD and Government Office for Coop synchronize calls and deadlines as much as possible given state and EU budget and cycles

2) Grantees utilize public calls for financing by Ministries and LSGs for co-financing purposes

While contribution to co-financing from the state budget via the Office for Cooperation for Civil Society exists and is useful for grantees, challenge in its utilization remains due to different budgeting and funding cycle between the EU and the state. Furthermore, there have been successful examples of utilization of co-financing from Ministries (e.g. Ministry of Education, Ministry of Information and Culture) and LSGs and this should be further encouraged as a way to improve both cooperation between CSOs and public institutions at all levels and maximize absorption of EU funds. This is a best practice which has ensured sustainability of actions and the absorption capacity of CSOs in new EU member states such as Croatia.
6.6. Media

**Recommendation 1.** Provide support in project preparation, especially in elaboration of indicators. Introduce simplified application documents and procedures.

Grant projects are not a traditional source of funding for media outlets, which need support in the preparation stage to be able to submit and manage projects according to specific requirements from the EU. Moreover, introducing lighter application documents, translating General Conditions into national language could further facilitate access to the grant scheme.

**Recommendation 2.** Continue supporting the stated objectives of the programme and the call.

Sustainability of quality media outlets and local media using investigative journalism as their modus operandi is currently almost impossible without project funding. This makes the programme and the grant scheme extremely important especially as all projects deal with key issues related to other EU-funded projects, thus enabling strong added-value.

**Recommendation 3.** Maintain TA support to grantees as it is essential for smooth project management and administration of grants.

Again, since project funding and thus project management and administration is not the typical operation for a media outlet or production, external support via TA is essential in ensuring smooth management and communication with the EU. There has been relatively high return rate of grantees from previous calls which demonstrate a learning curve, but additional measures such as trainings, mentoring etc. would be welcomed.

**Recommendation 4.** Facilitate further cross-fertilisation between EIDHR and IPA CSF grantees and media outlets supported via the Strengthening Media Freedom grant scheme.

Projects supported under the grant schemes are often covering same or similar issues as projects supported under EIDHR, IPA CSF and other grant schemes. It would be thus extremely useful to ensure better visibility and outreach of EU support to link up (e.g via TA desk, webplatform) media grantees with projects funded under other grant schemes, especially the ones dealing with the same sector/issue.

**Recommendation 5.** Encourage but do not condition partnership with public institutions, especially independent bodies mandated to protect citizens and human rights.

Cooperation with independent bodies mandated to protect citizens and human rights should be encouraged whenever possible as it ensures effective response from the relevant institutions and is a logical follow-up to the media piece or story published by the media. This will effectively and concretely contribute to improvement of the media situation.

**Recommendation 6.** Encourage the use of tools such as websites, social media to help with sustainability and impact of media outputs beyond the project

Websites, social media and other new electronic tools are a very cost-effective way to distribute and ensure outreach of media contents and production developed within supported projects. Since the grant scheme prospects of sustainability are weak, the use of such tools should be encouraged to bridge this problem.
**Recommendation 7.** Consider longer-term support for media to devise financial independence strategies.

The programme would benefit of engaging in strategic and longer-term core support (up to 48 or 24+24 month grants) for strategic investigative journalism and quality media outlets and production as a way to give them short- to mid-term security and help them devise strategies for long-term profitability while maintaining their media and editorial independence.

**Recommendation 8.** Support media production projects in accessing national and local public broadcasters

For projects consisting of media production, access to national and local broadcasters, especially public ones is essential in achieving any effect of their work. They would thus benefit from EU support in facilitating and ensuring broadcasters to commit and follow through on this. Encouraging cooperation between investigative journalism projects and public broadcasters or ensuring public broadcasters projects under the grant scheme are possible directions to be considered. Alternatively, allowing for budgeting of cost for payment air time could also help in this direction.
7. PROPOSAL FOR POLICY OBJECTIVES AND INDICATORS FOR THE NEXT PROGRAMMING PERIOD

7.1. EIDHR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Availability/Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To focus support in areas directly linked to key challenges in Negotiation Chapters 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) and 24 (Justice, Freedom and Security) and Chapter 19 (Social Policy and Employment) | • Significant no of projects approved are in key target areas of Ch 19, 23, 24, e.g. corruption;  
• Improved assessment of Serbia’s performance in areas of Ch19, 23, 24 | • Award notice for EIDHR programme/CfP  
• EC Serbia Annual Progress Report  
• International watchdog HR & democracy annual reports (e.g. TI Corruption Index, AI annual report, Universal Periodical Review report) | • Publicly available (EuropeAid, EUD Serbia website)  
• Publicly available (EUD Serbia, DG ENLARG/NEAR website)  
• Publicly available (TI website, AI website, Universal Periodic Review website) |
| To improve and make more effective the cooperation between CSOs and independent bodies and mechanisms for protection of citizens and human rights | • Increased no of reported cases by independent bodies and mechanisms, esp. those filed by CSOs,  
• Increased no of investigated and addressed by independent bodies and mechanisms, esp. those filed by CSOs,  
• No of proposals for improved regulatory framework or enforcement accepted by | • Ombudsman Annual Report (State and Provincial), Anti-Corruption Agency Annual Report, Equal Rights’ Protection Commissioner Annual Report, Committee for Examining Responsibility for Human Rights’ Violation Annual Report  
• EC Serbia Annual Progress Report | • Publicly available (Ombudsman website, Anti-Corruption Agency website, Equal Rights’ Protection Commissioner website)  
• Publicly available (EUD Serbia, DG ENLARG/NEAR website) |

---

82 Proposed policy objectives are selected to target only identified challenges are part of the evaluation of the EIDHR programme, rather than including sector-wide policy objectives for sector democracy and human rights, since the evaluation focused only on 2 specific EIDHR grant scheme evaluation.
To improve the performance of Serbia in implementing international and regional commitment in the area of HR law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Availability/willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To promote better living conditions among IDPs and contribute to the closure of informal collective centres through durable housing solutions complementing the RHP | - Improved living conditions for IDPs and former occupants of informal collective centres  
- Number of durable housing solutions for IDPs and occupants of informal collective centres  
- Number of informal collective centres closed down | - Annual Report of the Commissariat for Refugees & Migration  
- Project Implementation Report | - Requires regular surveys  
- Requires surveys at local level |
| 2. To support local socio-economic development in municipalities with large populations of refugees and IDPs | - Improved living conditions and enhanced economic opportunities in targeted municipalities  
- Number of income-generation grants for vulnerable households in targeted municipalities  
- Number of skills development training  
- Number of social services addressing | - Annual Report of the Commissariat for Refugees & Migration  
- Project Implementation Report  
- Local Action Plan | - Requires regular surveys  
- Obtaining accurate data is resource-intensive as the population in informal centres are constantly evolving |

7.2. Refugees and IDPs
the needs of vulnerable households in targeted municipalities

- Number of local initiatives supporting local economic development in targeted municipalities

### 7.3. Mental Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Availability/Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **To provide housing and livelihood support to the persons with mental illnesses that are categorised as able to live independently and are currently institutionalised** | - Number / % of people belonging to group of persons with mental illness who benefit from targeted deinstitutionalisation services  
- Level of increase of available housing and accompanying structures for deinstitutionalisation of persons with mental illness | -  | - |
| 2. **To promote strategies and plans for full implementation of targeted social services for people with mental illness who are able to live independently** | - Number of targeted social services addressing the needs of persons with mental illness  
- Breakdown of the national budget, indicating allocation for social service provision  
- Number / % of people with mental illness accessing licensed social services  
- Number and % of licensed social service providers of total number of institutions  
- Number of national minimum service standards adopted via by-laws | -  | - |
3. Adjust the health care financing mechanisms to ensure sustainability of deinstitutionalisation and improve access to health care services for persons with mental illness

- Mechanisms to apply capitation method in place
- Breakdown of the National Health Insurance budget, indicating allocation for deinstitutionalised persons with mental illness
- Health care provisions are compliant with EU standards

7.4. CBC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Availability/willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To encourage cross-border cooperation in the area of prevention and management of natural disasters with the overall aim of contributing to a better level of preparedness to natural disasters in border regions | - Number of joint strategic cross border projects addressing the needs for prevention and adequate response to disasters
- Natural disaster response compliance with EU standards | • | • |
### 7.5. Civil society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Availability/Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To promote quality inclusion of CSOs in policy- and decision-making by institutions, incl. programming of donor assistance (IPA via SEKO) and responsiveness of state institutions to their proposals</td>
<td>• Timely (between 14-30 days) proposals and information made available and response given by CSOs,</td>
<td>• SEKO mechanism website</td>
<td>• Publicly available (SEKO mechanism website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No of trainings, capacity development programmes and events for CSOs,</td>
<td>• Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society annual report</td>
<td>• Publicly available (Office annual report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• % or no of (by)law proposals consulted with CSOs,</td>
<td>• Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society annual report, EC Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 monitoring reports, Monitoring Matrix Serbian annual report</td>
<td>• Publicly available (Office annual report, MM Serbian annual report), internal (EC Guidelines report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No of suggestions by CSO proposed and ratio of their inclusion in final policy or funding documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance financial viability and sustainability of CSOs</td>
<td>• Tax legislation affecting CSOs esp. on individual and company donations improved</td>
<td>• Tax Administration reports</td>
<td>• Publicly available (Tax administration website, DG ENLARG/NEAR website, USAID Sustainability Index, WGI website, Office annual report, MM Serbian annual report), Internal (EC Guidelines report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diversified and balanced financial support obtained by CSOs (individual donations, support by companies, public financing)</td>
<td>EC Progress Report for Serbia USAID NGO Sustainability Index World Giving Index (WGI) Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society annual report, EC Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased no of campaigns by CSOs successfully raise funds from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

83 Proposed policy objectives are selected to target only identified challenges are part of the evaluation of the CSF Serbia programme, rather than including sector-wide policy objectives for sector civil society, since the evaluation focused only on 1 specific CSF grant scheme evaluation and since civil society sector-wide evaluation conducted 1 year ago has proposed still relevant sector-wide policy objectives.
| individuals and companies in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 monitoring reports, Monitoring Matrix Serbian annual report |
7.6. Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Availability/Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **To support investigative journalism in areas linked to key EU reforms** | • Increased no of investigative stories linked to key EU reforms  
• Increased no of debates in different media about issues covered by investigative stories  
• Improved knowledge and support of citizens for key EU reforms | • EC Serbia Annual Progress Report  
• TA to Strengthening Media Freedom reports  
• Eurobarometer  
• ANEM special reports  
• SEE Media Observatory annual and special reports  
• Guidelines for EU Support to Media Freedom and Media Integrity in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 reports | • Publicly available (EUD Serbia, DG ENLARG/NEAR website)  
• Internal reports  
• Eurobarometer survey on reform support  
• Publicly available (ANEM website)  
• Publicly available (SEE Media Observatory website)  
• Internal |

| **To enhance financial stability and editorial independence of quality media and public service broadcasting (PBS)** | • Lack of filed bankruptcy of quality media and positive financial balance for PSB  
• Decreased no of reported cases of pressure on editors | • EC Serbia Annual Progress Report  
• Serbian Business Register Agency (SBRA)  
• Media reports  
• SEE Media Observatory annual and special reports  
• Guidelines for EU Support to Media Freedom and Media Integrity in Enlargement | • Publicly available (EUD Serbia, DG ENLARG/NEAR website)  
• SBRA website  
• Publicly available media reports  
• Publicly available (SEE Media Observatory website)  
• Internal |

---

84 Proposed policy objectives are selected to target only identified challenges are part of the evaluation of the Media programme, rather than including sector-wide policy objectives for the media sector and since media sector-wide evaluation conducted 1 year ago has proposed still relevant sector-wide policy objectives.
| To strengthen capacity of journalists in investigative journalism | • Increased no of investigative and better quality of stories  
• Increased no of section in media outlets with investigative content | • TA to Strengthening Media Freedom reports  
• Grant scheme project reports/evaluation  
• EC Serbia Annual Progress Report  
• SEE Media Observatory annual and special reports  
• Guidelines for EU Support to Media Freedom and Media Integrity in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 reports | • Internal reports  
• Publicly available ([EUD Serbia, DG ENLARG/NEAR website](https://europa.eu))  
• Publicly available ([SEE Media Observatory website](https://see-media-observatory.eu))  
• Internal |
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Foreword

This Report is the final outcome of the *Evaluation of grant contracts implemented and financed by IPA and EIDHR*, which was carried out by IBF from 15 September to 4 December 2014.

The Report was revised on the basis of comments and suggestions from the EU Delegation in Serbia and other relevant stakeholders invited to the presentation workshop on 4 December 2014.
1. Executive summary

1.1. Purpose

As part of its regular monitoring & evaluation activities, the EU Delegation in Belgrade has initiated the evaluation of seven ongoing IPA and EIDHR-funded grant schemes, including the IPA 2012 Support to the reconstruction of flood affected areas in Serbia (EU Flood Relief Programme).¹

The aim of the evaluation is to assess results achieved so far by the various calls of proposals launched under these programmes in order to draw lessons for the future and inform the next programming cycle. In total, 5 grant projects were awarded without call for proposals (direct award) under the EU Flood Relief programme for a total amount of EUR 30m.

1.2. Evaluation methodology

The grants were evaluated against the five criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC - relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability.

Unlike other evaluations, this is not thematic but is ‘grant scheme specific’. The evaluation outputs will serve to enhance reporting on grant impact to Brussels and therefore focused on the lessons learned from assistance implementation, weaknesses and strengths of delivered assistance, coordination and alignment with on-going reforms, key implementation success factors, most effective types of assistance that provided sustainable results and future needs to be addressed by the new financial perspective 2014-2020.

In accordance with the ToR, the evaluation process was carried out through three phases: 1) Desk Phase, 2) Field Phase and 3) Synthesis Phase.

Given that all five grant projects are still ongoing, it was not possible to evaluate sustainability and impact. The evaluators, however, have tried to assess the likelihood of grants achieving sustainability and impact.

In addition to the evaluation results presented in this report, there are separate field visit reports for each flood-affected municipality visited, which can be found in Annexes.

1.3. Evaluation of the Flood Relief programme

1.3.1. Results achieved to date

Overall, the Flood Relief programme is on track and results achieved so far should make it possible to reach and even exceed original targets.

Regarding the housing component², by the end of October a total of 787 households have been selected for reconstruction works and 130 households for the construction of new houses across 31 municipalities.

¹ A separate report (Report I) covers six other grant scheme programmes which were included in this evaluation.
² UNOPS, ASB, DRC, Help
According to these numbers, the programme should cover approximately 4% of the total number of houses reported damaged or destroyed in the RNA. The programme will cover 57% of the needs originally identified by the municipalities. However, these figures are not yet final. By the end of October, 28 housing contracts had been signed for a total value of EUR 4.4m. This represents almost 50% of all resources allocated to housing across the four housing grants. The great majority of works on these contracts should be completed by the end of the year depending on weather conditions.

Regarding the **economic component**, 389 small businesses have been selected for income-generation grants. This corresponds to 25% of needs identified by municipalities. Although some tenders had been launched, no contracts were awarded by the end of October.

Regarding support to **agriculture**, 17,561 small scale farming families have been selected to receive recovery support consisting of seeds and seedlings, animal feed, livestock and/or equipment. By the end of October 2014, 8 contracts for a total value of EUR 1.3m had been awarded. This represents 19% of all resources allocated for agricultural packages.

Regarding the **public buildings component**, 23 contracts have been signed for a total value of EUR 1.2m. This represents 70% of all resources allocated to public buildings. Works should be completed in all educational establishments in the course of November.

Regarding support to **public infrastructure**, a contract has been signed for a total value of EUR 4.5m with Serbian Roads to rehabilitate a major communication axis for the municipality of Krupanj. This represents 100% of all resources allocated to the component.

The programme is also ensuring the effective operation of the **Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief**, in particular through the provision of salaries to staff members and consultancy fees of professional engineers. End of October, 4 contracts had been signed for a total value of EUR 0.2m or 20% of the total amount allocated to this sub-component.

**1.3.2. Main findings about the Flood Relief Programme**

- **Relevance**

  Finding 1. Overall, the relevance of the EU programme to Serbia’s recovery efforts is highly satisfactory

  Finding 2. The FAO choose to cast the net of its support as wide as possible with the objective of addressing the most pressing needs of a majority of small scale farming families. As a result, the scope of the initial proposal was reduced in agreement with Serbian authorities and the EU

  Finding 3. The assistance for the reconstruction of public buildings appears fully justified by the scale of damages and losses incurred

---

3 In total, the budget for the housing component amounts to EUR 9.8m
4 UNOPS, ASB, DRC, Help
5 including reconstruction materials and/or equipment and furniture
6 FAO
7 In total, the budget for agricultural packages amount to EUR 6.6m
8 UNOPS
b) **Efficiency**

**Finding 4.** The decision to award direct grants without calls for proposals was fully justified given the circumstances and the nature and scale of needs.

**Finding 5.** The aid was mobilised in record time for an EU programme and in a very efficient manner but it still took too long from the point of view of flood victims.

**Finding 6.** The selection of grantees to implement the assistance appears to be well justified as they brought valuable expertise, capacity and local knowledge.

**Finding 7.** Eligible municipalities have demonstrated a high level of commitment and support to the programme in spite of capacity and resource constraints. This is reflected by the excellent cooperation established with EU grantees and the degree of involvement of municipal staff in programme activities.

**Finding 8.** The common methodology adopted for the housing component was a useful tool to ensure transparency and rigour in the selection of beneficiaries.

**Finding 9.** However, the pre-selection made by municipalities was not subject to such a rigorous methodology.

**Finding 10.** The collection of applicants’ evidences in support of applications was particularly demanding for the beneficiaries. From this point of view, support from the EU grantees was very welcome and instrumental in ensuring a smooth selection process. The main reason for the latter to stretch over more than one month was however the lengthy issuance of legal acts.

**Finding 11.** Issues of property ownerships proved a major obstacle to the inclusion of some applicants, which was overcome only in some cases and with difficulty.

**Finding 12.** Re-categorisation of buildings slowed down the selection of beneficiaries. However, it was an important process in order to prevent funds being wasted on the restoration of seriously damaged houses.

**Finding 13.** The weather conditions, the capacity of contractors to manage several contracts in parallel and irregularities during the legal act process are the three main causes for concerns regarding the continuation of the programme.

**Finding 14.** In some cases, municipalities did not prepare a preliminary list of beneficiaries for income-generation grants burdening the finite capacities of EU grantees.

**Finding 15.** The FAO programme’s straightforward design made it possible to produce quick and large-scale results and gives guarantee that all targets will be achieved on time.

**Finding 16.** There was a danger of overlap between the income-generation grants and the FAO support to farmers but this has been well addressed.

**Finding 17.** The problems encountered during the execution of works on public buildings illustrate the challenges faced by the programme.

**Finding 18.** The EUD has shown a high-level of flexibility and responsiveness which is essential to the smooth implementation of the programme. In a few respects, however, there is room for improvement.
c) **Effectiveness**

**Finding 19.** Overall, the programme is on track and results achieved so far should make it possible to reach and even exceed original targets.

**Finding 20.** The EU grants are providing a level of support which corresponds to the needs of flood victims included in the programme.

**Finding 21.** The bias in favour of large households was justified but it sometimes left out people in real need.

**Finding 22.** The programme could not address the issue of tenants living in damaged properties.

**Finding 23.** In some cases, the questionable categorisation of buildings resulted in sub-optimal form of support.

**Finding 24.** Support was well proportioned to the needs of small businesses. However, larger businesses which incurred far greater damages are left without any support.

**Finding 25.** The priority given to schools was understandable although the ordeal of households made homeless by the floods seem more acute.

**Finding 26.** Additional needs are arising as the programme is being implemented. The latter will not be able to accommodate all of them within existing resources.

**Finding 27.** The emphasis on reaching out the greatest number of people means that the FAO programme provides simple forms of support. The approach adopted in agreement with Serbian authorities and the EU was not intended to address more complex and wider needs.

**Finding 28.** Despite some delays compared to the original plan, the challenge of minimising disruption to the school year is about to be met.

**Finding 29.** The support to the Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief has been effective, helping in particular the organisation fulfil its coordinating and supervising role to the best of its possibilities.

**Finding 30.** Unless more is done for preventing floods in the future, some of the programme’s results are at risk of further flooding.

**Finding 31.** The EU Programme is likely to make a decisive contribution to the recovery of flooded areas.

**Finding 32.** One of the positive side-effects of the programme is the reinforcement of local authorities’ capacities in dealing with the consequences of natural disasters.

**Finding 33.** The programme is a real chance for public institutions to perform long-due investment in their facilities and equipment.

**d) Sustainability**

**Finding 30.** Unless more is done for preventing floods in the future, some of the programme’s results are at risk of further flooding.

**e) Impact**

**Finding 31.** The EU Programme is likely to make a decisive contribution to the recovery of flooded areas.

**Finding 32.** One of the positive side-effects of the programme is the reinforcement of local authorities’ capacities in dealing with the consequences of natural disasters.

**Finding 33.** The programme is a real chance for public institutions to perform long-due investment in their facilities and equipment.

1.3.3. Main recommendations for the Flood Relief programme

a) **Recommendations related to the ongoing EU Flood Relief programme**

**Recommendation 1.** Prioritise the execution of works taking into account the beneficiaries’ current living conditions.

**Recommendation 2.** Ensure additional support for housing recovery in affected municipalities.
Recommendation 3. Perform a new needs assessment in affected municipalities to ensure that all households in need are thoroughly identified and covered

Recommendation 4. Consider reviewing the eligibility/selection criteria in particular regarding ownership issues to improve the programme’s coverage among the most vulnerable households

Recommendation 5. Transfer households living in particularly risky areas to safer locations and ensure connection to main public utilities

Recommendation 6. Introduce some flexibility regarding decisions on new constructions

Recommendation 7. Consider reviewing reconstruction standards so that decent living conditions can be ensured to the most vulnerable households

Recommendation 8. Draw lessons learned and share best practices before the next round of support

b) Other recommendations

Recommendation 9. Provide additional support to the agricultural sector to deal with the consequences of floods and strengthen the viability of small and medium scale farms

Recommendation 10. Improve the planning and coordination of flood prevention and management through effective systems and strategies in line with the EC Floods directive

Recommendation 11. Support Serbia in expanding the total area of its territory protected against floods through investment into strategic flood prevention and mitigation infrastructure

Recommendation 12. Build the capacity of local authorities to prevent and manage natural disasters, including flooding

Recommendation 13. Support investment into flood prevention mechanisms at the local level

Recommendation 14. Promote regional cooperation on flood prevention and management in particular through the cross-border programmes

Recommendation 15. The government should take measures to encourage owners of properties in flood risk areas to take out insurance

2. Evaluation methodology

2.1. General approach

The methodological approach is positioned within the context of recent EU Delegation sector evaluations plus the Serbian European Integration Office (SEIO) donor assistance sector evaluation (2013) and focuses on capturing policy lessons learned from a selection of grant schemes implemented under IPA and EIDHR 2009-2012.

The ToR recommended the use of the evaluation methodology defined in the DG ELARG Evaluation Guide9. In this context, the grants were evaluated against the five criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC - relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability (See Inception Report). All evaluation questions detailed on pages 6/7 of the ToR served as a basis for the evaluation with new questions

9 http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/index_en.htm
added to enhance evaluation outputs. Key judgement criteria were utilised to effectively answer the questions in the desk and field phases (see Inception Report). Given its peculiarity and the early stage of its implementation, the Flood Relief Programme has not been evaluated strictly against the OECD-DAC criteria although issues of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability were examined during the evaluation.

Unlike other evaluations, this is not thematic but is ‘grant scheme specific’ to determine success and sustainability of outputs. The evaluation outputs will serve to enhance reporting on grant impact to Brussels and therefore focused on the lessons learned from assistance implementation, weaknesses and strengths of delivered assistance, coordination and alignment with on-going reforms, key implementation success factors, most effective types of assistance that provided sustainable results and future needs to be addressed by the new financial perspective 2014-2020.

The methodological approach was designed to

- capture implementation progress/impact lessons through data review and stakeholder interviews to improve the efficiency of grant scheme implementation in the remaining programme period
  - Assess the design of planning documents and provide policy recommendations for improving future programme impact.

Broadly, the evaluation of selected grants and subsequent policy recommendations was based on:

- How project design and implemented activities to date are realising stated objectives
- The effectiveness of the particular project approach to realise stated objectives
- Impact of external factors on project progress and how the project has adapted accordingly
- The approach and performance of project management/stakeholders/project steering committees in realising project objectives and coordinating with same sector projects.

Due to the importance of emergency flood relief assistance, all five flood relief grants were included in the evaluation sample in line with the Inception Report. The evaluation concentrated on determining whether grants are being implemented in line with their contracts and are addressing the needs of final beneficiaries. The evaluation also analysed additional flood relief needs, which the grants could not cover and would deserve additional support from the EU. It also took into account needs arising from the September floods in Kladovo, Majdanpek and Njegotin. The evaluation determined whether additional funding from IPA 2014 for recovery needs make sense and if so, which of the five grant beneficiaries would be the most suited to implement additional recovery actions.

2.2. Evaluation stages

In accordance with the ToR, the evaluation process was carried out through three phases: 1) Desk Phase, 2) Field Phase and 3) Synthesis Phase (See Inception Report). In addition, a presentation of the

---

10 The five flood relief grants were designed to cover approximately 10% of the recovery needs assessed in the Recovery Needs Assessment (RNA) carried out in the aftermath of the floods. Under IPA 2014, another €62m have been earmarked for floods prevention and road networks (3d category roads). It could also include additional funds for recovery actions through a top up to existing floods relief grants, in particular in order to deal with the consequences of the September floods in Kladovo, Majdanpek and Njegotin.
draft Evaluation Report will be organised and a discussion will follow in order to capture and incorporate the feedback from the main stakeholders into the Final Report.

In addition to the desk analysis to prepare the Inception Report, analysis of relevant documentation provided by the EU Delegation has been carried out throughout the assignment.

The evaluators visited 10 municipalities covered by the five flood relief grants as shown below. The schedule of field visits and a list of all meetings held is presented in Annexes.

Table 1 Sample of flood relief beneficiary municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>ASB</th>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>UNOPS</th>
<th>FAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Čačak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kragujevac</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraljevo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krupanj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali Žvornik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obrenovac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraćin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabac</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smederevska Palanka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svilajnac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velika Plana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 municipalities</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The field phase involved face to face interviews with selected stakeholders and grant beneficiaries. Interviews were conducted on the basis of a questionnaire and a field visit report was completed after each visit (see Annexes).

Interviews with selected projects included grant beneficiaries, final beneficiaries any other relevant stakeholders. This multi-stakeholder approach (“triangulation”) incorporated interview feedback from the main final beneficiaries which was cross-checked with the perspectives of the grant beneficiaries/grant project manager to determine the actual impact of the grant. Although more resource intensive, the value of triangulation is its potential to expose unique differences or meaningful information that may have remain undiscovered with the use of only one approach or data collection technique in the grant scheme evaluation.

The data collected in the field or through the desk research was consolidated and analysed during the synthesis phase. The evaluation questions and judgment criteria (see Inception Report for details) was used to draw conclusions regarding the performance of each project and make informed policy recommendations for the future.

Given that projects are still ongoing\(^{11}\), it was not possible to evaluate sustainability and impact. The evaluators, however, have tried to assess the likelihood of grants achieving sustainability and impact.

In addition to the evaluation results presented in this report, there are separate field visit reports for each municipality visited, which are to be found in Annexes.

---

\(^{11}\) For example, some flood relief grants were signed as late as August 2014
3. Evaluation of EU flood relief programme

3.1. Background & context

3.1.1. The consequences and responses to the May 2014 floods

The May 2014 floods were caused by exceptionally strong rainfall levels, which provoked river overflows. They spread over 80,000 km² and directly affected over 1.5 million people. The floods caused also significant economic hardship for much of the population in Serbia and disproportionately affected poor and vulnerable people. According to the Recovery Needs Assessment (RNA) which the Government of the Republic of Serbia conducted immediately after the floods\textsuperscript{12}, the total value of damages and losses incurred in the 24 most affected municipalities\textsuperscript{13} is estimated at EUR 1,525 million, of which EUR 885 million (57% of the total effects) represent the value of destroyed physical assets, and EUR 640 million (43% of the total) refer to losses in production. When considering the additional affected municipalities, the total value of disaster effects would rise to EUR 1.7 billion\textsuperscript{14}.

The RNA estimated that in total 16,610 private buildings were flooded across the 24 most-affected municipalities. As shown in Table 2, the greatest numbers were recorded in Obrenovac (5,292), Paraćin (1,977), Svilajnac (1,816), Jagodina (1,529) and Lazarevac (1,230).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Houses</th>
<th>As %</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Obrenovac</td>
<td>72,493</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>31.68%</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Paraćin</td>
<td>55,454</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Svilajnac</td>
<td>23,596</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>10.93%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Jagodina</td>
<td>69,981</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lazarevac</td>
<td>59,366</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kraljevo</td>
<td>118,343</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Smederevska Palanka</td>
<td>52,285</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>South and East Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kragujevac</td>
<td>174,229</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Šabac</td>
<td>118,040</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Čačak</td>
<td>115,303</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Krupanj</td>
<td>17,751</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ub</td>
<td>29,562</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Valjevo</td>
<td>92,487</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Ljubovija</td>
<td>14,615</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Bajina Baštta</td>
<td>27,342</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Koceljeva</td>
<td>13,990</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Osečina</td>
<td>13,139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Trstenik</td>
<td>43,998</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Loznica</td>
<td>82,157</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Varvarin</td>
<td>18,254</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Velika Plana</td>
<td>41,985</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>South and East Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Kragujevac</td>
<td>12,351</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Šid</td>
<td>12,752</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>Šumadija and West Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Mali Zvornik</td>
<td>34,957</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>Vojvodina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,314,430 16,610 100% 24

Source: RNA, Statistical Office Municipalities and Regions of Serbia, 2011

\textsuperscript{12} The process of assessment was initiated on 9 June and was completed by July 10, 2014. It received the support from with support from the EU, the UN and the World Bank.

\textsuperscript{13} Obrenovac, Paraćin, Ub, Čačak, Krupanj, Šabac, Mali Zvornik, Velika Plana, Loznica, Trstenik, Jagodina, Šid, Valjevo, Osečina, Varvarin, Koceljeva, Kosjerić, Kraljevo, Kragujevac, Smederevska Palanka, Svilajnac, Ljubovija, Lazarevac and Bajina Bašta (see map Annex 6)

\textsuperscript{14} RNA, executive summary.
The floods also caused considerable damages to public buildings and infrastructure, in particular educational\textsuperscript{15} and health institutions\textsuperscript{16}. Losses included equipment, furniture and materials, which are essential for the daily functioning of these institutions.

The government of Serbia set up a dedicated account for private donations thanks to which RSD 4.5 billion (approximately EUR 38 million) were raised. At a conference organised in Brussels on 16 July, international donor countries and international financial institutions pledged almost \textbf{EUR 1 billion} to support Serbia with its recovery efforts consisting of approximately EUR 106 million of grant support (out of which EUR 80 million from the EU\textsuperscript{17}) and EUR 879 million of loans from IFIs. Finally, the country applied to the EU Solidarity Fund\textsuperscript{18} which is to provide EUR 60.2 million by December 2014.

The Serbian parliament adopted a \textbf{special law} on 18 July 2014 which applies to all cities and municipalities affected by the May floods\textsuperscript{19}. In line with this law, the Government issued a decree establishing a recovery programme for flood victims\textsuperscript{20}.

A new government institution – the \textbf{Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief (ORFR)} - was established on 22 May 2014 to ensure the efficient coordination of assistance to the inhabitants of the flooded areas. After organising the emergency support to the population in the immediate aftermath of the floods, the Office is at present implementing the Government recovery programme and coordinating recovery efforts, in particular to ensure that funding from the State and the international community is effectively implemented.

The decree establishing the Government recovery programme specifies the amount of \textbf{state compensation} each citizen affected by the floods is entitled to in proportion of the level of damages sustained (see Table 3). In case of destroyed houses, the Government recovery programme foresees the construction of standardised houses\textsuperscript{21}. Financial compensation is disbursed in all other cases i.e. when buildings can be repaired or it is not possible to build a new house on the existing plot.

\textsuperscript{15} The floods wave severely damaged the 35 educational institution buildings: 12 preschool institutions; 13 elementary schools and 10 secondary schools located in seven municipalities. In those buildings the educational activities are realised with 45,329 children/students - of which 14% are preschool children, 62% are elementary school students and 25% are secondary school students (RNA)

\textsuperscript{16} The RNA recorded a total of 74 health damaged facilities across 16 municipalities

\textsuperscript{17} EUR 30 million from IPA 2012 and EUR 50 million from IPA 2014

\textsuperscript{18} The European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) was set up to respond to major natural disasters and express European solidarity to disaster-stricken regions within Europe.

\textsuperscript{19} Law on Post-Flood Rehabilitation in the Republic of Serbia. The law targets 60 municipalities with a total population of 2,803,324 and is valid for one year.

\textsuperscript{20} Decree on the Establishment of the Government Recovery Programme for Damaged Family Houses

\textsuperscript{21} The surface of the new house depends on the size of the household: 60 m\textsuperscript{2} for one-two members of household, 80 m\textsuperscript{2} for up to four-member households and 100 m\textsuperscript{2} for five or more member households.
A crisis team was established in each municipality to deal with emergency and recovery efforts at the
local level. Local self-governments are responsible for assessing the damages/losses to the housing stock
on their territory. Based on this assessment, they issue legal acts (rešenje) to affected citizens giving
right to State compensation. The validity of these legal acts is verified by the ORFR, which orders the
construction of new houses or make payments to final recipients in line with the law.

By the end of October 2014, a total of 15,684 legal acts had been issued by 60 municipalities affected by
the floods (the majority of which in category III and IV) as shown in Figure 1.

![Number of issued acts](image)

**Figure 1**

The total value of State compensation amounted to RSD 3,753,746,912 (approximately EUR 31,400,000)
by the end of October 2014. The biggest number of recipients of State compensation was in Obrenovac
(42%) and Svilajnac (14%), which reflects the scale of damages in these two municipalities (see Annex 1
Issued legal acts per municipality).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of damages</th>
<th>Categories of damages</th>
<th>State Support value in dinars and equivalent in Euros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damages ranging from minor to severe</td>
<td>Category I</td>
<td>RSD 120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>RSD 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category III</td>
<td>RSD 250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category IV</td>
<td>RSD 350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category V</td>
<td>RSD 600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damages beyond repair</td>
<td>Category VI</td>
<td>1-2 member household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category VI</td>
<td>Up to 4-member household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category VI</td>
<td>5 or more member household</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Categories of damages – Decree on the Establishment of the Government Recovery Programme for Damaged Family Houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of damages</th>
<th>State Support value in dinars and equivalent in Euros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category I</td>
<td>RSD 120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>RSD 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III</td>
<td>RSD 250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category IV</td>
<td>RSD 350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category V</td>
<td>RSD 600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category VI</td>
<td>1-2 member household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category VI</td>
<td>Up to 4-member household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category VI</td>
<td>5 or more member household</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief, 31 October 2014
3.1.2. Overview of the EU support

The EU programme “Support to the reconstruction of flood affected areas in Serbia” (IPA) was adopted on 25 July 2014 to assist Serbia’s recovery efforts. The funding (EUR 30 million) is re-allocated from previous programmes under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA). The programme is implemented in the 24 of the worst affected municipalities situated in four regions of Serbia22.

The programme consists of four results:

1. Reconstruction and repair of public buildings in selected municipalities and purchasing of necessary equipment for regular provision of public services.
2. Implementation of activities related to private housing units through delivery of building construction material packages and reconstruction of damaged private housing
3. Provision of economic self-reliance support to the most vulnerable affected persons (entrepreneurs, SMEs and agriculture holding owners) through delivery of small grants for basic facilities reparations, renewing of equipment and operating materials to restart and maintain the business operations, in a number of selected municipalities.
4. Reconstruction of sections of the heavily damaged road and public infrastructure network

The programme is implemented through five grants awarded without call for proposals (“direct award procedure”) to three international organisations (UNOPS/IOM and FAO) and three NGOs (Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund, Danish Refugee Council and Help). These organisations were already involved during the floods in providing emergency support to affected municipalities and assisted with the needs assessment. They also all contributed to the design of the EU programme in cooperation with the ORFR, the Serbian European Integration Office (SEIO) and the EU Delegation in Serbia. The sharing of work, the distribution of municipalities and a common methodology23 to implement the programme (see next section 3.1.3) were agreed among the five grantees prior to the signature of contracts, which took place in July-August 2014.

While the FAO grant is focused exclusively on emergency support for small-scale farm families, the other four grants (UNOPS, ASB, DRC and Help) deal with housing support and income generation for the most vulnerable households in the 24 most affected municipalities.

The housing support consists either of reconstruction materials and works for houses belonging to categories I to V or the construction of completely new buildings for houses belonging to category VI. The beneficiaries of housing support (both reconstructed and new houses) are also provided with a set of furniture and domestic appliances24. In total, the EU programme is to provide 889 housing solutions (760 reconstruction and 129 new constructions) in the 24 selected municipalities (about 5% of the total 16,610 houses assessed as flooded)25.

The income-generation support consists of reconstruction materials & works for businesses premises and/or equipment and materials for businesses. In total, the EU programme will provide income-generation support to 287 businesses in the 24 selected municipalities.

---

22 Belgrade (2), South and East Serbia (3), Sumadija and West Serbia (18) and Vojvodina (1).
23 Implementation Methodology for Support to Flood Victims in Serbia (see Annex 10)
24 In some municipalities, this support was not connected to housing solutions. See section 3.2 below.
25 It was agreed that UNOPS would also address needs in any other municipality affected by floods whenever there is no other project/donor available (see below 3.2.1).
In addition, UNOPS has been entrusted with the renovation of 30 public buildings, the provision of improved living conditions in temporarily shelters, the rehabilitation of up to 21 km of local roads, the implementation of preventive measures against infectious disease, capacity building support to the ORFR and the communication about and visibility of the programme’s activities and results. Table 4 below summarises the key data about the five flood relief grants.

Table 4 Key data about flood relief grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>EU contribution</th>
<th>Co-financing</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Range of support</th>
<th>Target municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Housing center, IDC, Divac Foundation</td>
<td>€ 3,060,203.04</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>31/07/2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Housing solutions and income-generation for vulnerable households</td>
<td>Bajina Bašta, Ljubovija, Loznica, Mali Zvornik, Osečina, Šabac, Šid, Valjevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Eneca</td>
<td>€ 2,581,744.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26/07/2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Housing solutions and income-generation for vulnerable households</td>
<td>Čačak, Jagodina, Koceljeva, Paracin, Smederevska Palanka, Ub, Velika Plana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>€ 2,360,104.84</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24/07/2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Housing solutions and income-generation for vulnerable households</td>
<td>Kosjerić, Kraljevo, Lazarevac, Svilajnac, Trstenik, Varvarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>€ 14,000,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>04/07/2014</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Housing solutions and income-generation for vulnerable households, renovation of public buildings, roads rehabilitation, capacity building for Office for Reconstruction &amp; Flood Relief, infectious disease prevention, visibility &amp; communication</td>
<td>All 24 municipalities (Obrenovac and Krupanj in priority) + additional 7 municipalities (Gornji Milanovac, Pozega, Smederevo, Malo Crniče, Lajkovac, Mionica and Ruma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>€ 8,000,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29/07/2014</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Livelihood support to small scale family farms</td>
<td>All 24 municipalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total € 30,002,051.88

Table 5 shows the targets set in the original proposals for housing and income-generation support.

Table 5 Original targets housing support & income-generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Target for reconstruction*</th>
<th>Target for new houses*</th>
<th>Target for income-generating grants*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELP</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* including household furniture and appliances  
* including reconstruction materials and/or equipment and materials

3.1.3. Implementation methodology

a) Housing and income-generation support (UNOPS, DRC, ASB, Help)

The EU grantees agreed on a common methodology prior to the signature of the contract. The maximum level of support for the reconstruction of damaged houses, the construction of new houses and income-generation grants to small businesses was jointly agreed in that context (see below Table

---

26 Common methodology
6). The support for reconstruction works can only be used to restore buildings to their former state i.e. how they used to be before the floods.

### Table 6 Maximum level of support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Maximum amount</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of damaged house</td>
<td>€ 6,500.00</td>
<td>For building belonging to categories I - V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of new house</td>
<td>€ 20,000.00</td>
<td>For building belonging to category VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and domestic appliance</td>
<td>€ 2,200.00</td>
<td>For beneficiaries of reconstructed/new houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income-generation grant</td>
<td>€ 5,500.00</td>
<td>Including reconstruction of businesses premises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The methodology sets outs the steps for implementing the rehabilitation of damaged buildings, the construction of new buildings and the distribution of income-generation grants.

Regarding **housing support**, the process starts with the EU grantee contacting and explaining the project cycle and methodology to their counterparts in the municipalities. Municipalities are responsible for drawing the **preliminary list** of potential beneficiaries based on their own assessment and requests received from their citizens.

A **Joint Selection Committee** (JSC) is set up in each beneficiary municipality consisting of representatives from the local authorities and the municipal Crisis Team, the local Centre for Social Work, the ORFrAnd the grantee. The JSCs work in line with rules of procedures adopted on their first meeting and which are common to all four projects. The rules of procedures set out the criteria for selecting beneficiaries as well as the list of documents that applicants must submit in order to be eligible.

The EU grantee and municipal staff (civil engineers and members of local Centres for Social Work) carry out **field visits** to verify the eligibility of potential beneficiaries on the preliminary list, assess the damages incurred on their property and help households putting together their application dossier in line with the criteria defined in the rules of procedures. As a result of this field work, the list of potential beneficiaries is revised and presented to the JSC together with application dossiers submitted by households.

The JSC is responsible for reviewing and **scoring application dossiers** against the criteria set out in the methodology which give priority to larger households among the most vulnerable and disadvantaged categories of citizens. The applicants reaching the highest scores are selected within the funds available. Selection results are displayed on the information board in the municipal hall. There is a 8-day period for citizens to lodge complaints.

Upon adoption of the final list of beneficiaries by the JSC, the EU grantee carries out additional field visits together with municipal engineers to **draw bills of quantities** on basis of which tender dossiers are prepared. The tender is launched after approval from the EUD in Belgrade. The EU grantee is also responsible for evaluating tenders and award contracts.

The Construction Inspection departments within the municipalities are in charge of supervising the **execution of works**, which are also monitored by the EU grantee.

---

27 These amounts are indicated as unit prices in the budget proposals.
28 These include evidence of ownership and proof of residence, the legal act issued by the municipality, a declaration by the applicant, an identity card, and information about household members, health situation, incomes and benefits.
29 The latter step requires approval from the EUD in Belgrade.
Regarding income-generation grants, municipalities are responsible for drawing up a preliminary list of flooded small businesses owned by vulnerable categories of citizens. The EU grantee carries out field visits to verify the eligibility of potential beneficiaries on the preliminary list, assess the damages incurred on their property/equipment/materials and help business owners putting together their application dossier in line with the criteria defined in the methodology.

The EU grantee reviews and scores application dossiers against the criteria which give priority to business owners among the most vulnerable and disadvantaged categories of citizens. The applicants reaching the highest scores are selected within the funds available. Selection results are displayed on the information board in the municipal hall. There is a 8-day period for citizens to lodge complaints.

The EU grantee then carries out additional field visits to draw bills of quantities on basis of which tender dossiers are prepared. The tender is launched according to a fast-track negotiated procedure. If and when appropriate, the EUD grants its prior approval so that grantees can enter into direct negotiation with selected contractors. The EU grantee is also responsible for evaluating tenders, awarding contracts and supervising the execution of works.

b) Support to small scale farming families (FAO)

The FAO has developed a methodology to distribute assistance to small-scale family farmers affected by the floods in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture, local governments and the Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief. The methodology is designed to ensure that the assistance reaches as many households as possible, providing farmers with a range of supplies vital for the continuation of their agricultural activities and the restoration of their livelihoods. Selection criteria give priority to larger households facing the greatest disadvantages, due to their economic or social situation. The delivery of supplies is planned taking into account the agricultural calendar e.g. winter wheat seeds must be delivered by mid-October to correspond with the sowing season in Serbia.

In a first step, the FAO carries out information visits to the 24 recipient municipalities in order to brief responsible municipal staff about the type of support available under the grant, the eligible target group and the procedure for selecting beneficiaries and distributing them the packages.

In a second step, the municipality disseminates the FAO-developed questionnaire to potential beneficiaries through the local village councils in order to collect information about the beneficiary, the size of the household, the type of holding, the damages/losses sustained and the priority needs. Each applicant had to select three priorities among the 23 proposed packages consisting of seeds and seedlings, animal food, livestock and equipment as shown in Table 7:

Table 7 FAO 23 assistance packages to small scale family farms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seeds packages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 250kg winter wheat seeds + 300kg NPK fertilizer; 2. 200kg barley seeds + 300kg NPK fertilizer; 3. 150kg winter peas seeds + 400kg NPK; 4. 50,000 maize seeds + 400kg NPK fertilizer; 5. 20 kg alfalfa seeds + 400kg NPK fertilizers; 6. 20 kg clover seeds +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

30 In addition to the social situation of the business owner’s household, one of the main criteria is that the business should have been operating when floods occurred.

31 based on one of the exceptions foreseen in Annexe IV of the standard grant contract (when an emergency situation has been recognised by the European commission.

32 Tenderers are already pre-selected by the EU grantee, which are inviting them to submit a bid within 15 days only. The EU grantee awards the contract to the cheapest compliant offer.

33 The latter step requires also approval from the EUD in Belgrade.
Seedlings packages

7. 300 cherry seedlings; 8. 300 plum seedlings; 9. 300 sower cherry seedlings; 10. 1800 blackberry seedlings; 11. 1800 raspberry seedlings

Animal feed packages

12. 300kg cattle feed; 13. 300 kg pig feed; 14. 250 kg chicken feed

Equipment packages*

15. 100-120 sqm greenhouse + vegetable seeds + 100kg NPK; 16. Milking equipment; 17. Small agricultural equipment; 18. Pumps or equipment for irrigation

Livestock packages*

19. Up to 1 cow; 20. Up to 7 piglets; 21. Up to 7 small goats; 22. Up to 7 small sheep; 23. Up to 7 beehives

* only in case that the equipment and/or livestock was lost during the floods

The call for submitting application is opened for 8 days. The Municipality collects the filled in questionnaires and encodes the data into the FAO’s database. A software package, especially developed by the FAO, automatically analyses and scores the questionnaires against the eligibility and selection criteria. The list of selected beneficiaries is published in the municipality and village councils. There is an 8 day period for applicants to lodge a complaint before the list is finalised.34

Based on the list of beneficiaries and their priority needs, the FAO establishes the quantities of supplies to be delivered for the package and prepares a delivery timetable taking into account the agricultural calendar. In line with this timetable, the FAO launches the tenders for the respective packages through its Budapest office.35

The municipality provides a storage room and organises the distribution of assistance packages to the selected beneficiaries in line with their priority list36 with the support and under the supervision of the FAO.

3.2. Progress achieved to date

3.2.1. Overview of results achieved to date

Regarding the housing component37, by the end of October a total of 787 households have been selected for reconstruction works and 130 households for the construction of new houses across 31 municipalities.

---

34 In addition, complaints can always be submitted to the Municipality or directly to FAO, which will review them.
35 The programme is implemented by the FAO Coordination Office in Serbia with the support of the Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (REU) in Budapest and the Emergency and Rehabilitation Division (TCE) at Headquarters in Rome.
36 An applicant is entitled to only one assistance package. In case his first priority choice cannot be met given the limited quantities, he is offered his second choice. If the latter cannot be met either, he receives the third package selected.
37 UNOPS, ASB, DRC, Help
According to these numbers, the programme should cover approximately 4% of the total number of houses reported damaged or destroyed in the RNA. The programme will cover 57% of the needs originally identified by the municipalities. However, these figures are not yet final. By the end of October, 28 housing contracts had been signed for a total value of EUR 4.4m. This represents almost 50% of all resources allocated to housing across the four housing grants. The great majority of works on these contracts should be completed by the end of the year depending on weather conditions.

Regarding the economic component, 389 small businesses have been selected for income-generation grants. This corresponds to 25% of needs identified by municipalities. Although some tenders had been launched, no contracts were awarded by the end of October.

Regarding support to agriculture, 17,561 small scale farming families have been selected until present to receive recovery support consisting of seeds and seedlings, animal feed, livestock and/or equipment. By the end of October 2014, 8 contracts for a total value of EUR 1,3m had been awarded. This represents 19% of all resources allocated for agricultural packages.

---

38 In total, the budget for the housing component amounts to EUR 9.8m
39 UNOPS, ASB, DRC, Help
40 including reconstruction materials and/or equipment and furniture
41 FAO
42 The final number of assisted families might change based on verification of data
43 In total, the budget for agricultural packages amount to EUR 6.6m
Regarding the **public buildings component**\(^{44}\), 23 contracts have been signed for a total value of EUR 1.2m. This represents 70% of all resources allocated to public buildings. Works should be completed in all educational establishments in the course of November.

Regarding support to **public infrastructure**, a contract has been signed for a total value of EUR 4.5m with Serbian Roads to rehabilitate a major communication axis for the municipality of Krupanj. This represents 100% of all resources allocated to the component.

The programme is also ensuring the effective operation of the **Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief**, in particular through the provision of salaries to staff members and consultancy fees of professional engineers. End of October, 4 contracts had been signed for a total value of EUR 0.2m or 20% of the total amount allocated to this sub-component.

Details and supplementary Information about the other types of support is given in the sections below.

### 3.2.2. UNOPS/IOM

#### a) Housing component

According to the original proposal, UNOPS and IOM were responsible for providing housing solutions in Obrenovac (UNOPS) and Krupanj (UNOPS). However, the Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief assigned the construction of 73 houses to IOM\(^{45}\) in a total of 16 municipalities affected by floods including 12 houses in 7 municipalities outside the original coverage of the 24 municipalities\(^{46}\). The total budget allocated for the housing component amount to EUR 3.9m.

Regarding the **construction of new houses**, UNOPS recruited engineers to carry out assessment and prepared designs and plans for constructions. UNOPS signed two contracts for the construction of 8 new

---

\(^{44}\) UNOPS  
\(^{45}\) including basic home appliances and furniture  
\(^{46}\) Gornji Milanovac, Požega, Smederevo, Malo Crniće, Lajkovac, Mionica and Ruma
houses in **Obrenovac** for a total value of EUR 200,804. Construction started in the end of October with a completion date by the end of the year. However, works on two houses were stopped due to irregularities connected to the legal acts\(^\text{47}\). As a result, one house was removed from the list of assistance, while the other was downsized from 80 to 60 sqm. An additional 16 new houses might be constructed in Brace Jugovica pending the re-categorisation of existing buildings from Category IV to VI.

By end of October, the tenders for two new houses in **Krupanj** were finalised and works initiated. Invitation to the tender for another eight houses in Krupanj expired on 30 October 2014. Construction of 32 houses on flat grounds\(^\text{48}\) and 20 houses located on steep terrain\(^\text{49}\) are being awarded through separate tender to be finalised early November.

Regarding **reconstruction works**, IOM decided in agreement with the ORFR to focus its efforts on the settlement of **Brace Jugovica**, which has been utterly recovered by water in May and where every house has suffered considerable damages and losses. It was therefore decided to provide support to every single house in the settlement needing support. As a result, the common methodology (see section 3.1.3 above) was not applied in **Obrenovac**. There have been delays/issues with the issuance of legal acts slowing down the start of the programme. The lack of progress triggered street protests from the local inhabitants. However, the reconstruction of 106 houses in Obrenovac started at the beginning of October. Due to the reconstruction in phases and variety of types of works, only one house was finished, but about 50% of all the planned works is done. The deadline for completion of all houses is by mid-December and the works are going per schedule.

The reconstruction of 195 houses in **Krupanj** started at the beginning of October. 69 houses were finished by IOM, 44 by the beneficiaries themselves, 77 houses are underway and 5 will start by mid-November. The deadline for completion of the works is the end of November and the works are going per schedule.

---

\(^{47}\) Applicants provided untrue information  
\(^{48}\) in the municipalities of Paracin, Malo Crnice, Smederevo, Sid, Ruma, Obrenovac, Osecina, Lajkovac, Loznica, Gornji Milanovac, Mionica and Pozega  
\(^{49}\) in the municipalities of Valjevo, Lajkovac, Ub and Bajina Basta
UNOPS/IOM’s original targets of reconstructed buildings and new buildings for both reconstruction works & materials and new constructions are therefore likely to be met. An overview of housing solutions adopted in the seven municipalities compared to the original estimated damages and identified needs is given in Table 8 below.

Table 8 Overview of housing solutions – UNOPS/IOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total damaged houses (RNA)</th>
<th>Municipality’s preliminary list of needs</th>
<th>Final list agreed with ORFR</th>
<th>Municipality’s preliminary list of needs</th>
<th>Final list agreed with ORFR</th>
<th>% of identified needs (D+F)/(B+E)</th>
<th>% of damaged houses (D+F)/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajina Bašta</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gornji Milanovac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krupanj</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajkovac</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loznica</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malo Crniće</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mionica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obrenovac</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osečina</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paračin</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Požega</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smederevo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valjevo</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,719</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) **Provision of improved living conditions in temporarily shelters**

Families temporarily occupying army barracks in Obrenovac since May will be moved to another location in the Hotel Obrenovac, which first needs to be refurbished through the project. After assessing needs for reconstruction in coordination with the municipality, IOM has prepared a tender dossier. IOM has also assessed needs for a temporary shelter in Lazarevac in coordination with the municipality.

c) **Public building**

It was agreed that UNOPS would refurbish up to 30 educational, health and other public buildings. Priority was given to schools in order to ensure the normal start of the school year on 1 September 2014. As a result, UNOPS mobilised its engineers as soon as the grant contract was signed to assess damages and prepare bills of quantities in damaged buildings. The Ministry of Education selected 6 primary schools, 2 secondary schools, 6 technical schools and 1 kindergarten across four municipalities (out of the 45 educational buildings, which suffered damages) to be refurbished by the project (see below). The total value of works amounts to EUR 1.36m. In addition, the project is purchasing EUR 0.5m worth of school/kindergarten furniture and equipment to be supplied to the same establishments. In total, the value of contracts for schools (including furniture and materials) represents almost 70% of the total budget allocated for public buildings (EUR 2.5m).
Tenders were launched in late August, beginning of September and resulted in 22 contracts awarded to a total of 11 companies.

By the end of October, works were ongoing in 11 establishments and about to start for the remaining ones. Completion of works was planned for early November for most of the buildings. Delivery of equipment and furniture is scheduled to coincide with the end of works.

In addition, UNOPS was preparing a tender worth EUR 250,000 to refurbish the water supply system in Trstenik.

d) **Road networks**

This sub-component is managed by Serbian Roads, which is responsible for tendering and supervising repair and rehabilitation works on the damaged section of the State road Krst - Korenite – Krupanj. A tender was launched and evaluated early October and a design-build contract was awarded with a completion date of end of June 2015 for a total value of EUR 4.5m, corresponding to the budget planned for this sub-component.

e) **Prevention against infectious disease**

Under this component, UNOPS has purchased and delivered mosquito spraying to 24 municipalities, which have applied the substance in order to minimise the risk of infectious disease in flooded areas. The activity is completed. However, there are major savings which will be reallocated to the housing component (only EUR 173,053 have been utilised for this activity out of the EU 0.5m allocated for this sub-component).

f) **Capacity building to the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief**

Under this sub-component (EUR 1m), the project has been strengthening the newly established Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief with advice and staff support. Salary costs of 23 staff members are

---

### Table 9 Schools and kindergarten selected for support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total value</th>
<th>Establishment Type</th>
<th>Establishment Name</th>
<th>Value of works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obrenovac</td>
<td>€ 719,086.48</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Technical School Obrenovac</td>
<td>€ 262,047.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obrenovac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary School 'Jovan Jovanovic Zmaj' Obrenovac</td>
<td>€ 196,816.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obrenovac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary School 'Posavskih partizana' Obrenovac</td>
<td>€ 150,642.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obrenovac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Agricultural and Chemistry School Obrenovac</td>
<td>€ 57,408.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paracin</td>
<td>€ 150,897.68</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Technological School Paracin</td>
<td>€ 117,915.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paracin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Mechanical - Electro Technical School Paracin</td>
<td>€ 32,981.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabac</td>
<td>€ 117,353.64</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Chemical and textile vocational School Sabac</td>
<td>€ 73,441.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary School Laza K. Lazarevic Sabac</td>
<td>€ 32,809.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary School Stojan Novakovic Sabac</td>
<td>€ 11,103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svilajnac</td>
<td>€ 226,859.53</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Kindergarten Decja Radost Svilajnac</td>
<td>€ 226,859.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svilajnac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Agricultural-Veterinary School Svilajnac</td>
<td>€ 122,085.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svilajnac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>High School Svilajnac</td>
<td>€ 12,552.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary School Jevrem Obrenovic Sabac</td>
<td>€ 7,887.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 1,356,723.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
being covered for eight months. This support intended to last until May 2015 will be prolonged until
the end of the project.

A Grant Agreement with the Chamber of Engineers has also been concluded on behalf of the Office. Under this agreement, the Office is able to hire experienced civil engineers to provide ad hoc expertise, in particular, related to the verification of categorisation undertaken by municipalities.

Finally, the project is supporting the development of the Office’s webpage and has prepared the Office’s Communication Strategy. Contracts have been signed in the course of October to that effect.

**g) Communication and visibility**

Given that the other EU grantees have limited resources for communication and visibility, it was decided that UNOPS - with a more substantial budget for these activities (EUR 1m) - would play a leading role in planning, coordinating and implementing communication and visibility activities for the whole programme. Two communications consultants were engaged to that effect. A Communications Strategy is being prepared, which will apply to all EU grantees. The project is collecting brief reports from all other EU grantees in order to coordinate activities, identify visibility opportunities and plan major events with the view to enhancing the visibility of achieved results. Coordination is also taking place with the Press and Information Team in the EUD. In this context, UNOPS is compiling Communications Weekly Updates, which are being prepared by all EU grantees.

Several high visibility visits have already taken place to some of the 24 municipalities with the participation of EU officials, including the Head of Delegation.

UNOPS has also recruited a TV crew to make a documentary film, which will show the progress and results of the entire EU programme from beginning to end.

### 3.2.3. DRC/Eneca

**a) Housing component**

All 7 municipalities are included in the housing component managed by DRC and its partner: Cacak, Jagodina, Koceljeva, Paracin, Smederevska Palanka, Ub and Velika Plana. In their proposal, DRC planned to repair 170 damaged buildings and build 14 new houses in these municipalities.

Activities started immediately after signature of the contract. The implementation is being done according to the joint methodology adopted for all EU grants under the programme (see above 3.1.3). By early October, a total of 170 beneficiaries were selected and a tender for **reconstruction materials & works covering all 170 houses** (divided into seven lots) was launched according to the agreed fast-track

---

50 23 staff are currently being funded by the project

51 The other EU grantees are also implementing their own communication & visibility activities within their limited budget and are required to coordinate their activities in this field with UNOPS

52 To date, UNOPS has organised three visits of the Head of EU Delegation to Obrenovac, Svilajnac and Jamena (Šid). The FAO organised high-visibility events with the participation of the EU Head of Delegation, the Minister of Agriculture and the Mayor of Belgrade in Obrenovac to kick start the activities in September 2014. Visits of EUD officials were also organised in Trstenik and Sabac. During these events, the FAO distributed visibility materials (t-shirts, banners, and caps).
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negotiated procedure\textsuperscript{54}. In the third week of October, seven companies were awarded a contract for a total amount of EUR 729,552. Each contractor is covering one municipality.

Works started in all municipalities by the last week of October and should be completed within 45 days. The average cost amounts to EUR 4,100 per house (including materials and works)\textsuperscript{55}.

Regarding the construction of new houses, beneficiaries were selected in all seven municipalities by early October. As a result, two tenders were launched and a contract was awarded for all 14 houses in the third week of October to the same company for a total value of EUR 238,835.

Table 10 summarises the results achieved in all municipalities under the responsibility of DRC by the end of October 2014:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Steps} & \textbf{Reconstruction} & \textbf{New construction} \\
\hline
1. Obtaining and reviewing preliminary list from municipality & Completed & Completed \\
\hline
2. Setting-up Joint Selection Committee (JSC) and adopting Rules of Procedures & Completed & Completed \\
\hline
3. Carrying out field visits to check eligibility of potential beneficiaries / assess damages & 170 visits completed & 14 visits completed \\
\hline
4. Supporting potential beneficiaries with the preparation of full application & Completed & Completed \\
\hline
5. Selection of beneficiaries by JSC & 170 beneficiaries selected & 14 beneficiaries selected \\
\hline
6. Preparing bills of quantities and tender dossiers & Completed & Completed \\
\hline
7. Launching and evaluating tenders & tender launched early October & tender launched early October \\
\hline
8. Awarding contracts & 7 contracts awarded covering all 170 houses \textbf{Value: EUR 729,552} & 1 contract awarded covering all 14 houses \textbf{Value: EUR 238,835} \\
\hline
9. Supervising works & Works to be completed within 45 days & Works to be completed within 45 days \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

DRC’s original targets of 170 reconstructed buildings and 14 new buildings for both reconstruction works & materials and new constructions are therefore likely to be met. An overview of housing solutions

\textsuperscript{54} See footnote 32 above
\textsuperscript{55} The maximum amount allowed in the budget was EUR 6,500
adopted in the seven municipalities compared to the original estimated damages and identified needs is given in Table 11 below.

**Table 11 Overview of housing solutions – DRC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total damaged houses (RNA)</th>
<th>Municipality’s preliminary list of needs</th>
<th>Final list adopted by JSC</th>
<th>Municipality’s preliminary list of needs</th>
<th>Final list adopted by JSC</th>
<th>% of identified needs (D+F)/(B+E)</th>
<th>% of damaged houses (D+F)/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cacak</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagodina</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koceljeva</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paracin</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smederevska Palanka</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velika Plana</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>391</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) **Economic component**

The economic component covers six municipalities: Cacak, Koceljeva, Paracin, Smederevska Palanka, Ub and Velika Plana. In its proposal, DRC was planning to award 54 income-generation grants.

The component is implemented by Eneca, which started work immediately after contract signature. Eneca either reviewed the short list of potential applicants provided by the municipalities or when the latter was not available had to work with the list of all potential beneficiaries in municipality. The latter solution was more time-consuming since Eneca was obliged to check/visit every single applicant responding to the call. This was the case in Paracin.

Eneca followed the joint methodology adopted for the programme (see above section 3.1.3)

**Table 12 Steps already completed regarding housing – DRC End of October 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Obtaining and reviewing preliminary list from municipality</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carrying out field visits to check eligibility of potential beneficiaries / assess damages</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supporting potential beneficiaries with preparation of full application</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selecting beneficiaries</td>
<td>54 beneficiaries selected to receive both reconstruction materials and equipment/supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preparing bills of quantities and tender dossiers</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Launching and evaluating tenders</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Awarding contracts</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supervising delivery and works</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, **54 affected businesses were selected for support** across the 7 municipalities, which is in line with the original target. Bills of quantities are being developed and tenders are to be launched early
November. An overview of selected income-generation grants compared to the original identified needs is given for each municipality in Table 13 below.

Table 13 Economic component - DRC/Eneca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Preliminary list of needs</th>
<th>Final list for building materials</th>
<th>Final list for equipment and supplies</th>
<th>% of identified needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cacak</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jagodina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Koceljeva</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Paracin</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Smederevska Palanka</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ub</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Velika Plana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4. HELP

a) Housing component

Five municipalities are included in the housing component managed by Help: Kraljevo, Lazarevac, Svilajnac, Trstenik and Varvarin. In its proposal, Help planned to repair 120 damaged buildings and construct 14 new houses in these municipalities\(^{56}\).

Help started its activities immediately after signature of the contract in line with the joint methodology adopted for all EU grants under the programme (see above 3.1.3). By early October, a total of 120 beneficiaries were selected in all five municipalities and a tender for reconstruction materials & works were launched covering the first 51 houses was launched according to the agreed fast-track negotiated procedure\(^{57}\). A contract worth EUR 162,767.62 was signed with the selected company covering all 5 municipalities.

Works started in all municipalities by the last week of October and should be completed by December 3. The average cost per house amounts to 3,760.6 EUR (including materials and works)\(^{58}\).

Regarding the construction of new houses, beneficiaries were selected in all five municipalities; one tender was launched early October covering the first 9 houses in Svilajnac and Varvarin. The awarded contract was worth EUR 151,500.

Table 14 summarises the results achieved in all municipalities under the responsibility of Help by the end of October 2014:

\(^{56}\) including basic home appliances and furniture
\(^{57}\) See footnote 32 above
\(^{58}\) The maximum amount allowed in the budget was EUR 6,500
Table 14 Steps already completed regarding housing – Help End of October 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>New construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining and reviewing preliminary list from municipality</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Setting-up Joint Selection Committee (JSC) and adopting Rules of Procedures</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Carrying out field visits to check eligibility of potential beneficiaries / assess damages</td>
<td>145 visits completed</td>
<td>16 visits completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supporting potential beneficiaries with the preparation of full application</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Selection of beneficiaries by JSC</td>
<td>145 beneficiaries selected</td>
<td>16 beneficiaries selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparing bills of quantities and tender dossiers</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Launching and evaluating tenders</td>
<td>tender launched early October</td>
<td>tender launched early October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Awarding contracts</td>
<td>1 contract awarded covering 51 houses out of 145 Value: EUR 162,767.62</td>
<td>1 contract awarded covering 9 houses out of 16 Value: EUR 151,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supervising works</td>
<td>Works to be completed by 3 December 2014</td>
<td>Works to be completed by 3 December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Help is exceeding its original targets for reconstruction materials & works by 25 houses and meeting the target for new construction. This was made possible thanks to the low average cost per house.
Tenders for the remaining houses are being prepared and to be launched in early November. An overview of housing solutions adopted in all five municipalities compared to the original estimated damages and identified needs is given in Table 15 below.

Table 15 Overview of housing solutions – Help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total damaged houses</th>
<th>Municipality's preliminary list of needs</th>
<th>Original target for reconstruction</th>
<th>Final list adopted by JSC</th>
<th>Municipality's preliminary list of needs</th>
<th>Original target for new houses</th>
<th>Final list adopted by JSC</th>
<th>% of identified needs (D+F) /B+H</th>
<th>% of damaged houses (D+F) /A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kosjeric</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraljevo</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarevac</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svilajnac</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trstenik</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varvarin</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,507</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVALUATION OF GRANT CONTRACTS IMPLEMENTED AND FINANCED BY IPA AND EIDHR – Report II
b) **Economic component**

The economic component covers all six municipalities: Kosjeric, Kraljevo, Lazarevac, Svilajnac, Trstenik and Varvarin. In its proposal, Help planned to award 108 income-generation grants.

Help started work immediately after contract signature reviewing the list of potential applicants provided by the municipalities and implementing all the steps indicated in the joint methodology for the programme (see above section 3.1.3).

### Table 16 Steps already completed regarding housing – Help End of October 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Obtaining and reviewing preliminary list from municipality</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carrying out field visits to check eligibility of potential beneficiaries / assess damages</td>
<td>163 visits completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supporting potential beneficiaries with preparation of full application</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selecting beneficiaries</td>
<td>163 beneficiaries selected to receive both reconstruction materials and equipment/supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preparing bills of quantities and tender dossiers</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Launching and evaluating tenders</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Awarding contracts</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supervising delivery and works</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, **163 affected businesses were selected** for support across the 6 municipalities well above the original target of 108. Bills of quantities are being developed and tenders are to be launched in the first half of November. An overview of selected income-generation grants compared to the original identified needs is given for each municipality in Table 17 below.

### Table 17 Economic component - Help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Preliminary list of needs</th>
<th>Final list for building materials</th>
<th>Final list for equipment and supplies</th>
<th>% of identified needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(B+C)/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosjeric</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraljevo</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarevac</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svilajnac</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trstenik</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varvarin</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>493</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.5. ASB (HC/IDC/DIVAC)

a) Housing component

Eight municipalities are included in the housing component managed by ASB and its partners: Mali Zvornik, Ljubovija, Valjevo, Osečina, Šabac, Loznica, Bajina Bašta and Šid. In its proposal, ASB planned to repair 168 damaged buildings and construct 32 new houses in these municipalities.

ASB started its activities immediately after signature of the contract in line with the joint methodology adopted for all EU grants under the programme (see above 3.1.3). By early October, a total of 168 beneficiaries were selected in all eight municipalities and a tender for reconstruction materials & works was launched covering 168 houses (divided in 5 lots) was launched according to the agreed fast-track negotiated procedure. In the last week of October, five contracts were awarded to four different companies for a total amount of EUR 920,494.31. No contractor is covering more than two lots. Works started in all municipalities by the last week of October and the last contract is to be completed by December 31. The average cost per house amounts to 5,510.2 EUR (including materials and works).

Regarding the construction of new houses, 32 beneficiaries were selected in six municipalities, one tender was launched early October. Three contracts worth a total value of EUR 610,482.08 were awarded to two different companies. One company is responsible for 5 municipalities and 23 buildings.

Table 18 summarises the results achieved in all municipalities under the responsibility of ASB by the end of October 2014:

Table 18 Steps already completed regarding housing – ASB End of October 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>New construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Obtaining and reviewing preliminary list from municipality</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Setting-up Joint Selection Committee (JSC) and adopting Rules of Procedures</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Carrying out field visits to check eligibility of potential beneficiaries / assess damages</td>
<td>449 visits completed</td>
<td>50 visits completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supporting potential beneficiaries with the preparation of full application</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Selection of beneficiaries by JSC</td>
<td>168 beneficiaries selected</td>
<td>32 beneficiaries selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparing bills of quantities and tender dossiers</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Launching and evaluating tenders</td>
<td>tender launched early October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

59 including basic home appliances and furniture
60 See footnote 32 above
61 The maximum amount allowed in the budget was EUR 6,500
8. Awarding contracts
5 contracts awarded covering all 168 houses
Value: EUR 920,494.31
3 contracts awarded covering 33 houses out of 50
Value: EUR 610,482.08

9. Supervising works
Works to be completed on last contract by 31 December 2014
Works to be completed by end December 2014

ASB is on its way to meet its original targets for both reconstruction materials & works and the new constructions. A contract addendum is being prepared for the remaining new houses. An overview of housing solutions adopted in all eight municipalities compared to the original estimated damages and identified needs is given in Table 19 below.

Table 19 Overview of housing solutions – ASB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total damaged houses</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>New construction</th>
<th>% of identified needs (D+F)/(B+E)</th>
<th>% of damaged houses (D+F)/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bajina Basta</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubovija</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loznica</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali Zvornik</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osecina</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabac</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valjevo</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,017</strong></td>
<td><strong>449</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Economic component

The economic component managed by ASB and its partners covers all 7 municipalities: Mali Zvornik, Ljubovija, Valjevo, Osečina, Šabac, Loznica and Bajina Bašta. In its proposal, ASB planned to award 100 income-generation grants.

ASB started work immediately after contract signature reviewing the list of potential applicants provided by the municipalities and implementing all the steps indicated in the joint methodology for the programme (see above section 3.1.3).

Table 20 Steps already completed regarding housing – ASB End of October 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Obtaining and reviewing preliminary list from municipality</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carrying out field visits to check eligibility of potential beneficiaries / assess damages</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supporting potential beneficiaries with preparation of full application</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selecting beneficiaries</td>
<td>172 beneficiaries selected to receive equipment/supplies and 34 beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In total, **172 affected businesses were selected** for support across the 7 municipalities, which means that the original target is exceeded by 72. It was decided not to include Sid (Jamena) given that support was already available under the FAO project and that the requests from the eight beneficiaries submitted by the municipality exceeded the maximum grant amount available under the project. Bills of quantities have been developed. A market research was carried out to select a supplier for the equipment to be supplied to all 172 selected beneficiaries in seven municipalities (Ljubovia, Mali Zvornik, Bajina Basta, Loznica, Sabac, Valjevo, Osecina). A contract worth EUR 388,499.60 was awarded to one company according to the negotiated procedure\(^{62}\). The next tender for building materials is to be launched by mid-November upon approval from the EUD. An overview of selected income-generation grants compared to the original identified needs is given for each municipality in Table 17 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Preliminary list of needs</th>
<th>Final list for building materials</th>
<th>Final list for equipment and supplies</th>
<th>% of identified needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bajina Basta</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubovia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loznica</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali Zvornik</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osecina</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabac</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valjevo</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>510</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.6. FAO

Activities started immediately upon contract signature in late August 2014. It was decided on the first SC that support will be available to all family farms, registered or not. By the end of October, the FAO had deployed assistance to the affected municipalities in three phases:

**Phase 1**

Animal feed was distributed in 4 municipalities targeting 2,023 families. The FAO double-checked the list established by the municipalities and got final clearance from the DEU for this emergency delivery.

---

\(^{62}\) EUD approval still pending.
- 2,023 families in 4 municipalities have each received 320 kg of animal feed
- In total, 647,360 kg of animal feed were distributed in these 4 municipalities (Obrenovac, Trstenik, Cacak, Lazarevac)

**Phase 2**

By the end of September the selection of small-scale farming families to benefit from the programme was completed in all 24 municipalities. As a result of this selection, which took place in line with the FAO methodology (see above section 3.1.3), the FAO compiled a database of 17,561 eligible small farmers (see Figure 1 below). Each applicant has identified three priority needs, on the basis of which the FAO is organising tenders and delivering agricultural goods, livestock and equipment according to a pre-established timetable.

After review of applications, the FAO organised the delivery of animal (cow) feed to an additional 91 families in 3 municipalities which had selected animal (cow) feed as their first priority.
- 91 families in 3 municipalities have each received 320kg of animal feed
- In total, 29,120 kg of animal feed were distributed in these 3 municipalities (Cacak, Ub, Valjevo)

Under the same process and in optimum time for autumn sowing, 4,427 families in all 24 municipalities received winter wheat and fertilisers packages:
- 4,427 families in 24 municipalities received each 250kg of wheat seeds and 300kg of NPK fertilizers for winter sowing
- In total, 1,106,750 kg of wheat and 1,328,100kg of NPK fertilisers were distributed to all 24 municipalities

**Phase 3**

1,597 families have been selected to receive fruit seedlings. These are the families that have submitted fruit seedlings as the first priority. The process of delivery is expected to start early November following the planting season. The assistance package includes 300 cherry, sower cherry or plum seedlings, or 1,800 blackberries of raspberries seedlings per family (depending on the priority).

During the upcoming phases other prioritised packages (agricultural equipment, greenhouses, spring seeds and fertilizers, livestock, etc.) will be distributed to the remaining around 11,000 families.

The total value of contracts awarded by the end of October amounted to EUR 1,263,739.

**3.3. Main findings**

**3.3.1. Relevance**

**Finding 1. Overall, the relevance of the EU programme to Serbia’s recovery efforts is highly satisfactory**

The objectives and activities of the five EU grants are very relevant to the needs of the flood affected municipalities included in the programme. The design of the programme responds well to Serbia’s highest priority needs with the right range of support including not only housing and livelihoods covering supplies of vehicles, animal feed, wheat and barley seeds, fruit seedlings and fertilisers.

---

63 covering supplies of vehicles, animal feed, wheat and barley seeds, fruit seedlings and fertilisers.
assistance but also capacity strengthening. The focus on the most affected municipalities and the most vulnerable households makes perfectly sense.

**Finding 2.** The FAO choose to cast the net of its support as wide as possible with the objective of addressing the most pressing needs of a majority of small scale farming families. As a result, the scope of the initial proposal was reduced in agreement with Serbian authorities and the EU.

The priority of the FAO programme is to provide as many farming families as possible with vital supplies to revive their holding. While the initial grant proposal foresaw also infrastructure works, studies, advice and training\(^{64}\), the FAO decided in agreement with the Office for Reconstruction and Floods Relief and the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection (MAEP) to concentrate its support on a menu of 23 packages of agricultural supplies. Given the emphasis on numbers, the size of support provided to each farmer is not considerable and certainly insufficient to cover all needs. However, for the majority of beneficiaries these supplies are truly welcome. The quantity distributed for each package is the same for everybody irrespective of damages incurred. This is considered to be fair by the beneficiaries themselves since everybody is treated the same way. Moreover, given the small quantities involved it is unlikely that anybody would receive more than he actually lost during the floods. As a result, there have been very little complaints among the target group.

**Finding 3.** The assistance for the reconstruction of public buildings appears fully justified by the scale of damages and losses incurred.

The May floods caused considerable damages to public buildings, in particular educational institutions. Given that the water in flooded buildings reached a height between 50 cm and 2.5 m and that it remained up to 30 days in some facilities, damages to buildings and losses in equipment, furniture and materials have been considerable, causing major disruption to the end of the 2013 school year.

The Ministry of Education’s selection of priority schools to be included in the programme appears well justified. The programme is making progress with the reconstruction of schools, which receives the biggest amount of support. However, about 30% of the allocation for the public buildings is still to be committed.

### 3.3.2. Efficiency

**Finding 4.** The decision to award direct grants without calls for proposals was fully justified given the circumstances and the nature and scale of needs.

When the floods struck the Western Balkans in May 2014, the EU immediately announced an aid package to provide support to the populations in need and to help the governments undertake recovery efforts. Faced with the emergency of the situation and the scale of damages, the EU decided to channel its assistance through five large grants to three international organisations and three NGOs (see above.

---

\(^{64}\) The initial FAO proposal included two expected results, which will not be achieved through the programme: “Emergency coordination system and mechanisms established for the area of agriculture and rural development for relevant and timely response to the crisis” and “Capacities of local actors potentially improved for preventing and reducing the impact of hazards”. This capacity building and technical support to the municipalities was later dropped as it was agreed to focus more on inputs delivery for a wider number of families.
section 3.1.2). Grants were awarded without any call for proposals. This decision was appropriate and justified given the circumstances. Without this exceptional implementation mechanism, the aid would have taken several additional months to materialise.

**Finding 5.** *The aid was mobilised in record time for an EU programme and in a very efficient manner but it still took too long from the point of view of flood victims*

Considering that the EU programme was only adopted only on 25 July 2014 and that some grants were signed as late as end of August, the results achieved so far are impressive. They could not have been achieved without the extensive preparatory work, which took place during the design phase (i.e. before grant contract signature) and involved close cooperation between the EU grantees, the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief, the SEIO and the EUD. In particular, the development of a common methodology was instrumental in ensuring that the process of selection of beneficiaries could start immediately after contract signature.

However, from the point of view of households and individuals whose property has been damaged or lost during the floods in May, the support, which had been promised before the winter season, has been slow to materialise. The time necessary for assessing needs, preparing and adopting an assistance programme and signing grant contracts could not be compressed below four months.

Moreover, regarding the housing component, the selection of beneficiaries proved lengthier than expected (see Finding 10 and Finding 11 below). Despite all the preparatory work and the fact that EU grantees have been working at full capacity and with a high level of dedication, it took almost two months from contract signature for the works to start on buildings and the first results to be visible. This was mostly due to the meticulous process of ascertaining the eligibility of potential beneficiaries and the need to involve municipalities in their selection. Additional human resources on the part of the EU grantees could have shortened the time needed for this process but not dramatically.

**Finding 6.** *The selection of grantees appears to be well justified as they brought valuable expertise, capacity and local knowledge*

The choice of grantees was crucial to ensure that assistance would be properly and swiftly implemented. The fact that all six organisations are well implanted in Serbia and have been involved for many years in development projects at the local level means that they were able to quickly respond to the challenges and design aid programmes in minimal time.

In this regard, the experience from the three NGOs (Help, ASB and DRC), which specialise in providing housing solutions to vulnerable groups (gained over the years under IPA programmes in favour of refugees and IDPs) was an undeniable asset for the programme.

**Finding 7.** *Eligible municipalities have demonstrated a high level of commitment and support to the programme in spite of capacity and resource constraints. This is reflected by the excellent cooperation established with EU grantees and the degree of involvement of municipal staff in programme activities*

---

65 All three NGOs are implementing projects under IPA 2012 Support for improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of Collective Centres, which involve the construction of pre-fabricated houses for refugees and IDPs across Serbia
The success of recovery efforts at local levels hinges on the effective participation and support from the municipalities, which are receiving assistance. Local authorities are responsible for assessing damages to infrastructure, property and livelihoods. Local engineers are categorising buildings in accordance with the law. Based on this assessment, local authorities are issuing legal acts giving right to State financial compensation. Although not mandatory to access EU support, this document was requested from potential beneficiaries during the selection process as a basis for their inclusion into the EU programme and to determine the amount of support to which they are entitled. Many other documents to be submitted as part of the application dossier depended on the services of local authorities e.g. extracts from the land register, confirmation of place of residence, etc. In some cases, this resulted in delays as municipalities did not have always sufficient capacity to handle this extra workload at the speed required by the circumstances.

Local authorities play also a key role in selecting beneficiaries according to the common methodology (see above 3.1.3). Representatives from the municipality are chairing the Joint Selection Committee which reviews and scores application dossiers. In this respect, great care was taken to ensure that the criteria and rules set out in the common methodology were adhered to during the selection of beneficiaries. All files examined during the evaluation appeared complete and well kept.

Local authorities and their village councils played a decisive role in reaching out to the target groups of the agricultural programme implemented by the FAO. They also provided valuable support with the creation of a database of potential beneficiaries collecting and encoding information and data on the basis of which final beneficiaries of agricultural packages were selected.

Finally, the municipality is supervising the good execution of construction works and delivery of supplies together with the EU grantees.

Regarding the housing component, the involvement of municipalities is essential to solve issues around property ownerships or to find solutions to unexpected problems.

Municipalities are also contributing to the implementation of the FAO programme in a decisive way, disseminating information to the target group, collecting and encoding data from applications into the FAO software and providing the necessary logistic support to ensure the speedy delivery of assistance packages to selected beneficiaries. During the selection stage, the active involvement of village councillors was essential to reach potentially eligible farmers, especially in remote areas. It appears, however, that not every councillor has fulfilled this crucial task with the same dedication and commitment. As a result, some eligible families might have been left out of the programme.

Finding 8. The common methodology was a useful tool to ensure transparency and rigour in the selection of beneficiaries

The common methodology set out clear criteria to select beneficiaries. It also specifies the steps, which have to be taken in order to verify the eligibility of applicants and assess the exact scope of damages. This systematic approach was time-consuming but it ensured that the selection of beneficiaries was fair and transparent. The criteria and the ranking lists resulting from the evaluation conducted by the JSC were published on information boards in municipal halls and time was given for citizens to lodge a

---

66 For example, when plots of land were considered unsuitable for construction works as a result of the floods, some municipalities identified and provided alternative plots.
complaint. When it happened, the methodology provided clear justifications of the decisions taken by JSC.

Since the Joint Selection Committee relied on the legal act to decide about the legitimacy of the application and determine the amount of support to be granted, any issue with that document means that whole application is being put under question.

**Finding 9.** However, the pre-selection made by municipalities was not subject to such a rigorous methodology

Given the extent of the disaster, it would have been impossible for the EU grantees to check and assess all damaged properties themselves. Therefore, upon starting their work, they relied on a preliminary list of potential beneficiaries provided by the municipalities. Although the latter were aware of the focus of the programme giving priority to the most vulnerable households, this preliminary selection was primarily made on the basis of the categorisation of damaged buildings performed by municipal engineers. This list was cross-checked by the local Centres for Social Works, which assessed the social situation of households. Although the JSC selection and the verification work carried out by the EU grantee is a guarantee that the programme is supporting people in real need, there is no full certainty that some households deserving support might not have been left out of the preliminary list by mistake and negligence. The likelihood of this happening is however low since the selection process was widely publicised and people were given time to declare their needs to local authorities. There were some instances, however, when the EU grantee discovered potential beneficiaries, which were not on the preliminary list. On the other hand, there were many cases when households indicated on the list were found ineligible. However, this was mostly due to ownership issues and was seldom related to the social situation of applicants.

**Finding 10.** The collection of applicants’ evidences in support of applications was particularly demanding for the beneficiaries. From this point of view, support from the EU grantees was very welcome and instrumental in ensuring a smooth selection process. The main reason for the latter to stretch over more than one month was linked to the lengthy issuance of legal acts

Many applicants experienced difficulties in submitting complete application dossiers with all required evidences including authorised copies of legal documents. As a result, proceedings from the JSC had to be suspended on many occasions until the missing information was collected. In most cases, support from the EU grantee or the municipality was necessary to ensure that this was done thoroughly and correctly. Although the methodology only foresaw that the JSC would meet twice, in practice three or even four meetings were necessary to come up with a final list of selected beneficiaries.

**Finding 11.** Issues of property ownerships proved a major obstacle to the inclusion of some applicants, which was overcome only in some cases and with difficulty

Considerable efforts from EU grantees and the municipality were necessary to clarify and solve ownership issues. In case of multiple ownerships, this involved contacting relatives and mediating among them until agreement was found. In case of unclear or illegal ownerships, this required some
proofs that the household had been occupying the land/premises and regularly paying bills. Although time-consuming this approach made it possible to include many households in real need.

Despite these efforts, many other households have been excluded on the ground of ownership (and lack of legal act) despite of inhabiting the same building for decades, paying bills and receiving mail. This problem is serious given the scale of illegal construction in Serbia. Moreover, illegal construction is often the only available option for vulnerable households.

Some households were also excluded because they were registered at another address than the one where they live for various reasons (health care, passivity and lack of sanctions for failing to change registered residence etc.). As a result, they were not eligible for support despite inhabiting a damaged house.

Finding 12. Re-categorisation of buildings slowed down the selection of beneficiaries. However, it was an important process in order to prevent funds being wasted on the restoration of seriously damaged houses.

The categorisation of buildings is carried out by municipal engineers, who sometimes have given a different interpretation of the criteria set out in the law to perform their assessment. As a result, the categorisation of some buildings was put under question. The problem is partly due to the obsolescence of the law itself which was drafted many years ago and not specifically for the purpose of floods. The problem also highlights the need for common standards/training in order to achieve greater consistency of approach among engineers. Whenever they identified a building which did not seem to belong to the right category (this was often the case of category III, IV or V buildings with severe or irremediable structural damages), EU grantees requested a second opinion from the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief’s engineers. On that basis, the municipal engineer would review his/her diagnosis leading to the re-categorisation of the building and the issuance of a new legal act by the municipality. In many cases, this allowed EU grantees to recalibrate the amount/type of support in order to correspond better to needs. Again, this was a time-consuming process which slowed down the selection of beneficiaries. However, it was an important process in order to prevent wasting funds on the restoration of seriously damaged houses with a high probability of further degradation.

Finding 13. The weather conditions, the capacity of contractors to manage several contracts in parallel and irregularities during the legal act process are the three main causes for concerns regarding the continuation of the programme.

From the end of October, the programme has entered a crucial stage with construction/repair works taking place in parallel in more than 24 municipalities. Given the proximity of the winter season and the number of flood victims living in make-shift shelters, it is imperative for works to be completed as soon as possible. There is a high probability that unfavourable weather conditions might slow down the execution of works. From this point of view, it will be necessary to prioritise the reconstruction/construction of buildings taking into account the temporary housing arrangements of beneficiaries, some of whom are living in extremely precarious conditions. Given the uncertain state of many buildings, a reassessment of repair needs is bound to happen in course of the works, which might therefore be more demanding than originally expected. As a result, the capacities of some contractors might be overstretched and delays could easily occur, which is a cause for concern. From this point of
view, the supervision realised by the municipalities and EU grantees will be very important to ensure that works are progressing at the agreed pace and that solutions are found rapidly with contractors regarding unexpected repairs/costs.

Another cause for concern is the delay connected to the verification process of legal acts. Some works have already been suspended when it was found that some applicants did not provide accurate/true information when applying for support to municipalities. Issues of that nature are bound to happen as the verification process continues and are likely to result in major delays.

Finding 14. In some cases, municipalities did not prepare a preliminary list of beneficiaries burdening the finite capacities of EU grantees

Like for the housing component, the EU grantees relied on a preliminary list of potential beneficiaries from the municipalities to start their activities. This first selection is essential since it would be too time- and resource-consuming for grantees to collect and appraise information about all potential beneficiaries in the territory of each municipality. However, some municipalities did not perform this first selection, which the EU grantees had to undertake themselves putting their finite capacities under strain.

Finding 15. The FAO programme’s straightforward design made it possible to produce quick and large-scale results and gives guarantee that all targets will be achieved on time

The methodology for selecting beneficiaries was straightforward and easy to implement and allowed for the quick and timely delivery of much needed supplies to an impressive number of beneficiaries. The software package developed for the purpose of the programme enabled the FAO to analyse and score applications against criteria in record time. Activities are therefore on track and after the delivery of the first assistance packages, implementation mechanisms are well-tested. The rest of the FAO programme should be a straightforward delivery of the remaining pre-defined packages to the 17,560 selected beneficiaries in line with the timetable.

Finding 16. There was a danger of overlap between the income-generating grants and the FAO support to farmers but this has been well addressed

Since many inhabitants of affected areas rely on agriculture for a living, there was potentially a risk of overlap between the economic component carried out by the three NGOs and the support to small farmers which the FAO is implementing throughout all 24 municipalities. This was however avoided by an exchange of information between the EU grantees and the fact that the size of support under the FAO programme was more modest.

Finding 17. The problems encountered during the execution of works on public buildings illustrate the challenges faced by the programme

Works turned out to be more demanding in some schools than first expected. As a result, it was necessary to re-plan works dynamics and extend contracts. Unexpected delays of that nature are bound

---

67 The final number of beneficiaries may vary with the verification process.
68 In some cases this resulted in quantities of supplies being revised under the economic component.
69 For example, in Obrenovac, the contractor found major problems with the electrical networks in two schools, which were not identified first and slowed down the reconstruction works. As a result, contracts were extended by two weeks.
to happen when repair works start in earnest on buildings, which have remained for so long under water. It created legitimate frustration among school principals, who are under the pressure to return teaching conditions to normal as quickly as possible.

**Finding 18.** The EUD has shown a high-level of flexibility and responsiveness which is essential to the smooth implementation of the programme. In a few respects, however, there is room for improvement

An emergency programme of the scale and complexity as the one currently implemented by the EU could not succeed under the same mechanisms and standards usually applied in the context of regular IPA programmes. The EU, being well aware of this, has relaxed its rules to the extent possible in order to improve the efficiency and rapidity of programme implementation. For example, shorter time frames have been allowed for tendering works. However, the necessity to obtain approval from the EUD for each procurement procedure turned out to be impractical since time gains resulting from shorter tendering procedures have often been outweighed by the lengthy approval process. Another issue which affects negatively the performance of EU grantees concerns reporting requirements, which appear excessive\(^{70}\) taking into account the duration of grant projects and the time constraints faced by EU grantees.

Nonetheless, all EU grantees have expressed their appreciation of EUD Task Managers, whose support and commitment is considered essential to the success of their activities.

The EU reacted swiftly to address another problem that risked derailing the timely implementation of the programme: the surface of pre-fabrication houses foreseen in the grantees’ proposals turned out to be smaller than the ones funded out of the Government’s recovery programme. As this risked reducing considerably the interest of potential beneficiaries in applying for EU support, the EU agreed to align the size of pre-fabricated houses with the Government’s recovery programme\(^{71}\).

### 3.3.3. Effectiveness

**Finding 19.** Overall, the programme is on track and results achieved so far should make it possible to reach and even exceed original targets

The programme started effective implementation in late July/ end of August, which means that this overall assessment concerns only the first two months of implementation and the four preceding months when the programme was designed. The latter period lasted from mid-May to end of August and included the preparation of a Project Fiche and five grant proposals.

After two months only of effective implementation, the programme has reached major milestones with the selection of beneficiaries completed, works initiated in all eligible municipalities and delivery of agricultural support ongoing. Although the programme has now entered its most critical stage of implementation with construction works taking place in parallel in more than 24 municipalities, results

\(^{70}\) In addition to weekly reports, EU grantees must prepare two different monthly reports one for UNOPS and one for the EUD Task Managers.

\(^{71}\) The surface of the new house finally agreed was 60 m\(^2\) for one-two members of household, 80 m\(^2\) for up to four-member households and 100 m\(^2\) for five or more member households
achieved so far means that the prospects for a timely completion of activities and the achievement of programme’s objectives are high.

**Finding 20. Regarding housing, the EU grants are providing a level of support which corresponds to the needs of flood victims included in the programme**

While the State financial compensation has been distributed widely and provided much needed support to flood victims, it is clearly insufficient to cover the costs of damages/losses incurred\(^\text{72}\). From this point of view, the EU programme is more than complementing support granted by the State\(^\text{73}\). It allows flood victims missing the necessary means to return to living conditions similar to the ones they enjoyed before the floods. Owners of category VI houses are even more privileged since in almost all cases the new house they get through the programme is of much better quality than the one they used to live in.

**Finding 21. The bias in favour of large households was justified but it sometimes left out people in real need**

The JSC gave more points to larger households in line with the criteria set out in the methodology. This made perfectly sense in order to maximise the number of people to benefit from the programme. However, as a result, many single or two-member households (often elderly people) while deserving support made it only on the reserve list and were left without any support other than the one granted by the State.

**Finding 22. The programme could not address the issue of tenants living in damaged properties**

Since the inclusion into the EU programme rests on the submission of a legal act and that the latter requires proofs of ownership and residence, it was not possible to provide assistance to households living in rented houses damaged by the floods. The owners themselves could not apply for support since the latter require residence in the affected building. These households are therefore deprived of any support unless the owners have the means and are willing to refurbish their house themselves.

**Finding 23. In some cases, the questionable categorisation of buildings resulted in sub-optimal form of support**

When it was not possible to re-categorise a building to category VI, the costs of repairs would usually be above-average (given the scope of works necessary to fix the building) and in some cases would almost near the costs of a new building.

**Finding 24. Support was well proportioned to the needs of small businesses. However, larger businesses which incurred far greater damages are left without any support**

The income-generation grants to be distributed through the programme will provide a lifeline to many small entrepreneurs, whom the floods deprived of their means of living. In this respect, the programme is well calibrated to the needs of this target group as the equipment and materials to be purchased through the grants is critical for reviving activities and restoring livelihoods. However, the size of the

---

\(^{72}\) Except for category VI where the amount of State compensation corresponds to market prices for new houses.

\(^{73}\) The beneficiaries of the EU programme do not forfeit their right to State financial compensation except when the programme provides them with a new house (category VI).
grant is too small to accommodate the needs of larger companies, which often incurred much larger damages or losses and are facing tremendous difficulty in restoring their profitability.

**Finding 25.** Additional needs are arising as the programme is being implemented. The latter will not be able to accommodate all of them within existing resources.

In many municipalities, the JSC established a reserve list of eligible beneficiaries. The EU grantees are doing their best to include them thanks to savings and reallocation of funds. However, it is already clear that it will not be possible to cover all needs within the funds currently available. Moreover, new needs have already arisen since the JSC completed the selection of beneficiaries. In some cases, these are households, which were not originally identified by the municipalities or whose properties suffered further damages as time went by.

**Finding 26.** The priority given to schools was understandable although the ordeal of households made homeless by the floods seem more acute

The aim of the programme regarding public buildings was for all children in the affected municipalities to normally attend classes from the beginning of the 2014 school year. As a result, UNOPS gave priority to the refurbishment of schools. This might have slowed down efforts on the housing component. Given the poor living conditions of many households and the proximity of the winter season, it is questionable whether all schools should have been given the same priority.

**Finding 27.** The emphasis on reaching out the greatest number of people means that the programme provides simple forms of support. The approach adopted in agreement with Serbian authorities and the EU was not intended to address more complex and wider needs.

While the programme is providing valuable support on a large scale, its impact is limited and short-lived. It is not able (nor intended) to address more complex needs which the sector is facing (including the protection against floods) and which would require more targeted and sophisticated forms of support. Moreover, some larger farm holdings which have incurred serious damages did not receive any help (since they were ineligible) although they struggle to restore their profitability.

**Finding 28.** Despite some delays compared to the original plan, the challenge of minimising disruption to the school year is about to be met

The school year started on 1 September 2014 while most of the reconstruction works were ongoing or about to start. Although all schools opened as planned, teaching conditions were sub-optimal in most schools by the end of October. However, works were progressing well and there was every likelihood that they would be completed by the end of November for all establishments.

**Finding 29.** The support to the Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief has been effective helping in particular the organisation fulfil its coordinating and supervising role to the best of its possibilities

The ORFR is a very young institution which has risen with remarkable rapidity and efficiency to the challenges involved in distributing State aid and coordinating and supervising recovery efforts. Through its flexible and ad-hoc support, the EU programme has been contributing to the effective operations of
the ORFR from almost the very beginning, enabling it to recruit and retain qualified staff and access the expertise needed for accomplishing its duties.

However, the implementation of recovery efforts on such a scale is fraught with complexities, in particular regarding the supervision of recovery measures and the coordination among donors. Regarding the latter issue, there have been many occurrences of overlapping support being offered by donors, which in most cases were identified by the project implementers themselves and sufficiently early to be corrected and avoid waste of funds. These examples illustrate the need for putting systems in place to ensure that international assistance is deployed in the most efficient manner.

### 3.3.4. Sustainability

**Finding 30.** *Unless more is done for preventing floods in the future, some of the programme’s results are at risk of further flooding*

When it is completed, the programme will have invested a significant amount of money into the housing stock and public buildings across Serbia. Given that the municipalities receiving assistance under the programme remain exposed to flooding and (for some of them) landslides, all this investment could be easily lost if another disaster occurs in the near future, a possibility which should not be ruled out in the context of current climate changes, which have seen an increase in the frequency and scale of natural disasters. This is particularly true of the more costly new constructions, which were in most cases built on the same plot where the destroyed properties stood i.e. in the vicinity of a river or a stream. This situation calls for vigorous and systematic measures to regulate water courses and strengthen defence mechanisms against floods, in particular at the local level.

### 3.3.5. Impact

**Finding 31.** *The EU Programme is likely to make a decisive contribution to the recovery of flooded areas*

Although it will not address the full extent of needs, the impact of the EU programme is likely to be considerable. By restoring the living conditions and livelihoods of the most disadvantaged households in flood affected areas, the EU is making a decisive contribution to Serbia’s recovery efforts, enabling the country to overcome the worst consequences of the May floods.

**Finding 32.** *One of the positive side-effects of the programme is the reinforcement of local authorities’ capacities in dealing with the consequences of natural disasters*

The May floods represent maybe the biggest challenge the municipalities involved have ever faced. Some of them were better prepared to deal with its consequences. This was already visible in the early hours of the disaster when emergency measures had to be taken to strengthen flood defenses or evacuate inhabitants from flooded areas. In this respect, municipalities having a special department for dealing with natural disasters as well as emergency plans already in place before the floods were able to respond more effectively and swiftly. However, none of them were prepared to implement recovery efforts on such a scale. In this respect, the EU programme is instrumental in building capacities of local

---

74 Serbia experienced major flooding in 2006, when the maximum capacities of the Danube, Sava and Tisa rivers were breached. Over 200,000 hectares of agricultural land were flooded, as well as 2,000 houses in 30 communities within unprotected areas.
authorities to address the consequences of natural disasters in a systematic, effective and transparent manner.

**Finding 33.** The programme is a real chance for public institutions to perform long-due investment in their facilities and equipment

In total, the programme will invest approximately EUR 1.8m (including equipment, furniture and materials) into the selected schools. For most of them, this is a unique opportunity to enhance the quality of their teaching conditions and environment and realise investments, which were often long-due and would have taken much more time to happen without the programme.

### 3.4. Recommendations

#### 3.4.1. Recommendations related to the ongoing EU programme

**Recommendation 1.** Prioritise the execution of works taking into account the beneficiaries’ current living conditions

As contractors have limited capacities, the EU grantee should make sure that they prioritise the houses belonging to the most vulnerable households taking into account their temporary accommodation arrangements.

**Recommendation 2.** Ensure additional support for housing recovery in affected municipalities

It was obvious from the very beginning that the means provided through the EU programme would not be sufficient to cover all housing and economic regeneration needs in the affected municipalities. The programme has generated many reserve lists of households, which are eligible and in need of support but could not be included due to a lack of funds. In addition, new needs – not identified when the municipalities drew up their preliminary lists – have arisen in the course of implementation.

Since it is clear that savings from current grants will be insufficient to cover these needs in their entirety, the EUD has already requested new concept notes from the grantees (date of submission 30 October) in order to decide on possible top-ups. This approach makes perfectly sense. Systems are already in place, the methodology for the programme is well established and grantees enjoy productive relationships with local authorities. Thus, the most effective and fastest way to channel additional funding is through existing grants. Moreover, the very good performance achieved so far by the grantees fully vindicates a cost extension to the grant contracts in order to cover more housing and economic generation needs in the affected municipalities.

**Recommendation 3.** Perform a new needs assessment in affected municipalities to ensure that all households in need are thoroughly identified and covered

---

75 In Svilajnac, for example, the local kindergarten is being refurbished and reequipped to very high standards thanks the EU and a number of other international and private donors. As a result, the number of children on the kindergarten’s waiting list is on the increase compared to last year.

76 Some households staying with relatives have adequate living conditions while others living in make-shift constructions or under tents are particularly vulnerable with the coming winter.

77 There are lists for both the housing and the economic component.
It is however proposed that municipalities should first perform a new needs assessment since the lists they originally established are already relatively old and in need of a cross-check to ensure that no potentially eligible beneficiaries have been left out or, on the contrary, that some households on reserve lists are not in need of support anymore. Such a needs assessment is also required to decide whether further funding from the EU is needed for housing and economic regeneration beyond the envisaged top up. This process should involve municipal engineers to verify once more whether categories of damages were well assigned or are in need of revision. This is all the more necessary given that some buildings might have deteriorated since the first assessment was made.

**Recommendation 4.** Consider reviewing the eligibility/selection criteria in particular regarding ownership issues to improve the programme’s coverage among the most vulnerable households

Before implementing a new round of reconstruction/construction works, eligibility and selection criteria should be reviewed/revised to take the following issues into account:

- More weight should be given to single or two–member families, especially elderly people
- Exceptions regarding ownership issues should be made for households in great social needs:*
  - *Illegal construction*. Many vulnerable households are actually living in an illegal construction. Support should be available for these households if they can provide sufficient proofs of permanent residence in the absence of a legal act.
  - *Place of residence*. Certified statement from households living in a damaged building but officially registered elsewhere should be counted as evidence of residence.
  - *Rented building*. Households living in rented buildings damaged by the floods should be provided with the necessary building materials to restore their premises. In case of major works or construction, the programme should provide support in securing the consent from the owner.

**Recommendation 5.** Transfer households living in particularly risky areas to safer locations and ensure connection to main public utilities

In case a damaged house is located on a land particularly prone to floods, municipal authorities should provide public land in a safer location where new constructions can be built with EU support. Likewise, the municipal authorities should ensure the availability of public utility networks (electricity, sewerage and water supply). The EU grants should be able to cover costs of connection to the mains/grids whenever this is necessary in order to ensure decent living conditions to households.

**Recommendation 6.** Introduce some flexibility regarding decisions on new constructions

Whenever EU grantees’ engineers consider that a building classified in category III, IV or V deserves to be included in category VI, it should be left to the discretion of the EU grantee to decide whether to build a new construction if it is considered safer or that estimated repair costs are in the same range as the cost of a new house. This should be possible even if the re-categorisation process fails.

---

78 In particular Roma families
Recommendation 7. Consider reviewing reconstruction standards so that decent living conditions can be ensured to the most vulnerable households

In many cases, the most vulnerable affected families lacked basic facilities even before the floods e.g. toilet in the house, water supply, safe roof, etc. Therefore, instead of limiting EU support to the repair of flood damages, EU grantees should be able to calibrate their assistance in order to ensure that decent living conditions are created for these households.

Recommendation 8. Draw lessons learned and share best practices before the next round of support

Before the start of a new round of housing/economic regeneration support, it would be worthwhile for the EU grantees together with the ORFR and the EUD to draw lessons learned from the implementation of the programme so far. This should cover issues already mentioned above related to the common implementation methodology and problems encountered during implementation. EU grantees have developed many implementation tools which would deserve being shared among each other. More generally, it should be ensured that the experience and know-how accumulated during the programme is effectively transferred to the ORFR.

3.4.2. Other recommendations

The following medium- to long-term recommendations are made with a view to promoting Disaster Risk Management and Resilience Building in Serbia. They would contribute to

(i) govern risks and crises under which the central and the municipal governments can adopt and implement legal, policy and institutional systems and regulatory frameworks for risk reduction and crisis management (Recommendation 10)

(ii) watch to safeguard under which the municipalities can provide (Recommendations 12 and 14);

(iii) apply risk and vulnerability reduction measures at household and community level (Recommendations 11, 13, 14 and 15);

(iv) enhance the response capacity through training and mentoring to enable the municipalities and Ministry to prepare for and manage effective responses (Recommendations 13 and 14)

Recommendation 9. Provide additional support to the agricultural sector to deal with the consequences of floods and strengthen the viability of small and medium scale farms

The May 2014 floods have caused extensive damages to agricultural lands. Many farmers having lost their crops in 2014 are at risk of further losses in the coming years given the poor state of agricultural areas in many municipalities. Funding is required for soil decontamination and clean-up operations in order to help restore productive arable and grazing lands. Farmers also need assistance with the improvement of agricultural drainage, which is essential not only to increase their yields but also as a flood prevention mechanism. Last but not least, there is a general need to support local farmers in protecting themselves effectively against floods through the identification of risks and the installation of protective devices and/or materials. This assistance should be combined with more general support for the modernisation of agriculture in flooded areas. Small and medium scale farms should be targeted with tools, technology and training in order to help them secure harvests and increase their productivity.
and environmental compatibility. Technical assistance combined with grant support would be an ideal delivery mechanism to which the EU could contribute.

**Recommendation 10. Improve the planning and coordination of flood prevention and management through effective systems and strategies in line with the EC Floods directive**

As an EU candidate country, Serbia is expected to adopt the Floods Directive (2007/60/EC), which complements the EU’s Water Framework Directive (WFD) with the overall aim of managing flood risks that pose threats to human health, the environment, cultural heritage and economic activities, and integrated with overall water management and pollution prevention. The Floods Directive is based on three steps: preliminary flood risk assessment; the preparation of flood risk maps; and the preparation of flood risk plans, based on prevention, protection and preparedness.

According to the Directive, flood management strategies should be in place by 2015. The WFD obliges Serbia to prepare six-yearly flood risk management plans at both the central and local levels. Flood risk management must be integrated with overall water management and pollution prevention. This requires institutional and planning coordination on both an administrative (central/local) and natural hydrological basis.

Institutional responsibilities for flood management involve the Water Directorate, three Public Water Management Enterprises covering national, provincial and capital city responsibilities, local PUCs, the Republic Hydro-meteorological Service of Serbia and EPS.

The Ministry of Interior and the Sector for Emergency Management (SEM) specifically is responsible for disaster risk reduction. The responsibilities of other institutional actors, including civil defence, are determined by the General Flood Defence Plan under the direction of the Ministry of Interior. A Republic Emergency Management Headquarters in Belgrade has been created which provides a National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, incorporating public administration institutions and NGOs. Flood defence plans are mainly prepared for high risk areas with existing flood protection measures. Local self-governments are responsible for flood protection measures in non-high risk areas.

Finally, the Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief, which has been coordinating emergency and recovery efforts in the aftermath of the May 2014 floods, is slated to play a long-term role in the prevention and management of civil emergencies.

In this context, there is a need for further institutional support regarding flood prevention and management in Serbia (including coordination and demarcation of responsibilities) to ensure that risks are constantly and properly assessed and monitored, national priorities are defined in line with needs and the EU Flood Directive, investment into prevention/mitigation measures are planned and executed and nationwide arrangements to respond effectively to flood emergencies are in place.

Support is particularly required to ensure that central and municipal governments are able to adopt and implement legal, policy and institutional systems and regulatory frameworks for risk reduction and crisis management.

---
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80 IPA has already provided assistance in this area in the past. For example, the Water Directorate has designed a Water Management Information System for Serbia, carried out a study of flood prone areas (to harmonise with the EC Directive) and has engaged in the regional Danube Flood Risk Project.
**Recommendation 11. Support Serbia in expanding the total area of its territory protected against floods through investment into strategic flood prevention and mitigation infrastructure**

The EU and IFIs should support Serbia in strengthening and expanding the total area of its territory protected from floods. Funding should be made available for strategic flood prevention & mitigation measures, including river regulation through the construction of dams and reservoirs to store flood waters and the development/strengthening of flood protection infrastructure such as dykes, levees, floodwalls, channel alterations, high-flow diversions and land treatment, in particular in areas identified as carrying significant flood risks.

**Recommendation 12. Build the capacity of local authorities to prevent and manage natural disasters, including flooding**

In the aftermath of the May Floods, all affected municipalities established a Crisis Team to deal with the consequences of the disaster and coordinate recovery efforts. Some municipalities had set up special units within their administration to deal with risk prevention and civil emergencies prior to the disaster. However, local capacities in these areas remain overall very limited in Serbia. Although disasters are largely unpredictable, their worst effects can be partially or completely prevented by preparation, early warning, and swift, decisive responses. In this context, there is a need to help local self-governments get prepared for unexpected natural disasters by setting up the required structures and adopting the necessary plans while ensuring that resources are applied effectively. LSGs should be ready to mobilise all the relevant services on their territory to face unexpected threats. Fire services, ambulance services, emergency medical services, engineers, rescue workers and traffic services can all become involved in disaster management. LSGs should be able to operate regular information and early warning mechanisms against potential, known and emerging threats by making use of available risk and hazard mapping, and linking with works carried out by other national and regional bodies.

In this context, the first step consists in the adoption of a local disaster management plan, in particular for disasters that occur regularly – such as flooding of settlements, agricultural lands, and roads. The plan should include such needs as information campaigns/training for citizens to ensure that the population is aware of what they can do to prevent specific disasters and how they should react when they happen.

The central government should initiate, coordinate and support the efforts of LSGs to strengthen their capacity to prevent and manage natural disasters through training and mentoring. The EU could contribute funding to finance the implementation of comprehensive local disaster prevention/management plans.

**Recommendation 13. Support investment into flood prevention mechanisms at the local level**

81 The total area in Serbia defended from flooding in 2012 amounted to 1 468 000 hectares, which was a 25% decrease compared to 2011. The vast majority of this protected land (86% in 2012) is agricultural, which suffered a marginally larger relative decline in defences (26%).

82 High-flow diversions redirect excess flows from developed areas using natural or artificially constructed bypass channels or conduits. Land treatment measures modify floods by increasing infiltration and decreasing the amount of and rate of run-off.

83 The preliminary flood risk assessment carried out by the Water Directorate has identified 127 Areas of Potential Significant Flood Risk along 96 watercourses in Serbia.

84 For example, in Cacak and Kraljevo.
While there is a need to carry out large-scale investment on the main rivers and watercourses, flood prevention measures at the local level can make a real difference in times of floods as illustrated by the anti-erosion works on the Raska river carried out in the framework of an EU-funded project. These were instrumental in protecting the municipality of Novi Pazar against the 2014 floods. Many riverbeds across Serbia (particularly of small river tributaries) are poorly regulated and are therefore prone to overflow, causing great damages to agricultural land and settlements. The project in Novi Pazar shows that investment into prevention measures can be very cost effective. Local self-governments should be encouraged to implement flood prevention/mitigation measures and support should be available for local investment into the construction of flood protection structures and clean-up operations of riverbeds and channels in line with national strategies and plans. In addition, there is a need to promote risk and vulnerability reduction measures at household and community level.

**Recommendation 14. Promote regional cooperation on flood prevention and management in particular through the cross-border programmes**

The cross-border programme is a well-suited instrument for promoting flood prevention and management at the local level given that state borders in the region often correspond to the course of major rivers. Moreover, less than 10% of all available surface waters in Serbia originate within its borders. The remaining 90% are trans-boundary waters entering Serbia through the Danube, Sava, Tisa, Drina and other rivers. The flooding of the entire village of Jamena (Sid) caused by the bursting of a Croatian dam illustrates the need for cross-border initiatives to implement effective flood prevention and management policies. In this context, it is recommended that specific calls of proposals be launched in the framework of CBC programmes to encourage cross-border cooperation in the area of flood prevention/management with the overall aim of contributing to a better level of preparedness to floods in border regions. Eligible actions should include:

- Capacity building of operational units in local authorities dealing with flood prevention and management
- Development of flood prevention and management plans
- Setting up flood forecasting and early warning systems
- Performing risk analysis and carrying out feasibility studies to address major risks
- Investment into local flood prevention mechanisms
- Investment into cleaning operations of local channels and river streams

**Recommendation 15. The government should take measures to encourage owners of properties in flood risk areas to take out insurance**

Only 3% of owners in Serbia have their properties insured against flooding. Given the frequency of floods in recent years and the costs of repairing damage to buildings and their contents, Serbia should

---

85 The Raška River flood protection project including the construction and reconstruction of the dams was funded by the EU and the Government of Switzerland through the European Partnership with Municipalities Programme EU PROGRES with 420,000 EUR.

86 The total damage suffered in 2013 due to floods from the Raska river was more than EUR 1m while it surpassed EUR 2m in 2012.

87 A good example of such a project is the IPA 2010 Cross-border Flood Protection and Rescue implemented under the CBC Serbia-Montenegro.
consider setting up an insurance programme to encourage property owners in flood risk areas to purchase insurance protection from the government at subsidised rates.
### 4. PROPOSAL FOR POLICY OBJECTIVES AND INDICATORS FOR THE NEXT PROGRAMMING PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Availability/Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. To provide housing and livelihood support to the most disadvantaged and vulnerable categories of citizens in areas affected by the floods** | • Living conditions and livelihoods in flood-affected municipalities are returned to pre-flood situation (needs identified in RNA and subsequent assessments are addressed)  
• Number of durable housing solutions for vulnerable households affected by floods  
• Number of small businesses owned by vulnerable categories of citizens revived through income-generation grants | • Reports from the Commission for Damage Assessment  
• Reports from the ORFR  
• Analysis from beneficiary municipalities  
• Project implementation reports | • A new recovery needs assessment is required to reassess reconstruction/construction needs. This new assessment should be used as a benchmark to implement new recovery activities  
• Data related to provided housing solutions to be obtained through project monitoring |
| **2. To support the agricultural sector of flooded areas in recovering from the long-term consequences of floods (including support for resilience building against floods) and reaching higher levels of productivity and environment compatibility** | • % of damaged arable and grazing lands restored  
• Production capacities of small and medium farms in flood-affected areas restored  
• % of increase in productivity of small and medium farms in flood-affected areas  
• Level of environmental compliance among small and medium farms in flood-affected areas  
• % of export increase among small and medium farms in flood-affected areas | • Reports from the MAEP  
• Surveys from beneficiary municipalities/ local agriculture extension services  
• Project implementation reports | • A baseline needs to be established before start of implementation. This will involve the MAEP and LSGs/local agricultural extension services  
• Data related to project results to be obtained through project monitoring |
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#### 3. To promote flood prevention strategies and plans and support strategic investment into flood protection infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Reports from the Ministry of Interior</th>
<th>Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate)</th>
<th>Reports from the ORFR</th>
<th>EC Progress Report</th>
<th>Project implementation reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of soil decontamination and clean-up operations on flood-affected agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of small and medium farms in flood-affected areas receiving support through the programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective planning and management systems are in place to reduce and manage flood-related risks in line with EU Flood Directive, including hydrological forecasting system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of territory protected against floods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of flood protection infrastructure built (dams, reservoirs, dykes, levees, floodwalls, etc.) in line with national priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of flood hazard/risk maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from the ORFR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Progress Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Flood Relief Directive, Serbia undertakes to prepare flood risk assessment; flood risk maps and flood risk plans which can be used to monitor progress towards targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. To support investment into flood protection mechanisms and improve flood prevention and management capacities at the local level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Reports from the Ministry of Interior</th>
<th>Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate)</th>
<th>Reports from the ORFR</th>
<th>EC Progress Report</th>
<th>Project implementation reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of territory protected against floods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported LSGs have effective management capacities to deal with disaster management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster risk reduction plans developed and adopted in target LSGs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-warning and disaster risk prevention solutions adopted in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from the ORFR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local plans from beneficiary municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to develop an information system to track plans/investment realised at the local level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target LSGs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of investment into flood prevention and mitigation infrastructure at local level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 1. Overview of the Flood Relief housing component (31 October 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU Grantee</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Overall Total damaged houses (RNA) A</th>
<th>Preliminary list</th>
<th>Final list</th>
<th>% of identified needs (D+E)/(B+C)</th>
<th>% of damaged houses (D+E)/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bajina Basta</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ljubovija</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loznica</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mali Zvornik</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osecina</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sabac</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valjevo</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carak</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jagodina</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koceljeva</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paracin</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smederevska Palanka</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Velika Plana</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Help</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kosjerić</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kraljevo</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lazarevac</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Svilajnac</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trstenik</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varvarin</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNOPS/IOM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bajina Bašta</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gornji Milanovac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kruševac</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lajkovac</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loznica</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malo Črniče</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mionica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obrenovac</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osečina</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paracin</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Požega</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Šid</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smederevo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valjevo</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,280</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2. Number of legal acts issued in municipalities covered by the EU Flood Relief Programme (31 October 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities included in EU programme</th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
<th>Category IV</th>
<th>Category V</th>
<th>Category VI</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Total I-IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAJINA BAŠTA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČAČAK</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORNJI MILANOVC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAGODINA</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCELJEVA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOSJERIĆ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAJUSJEVAC</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRALJEVO</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRUPIJAN</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAJKOVAC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAZAREVAC</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUJOVJEA</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOJNICA</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALI ZVORNIK</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALO CRNIĆE</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIONICA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBRENOVAC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,408</td>
<td>5,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSOČINA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAČIN</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POZEGA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUMA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABAC</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SĐ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEDEREVO</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEDEREVSKA PALANKA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVILAJNAC</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>2,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRSTENIK</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALJEVO</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARVARIN</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VELIKA PLANA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total                            | 2,748       | 2,331       | 6,560        | 2,564       | 174         | 60          | 14,437      | 14,377    |
## Annex 3. Grant sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Scheme</th>
<th>Applicant name</th>
<th>Action title</th>
<th>Field theme</th>
<th>Location of applicant</th>
<th>Sum of EU contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBC CRO-SRB</td>
<td>Nature Conservation Movement of Sremjska Mitrovica (Pokret gorana Sremjske Mitrovici)</td>
<td>Living Danube - strengthening capacities for the protection of Middle Danube ecosystems - Road to Sustainability of the Danube - Border to Sustainability of the Croatia - Serbia Cross Border Region</td>
<td>Environment protection</td>
<td>Sremjska Mitrovica</td>
<td>€ 119,478.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC SRB-BIH</td>
<td>Public Utility Service Company “Dunis” - Ub - Serbia</td>
<td>Improved waste water and environment management in the areas of Ub and Eastern Sarajevo</td>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>€ 137,498.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist organization Priboj</td>
<td>Improvement of the International Lim Biathlon manifestation Priboj-Rudo (Sethove) - Regatta for all</td>
<td>People-to-People</td>
<td>Priboj</td>
<td>€ 88,725.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unesco</td>
<td>Wise use of common natural resources - road to sustainability of the Serbia/BiH cross-border region</td>
<td>Environment protection</td>
<td>Beograd</td>
<td>€ 134,958.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC SRB-MNE</td>
<td>JVP Srbijavode/Public Water Management Company “Srbijavode”</td>
<td>Through Geographic Information System Towards Better Cross-Border Flood Risk Management in the Lim River Basin</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Social Development</td>
<td>Beograd</td>
<td>€ 211,627.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Serbia</td>
<td>Cross-border Flood Protection and Rescue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic &amp; Social Development</td>
<td>Beograd</td>
<td>€ 165,822.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field theme</th>
<th>Location of applicant</th>
<th>Sum of EU contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education reform, intercultural and democracy learning</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 99,329.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSDev, public administration reform (incl. sub-granting)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 98,740.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Freedom</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 106,397.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural dialogue, asylum-seekers and migrants</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 91,067.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs awareness-raising, education</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 139,928.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Freedom</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 103,223.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praets</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 46,670.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-trafficking</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 47,480.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 52,516.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s organizations</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 45,416.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison reform</td>
<td>Nis</td>
<td>€ 95,665.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for Roma to Support Inclusive Education for Roma</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 84,365.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma, education</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 44,942.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma, children with disabilities</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 68,144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 44,397.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 46,499.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Priboj</td>
<td>€ 47,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 41,284.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>€ 49,894.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>€ 99,978.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Priboj</td>
<td>€ 49,894.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth</td>
<td>Novi Sad</td>
<td>€ 46,282.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Scheme</td>
<td>Applicant name</td>
<td>Action title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floods relief</strong></td>
<td>Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund</td>
<td>Provision of housing reconstruction and economic revitalisation to most vulnerable flood-affected families in Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
<td>Supporting Recovery of Floods Affected Households and Local Economies in Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations</td>
<td>Agricultural and food security emergency assistance to flood affected small-scale farmers in Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help-Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe e.V.</td>
<td>EU assistance for flood relief in Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>Serbia Floods Rehabilitation Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Health</strong></td>
<td>Caritas Sabac</td>
<td>Support to prevention of residential treatment of persons with mental and intellectual disorders in Mačvanski County through development of community-based home and day care services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital Dr Slavoljub Bakalovic</td>
<td>Improvement of mental health protection in Vršac municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Sveti Vasilije Ostroski Cudotvorac</td>
<td>Independent community-based living for people with mental disability and mental health disorders in the Municipality of Novi Bečej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Institution for adults “Srce u Jabuci”</td>
<td>Increasing capacities for independent living in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serbian Association for promoting Inclusion SAPI</td>
<td>Towards living in the community and further supported housing for persons with intellectual and other disabilities in Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugees &amp; IDPs</strong></td>
<td>Creative Educational Center KEC</td>
<td>Community based services and employment for people with intellectual disabilities as well as those with mental disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Deutschland</td>
<td>Support to sustainable return and reintegration of IDPs to Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
<td>Supporting livelihood enhancement and closures of collective centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help - Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe e.V.</td>
<td>Support to improvement of living conditions of forced migrants and closure of collective centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipality of Batocina</td>
<td>Integration of refugees and IDPs in the municipality of Batocina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipality of Ruma</td>
<td>Improving living conditions, building livelihoods; comprehensive assistance to IDPs in Ruma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4. Field visit Reports - Flood Relief

Field Visit Report – Čačak

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 30/10/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>20/10/14</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>City hall</td>
<td>Vojislav Ilić, Mayor&lt;br&gt;Snežana Radovanović, Trustee for Refugees&lt;br&gt;Milan Bojović, Assistant Mayor&lt;br&gt;Vladimiri Grujović, Head of LED&lt;br&gt;Zoran Belčić, Director Centre for Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Čačak</td>
<td>2 selected beneficiaries reconstruction works &amp;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Original targets to be achieved for the city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Reconstruction materials</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income-generation grants</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Progress achieved to date

Čaćak was the first city to be hit by the floods in May when the river West Morava overflowed its banks. 40% of the city’s surface was flooded (approximately 30 hectares). Damages/losses to public infrastructure, agriculture and buildings were estimated at €15m. 496 buildings were damaged. The city was also affected by floods in April and September. It is currently setting up a department within the administration to deal with disaster prevention and risk management.

✓ Reconstruction materials & works

In the course of August, the city identified 74 households as a preliminary list of potential beneficiaries for the DRC grant. A call for applications was launched and opened for two weeks. DRC’s social workers and civil engineers have visited the beneficiaries identified by municipalities. The aim of the visits was to understand better recovery needs, to assess the eligibility of the potential beneficiaries and to identify potential issues to be resolved prior to the selection process e.g. land ownership. DRC also provided support to applicants in preparing and submitting their dossier to the city together with all the necessary evidences.

14 applications received by the deadline were assessed by the joint selection committee consisting of representatives from the city, the local Centre for Social Welfare (CSW), the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief and DRC.

The application dossiers were scored against the criteria set out in the methodology. The committee took into account the findings from DRC’s field visit reports. The applicants reaching the highest scores have been selected within the funds available. The final scoring list is displayed on the information board in the municipal hall.
The **final list of beneficiaries was adopted** early September as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstruction materials &amp; works*</th>
<th>Original list</th>
<th>Final list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* including basic household appliances and furniture sets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In parallel with the work of the joint selection committee, DRC/DRC prepared detailed bills of quantities both for reconstruction materials & works. Bills of quantities for all seven municipalities including Cacak were compiled into a single tender dossier. The tender was launched by DRC end of October 2014 with in line with the Emergency Tender Procedure agreed with the EUD. The contract for Cacak was awarded to one company.

The evaluator visited 2 households selected for reconstruction works. Current living conditions (no heating) and the state of their property fully justify their selection.

✓ **Economic component**

Cacak was at first not included in the economic component. However, the municipality approached DRC with a list of affected businesses. As a result, one grant was awarded to a local business.

### 3 Problems encountered and actions taken

✓ DRC contacted the Office for Reconstruction & Flood Relief to agree on the re-categorisation of some buildings. Agreement was granted in several cases.

✓ Ownership of land and/or building proved a major obstacle to some applicants. Considerable efforts from DRC and the city were necessary to clarify and solve ownership issues. In case of multiple ownerships, this involved contacting relatives and mediating among them (obtaining at least a declaration than they are entitled to live in the building). In case of illegal ownerships, this required some proofs that the household is paying builds and had been occupying the land/premises for more than several years (declaration from neighbours).

### 4 Next steps

✓ The contract for reconstruction materials & works is to be awarded by the end of October. Delivery and works are to start end of October. They should be completed within 2 months depending on the weather conditions.

✓ Delivery of reconstruction materials and supplies to micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs to start end of October and early November. They should be completed within 2 months.

### 5 Additional Needs

✓ According to the municipality, there is a reserve list of more than 50 buildings which could be renovated if additional funding was available.

### 6 Conclusions

✓ Activities in Cacak are on track.

✓ Delays with the reconstruction works are likely due to the winter season.
Field Visit Report - Kraljevo

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 03/11/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HELP</td>
<td>27/10/14</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>City hall</td>
<td>Dragomir Spasic, Help Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milan Gocobiija, Site Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ilinka Pribojac, Help Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Igor Vatricевич, Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milan Vasiljevic, Municipality representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kraljevo</td>
<td>1 selected beneficiary for reconstruction building &amp; works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Original targets to be achieved for the municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>Reconstruction materials</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income-generation grants</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Progress achieved to date

The rivers Ibra and Morava, which are flowing through the municipality of Kraljevo, flooded the municipality and surrounding villages in May but also in April and July. Given the size (1,050 km²) and shape of the municipality, damages are spread over a wide area, which complicates rescue/recovery operations. In spite of budget constraints, the municipality was relatively well prepared to deal with the disaster given the experience it gained in recent years in facing emergency situations – the city was hit by a major earthquake in 2012. According to the municipality of Kraljevo 471 private/public buildings and 100 businesses sustained damages/losses as a result of the May floods. There was no category 6 house. 72 km of road were also damaged and many bridges were wiped out. The municipality is hosting a large population of IDPs from Kosovo who often live in precarious conditions and were affected by the floods. The Municipality is receiving support from Help and FAO

✔ Reconstruction materials & works

A first list was drawn of 23 potential applicants for reconstruction materials & works and 20 for furniture and materials was drawn by the municipality with the help from the Centre for Social Work in Kraljevo, which helped identified the most vulnerable households. A joint selection committee was set up comprising representatives from the municipality, the local Centre for Social Welfare (CSW), the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief and Help.

HELP’s social workers and civil engineers visited all potential beneficiaries identified by municipalities on the preliminary list. The aim of the visits was to understand better recovery needs, to assess the eligibility of the potential beneficiaries and to identify potential issues to be resolved prior to the selection process e.g. land ownership.
HELP provided support to potential applicants in preparing and submitting their application dossier to the municipality together with all the necessary evidences. All 43 identified potential applicants (23 for reconstruction materials & works and 20 for furniture and materials) submitted an application with supporting documentation.

The joint selection committee have reviewed and scored application dossiers against the criteria set out in the methodology. The committee took into account the findings from HELP’s field visit reports. The applicants reaching the highest scores have been selected within the funds available. The final scoring list was displayed on the information board in the municipal hall. There was 8 days for complaining at the end of which the final list was published. 19 beneficiaries were selected given savings on the scope work.

The final list of 19 beneficiaries being adopted in late October as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstruction materials &amp; works</th>
<th>Pre-fabricated houses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original list</td>
<td>Final list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original list</td>
<td>Final list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the municipality wanted to help as many households as possible, it decided to provide 10 households with reconstruction materials and 9 households with furniture and equipment.

In parallel with the work of the joint selection committee, HELP prepared detailed bills of quantities both for reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses. Bills of quantities for the municipalities of Kraljevo, Lazarevac, Svilajnac, Trstenik, Varvarin were compiled into a single tender dossier for 51 buildings (including 10 buildings in Kraljevo). The tenders were launched on 09 October (reconstruction materials & materials) with a deadline on 20 October in line with the Emergency Tender Procedure agreed with the EUD.

The evaluator visited 1 selected beneficiary for reconstruction materials and works. Current living conditions and the state of their property fully justify the selection.

Income-generation grants

Regarding income-generating grants, the municipality decided to focus on reviving the agricultural sector. It compiled a 45 preliminary list of potential beneficiaries, mostly small farmers in need of green houses and seedlings. Help visited all beneficiaries and checked the eligibility of each beneficiary removing from the list businesses which were not active in the last three years or did not belong to vulnerable groups. As a result, the list was narrowed down to 30 beneficiaries (18 farmers and 12 SMEs) who were considered eligible according to the methodology giving preference to the most vulnerable categories of households. Help further identified needs (in order to draw bills of quantities) and make sure evidences to support application were being collected.

Bills of quantities were drawn accordingly and added to the bills of quantities for other municipalities in order to form a single tender dossier. The tender dossier is being prepared.

3 Problems encountered and actions taken

- Approval of emergency tendering procedure but not a major problem.
- The collection of the necessary evidences to support the application filed by beneficiaries was often time-consuming.
The costs of repairs being below expected average, 9 additional households were included on the final list compared to the original plan.

However, splitting beneficiaries into 2 groups (1. Beneficiaries of reconstruction materials/works and 2. Beneficiaries of equipment) reduces the impact of the support since none of the beneficiaries are given a full solution.

Ownership of land and/or building proved a major obstacle to some applicants. 2 applicants were rejected on that ground although they were among the most needy according to the ranking list. Proofs were collected that households were occupying the land/premises and were paying bills for more than several years. A request was sent to the Office for Reconstruction but no approval was given in this case. In the meantime, a solution was found for the households to support them through private donations.

4 Next steps

✓ Contract for reconstruction and works to be awarded end of October. Works to start immediately on 10 houses and to be completed in 48 calendar days depending on the weather conditions.
✓ Contract for 9 additional houses to be signed end of November
✓ Contract for furniture and appliance to be signed end of November
✓ Tender for supplies to micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs to start early November until December. Contracts to be signed end of December for different type of supplies.

5 Additional Needs

✓ There is a reserve list of 10 houses, which would be eligible for support in case of more funding
✓ Many households renting a house are in need of support but are not eligible to the project.
✓ Repair of roads and bridges
✓ River regulation including protection walls and embankments. This was considered to be more important than the purchase of equipment by the beneficiaries of income-generation grants.

6 Conclusions

✓ Activities in Kraljevo are on track. However, the winter season is likely to slow down reconstruction activities.
Field Visit Report – Krupanj
Written by Paul Georis
Date: 28/10/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>22/10/14</td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>City hall</td>
<td>Rade Grujic, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zorica Marinkovic, Assistant for Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ljiljana, FAO Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Original targets to be achieved for the municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Delivery of packages for small-scale agricultural holdings</td>
<td>23 packages x 24 municipalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Progress achieved to date

✓ In addition to extensive damages to private and public buildings (1,500 of them have initially been reported as flooded), the floods also greatly affected agricultural land in Krupanj. Many fields in the vicinity of the river are still unusable for agricultural purposes because of mudflows and other debris left behind by the floods. Landslides have also ruined many agricultural parcels depriving small farmers from their livelihood, in particular in remote and mountainous areas.
✓ FAO visited Krupanj in the third week of August and briefed the municipality about the type of support available under the FAO grant, the target group and the procedure for selecting beneficiaries and delivering the packages to farmers.
✓ The municipality through its local village councils distributed the FAO questionnaire to potential beneficiaries in order to collect information about the size of the household, the type of holding, the damages/losses sustained and the priority needs. Each applicant had to select three priorities among the 23 proposed packages. The call was launched on 24 August for 8 days. The Municipality compiled a list of 1,348 applicants, which was sent to FAO by September 5 together with all the filled in questionnaires.
✓ The questionnaires were entered into the FAO’s database and reviewed according to the criteria defined in the methodology (a software specially developed by the FAO was used for that purpose). 1,347 applications in Krupanj were considered eligible for support.
✓ 154 households were selected to receive package 1 (winter wheat 250 kg) and package 2 (fertilizer 300 kg).
✓ FAO launched a tender for the first two packages through its Budapest office covering all 24 municipalities.
✓ The municipality provided a storage room and organised the distribution of the packages to the selected beneficiaries in mid-October 2014.

3 Problems encountered and actions taken

✓ Some local village councils were slow at distributing questionnaires and contacting potential applicants. The municipality organised meetings with them to mobilise and check progress.
4 **Next steps**

- The municipality is preparing for the delivery of fruit seedlings in line with the timetable prepared by the FAO. **346 beneficiaries** have been selected among the 1,487 applicants pre-selected in Krupanj. Each package will contain 300 plum, cherry or sour cherry seedlings or 1,800 blackberries or raspberries seedlings.

5 **Additional Needs**

- There is an urgent need to clean up deposits/debris left behind by the floods in order to restore the quality of the soil. Many farmers may otherwise incur new losses as their land is unsuited for growing crops or even tending livestock.
- Ensure clearance of river beds and channels and maintenance of existing and construction of additional flood protection walls and banks
- Additional support to small farmers whose livelihood was severely curtailed as a result of the floods/landslides
- Repair works to roads, bridges and canalisations damaged by the floods/landslides.
- Landslides mitigations measures (drainage, reinforcement) to improve slope stability.

6 **Conclusions**

- Assistance to local farmers through the project is on track but unlikely to be sufficient to deal with the scale of damages sustained by the local agriculture.
Field Visit Report – Mali Zvornik

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 28/10/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>22/10/14</td>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>City hall</td>
<td>Milivoje Tanasovic, Mali Zvornik President of the Selection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members of Selection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mauro Mascioli, ABS Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members of Joint Selection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASB/DIVAC Project Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Mali Zvornik</td>
<td>Vucetic Milan Family, selected beneficiary (Housing Component)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vucetic Simana Family selected beneficiary (Economic Component)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milivoje Tanasovic, Mali Zvornik President of the Selection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mauro Mascioli, ABS Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASB &amp; partners staff members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Original targets to be achieved for the municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Reconstruction materials &amp; works</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic component</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Progress achieved to date

The municipality of Mali Zvornik has been badly affected by the floods. Situated in a mountainous area, the municipality suffered many landslides and mudflows which damaged public/private buildings and ruined agricultural land.

- ✔ Reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses

The municipality of Mali Zvornik handed a preliminary list of 70 potential beneficiaries for reconstruction materials & works to ASB based on the initial assessment carried out together with the local Centre for Social Work, which identified the most vulnerable households. A joint selection committee was set up comprising representatives from the municipality, the local Centre for Social Welfare (CSW), the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief and ASB.

ASB’s social workers and civil engineers visited all potential beneficiaries identified by municipalities in the preliminary list. The aim of the visits was to understand better recovery needs, to assess the eligibility of the potential beneficiaries and to identify potential issues to be resolved prior to the selection process e.g. land ownership.
70 applications were received. The joint selection committees have reviewed and scored application dossiers against the criteria set out in the methodology taking into account the findings from ASB’s field visit reports. The applicants reaching the highest scores have been selected within the funds available. The final scoring list is displayed on the information board in the municipal hall. There is no reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstruction materials &amp; works*</th>
<th>Pre-fabricated houses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original list</td>
<td>Final list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* including basic household appliances and furniture sets.

In parallel with the work of the joint selection committee, ASB prepared detailed bills of quantities both for reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses. Bills of quantities for all 8 municipalities were compiled into a single tender dossier. The tender was launched by ASB on 3 October 2014 with a deadline on 17 October in line with the Emergency Tender Procedure agreed with the EUD. The tenderer is to be selected by 25 October.

The evaluator visited 1 household selected for reconstruction works. Current living conditions of these beneficiaries and the state of their property fully justify their selection.

- **Economic component (Divac)**

Divac is in charge of the component for economic grants which support the purchase of equipment and/or the reconstruction of business premises for micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs.

Divac received a [240 preliminary list](#) of potential beneficiaries compiled by the municipality in the aftermath of the floods. Divac checked the eligibility of each beneficiary removing from the list businesses which were not active in the last three years or did not belong to vulnerable groups. As a result, the list was narrowed down to [85 beneficiaries](#) who were visited by Divac to check needs and identify issues connected to evidences to be submitted. As a result, Divac selected [23 beneficiaries](#) (three of which for reconstruction materials) in line with the criteria set out in the methodology giving preference to the most vulnerable categories of households. All beneficiaries are agricultural households.

Bills of quantities were drawn accordingly and added to the bills of quantities of the other 7 municipalities in order to form a single tender dossier with different lots. ASB requested the authorization from the EUD to enter negotiation with the company selected after market research with offers. For Mali Zvornik, the value of the contract is estimated at 47,370 EUR.

The evaluator visited 1 household selected for income-generating grant.

### 3 Problems encountered and actions taken

- ASB requested the re-categorisation of three buildings, which sustained greater damages than what was stated in the Official Act. Two requests were turned down and one accepted.
- 15 damaged houses situated on a terrain considered dangerous for lack of stability could not be selected.
4 Next steps

✓ The contract for reconstruction materials & works is to be awarded by the end of October. Delivery and works are to start end of October. They should be completed within 60 days depending on the weather conditions.

✓ Another contract for the pre-fabricated house is to be awarded by the end of October. Delivery and works are to start end of October. Works should be completed within 60 days depending on the weather conditions.

✓ Delivery of reconstruction materials and supplies to micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs to start end of October and early November. They should be completed within 2 months.

5 Additional Needs

- 4 additional households are on the reserve list for reconstruction works and 30 for the economic component and could be helped with additional funding.
- 15 damaged houses situated on a terrain considered dangerous for lack of stability. There is a need to construct new buildings in another location or perform the strengthening the land.

✓ Ensure clearance of river beds and channels and maintenance of existing and construction of additional flood protection walls and banks

✓ Additional support to small farmers whose livelihood was severely curtailed as a result of the floods/landslides

✓ Repair works to roads, bridges and canalizations damaged by the floods/landslides.

✓ Landslides mitigations measures (drainage, reinforcement) to improve slope stability.

6 Conclusions

✓ Activities in Mali Zvornik are on track.

✓ There could be some delays with the reconstruction works/ construction of pre-fabricated houses due to the winter season.
Field Visit Report – Obrenovac

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 02/11/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>28/10/14</td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Primary School “J.J. Zmaj”, Obrenovac</td>
<td>Vera Djordjevic, School Principal Svetlena Mijuk, UNOPS Project Assistant Jelena Despotovic, UNOPS Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Primary school “Posavski Partizani”, Obrenovac</td>
<td>Vesna Jesic, School Principal Svetlena Mijuk, UNOPS Project Assistant Jelena Despotovic, UNOPS Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Technical School Obrenovac</td>
<td>Rajka Babovic, School Principal Svetlena Mijuk, UNOPS Project Assistant Jelena Despotovic, UNOPS Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Obrenovac</td>
<td>2 selected beneficiaries of new houses Contractor of new houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Municipality of Obrenovac</td>
<td>Ivan Vujic, Deputy Mayor Svetlena Mijuk, UNOPS Project Assistant Jelena Despotovic, UNOPS Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Original targets to be achieved for the municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>Public buildings in Obrenovac</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction materials &amp; works</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income-generation grants</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Progress achieved to date

Obrenovac suffered the greatest damages by the May 2014 floods among all 24 municipalities.

a) Public buildings

The evaluator visited three of the six schools currently being refurbished by UNOPS in Obrenovac:

1. Extensive reconstruction works are taking place in the ground floor of the Primary School “J.J. Zmaj”, which has been severely damaged by the floods (3,500 sq. metres were flooded. The water level reached 2.5 meters and the school remained flooded during 20 days). Works started on 01.09.14 and are expected to be completed by 01.11.14. The school year started on time but classes are being held only in the upper floor. Given the lack of space and the ongoing works, teaching conditions are sub-optimal. Repair costs amount to € 196,816 EUR.

2. Wide-scale reconstruction works were also apace in the Primary School “Posavski Partizani”, which sustained also considerable damages in its ground floor and basement. Works started on 08.09.14 and are expected to be completed by 10 November. Classes are being held but teaching conditions are disrupted by the works and the lack of space.. The heating system was
put back into operation. Although she very satisfied with the quality of the works, the principal complained that her school was not given the same priority than the Primary School “J.J. Zmaj”. Repair costs amount to € 150,642 EUR.

3. Works started in the Technical School Obrenovac with two workshops already refurbished. However, works could not start on the oldest building of the school where the administration offices are located and which suffer the most with major cracks in the walls. A study tested the stability of the building confirmed that it was structurally sound and that repairs were possible. The costs of the latter will amount to € 262,047.20.

A contractor has already been selected to supply schools with new furniture and equipment. Delivery is being postponed until completion of all works.

b) Housing component

✓ Reconstruction materials & works

IOM is responsible for refurbishing 150 houses in the settlement Brace Jugovic. Given that all houses are covered in the settlement, there was no Joint Selection Committee.

✓ Construction of new houses

UNOPS is responsible for the construction of 10 new houses in Obrenovac.

The evaluator visited 2 building sites. Works were well advanced. One household lived next to the new building under a tent.

3 Problems encountered and actions taken

a) Public buildings

✓ Major problems with the electrical networks caused delays with the reconstruction works in two schools. As a result, it was necessary to re-plan the works dynamics.

✓ The fact the same contractor is involved in four schools means that his capacities are overstretched (lack of workers), which is creating tensions among school principals and could cause further delays.

b) Housing component

✓ There are delays/issues with the issuance of legal acts for the reconstruction of houses in the settlement Brace Jugovic. Slow progress with the reconstruction works triggered street protests from the local inhabitants.

✓ UNOPS requested re-categorisation (request addressed to Reconstruction & Flood Relief Office which gave instructions to the municipality) of 18 houses in Obrenovac from category 3-4 to category 6. UNOPS might get responsibility for reconstructing them (requiring additional funds or reallocations).

✓ One of the beneficiaries gave false information about number of household members. As a result, the house has been downsized. The legal act from another beneficiary was cancelled because it contained false information about ownership.
It appears that the beneficiaries of new houses constructed by UNOPS are not provided with any furniture and utensils. Some of them having lost all their belongings in the floods are unable to cover these expenditures. No support was foreseen from the municipality.

4 Next steps

a) Public buildings

✔ Works are to be completed on all six schools in Obrenovac by end of the year.
✔ The delivery of school furniture will take place as soon as works are completed.

b) Housing component

✔ 10 new houses to be completed by early January
✔ IOM to launch tender for reconstruction materials & works.

5 Additional Needs

a) Public buildings

✔ No new needs regarding public buildings.

b) Housing component

✔ According to the municipality, 30 houses need to be repaired for which there is no funding.
✔ Refurbishment of water and waste water systems are a major priority
✔ Likewise, there is an urgent need to reinforce/elevate protective walls and embankments along the river as a protection measure against the floods.

6 Conclusions

✔ Activities in Obrenovac are on track.
✔ Progress with reconstruction/construction will depend on mild weather conditions during winter.
Field Visit Report - Paračin

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 28/10/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>05/10/14</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>City hall</td>
<td>• Verica Recevic, DRC Programme Manager&lt;br&gt;• Saša Paunović, Mayor&lt;br&gt;• Boban Dejanović, Municipal Coordinator, JSC member&lt;br&gt;• Jasmina Vidović, Head of procurement and LEC, member of JSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>City hall</td>
<td>• Milivoje Jovanovic, Eneca&lt;br&gt;• Verica Recevic, Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Paracin</td>
<td>• Selected final beneficiary - income-generating grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Paracin</td>
<td>• Selected final beneficiaries - reconstruction materials&lt;br&gt;• Selected final beneficiaries - pre-fabricated house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS/IOM</td>
<td>24/10/14</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Secondary Mechanical-Electro Technical School</td>
<td>• Aleksandra Djordjevic, School Principal&lt;br&gt;• Marija Zekic, Municipal Council member&lt;br&gt;• Jovan Dzeletovic, UNOPS Project Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>Secondary Technological School</td>
<td>• Dejan Nesic, School Principal&lt;br&gt;• Jovan Dzeletovic, UNOPS Project Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Original targets to be achieved for the municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Reconstruction materials</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income-generation grants</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS/IOM</td>
<td>Public building</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Progress achieved to date

a) DRC/Eneca

The municipality assessed that 1,977 houses were damaged by the floods. DRC/Eneca’s initial efforts have been focused on setting up the system at the local level and gaining the trust and support from municipal counterparts. The first meetings were held in August to ensure that everybody understood the process and were aware of their responsibilities.
Shortly after the floods, the municipality of Paracín carried out a preliminary assessment and established a preliminary list of **84 potential beneficiaries** for reconstruction materials & works and **12 for pre-fabricated houses**. This list included only the most vulnerable households.

A joint selection committee was set up comprising representatives from the municipality, the local Centre for Social Welfare (CSW), the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief, the Crisis Committee Team and DRC.

DRC's social workers and civil engineers have visited all 84 potential beneficiaries identified by municipalities in the preliminary list. These visits took place with the Centre for Social Work and Crisis Committee Team (set up after the floods by the municipality on instructions from the government) and Local Administration Office in Paracín. The aim of the visits was to understand better recovery needs, to assess the eligibility of the potential beneficiaries and to identify potential issues to be resolved prior to the selection process e.g. land ownership.

Based on the field visits, a pre-selection list was established of 51 households, which were invited to submit an application together with supporting documents. DRC provided support to these applicants in preparing and submitting their application dossier to the municipality together with all the necessary evidences. In the course of the submission, another round of field visits to affected households took place to check the submitted applications. As a result, it was found out that 8 houses deserved to be re-categorised as they had sustained more damage than those stated in the Official Act. The process was coordinated with the EUD, the Office for Reconstruction and Floods Relief and the municipality. As a result, these 8 houses were re-categorised to category 6.

The joint selection committees have reviewed and scored **43 application dossiers** against the criteria set out in the methodology. The committee took into account the findings from DRC's field visit reports. The applicants reaching the highest scores have been selected within the funds available. The final scoring list is displayed on the information board in the municipal hall. Four rounds of meetings were necessary to reach the final list as some applicants did not submit the required evidences.

The evaluator attended the fourth joint selection committee meeting, which resulted in the **final list of beneficiaries being adopted** as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reconstruction materials &amp; works*</th>
<th>Pre-fabricated houses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original list</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final list</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*including basic household appliances and furniture sets.*

In parallel with the work of the joint selection committee, DRC prepared detailed bills of quantities both for reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses. Bills of quantities were compiled into two separate tender dossiers for each component. The tenders were launched for reconstruction materials & materials and for pre-fabricated houses in line with the Emergency Tender Procedure agreed with the EUD.

The evaluator visited three selected beneficiaries for reconstruction works and pre-fabricated houses. Current living conditions of these beneficiaries and the state of their property fully justify their selection.
Income-generation grants

Eneca is in charge of the component for income-generating grants which support the purchase of equipment and/or the reconstruction of business premises for micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs.

Eneca received a preliminary list of potential beneficiaries compiled by the municipality in the aftermath of the floods which included 358 potential beneficiaries. Eneca checked the eligibility of each beneficiary removing from the list businesses which were not active in the last three years or did not belong to vulnerable groups. As a result, the list was narrowed down to 59 beneficiaries who were visited by Eneca to check needs and identify issues connected to evidences to be submitted. As a result, Eneca selected 24 beneficiaries in line with the criteria set out in the methodology giving preference to the most vulnerable categories of households. There is a reserve list of 14 beneficiaries for economic component.

Bills of quantities were drawn accordingly and added to the bills of quantities for other municipalities in order to form a single tender dossier.

The evaluator visited one of the nine selected beneficiaries for the income-generation grant. The owner was struggling to maintain her business afloat with non-functional premises and inadequate equipment. Her selection seemed fully justified.

b) UNOPS

The evaluator visited two higher schools which were flooded in Paracin and refurbished by UNOPS (one other school is refurbished by Norway).

1. UNOPS developed bills of quantities during August and September to refurbish Secondary Mechanical-Electro Technical School. At the time of the visit, an entire wing with class rooms had been refurbished and the central heating was replaced as it was completely destroyed (it provides heating to all four schools in Paracin). Repair costs amounted to 33,000 EUR. The school year started as planned and teaching conditions are now back to normal.

2. UNOPS engineers have also developed tender documentation for the Secondary Technological School which sustained severe damages on the ground floor (total surface: .). The school year started as planned but in difficult conditions as all classes are held on the second floor and there is a lack of space. The EU is financing the biggest part of the works but other donors are also contributing. EU repair costs amounted to 118,000 EUR.

The school principals have been active in raising funds from other donors in order to cover additional needs.

3 Problems encountered and actions taken

a) DRC/Eneca

- The size of pre-fabrication houses foreseen in the proposal turned out to be smaller than what was announced by the government. Given that this risked reducing considerably the interest of potential beneficiaries in applying for EU support, a derogation was sought and obtained from
the EUD to increase the size of pre-fabricated houses to bring it in line with the government’s regulation.

✓ DRC found that some buildings although beyond repair were not included into category 6. As a result, there was a risk of providing insufficient support to people in real need. An agreement was found with the municipality to reassess these buildings and give them the appropriate category.

✓ In some cases, the municipality was slow in issuing the legal order ("rešenje") which officially recognises the damages sustained by the applicant and his entitlement for compensation.

✓ Ownership of land and/or building proved a major obstacle to some applicants. Considerable efforts from DRC and the municipality were necessary to clarify and solve ownership issues. In case of multiple ownerships, this involved contacting relatives and mediating among them. In case of illegal ownerships, this required some proofs that the household had been occupying the land/premises for more than several years.

✓ In some cases, the plots of land where pre-fabricated houses are to be built are not suitable construction grounds after the floods. The municipality strove to find new locations.

✓ It was found out through the municipality that Red Cross was preparing a delivery of equipment and white goods to the beneficiaries of pre-fabricated houses. DRC contacted the Red Cross which then decided to supply the equipment to other beneficiaries.

b) **UNOPS**

✓ No problem mentioned

4 **Next steps**

a) **DRC/Eneca**

✓ Contracts for all forms of support are to be awarded by the end of October

✓ Delivery of reconstruction materials and reconstruction/construction works are to start end of October and early November. They should be completed within 2 months depending on the weather conditions.

✓ Delivery of reconstruction materials and supplies to micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs to start end of October and early November. They should be completed within 2 months.

b) **UNOPS**

✓ Works on the Secondary Technological School are expected to start early November and be completed by end of the year.

5 **Additional Needs**

✓ No additional needs for public buildings

✓ There is a need 5 pre-fabricated houses and 35 houses for reconstruction and works (DRC)

✓ There is a reserve list of 14 beneficiaries for economic component.

6 **Conclusions**

✓ Activities in Paracin are on track both for DRC/Eneca and UNOPS

✓ There could be some delays with the reconstruction works/ construction of pre-fabricated houses (DRC) due to the winter season.
✓ Selection of vulnerable households seems appropriate
✓ Reconstruction works is progressing well on schools (UNOPS)
Field Visit Report – Šabac

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 30/10/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>20/10/14</td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Primary school “Laza K. Lazarevic”</td>
<td>Slobodan Bogdanovic, School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vesna Djokovic, Municipal engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Svetlana Mijuk, UNOPS Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivana Komnenic, UNOPS Project Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Primary school “Stojan Novakovic”</td>
<td>Milena Vucicevic, School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vesna Djokovic, Municipal engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Svetlana Mijuk, UNOPS Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivana Komnenic, UNOPS Project Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Primary School “Jevrem Obrenovic”</td>
<td>Svetlana Smiljanic, School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vesna Djokovic, Municipal engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Svetlana Mijuk, UNOPS Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivana Komnenic, UNOPS Project Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>20/10/14</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>City hall</td>
<td>Dragana Milosavljević, President of the Selection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoran Miletić, Specialist in the Directorate of Agriculture town of Sabac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vesna Djokovic, Municipal engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milena Timotijević, Housing Centre Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xxx, IDC Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Sabac</td>
<td>Isakovic Dragisa, Family, selected beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ljubica Randić, Family, selected beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milena Timotijević, Housing Centre Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xxx, IDC Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Original targets to be achieved for the municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>Public buildings in Sabac</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Reconstruction materials</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income-generation grants</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Progress achieved to date

a) UNOPS

The evaluator visited three of the four public buildings currently being refurbished by UNOPS in Šabac:

1. Works were ongoing in the sport hall of the Primary school Lazar K. Lazarevic” and to be completed by the end of the year. Repair costs amounted to € 7,887.86 EUR. Since the damages to the school were limited to the sport hall, the disruption of the school year has been minimal.

2. Works were almost complete in Primary school “Jevrem Obrenovic” which sustained damages in its basement. The heating system was put back into operation. Teaching conditions are normal. The principal is very satisfied with the support received from the EU but complained about the lack of resources in general to keep the school’s building and equipment in good condition. Repair costs amounted to € 11,103 EUR.

3. The Primary school “Stojan Novakovic”, was used as collection centre during the floods. Its oil tank stopped functioning as a result of the floods while the slabs of the school yard were seriously damaged by heavy vehicles and materials. There was no disruption to the school year and the teaching conditions are normal. Repair costs amounted to 32,809 EUR.

b) ASB/Housing Centre/Divac

Housing centre and Divac Foundation (ASB’s partners) are responsible for the implementation of project activities in Sabac. There were 585 buildings sustaining damages/losses. Most houses have been assessed in categories 1 to 3. Only one house was granted category 5. Sabac has also a large population of refugees.

✓ Reconstruction materials & works (Housing centre)

In the course of August, the municipality identified 51 households from disadvantaged backgrounds as potential beneficiaries for the ASB grant. A call for applications was launched and opened for a week (19.08-01/.09). 41 households applied. Housing centre’s social workers and civil engineers have visited the beneficiaries identified by municipalities. The aim of the visits was to understand better recovery needs, to assess the eligibility of the potential beneficiaries and to identify potential issues to be resolved prior to the selection process e.g. land ownership. The Housing Centre also provided support to applicants in preparing and submitting their dossier to the municipality together with all the necessary evidences.

29 applications were assessed and scored by the joint selection committee consisting of representatives from the municipality, the local Centre for Social Welfare (CSW), the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief, the Crisis Team and ASB/Housing centre.

The application dossiers were scored against the criteria set out in the methodology. The committee took into account the findings from Housing centre’s field visit reports. The applicants reaching the highest scores have been selected within the funds available. The final scoring list is displayed on the information board in the municipal hall. Four rounds of meetings were necessary to reach the final list as some applicants did not submit the required evidences.

The final list of beneficiaries was adopted on 12 September as shown in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstruction materials &amp; works*</th>
<th>Original list</th>
<th>Final list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* including basic household appliances and furniture sets.

In parallel with the work of the joint selection committee, Housing Centre/ASB prepared detailed bills of quantities both for reconstruction materials & works. Bills of quantities for all 8 municipalities were compiled into a single tender dossier with five lots. The tender was launched by ASB on 3 October 2014 with a deadline on 17 October in line with the Emergency Tender Procedure agreed with the EUD. The tenderer is to be selected by 25 October.

The evaluator visited 1 household selected for reconstruction works. Current living conditions of these beneficiaries and the state of their property fully justify their selection.

- Economic component (IDC Foundation)

IDC Foundation is in charge of the component for income-generating grants which support the purchase of equipment and/or the reconstruction of business premises for micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs.

Divac received a preliminary list of 57 potential beneficiaries (agricultural holdings) in four villages compiled by the municipality. In addition, the municipality identified 5 SMEs, which were not found eligible by eligible. IDC checked the eligibility of each beneficiary removing from the list businesses which were not active in the last three years or did not belong to vulnerable groups. Another 4 beneficiaries were identified by IDC and an additional one by the municipality. As a result, the list was narrowed down to 53 beneficiaries who were all visited by IDC to check needs and identify issues connected to evidences to be submitted. As a result, IDC selected 31 beneficiaries in line with the criteria set out in the methodology giving preference to the most vulnerable categories of households. Most beneficiaries belong to the agricultural sector where recovery needs are considerable.

Coordination with FAO is taking place (the list of FAO beneficiaries has been transmitted to ASB). The average amount of grant is €2,500. All grants were for equipment and furniture.

Bills of quantities were drawn accordingly and added to the bills of quantities of the other 7 municipalities in order to form a single tender dossier with different lots. ASB requested the authorization from the EUD to enter negotiation with the company selected after market research with offers. For Sabac, the value of the contract is estimated at 71,474 EUR.

The evaluator visited 1 household selected for income-generating grant.

3 Problems encountered and actions taken

a) UNOPS

- The same contractor has been awarded the contract for repair works in the three schools. The capacities are slightly overstretched. Works in the Primary school “Stojan Novakovic were a few days behind schedule causing the School’s Principal some frustration.
b) **ASB/Housing Centre/Divac**

- Some buildings although awarded category 3 are in a very poor state. In some cases, the reconstruction costs are almost equal to the costs of a new building.
- ASB contacted the Office for Reconstruction & Flood Relief to agree on the re-categorisation of two buildings. Engineers from the Office Agreement carried out a visit but categories were not changed (the municipality’s engineers have the final say).
- Ownership of land and/or building proved a major obstacle to some applicants, in particular in the Roma settlement. Considerable efforts from ASB/Housing Centre and the municipality were necessary to clarify and solve ownership issues. In case of multiple ownerships, this involved contacting relatives and mediating among them. In case of illegal ownerships, this required some proofs that the household had been occupying the land/premises and paying bills for more than several years.

4 **Next steps**

a) **UNOPS**

- Works to be completed on all three schools in Sabac by the end of October.
- Tender is launched for the fourth school. Preparation of designs required prior study of underground water.

b) **ASB/Housing Centre/Divac**

- The contract for reconstruction materials & works is to be awarded by the end of October. Delivery and works are to start end of October. They should be completed within 30 days depending on the weather conditions and the capacities of the contractor.
- Contract with supplier of greenhouses/seeds for small-scale businesses will be signed upon approval from the EUD on the procedure.
- Delivery of reconstruction materials and supplies to micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs to start end of October and early November. They should be completed by the end of year.

5 **Additional Needs**

a) **UNOPS**

- No new needs regarding public buildings.

b) **ASB/Housing Centre/Divac**

- 4 additional households are on the reserve list for reconstruction works and 30 for the economic component and could be helped with additional funding.
- There are about 20 houses in the Roma settlement which were flooded (situated in the river bed. The land is not suitable for habitation but people live there and pay bills).
- According to the Housing Center, many vulnerable families affected by the floods were not included in the preliminary list provided by the municipality of the Sabac (the initial assessment in Sabac realised immediately after the floods identified 600 or 1500 households). If additional funds became available, they could be eligible for support.
- Regarding economic component, there is a reserve list of 22 eligible applicants which could be helped with extra funding.
6 Conclusions

✓ Activities in Sabac are on track both for ASB/Housing Centre/Divac and UNOPS
✓ Delays with the reconstruction works (ASB) are likely due to the winter season and maybe insufficient capacities on the part of the contractor.
Field Visit Report – Sid

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 06/11/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>05/11/14</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>City hall Sid</td>
<td>Dejan Kojic, Assistant Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aleksandar Mentov, FAO Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miodrag Starcevic, village councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamena Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>council</td>
<td>Aleksandar Mentov, FAO Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>05/11/14</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Jamena</td>
<td>Family Maksimovic, beneficiaries of housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>Romko Papuga, Chief of Municipal Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Joint Selection Committee (JSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miroslav Kolarov, Municipality of Sid, JSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serjan Malesevic, Municipality of Sid,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President of the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dragan Petrovic, Municipality of Sid, Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development, Member of JSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mauro Mascioli, ABS Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members of Joint Selection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing centre Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Original targets to be achieved for the municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Reconstruction materials &amp;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic component</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Delivery of packages for small-scale</td>
<td>23 packages x 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agricultural holdings</td>
<td>municipalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Progress achieved to date

The village of Jamena situated 15 km away from Sid city centre was completely flooded when a dyke in Croatia broke away. All 250 households (around 950 people) were affected. Most of them live off agriculture. The Municipality of Sid applied for funding from the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina to improve the network of river channels in the vicinity of Jamena.

a) FAO

✓ FAO visited Sid in the third week of August and briefed the municipality about the type of support available under the FAO grant, the target group and the procedure for selecting beneficiaries and delivering the packages to farmers.
The municipality through the local village council in Jamena distributed the FAO questionnaire to potential beneficiaries in order to collect information about the size of the household, the type of holding, the damages/losses sustained and the priority needs. Each applicant had to select three priorities among the 23 proposed packages. The call was launched in late August for 8 days. The Municipality compiled a list of 250 applicants, which was sent to FAO by September 5 together with all the filled in questionnaires.

The questionnaires were entered into the FAO’s database and reviewed according to the criteria defined in the methodology (a software specially developed by the FAO was used for that purpose). All 250 applications were considered eligible for support.

40 households were selected to receive package 1 (winter wheat 250 kg) and package 2 (fertilizer 300 kg).

FAO launched a tender for the first two packages through its Budapest office covering all 24 municipalities.

The village of Jamena provided a storage room and organised the distribution of the packages to the selected beneficiaries in mid-October 2014.

**b) ASB/Housing Centre**

Reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses

The municipality of Sid handed a preliminary list of 51 potential beneficiaries to ASB (43 for reconstruction materials & works and 8 for pre-fabricated house), which was drawn based on the initial assessment of houses which were given categories 3, 4 and 6 (there was no category 5). A joint selection committee was set up comprising representatives from the municipality, the local Centre for Social Welfare (CSW), the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief and ASB.

ASB’s social workers and civil engineers visited all potential beneficiaries identified by municipalities in the preliminary list. The aim of the visits was to understand better recovery needs, to assess the eligibility of the potential beneficiaries and to identify potential issues to be resolved prior to the selection process e.g. land ownership.

ASB provided support to potential applicants in preparing and submitting their application dossier to the municipality together with all the necessary evidences. 51 applications were submitted (43 for reconstruction materials & works and 8 for pre-fabricated house) to the joint selection committees which reviewed and scored application dossiers against the criteria set out in the methodology taking into account the findings from ASB’s field visit reports. The applicants reaching the highest scores have been selected within the funds available. The final scoring list was displayed on the information board in the municipal hall early September.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstruction materials &amp; works*</th>
<th>Pre-fabricated houses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original list</td>
<td>Final list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original list</th>
<th>Final list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*including basic household appliances and furniture sets.

In parallel with the work of the joint selection committee, ASB prepared detailed bills of quantities both for reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses. Bills of quantities for all 8 municipalities were compiled into two tender dossiers (one for reconstruction works and one for pre-fabricated houses). The tender was launched by ASB on 3 October 2014 with a deadline on 17 October in line with the Emergency Negotiated Tender Procedure agreed with the EUD. The tenderer was selected by 25
October. Works started the first week of November on all 28 buildings (22 reconstruction and 6 pre-fabricated houses) and should be completed by the end of the year.

The evaluator visited 2 households selected for reconstruction works. Works were progressing well on both buildings and beneficiaries expressed their satisfaction and gratitude for the support granted.

Regarding the economic component, it was decided not to include Jamena since farmers needed heavy equipment (tractors, etc.) and it already received support from FAO.

3 Problems encountered and actions taken

✓ The collection of evidences was time-consuming as many applicants did not provide all the necessary documents or did not provide authorised copies. As a result, the joint selection committee had to meet four times (the JSC regulation foresees only two meetings)
✓ There were 7 complaints out of which 2 were accepted as valid.
✓ There a few issues with ownership of land and/or building but the municipality took action to resolve them. For example, it was necessary to contact a relative from one of the applicants to arrange the donation of his property to his relative.

4 Next steps

✓ Contracts for all forms of support are to be awarded by the end of October
✓ Delivery of reconstruction materials and reconstruction/construction works are to start end of October and early November. They should be completed within 2 months depending on the weather conditions.
✓ Delivery of reconstruction materials and supplies to micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs to start end of October and early November. They should be completed within 2 months.

5 Additional Needs

✓ There are 19 additional households on the reserve list for reconstruction works.
✓ Additional support to small farmers whose livelihood was severely curtailed as a result of the floods – FAO support is not sufficient.
✓ Strengthening of protective walls and dykes (on the Croatian side)

6 Conclusions

✓ Activities in Sid are on track both for the FAO and ASB/Housing Centre
✓ Selection procedure is clear and well documented.
✓ There could be some delays with the reconstruction works/ construction of pre-fabricated houses due to the winter season.
Field Visit Report – Smederevska Palanka

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 28/10/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>16/10/14</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>City hall</td>
<td>Ivana Marinkovic Kovjanic – DRC Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selena Torlakovic – DRC Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vesna Bjelic – Beneficiary Selection Committee (BSC) Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dragan Milic - Head of the Municipal Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gordana Cvetkovic - SWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Smederevska Palanka</td>
<td>Kajtazovic family, selected beneficiary for reconstruction materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ulamovic family selected beneficiary for reconstruction materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Original targets to be achieved for the municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Reconstruction materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income-generation grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Progress achieved to date

DRC/Eneca’s initial efforts have been focused on setting up the system at the local level and gaining the trust and support from municipal counterparts. The first meetings were held in August to ensure that everybody understood the process and were aware of their responsibilities.

✔ Reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses

Shortly after the floods, the municipality of Paracin carried out a preliminary assessment and established a long-list of potential beneficiaries for reconstruction materials & works and for pre-
fabricated houses. This first list was drawn with the help from the Centre for Social Work in Paracin, which identified the most vulnerable households. A joint selection committee was set up comprising representatives from the municipality, the local Centre for Social Welfare (CSW), the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief and DRC.

This **preliminary list** included 84 potential beneficiary households for reconstruction materials & works and 12 for pre-fabricated houses.

DRC’s social workers and civil engineers have visited all potential beneficiaries identified by municipalities in the preliminary list. The aim of the visits was to understand better recovery needs, to assess the eligibility of the potential beneficiaries and to identify potential issues to be resolved prior to the selection process e.g. land ownership.

The municipality launched a **call for application**. DRC provided support to potential applicants in preparing and submitting their application dossier to the municipality together with all the necessary evidences. The call was opened for two weeks.

The joint selection committees have reviewed and scored application dossiers against the criteria set out in the methodology. The committee took into account the findings from DRC’s field visit reports. The applicants reaching the highest scores have been selected within the funds available. The final scoring list is displayed on the information board in the municipal hall. Four rounds of meetings were necessary to reach the final list as some applicants did not submit the required evidences.

The evaluator attended the fourth joint selection committee meeting, which resulted in the **final list of beneficiaries being adopted** as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstruction materials &amp; works*</th>
<th>Pre-fabricated houses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original list</strong></td>
<td><strong>Final list</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* including basic household appliances and furniture sets.

In parallel with the work of the joint selection committee, DRC prepared detailed bills of quantities both for reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses. Bills of quantities for the municipalities of xx were compiled into two separate tender dossiers for each component. The tenders were launched in line with the Emergency Tender Procedure agreed with the EUD.

The evaluator visited three selected beneficiaries for reconstruction works and pre-fabricated houses. Current living conditions of these beneficiaries and the state of their property fully justify their selection.
✓ Income-generation grants

Eneca is in charge of the component for income-generating grants which support the purchase of equipment and/or the reconstruction of business premises for micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs.

Eneca received a preliminary list of potential beneficiaries compiled by the municipality in the aftermath of the floods which included 358 potential beneficiaries. Eneca checked the eligibility of each beneficiary removing from the list businesses which were not active in the last three years or did not belong to vulnerable groups. As a result, the list was narrowed down. All potential beneficiaries who were visited by Eneca to check needs and identify issues connected to evidences to be submitted. As a result, Eneca selected 9 beneficiaries in line with the criteria set out in the methodology giving preference to the most vulnerable categories of households.

Bills of quantities were drawn accordingly and added to the bills of quantities for other municipalities in order to form a single tender dossier.

III. Problems encountered and actions taken

✓ The size of pre-fabrication houses foreseen in the proposal turned out to be smaller than what was announced by the government. Given that this risked reducing considerably the interest of potential beneficiaries in applying for EU support, a derogation was sought and obtained from the EUD to increase the size of pre-fabricated houses.

✓ DRC found that some buildings although beyond repair were not included into category 6. As a result, there was a risk of providing insufficient support to people in real need. An agreement was found with the municipality to reassess these buildings and give them the appropriate category.

✓ In some cases, the municipality was slow in issuing the legal order ("rešenje") which officially recognises the damages sustained by the applicant and his entitlement for compensation. This was due to limited capacity in the municipality, to ownership issues and to

✓ Ownership of land and/or building proved a major obstacle to some applicants. Considerable efforts from DRC and the municipality were necessary to clarify and solve ownership issues. In case of multiple ownerships, this involved contacting relatives and mediating among them. In case of illegal ownerships, this required some proofs that the household had been occupying the land/premises for more than several years.

✓ In some cases, the plots of land where pre-fabricated houses are to be built are not suitable construction grounds after the floods. The municipality strove to find new locations.

IV. Next steps

✓ Contracts for all forms of support are to be awarded by the end of October

✓ Delivery of reconstruction materials and reconstruction/construction works are to start end of October and early November. They should be completed within 2 months depending on the weather conditions.
Delivery of reconstruction materials and supplies to micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs to start end of October and early November. They should be completed within 2 months.

V. Additional Needs

VI. Conclusions

- Activities in Smederevska are on track for DRC/Eneca
- There could be some delays with the reconstruction works/ construction of pre-fabricated houses (DRC) due to the winter season.
- Selection of vulnerable households seems appropriate.
# Field Visit Report - Svilajnac

Written by Paul Georis  
Date: 25/10/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HELP              | 16/10/14 | 14:00 | City hall      | Andrej Terzic, Programme Coordinator  
Ivko Nedovic, Director of social welfare  
Olivera Stanicjevic, Head of the municipal administration  
Dr. Danijela Stojadinovic, Deputy Mayor and Deputy chief of Emergency team |
|                   |          |       |                | 15:00 Svilajnac  
Lazic Dragomira, selected beneficiary for pre-fabricated house  
Nenad Cvetkovic, selected beneficiary for reconstruction materials |
| UNOPS/IOM         | 24/10/14 | 10:00 | High School Svilajnac | Jovan Dzeletovic, UNOPS Project Engineer  
Sladjana Stojanovic, School Principal High School Svilajnac |
|                   |          |       | Kindergarten “Decija radost” Svilajnac | Jovan Dzeletovic, UNOPS Project Engineer  
Zorica Djordjevic, Principal Kindergarten “Decija radost” |
|                   |          |       | Agricultural and Veterinary School Svilajnac | Jovan Dzeletovic, UNOPS Project Engineer  
Jelena Zindovic, Secretary, Principal Agricultural and Veterinary School |
| FAO               | 24/10/14 | 13:00 | City hall      | Aleksandar Mentov, Project Manager  
Municipality of Svilajnac |
|                   |          |       | Svilajnac      | Beneficiaries of package 1 winter wheat and package 2 fertilizer |

1 **Original targets to be achieved for the municipality:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>Reconstruction materials &amp; works</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income-generation grants</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS/IOM</td>
<td>Public building</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Delivery of packages for small-scale</td>
<td>23 packages x 24 municipalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Progress achieved to date

a) Help

Up to 2,500 buildings have been flooded in the municipality of Svilajnac.

✓ Reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses

Approximately 2,500 buildings were flooded in Svilajnac, when the river Morava overflowed its banks. The municipality of Svilajnac established a preliminary list of 140 potential beneficiaries for reconstruction materials & works and 12 for pre-fabricated houses. This first list was drawn with the help from the Centre for Social Work in Svilajnac, which identified the most vulnerable households. A joint selection committee was set up comprising representatives from the municipality, the local Centre for Social Welfare (CSW), the Government Office for Reconstruction and Flood Relief and Help.

HELP’s social workers and civil engineers visited all potential beneficiaries identified by municipalities on the preliminary list. The aim of the visits was to understand better recovery needs, to assess the eligibility of the potential beneficiaries and to identify potential issues to be resolved prior to the selection process e.g. land ownership.

HELP provided support to potential applicants in preparing and submitting their application dossier to the municipality together with all the necessary evidences. 148 applications were submitted to the joint selection committee (136 for reconstruction materials & works and 12 for pre-fabricated houses), which reviewed and scored application dossiers against the criteria set out in the methodology. The committee took into account the findings from HELP’s field visit reports. The applicants reaching the highest scores have been selected within the funds available. The final scoring list was displayed on the information board of the municipal hall. Out of the 136, 74 selected and 18 are on a reserve list.

The final list of beneficiaries adopted by the joint selection committee included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reconstruction materials &amp; works*</th>
<th>Pre-fabricated houses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original list</td>
<td>Final list</td>
<td>Original list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* including basic household appliances and furniture sets.

In parallel with the work of the joint selection committee, HELP prepared detailed bills of quantities both for reconstruction materials & works and pre-fabricated houses. Bills of quantities were compiled into two separate tender dossiers for each component covering several municipalities. The tenders were launched on 09.10.14 (reconstruction materials & works for Kraljevo, Lazarevac, Svilajnac, Trstenik and Varvarin including 15 for Svilajnac) and on 07.10.14 (pre-fabricated houses for Svilajnac and Varvarin including 8 for Svilajnac) in line with the Emergency Tender Procedure agreed with the EUD.

The evaluator visited two selected beneficiaries for reconstruction works and pre-fabricated houses. Current living conditions of these beneficiaries and the state of their property fully justify their selection.

✓ Income-generation grants

Regarding income-generating grants, the municipality decided to focus on reviving the agricultural sector. It compiled a preliminary list of potential beneficiaries which included 268 potential
beneficiaries. Help had to visit all of them checked the eligibility of each beneficiary removing from the list businesses which were not active in the last three years or did not belong to vulnerable groups. As a result, the list was narrowed down to **39 beneficiaries** (9 SMEs and 30 agricultural households) who were visited by Help to check needs and identify issues connected to evidences to be submitted. All beneficiaries have to comply with the criteria set out in the methodology giving preference to the most vulnerable categories of households.

Bills of quantities were drawn accordingly and added to the bills of quantities for other municipalities in order to form a single tender dossier.

**b) UNOPS**

The evaluator visited three public buildings flooded in Svilajnac and currently being refurbished by UNOPS:

4. At the time of the visit, works were completed in the High School Svilajnac: two workshops had been refurbished and the school’s central heating had been put back into operation. The school year started as planned and teaching conditions are now back to normal. Repair costs amounted to approximately 12,000 EUR.

5. Works are progressing apace in the kindergarten “Decija radost”, which received support from many different donors. The Director of the establishment has been very active and successful in raising funds for the school (B92 and Novak Djokovic Foundations, Japanese Embassy). The EU is funding the refurbishment of the main building. As a result, the premises are being refurbished and reequipped to very high standards and the number of children on the kindergarten’s waiting list is on the increase compared to last year. Because of lack of space, however, the kindergarten could only welcome half of children enrolled for this year. Repair costs amounted to approximately 220,000 EUR.

6. Works has also started for the Agricultural and Veterinary School which sustained severe damages to class-rooms situated in the school’s basement and its sports hall. However, there was no disruption to the school year. Repair costs amounted to 120,000 EUR.

All school principals expressed their gratitude for the financial support obtained from the EU, which was considered well-timed and crucial for the reopening of the schools in time for the new school year. There was also general satisfaction regarding the cooperation with UNOPS.

**c) FAO**

- FAO visited the municipality of Svilajnac in August and provided information about the type of support available under the FAO grant, the target group and the procedure for selecting beneficiaries and delivering the packages to farmers.
- The municipality mobilised local village councils to distribute a questionnaire to potential beneficiaries in order to collect information about the size of the household, the type of holding, sustained damages/losses and priority needs. Each applicant had to select three priorities among the 23 proposed packages. The call was opened for 10 days.
- 591 households originally filled in questionnaires were entered into the FAO’s database and reviewed according to the criteria defined in the methodology. A few additional households were added later on. As a result, **600 households** were considered eligible for support under the project.
193 households were selected to receive package 1 (winter wheat 250 kg) and package 2 (fertilizer 300 kg). The municipality provided a storage room and organised the distribution of the packages to the selected beneficiaries which was completed on 22 October 2014.

The evaluator visited two households who received packages 1 and 2.

3 Problems encountered and actions taken

a) Help

✓ 4 potential applicants were asked not to submit an application – two were already covered by Divac and other two others were belonging to the same family.
✓ Out of the original list (136) many were already refurbished. As result, many did not need support.
✓ The joint selection committee first adopted 8 applicants for pre-fabrication houses out of the list of 12. One was added after ownership issue was approved. Three other applicants were added and approved at a later stage. This requires new JSC meetings.
✓ The municipality did not prepare a list for income-generation grants. As a result, it was necessary to publish a call. This was time-consuming and created additional work for Help in managing the process.
✓ The collection of the necessary evidences to support the application filed by beneficiaries was often time-consuming.
✓ Ownership of land and/or building proved a major obstacle to some applicants HELP and the municipality had to clarify and solve ownership issues. In case of multiple ownerships, this involved contacting relatives and mediating among them. In case of illegal ownerships, this required some proofs that the household had been paying bills and occupying the land/premises on a permanent basis (testimony from neighbours).

b) UNOPS

✓ Some delays are expected with works in the Agricultural and Veterinary School because of safety issues related to the heating system, which need to be factored into the bills of quantity.

c) FAO

✓ No issue mentioned

4 Next steps

a) Help

✓ Contracts for housing (reconstruction materials & works + pre-fabricated houses) are to be awarded by the end of October. Works to be completed for 48 (reconstruction materials & works) and 45 days (pre-fabricated houses)
✓ Tender for supplies to micro and small enterprises and entrepreneurs to start early November until December. Contracts to be signed end of December for different type of supplies.

b) UNOPS

✓ Works in the kindergarden “Decija radost” are expected to be completed early November.
✓ Works in the Agricultural and Veterinary School are expected to be completed by end of November.
c) **FAO**

- The municipality is preparing for the delivery of fruit seedlings in line with the timetable prepared by the FAO. The 6 beneficiaries have been selected among the 600 applicants pre-selected in Svilajnac. Each package will contain 300 plum, cherry or sour cherry seedlings or 1,800 blackberries or raspberries seedlings.

5 **Additional Needs**

- Many households renting a house are in need of support but are not eligible to the project.
- In addition to the 18 households on the reserve list, the municipality estimated that 45 additional households would require support with reconstruction.
- 5 additional households would need pre-fabricated houses (Municipality estimate).
- 100 additional households would be eligible for the economic component (Municipality estimate).
- Analysis of causes of floods.
- River regulation.
- Cleaning and upkeep of main streams.

6 **Conclusions**

- Activities in Svilajnac are on track for all three grantees.
- There could be some delays with the reconstruction works/ construction of pre-fabricated houses (HELP) due to the winter season.
Field Visit Report – Velika Plana
Written by Paul Georis
Date: 28/10/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>16/10/14</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>City hall</td>
<td>Goran Despotovic, Municipality of Svilajnac, department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aleksandar Mentov, FAO Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Velika plana</td>
<td>Beneficiary of package 1 winter wheat and package 2 fertilizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Original targets to be achieved for the municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Beneficiary</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Delivery of packages for small-scale agricultural holdings</td>
<td>23 packages x 24 municipalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Progress achieved to date

✓ Damages to dwellings were limited in the municipality of Velika Plana. However, approximately 5,000 hectares of agricultural land were flooded causing extensive crop loses and partial soil deterioration. This affected particularly households engaged in semi-subsistence farming. State support to small-scale farm holdings in the aftermath of the floods consisted of limited supplies of fuel and maize seeds.

✓ FAO visited Velika Plana in the third week of August and briefed the municipality about the type of support available under the FAO grant, the target group and the procedure for selecting beneficiaries and delivering the packages to farmers.

✓ The municipality mobilised local village councils to distribute a questionnaire to potential beneficiaries in order to collect information about the size of the household, the type of holding, the damages/losses sustained and the priority needs. Each applicant had to select three priorities among the 23 proposed packages. The call was opened for 8 days until September 1. The Municipality compiled a list of 441 applicants, which was sent to FAO by September 5 together with all the filled in questionnaires.

✓ The questionnaires were entered into the FAO’s database and reviewed according to the criteria defined in the methodology (a software specially developed by the FAO was used for that purpose). As a result, 430 households in Velika Plana were considered eligible for support under the project.

✓ 141 households were selected to receive package 1 (winter wheat 250 kg) and package 2 (fertilizer 300 kg).

✓ FAO launched a tender for the first two packages through its Budapest office covering all 24 municipalities.

✓ The municipality provided a storage room and organised the distribution of the packages to the selected beneficiaries which was completed end of October 2014.

The evaluator visited two households who received packages 1 and 2. The beneficiaries are small farmers whose only support since the floods had been fuel and maize seeds distributed by the State in the immediate aftermath of the floods. Both beneficiaries highly valued the support received from the
project helping them resume normal farming activities and restore their livelihood, which was placed under serious threat as a result of the floods.

3 **Problems encountered and actions taken**

✓ There was no problem encountered with the selection of beneficiary households. Nine applicants were rejected for not complying with the criteria. No complaints have been recorded by the municipality.

✓ The main challenge was to ensure that the delivery of packages 1 and 2 would take place by mid-October in time for the wheat winter sowing season.

4 **Next steps**

✓ The municipality is preparing for the delivery of fruit seedlings in line with the timetable prepared by the FAO. The 12 beneficiaries have been selected among the 430 applicants pre-selected in Velika Plana. Each package will contain 300 plum, cherry or soyer cherry seedlings or 1,800 blackberries or raspberries seedlings.

5 **Additional Needs**

✓ Clean up deposits left by the floods on many land parcels in order to revive soil productivity.

✓ Ensure clearance of river beds and channels and maintenance of flood protection walls and banks

✓ Support for medium-sized agricultural holdings which sustained considerable damages and were not eligible for support under the project.

6 **Conclusions**

✓ The municipality is very satisfied with the support from the FAO and the cooperation established to implement the assistance to local farmers.
Annex 5. Project Evaluation Reports

1. EIDHR

Amity

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Tanja Hafner Ademi
Date: 9th November, 2014

Project Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>EIDHR CBCC 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2013/300-531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>For More Dignifying Life of the Elderly in Residential Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Amity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>52,520 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>49,894 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>29.04.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>28.04.2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contribution to strengthening the role of civil society in promoting and protection of the human rights of the elderly in residential care in Serbia</td>
<td>• Increased sensitivity of CSO dealing with the elderly issues, persons with disabilities (PWD) and women as well as general public for human rights (HR) of the elderly in residential care (nursing homes), by promoting international standards and experience exchange;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved mechanisms for HR protection of the elderly in residential care, by advocating and CSO dialog with the representatives of both national and local institutions, in connection to revision of current legal frame in accordance to EU and UN standards and EU Council recommendations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved monitoring system for monitoring of HR of the elderly in residential care, through local informal CSO networks, which are going to carry out monitoring of rights’ exercising and to react in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Cases of Obstructions

**Expected results**

- Members of CSO dealing with the issues of the elderly, PWD and the women, are familiar with the position of the elderly in residential care and empowered to recognize and act if their HR are endangered;
- Dialog is established with the institutions in charge and decision makers both on national and local level; they are familiar with the status of the HR of the elderly in residential care and directions for improving it;
- R3: Increased protection of the HR of the elderly in residential care.

**Main outputs**

- Data on respect of HR of the elderly in residential care are gathered, analyzed and together with the recommendations presented to the stakeholders and general public;
- Advocacy and media campaign (leaflets, posters and other promotional results, participation in radio and TV broadcasts, articles in journals, press conferences, banners on internet sites);
- 11 trainings: 4 for 40-45 participants from CSO; 4 trainings for 100 elderly/guardians-relatives; 3 trainings for 60 members of the staff and other professionals; working materials prepared;
- 4 informal local CSO networks created in local communities; policy recommendations created; materials from the meetings/round tables; media appearances.

### I. Conceptual Design

1. **Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?**

   Yes. Comprehensive approach esp in relation to different target groups’ inclusion.

2. **Is it easy to understand the project logic?**

   Yes.

3. **Are there clear OVIs?**

   Yes. OVIs are clear, realistic.

### II. Relevance

4. **How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives?**

   It addresses building of capacities and expertise in human rights and basic freedoms of the elderly, PWD and the women in social protection institutions in Serbia, by strengthening the role of CSO dealing with those groups for monitoring and protection.

5. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**

   Serbia has increasing aging population (e.g. in 2009 there were over 1,250,000 persons, i.e. 17% of general population in Serbia who were of 65 plus). Residential care in 58 public institutions (gerontology centers, nursing homes, departments of CSW) has less than 10 thousand elder beneficiaries. During previous 10, large number of private institutions for accommodation of the elderly. Officially, 103 institutions are registered, with the capacity of 3,000 beneficiaries, and there are even more unofficial institutions. There is a need for improvement of legal frame and introduction of clear standards of human rights respect in regulations and standards, where the elderly will not be treated as the object in satisfying their basic needs, but the active beneficiary who receives the services that include the highest standards in respecting human rights.

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**

   Yes.
### III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are they in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The project is closed. All activities and outputs have been delivered.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?

Yes. There was an independent external audit and evaluation of the project performed.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?

All funds have been disbursed. The final payment of the European Commission was reduced for EUR 415.43. Auditors found that the costs of car repair and lunch (during the field activities) were registered under travel costs. According to grantee, this is due to the fact that Amity has for the first time managed an EU grant and was not not familiar enough with certain specifics, so they registered those costs as used for other donors.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

There were 2 addendums and 2 administrative orders for the needs of allocating additional funds in accordance with the adjustments of the activities.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

Planned project funding (co-financing) did not realize and the staff was under budgeted, thus Amity staff worked additionally on voluntary basis.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

Yes. High level of media outreach and additional activities were implemented.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

Amity was very successful in working with media in promoting HR of elderly and informing the public about the situation in residential areas as part of its monitoring. Impressively, interest by 85 different media was reached. Amity reports that journalists answered to their calls to all of the events, provided fair reports, others disseminated information, invited them to be their guests at radio or TV shows or opened their doors to them when we asked. The free air and press time amounting to 677 minutes on TV and 331 minutes on the radio, and presence in 10 different papers constitutes a very high leverage on the resources invested by the EU. According to the Project Evaluation: “The Project’s secret of success in this area may very well lie in its’ strong roots in constituency and it’s meticulous use of simple, everyday terminology when talking to media.” Action envisaged that information of it and about the respect/violation of human rights of the elderly in residential care, as well as about EU and other international standards in the area should reach over 300,000 citizens, however Amity reports reaching impressive over 2.5 million citizens.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

Amity reported EUD staff as very supportive, professional and very willing to help.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

Generally a problem expressed by the organization. For this projects secured by the Government Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Team (SIPRU), which was acted as project associate and builds on long term cooperation between SIPRU and Amity.
IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

Yes. Project’s **capacity building component** included: Strengthened role of 81 different CSOs in promotion and protection of HR of the older people in residential care in Serbia (at least 39 CSOs working with and for the elderly, PWD and women in Serbia took active watchdog role in monitoring and promotion; at least 49 CSOs improved their competencies in areas of HR esp. in mechanisms of their protection, by participation in training sessions, direct monitoring of human rights of older persons in institutions and advocacy activities); Amity worked with members of 21 associations of pensioners and other organizations of the pensioners, who participated in monitoring, training, advocacy actions or discussed recommendations on the meetings of their boards of management to sensitized them about the aspect of HR of older people, they acquired new knowledge on standards, guidelines and mechanisms of protection of human rights. 74 employees at residential care institutions where monitoring was carried out improved their knowledge on EU/UN standards and guidelines on respect of HR and are sensitized and motivated for their application when working with the older people. Amity talked directly to 71 employees and 65 employees and other professionals were trained and they shared newly acquired knowledge and materials (50 pages) with their colleagues. 85 different media were engaged.

**Outreach and media** activities included: Over 2.5 million citizens of Serbia, including the oldest ones, were informed about the status of respect of HR of older persons in institutions, as well as mechanisms of protection of HR, in accordance with EU/UN standards and guidelines via 122 media appearances (17 and a half hours of broadcasts on 26 TV stations and 10 radio stations on national, regional and local level, as well as in 11 printed media) and other communication media (internet portals, social networks, etc.).

**Advocacy component** included: Decision makers at both national and local level are introduced to the status of HR of older people in institutions and are additionally sensitized to importance of respect for EU/UN standards and guidelines on human rights of the elderly, not only of those in residential care institutions but those living in their local communities. They demonstrated readiness to work on improvement of legislative or practice, all in accordance with their authorisations.

All project activities have been implemented in accordance with the plan, usually with the larger number of participants than originally planned. For example, 200 persons in training sessions were targeted, but 258 persons participated. Instead of 21 planned events they had 29. There were 76 participants of the Final Conference instead of 50 originally planned.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

The project has managed to reach very concrete effects in the area of HR of the elderly in residential care. Ministry of Labor, Employment, Veteran and Social Issues increased its activities on closing the unregistered (“illegal”) Homes for Elderly. During the period July – September 2014, 10 illegal homes were closed down; Ministry of Labor, Employment, Veteran and Social Issues included Amity’s expert in its human rights monitoring team, which went to extraordinary visit to Home for Persons with Mental Disabilities at Stara Moravica, on 9th July 2014; Ombudsman of the Province of Vojvodina also made some extraordinary visits to the homes in Vojvodina.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Yes. Autonomous Women’s Center (AWC) contributed to gender sensitive aspects of gender equality in
project activities and was probably an appropriate partners due to its long experience in monitoring and advocacy on women issues. AWC was responsible for the following activities: 1) participation in preparing the questionnaire for monitoring the rights of the elderly in institutions (gender-sensitive aspect), 2) recruitment and selection of women’s organizations to participate in the Action, 3) participation in the creation of the training module, 4) providing a trainer for training of CSO, staff and elderly, 5) participation in creation of policy documents and recommendations (with respect of the gender aspects of human rights), 6) participation in the campaign (at conferences and other gatherings) 7) horizontal transfer of knowledge to the network of women’s civil society organizations.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

This was first project funded by EU for Amity. They consider that the impact of the project was larger than expected. It raised significant interest among all stakeholders, since this was the first project targeting HR of older people, which included both state-founded and privately owned homes. In addition, the project mobilized wider community throughout Serbia, both on national, regional and local level and ensured that the issue of human rights of the elderly will remain high on the priority list of all.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

It is not likely that significant positive change in connection to the HR of older people in institutions will occur without the grant. The target group the elderly is generally side-lined when it comes to social welfare policy.

22. Is the project likely to result in major socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

The project raised level of interest for the issues of HR of the elderly in residential care. There have been concrete spin-off activities triggered by the project, such as: Ministry of Labor, Employment, Veteran and Social Issues increased its activities on closing the unregistered (“illegal”) Homes for Elderly. During the period July – September 2014, 10 illegal homes were closed down; Ministry of Labor, Employment, Veteran and Social Issues included Amity’s expert in its human rights monitoring team, which went to extraordinary visit to Home for Persons with Mental Disabilities at Stara Moravica, on 9th July 2014; Ombudsman of the Province of Vojvodina also made some extraordinary visits to the homes in Vojvodina.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realization of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Project corresponds to the recommendations of the First National Report on Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction in Serbia (2011), which states insisting on improvement of institutional protection for the beneficiaries who still need it, as one of the directions of action. In addition, it corresponds to the National IPA 2011 Project “Support for De-institutionalization and Social Inclusion of the Persons with Mental Disability and Mental Illness”, which currently being implemented.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

Project is not formally part of a larger program, but is in synergy with: 2002 Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing (MIPAA); broad-based international initiative for a new Convention on the rights of the
elderly; 2012 Vienna Ministerial Political Declaration. Projects is liked to recommendations from TAIEX Workshop on long-term care, the EC organized in Belgrade, on 28th-29th November 2012, by promoting the concept of the long-term care in institutions and in accordance with EU/UN standards for respect of human rights of the elderly. It is also in synergy with the recommendations from the Report of the Commissioner for Human Rights of the CoE after his visit to Serbia on 12th -15th June, 2011 recommending passing of a law governing protection and promotion of the rights of PWD. He raised concerns about accommodation in institutions without one’s consent, reported abuse of the legal capacity proceedings, often by close family members. The Commissioner urges the authorities to adopt legislation aimed at the protection of the human rights of persons with disabilities in accordance with the UN Convention on the rights of PWD. In October 2001, the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe pointed out the importance of creating the minimum of criteria, which are going to guarantee the respect of human rights of older, people in institutions on the Seminar on Human Rights and the Special Situation of Older People in Nursing Homes.

Project is also in line with the recommendation from “Serbia 2012 Progress Report” which states that “…increased efforts are also needed to restructure and reform social protection…”. Finally, it corresponds to the recommendations of the First National Report on Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction in Serbia where directions of actions insist on improving the quality of institutional protection for the beneficiaries in need of it. It also corresponds to the national 2011 IPA Project “Support for De-institutionalization and Social Inclusion of Persons with Mental Disability and Mental Illness”, approved and being currently implemented. It is complementary to the National Strategy for Fight against Discrimination for the Period 2013 – 2018, which recognizes older people as one of specially deprived groups.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Extensive media campaign contributed to continuation of the outputs after the project’s official ending. As mentioned above, there have been some activities of the state institutions directly influenced by this project. Local coalitions formed under this project are active on further protection of human rights of the elderly in their communities, some with very tangible results (such as re-opening of the health centres’ branch offices in villages of Smederevo). Influenced by the findings of this project, Amity ensured funding for three other projects targeting HR of older people: For More Consistent Respect of Human Rights of Older People in Serbia, Let’s not Forget Those Who Forget – Advocating for Day-care Centre for Persons with Dementia, Support to the Elderly from Rural Areas in Accessing Rights.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

The issue tackled in the project is very sensitive and complex. Duration of the grant was sufficient only to initiate the discussion and raise some issues. Further support to the initiative of protecting HR of the elderly both in residential care and in home care is needed.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

At the level of Amity, sustainability as already demonstrated through additional activities since end of project builds on decades of experience in project management and expertise in HR of elderly is very solid. Additional funding, capacity building and advocacy for continues monitoring cycles in situation in residential homes will be needed to achieve longer-term impact. As reported by Amity, duration of the
project was sufficient only to initiate the discussion and raise some issues.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Extensive media campaign contributed to follow-up to policy recommendations developed during the project, e.g. re-opening of the health centres’ branch offices in villages of Smederevo. Influenced by the findings of this project, Amity ensured funding for three other projects targeting HR of older people: For More Consistent Respect of Human Rights of Older People in Serbia, Let’s not Forget Those Who Forget – Advocating for Day-care Centre for Persons with Dementia, Support to the Elderly from Rural Areas in Accessing Rights.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Amity and AWC are long-standing active partners (since 2007) in the framework of joint projects relating to poverty reduction of individual target groups. They have gained trust over the years of cooperation based on shared values, commitment to the topic and focus on the groups, as well as the high standard of work of both organizations. AWC and Amity are members of the European Anti-Poverty Network - Serbia in which they work on poverty reduction of their target groups.

According to Project Evaluation: “…, the partnership between Amity and AWC certainly exists and will continue through individual or joint projects, either through exchange of experiences, knowledge and support in relation to the issues that organizations are involved with - the elderly, women who are victims of violence and poverty.”

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project is extremely relevant to the call for proposals and the target group. Amity is an example of a mature organization, recognized by institutions for its expertise and proven track record of results. While they have outperformed at all levels-outputs, activities, results and impact in terms of efficient, they nevertheless faced smaller issues of effectiveness usual for a newcomer grant beneficiary. Prospect of sustainability are good, since Amity remains committed to working on the issue of HR of elderly and since institutions have taken up many of the policy recommendations put forwards. However, longer-term support (36-48 months) to same type of project activities would increase the long-term effect and institutionalization of the outputs and results produced by the project, i.e. improvement of HR of elderly in residential care. Finally, project has demonstrated the importance and effect of small grants in achieving of concrete and tangible results.

While capacity-building component was strong, esp. at the civil society end, it is important especially to engage and empower pensioners association to take on advocacy on behalf of the elderly in residential care. Piloting of alternative approaches to elderly, residential care and presenting best practices form Serbia and abroad as well as working on complementary issue of HR of elderly outside of residential care (e.g. at home with extended family, day centers for elderly) could help the long-term effort in improving the position of the elderly care in Serbia over a long-term period.
### VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/10/2014</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td><strong>Slobodanka Macanovic</strong>, Director, Autonomous Women Center&lt;br&gt;<strong>Jelena Keserović</strong>, Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/10/2014</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Amity office, Belgrade</td>
<td><strong>Nadezda Sataric</strong>, President of Management Board, Amity&lt;br&gt;<strong>Mirjana Sataric</strong>, Project Manager, Amity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Project Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>EIDHR CBCC 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2013/316-541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Enhancing the asylum protection system in Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Asylium Protection Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>52.516,34 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>49.890,52 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>95 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>30.04.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>29.04.2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Summary**

*(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance the respect of human rights of asylum seekers, refugees and others who were forced to migrate to Serbia</td>
<td>• Increase the capacities in asylum of relevant local and central asylum stakeholders, including local civil society organisations, strengthening their cooperation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build dialogue between asylum seekers and local communities thus combating prejudices against immigrants and asylum seekers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve the access of asylum seekers to legal aid in asylum process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Address the gaps within the asylum protection laws or policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Capacities of approx. 80 relevant central and local level</td>
<td>• 8 training workshops for relevant central and local level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Local level actors to implement their mandates with regard to the asylum protection system strengthened and an estimated of 10 CSOs with strengthened capacities to act at local level; cooperation between all actors increased; |
| 40 workshops organised for asylum seekers; a minimum of 1000 persons reached through information campaign; sustainable source of information on asylum protection system provided to interest parties; |
| 500 asylum seekers provided with free legal aid, 300 illegal migrants provided with information on their current legal position, on asylum, and on the ways of entering into legal frameworks; |
| Targeted advocacy activities conducted to align the asylum procedures and legislation with European standards. |
| Stakeholders and 3 workshops for local CSOs; |
| Development of publication “Responsibilities of actors in the asylum protection system”, “Responsibilities”, “Asylum stories”; |
| 40 creative and cultural workshops for asylum seekers; |
| Information campaign for the public: develop an interactive information portal, 2 exhibitions and 2 fairs, 2 public debates, 1000 leaflets, 100 posters and 4 billboards, 300 flyers with information for illegal migrants; |
| Provide legal aid and information to asylum seekers and illegal migrants (500 persons); |
| Advocacy |
| Conduct advocacy activities, policy paper, 2 round tables, 2 press conferences. |

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

Yes. Methodology section is more description of activities. Description of activities incl information on multiplying effects.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

Clear, but unambitious. OVIs at the level of expected results, specific objectives are defined in quantitative forma and as targets, but formulated at the level of activities.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

Project relates to all 4 sectors/themes of the call for proposals. Project is specific vulnerable group oriented to illegal immigrants and asylum seekers. It aims at enhance their political representation and participation, inclusiveness in the Serbian society, foster inter-cultural tolerance, understanding between illegal immigrants and asylum seekers and local population and counteracting stereotypes. Project is directly targeting state coping with increased influx of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers and addressing of identified gaps in implementation of related legislation and commitments under the EU Acquis and visa liberalization regime.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

While the project directly targets local stakeholders and CSOs in terms and the need to building their capacities, understanding in addressing the issue of illegal immigrants and asylum seeks in their communities, its final beneficiaries are illegal immigrants and asylum seekers in Serbia (specifically in municipalities with asylum centers and migrants: Banja Koviljača (Loznica), Bogovoda (Lajkovac), Beograd, Subotica. Project is relevant as it combines different tools to address multitude of issues with the problem with receipt and treatment of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers by the local communities and general by state situations, incurring respect for basic human rights, access to basic services.
### III. Efficiency

#### 7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

Project has been closed for 7 months at the time of the evaluation. All project activities were implemented and all outputs were delivered. In terms of capacity-building, 89 central and local level actors on asylum, among which 69 central and local level actors and 20 CSOs representatives were involved in trainings and workshops and have increased their capacities in delivering basic services to asylum seekers. All planned 40 cultural, creative, hygienic and empowering workshops organized for asylum seekers, were implemented and attended by 296 participants. An estimated minimum of 360 persons from local communities had direct contact with asylum seekers through participating in events and workshops. Together with organized fairs, direct interaction with each other and get to know the personal side of each other, hence contributing to increased awareness of local citizens about the rights and needs of asylum seekers. Together with the information campaign with an estimated minimum of 30000 persons reached comprehensive information about the needs and situation of asylum seekers and presented the issue of asylum as a humanitarian issue, combating the negative and often stereotyped perceptions of them as thieves, criminals etc. Through legal aid provided through the action, 896 asylum seekers were able to take full advantage of their rights and benefit from improved access to asylum procedure, social aid and healthcare, receiving protection from misuse in the asylum procedure and being guaranteed proper interviewing. Additionally, asylum seekers were empowered through enhanced awareness of their rights guaranteed by the asylum system and their obligations. The action also informed 564 illegal migrants on their current legal status, the rights they have and they do not have, as well as the rights guaranteed by the asylum system for asylum seekers. As a result, the action significantly enhanced the access of asylum seekers to legal aid.

Finally, conducted advocacy activities focused on 4 shortcomings in the current asylum legislation, implementing practice and asylum system and resulted in raising the issue in the public and the decision makers on the problem of lack of accommodation for asylum seekers, the absence of issuing asylum ID cards and the non-efficient work of the Asylum Office. As a result of the ongoing pressure, the Government opened three new asylum centers in Sjenica, Tutin and Obrenovac, formed a Project group to prepare amendments for the new asylum law, while the Asylum Office started registering asylum seekers in the camp of Bogovadja.

#### 8. Is the project well managed and monitored?

No issues reported.

#### 9. How much of the grant is disbursed?

All grant has been disbursed, expects for the unspent funds in amount of 64,234 EUR.

#### 10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

No.

#### 11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

There was 1 addendum for the use of Heading 8 Contingency reserve approved by the Contracting Authority. Contingency reserve was planned to be used in and served for circumstances for which it was initially planned and approved- significant new increase of asylum seekers, due to opening of new asylum centers in Sjenica, Tutin,
Obrenovac, humanitarian crisis in the area of Bogovadja, start of anti-asylum media campaign.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

APC reported having enough qualified staff for project implementation.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

Yes.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

Visibility activities included publishing and sharing brochures, leaflets, flyers, organizing public debates, exhibitions and fairs, round tables, preparing policy papers, organizing press conferences and creating and managing Website Online Hub, conducting media campaigns with posters, city lights, billboards and strong media (newspaper articles and TV emissions) participation.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

Support was useful, timely and effective.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

APC secured co-financing with its own financial reserves. No difficulties reported.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

In quantitative terms, only capacity-building activities have been underutilized, whereby 69 (out of 80) local stakeholders and 10 (out of 20) CSOs have participated to the workshops/trainings. Reasons stated by APC include small and inactive character of local communities where asylum seekers and illegal migrants reside. However, in the majority of cases project results exceeded the prescribed project results by reaching 30000 out of planned 1000 through information campaign, by assisting 869 asylum seekers with free legal aid instead of 500 asylum seekers prescribe and 564 irregular migrants informed on their current legal position, on asylum, and on ways of entering into legal frameworks instead of 300 irregular migrants prescribed by the project application).

Project contributed to bridging the existing gap between asylum seekers, refugees and others who were forced to migrate to Serbia and the laws and institutions that exist for their protection, as well as influence a more effective, more sensitive and tolerant approach of the local community where collective and asylum centers are located and general public through sharing information, best practices and advocating in order to enhance the system of protection of asylum seekers, refugees and persons forced to migrate in Serbia.

The project did not only met the expected results and significantly contributed to achieving specific and overall objectives, but has been implemented at a time when the situation with the asylum seekers deteriorated in local communities in which APC was working. At the end of 2013, the absence of asylum accommodation facilities, high number of persons seeking asylum and slow functioning of the asylum system led to a humanitarian crisis in areas where asylum centers were placed. More than 300 persons seeking asylum were constantly out of the asylum centers. Bad weather conditions, lack of food and shelter contributed to the already poor health and living conditions of asylum seekers waiting in front of the centre. According to APC, the situation represented a favourable ground for local political games, discontent of local citizens and spreading of prejudices and xenophobia. It was thus agreed to use the contingency reserve for providing legal aid to asylum seekers residing in the three additional asylum centres in Sjenica, Tutin and Obrenovac and for an additional citylights media campaign. APC helped to prevent and to extent revert public opinion about asylum seekers as thieves, criminals to
people that have come to Serbia due to humanitarian disaster and violation of HR in their countries.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

For the local communities and authorities, the project improved knowledge about the position of asylum seekers, inter-cultural exchange and tolerance and informed on how asylum system in Serbia functions. Local authorities are more aware of their obligations and of problems that could be caused by not understanding or neglecting the plight of asylum seekers. With ordinary citizens, the project raised their awareness about the humanitarian character of asylum seeker situation. Local CSO were informed and increased their capacities in relation to asylum issues, had the opportunities to engage in this field and develop cooperation with organizations (APC and others) and institutions at the central level in the future.

For asylum seekers, the project enabled necessary legal asylum information as well as access to legal aid, health service and is likely to be less exposed to discrimination in local communities. Asylum seekers are legally represented in the asylum procedure and asylum court procedures and their rights on fair procedure is secured. APC was able to address a number of most urgent issues such as inadequate and incomplete legal provisions, lack of conducting registration and absence of issuing asylum ID cards, insufficient accommodation capacities and lack of integration provisions. Illegal migrants, who previously did not have access to information on their legal position or had unrealistic expectations regarding their target countries, are now informed about the consequences.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

No formal project partner was involved.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Improved delivery of basic services, information on status, rights and option for illegal immigrants and asylum seekers in Serbia is likely to last in the local communities and center where the project was implemented, e.g. issue of issuing ID cards to asylum seekers, 24 hour local ambulance service. However, since the expected raise of illigal immigrants and asylum seekers is likely to happen already in the winter of 2014 the strengh tened system and local communities the situation will remain fragile. Since this project has been crucial for APC to consolidate its apporach and work on asylum seekers and since it has secured several projects to continue this effort, it can be expected that the impact will be mid- to long-term.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Little changes and development would have occurred without the grant. Negative political and media campaign would present asylum seekers as dangerous and as threat to the society, would develop prejudices and xenophobia in the local and wide public creating initial and long-lasting negative view on the issue of asylum and protection of asylum seekers. Local and central stakeholders would not raise their capacities and local communities wouldn't raise awareness on the position and characteristics of asylum seekers as well as on their needs. Local citizens and local children would not be in the situation to develop direct contacts and communication with asylum seekers, to fight prejudices toward asylum seekers and interact mutually and systematically.

22. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.
Building of capacities and knowledge of citizens, authorities and CSOs in targeted local communities is expected to result in social cohesion and tolerance. It should also result in engaging local population in delivering services, esp. in collective and asylum center as well as to improve basic services for the communities themselves (e.g. advocacy on 24 hour ambulance service for both citizens and asylum seekers in Bodovadja.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Project has contributed to the process of improving the asylum legislation and asylum system as one of the priority under the EU Acquis Chapter 24 and obligations steaming from the visa liberalization system.

With project campaigns, advocacy and constant addressing the asylum issues in the wide public, project contributed fighting discrimination, spreading xenophobia, violence and radical extremist views on the issue of asylum seekers, migrants and foreigners, especially in the moment of asylum humanitarian crisis in the last quarter of 2013.

Project contributed in dealing with humanitarian crisis related to accommodation on asylum seekers in last quarter of 2013 by emphasizing negative and possible effects of the crisis and initiating local stakeholders' campaigns that drew attention of the Government on the burning asylum issues as important to be resolved in the future.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

The project exploited Government Strategy for the Management of Migrations adopted in 2009, which explicitly mentions APC as the CSO responsible for providing legal aid and assistance to asylum seekers as well as APC synergies with local Centre for social welfare in Loznica and Lajkovac, Local municipality of Lajkovac, Centre for unaccompanied minors in Belgrade, Red Cross, Commissariat for refugees and migration (KIRS) and local CSOs. Moreover project exploits synergies with media (with Vecernje Novosti and other) and with European Council of Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) as its member.

The project exploited synergies with BCIF Trag founded APC project of advocating to Local Municipality of Lajkovac for local ambulance in the area of Bogovadja for local citizens and asylum seekers (Advocating for local ambulance working full time for local citizens and asylum seekers), as well as synergies with Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) founded APC project on presenting profile of asylum seekers in Serbia and Serbian asylum seekers in Europe to the public (Comparative Analysis - Social Inclusion and needs of the Asylum Seekers in the Serbian Asylum System and the Serbian Citizens with Unfounded Asylum Applications abroad). Further on the project exploited synergies with Government Project Group for Drafting New Asylum Law established by the Government after the humanitarian crisis in last quarter of 2013.

The CSF Action "Opening Dialog Within Local Communities – Migrants and Citizens Towards Tolerance and Non-violence" currently implemented in partnership with the NGO ATINA directly builds on the present action, making use of the cooperation established with local CSOs, which are now involved in building local networks, as well as in continuing the strengthening of capacities of migrants to act as cultural mediators to support migrants' inclusion and promote intercultural dialogue.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

APC in cooperation with Local Municipality of Lajkovac received a small grant from TRAG Foundation for local ambulance in the area of Bogovadja for local citizens and asylum seekers (Advocating for local ambulance working full time for local citizens and asylum seekers). APC is a partner in an ongoing project funded by IPA CSF Serbia 2012 Programme lead by NGO Atina "Opening Dialog Within Local Communities – Migrants and Citizens Towards Tolerance and Non-violence", which directly builds on the present action, making use of the cooperation established with local CSOs, which are now involved in building local networks, as well as in continuing the
strengthening of capacities of migrants to act as cultural mediators to support migrants’ inclusion and promote intercultural dialogue.

The EIDHR Action “Enhancing Access to Education and Preventing Gender-based Violence of Asylum Children in Serbia” currently implemented in partnership with the NGO ATINA directly builds on the present action, making use of the cooperation strengthened with local and central level asylum stakeholders and local CSOs as well as making use of results and experience gained in realization of project cultural, creative, empowering workshops and legal aid provided as well as making use of research and publications drafted and realized under the Grant project.

The Swiss Development and Cooperation Action “Sharing positive practice on intercultural dialogue and interaction among asylum seekers and local citizens” currently implemented in partnership with local organization Cultural Centre Hadzi Ruvim, directly built on the project, making use of the cooperation strengthened with local and central level asylum stakeholders and local CSOs, as well as making use of results and experience gained in realization of the project, especially experience in local level advocacy and trainings under the project, making use of established synergies and raised capacities of Local Authorities of Lajkovac and Lajkovac local stakeholders.

The Dutch Embassy action “Fairer Asylum Procedures Improved in Serbia”, directly built on the project, making use of the strengthening cooperation with local and central level asylum stakeholders especially MoI, Asylum Office and Border Police, as well as making use of trainings organized, research and publications, policy paper realized, round tables and debates organized under the action, in order to increase the capacities of the officers in charge of conducting first and second instance procedure by providing support, training and expertise on how to properly conduct the asylum interviews, how to interview and work with vulnerable groups of applicants and how to research country of origin information (COI).

Moreover, spin off activities triggered by the Grant are voluntary gathering of humanitarian aid to asylum seekers, expanding the network of volunteers in local communities and organizing visits to Belgrade for individual asylum seekers from the asylum camps, provision of internships in APC for foreign students future professionals in the field of asylum, expanding internships for domestic students on the students from faculties of media and communication, journalism, philosophy, more active APC presence in the media presenting positive view on asylum seekers, preparation of new asylum stories edition, conducting research and drafting study on psychological wellbeing of the asylum seekers in the asylum system in Serbia, preparing and making short videos to be interactively used on the social networks creating small library on bad and good practices toward asylum seekers, on position of asylum seekers in Serbia and danger on their move.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

APC, other EU projects (e.g. IPA CSF Atina project) and institutions remain active on the issue of illegal migration and asylum seekers’ basic needs, rights and (co-)existence, especially in receiving communities. Positive opinion of wide public on the issues of asylum seekers is hardly to be changed suddenly and in near future should be maintained due to such continues activities. Strengthened and connected local actors in asylum continue to build its activities upon raised capacities and cooperation, building networks and applying for projects in the area of asylum together and supported with APC and other organizations. Through asylum info leaflets asylum seekers are kept being informed on their rights and through manual, info leaflets and other publication APC and other lawyers and other local stakeholders are in the position to continue and develop project outputs achieved and activities. Project website is serving as sustainable reference for raising awareness in local communities and central level and combatting prejudice against immigrants and asylum seekers in wide public, constantly offering to the media and wide public news and info on the action and on asylum-related issues in Serbia and worldwide. Moreover, since the project is linked to the core mission of APC, it is constantly developing and upgrading its project activities.
through new project activities building on and expanding outputs and results achieved under the project, especially in the field of legal and psychosocial protection, interaction and dialogue in local communities, media campaigns and advocacy for modification in asylum system and fighting against prejudices and xenophobia, all together with local organizations and stakeholders.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Additional IPA CSF, EIDHR and other donor projects will secure that at least on the mid-term the sustainability of outputs and results.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Yes. Mentioned project under IPA CSF Serbia 2012 Programme lead by NGO Atina “Opening Dialog Within Local Communities – Migrants and Citizens Towards Tolerance and Non-violence” and EIDHR Action “Enhancing Access to Education and Preventing Gender-based Violence of Asylum Children in Serbia”.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

No formal partners were involved, but new partners are being forged with CSO working on similar issues such as NGO Atina and esp with state and local authorities. APC has signed a MoU with local welfare centre in Loznica, with local CSOs in Subotica (Eastern European mission) and with Reception centre for unaccompanied foreign minors, and have arrangements with municipal authorities and CSOs which beside other enable to make use of premises for public debates, exhibitions as well as for organizing fairs.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Support actions that would further improve direct support (legal and psychosocial) to asylum seekers and migrants combined with media and youth activities and initiatives advocating for the further improvements in asylum system and integration. Actions that would support COI (Country of origin information) research and database techniques. Intercultural dialogue and interaction as well as future asylum integration activities. Moreover, actions that will raise technical capacities of CSOs active especially in the field of asylum, as well as local and central stakeholders.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project is extremely relevant to the call for proposal and target group, i.e. illegal immigrants and asylum seekers. Project coincided with a considerable increase of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers in bordering local communities at the end of 2013 and this amplified its effectiveness and immediate impact, however sustainability is challenging at the end of the target group (i.e. most illegal immigrants and asylum seekers continue their move and do not stay in Serbia) as well as institutions (i.e. continued increase of immigrants and asylum seekers presures the already overburdened and weak asylum protection system). Efficiency was also very high, especially considering achieved media output and outreach to the target group, but a downside was that communities in which immigrants and asylum seekers centers are located have little and unactive civil society thus direct intervention of APC was crucial for the project success. This was the first EU-funded project for APC and it helped the organization consolidate its scattered specialized work in asylum protection and migration into a coherent support and advocacy programme consisting of legal support, capacity-building, advocacy, information and media campaign. APC is recognized for its work by institutions and this allowed for the success of the project and while APC has follow-up projects in cooperation with other CSOs working on similar or related issues (e.g. CSO Atina) it would further benefit especially in its national-level advocacy in cooperation with Chaper 24 related
coalitions and network. Moreover, ways for further institutionalization and delivery of service to illegal immigrants should be focus of future work of APS since further increase of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers is expected in the short- to mid-term period.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>Asylum Protection Center office, Belgrade</td>
<td><strong>Rados Djurovic</strong>, Director, Asylum Protection Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to strengthening the role and influence of civil society through leading development of far-reaching dialogue on tackling the problem of trafficking for sexual and other forms of exploitation in Serbia</td>
<td>• Contribute to quality of preventative measures, rehabilitation, repatriation and integration services provided to women and children victims of trafficking for sexual and other forms of exploitation through multiple stakeholders consensus building on applying EU approaches, values and standards in Serbia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Trained and established psychotherapists’ network, composed of 50 specialized psychotherapist from 30 different towns making available professional psychotherapy support to trafficking in human beings victims (THB) victims across Serbia (esp. outside of major cities);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International Conferences on the Contemporary Psycho-Social Challenges in Combating Human Trafficking and Conference on the Migration and Human Trafficking were organized for exchange of experience of international pundits, state officials, mental health professionals and NGO representatives;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Organization of discussion by multiple stakeholders’ on the influences of Serbia’s EU accession on the issue. Knowledge gathered and shared toward policy and service recommendations;
• Practical knowledge and latest techniques on providing therapists support to victims discussed amongst national and international professionals, and shared across Serbia;
• Awareness raised in Serbia on the issue of trafficking for sexual and other forms of exploitation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Conceptual Design</th>
<th>• Production of a practical guide for psychotherapists, psychologists and psychiatrists who work with victims and other professionals dealing with them (legal practitioners, medical stuff, NGOs): Human trafficking, Trauma and Psychotherapy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?</td>
<td>Yes. Both are well articulated and clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there clear OVIs?</td>
<td>OVIs are clear. Formulated on the level of output rather than targets of achievement (probably due to lack of sources of verification).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Relevance</th>
<th>4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project is addressed to developing a multi-stakeholder consensus and improvement of (psychotherapeutically) services of THB victims in terms of quality and access. Project responds to themes i), ii) and iv) of the CIP as it encouraged: strengthening of a common national, public and CSO-wide agenda for pursuit of combating trafficking in women and children; building towards consensus amongst different national, EU and international stakeholders on best approaches in applying EU approaches, values and standards in victim’s protection in Serbia; and, enhancing social inclusion within Serbia by advocating for improved attitudes among professionals and the general public towards victims.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?</td>
<td>First time psychotherapists in Serbia trained in techniques of complex trauma etc. in working with THB victims; manual and 50 therapists network developed which continues to provide services to victims in 30 cities and towns across Serbia without exposing them of risk of further THB. Psychotherapy extremely important as THB victims are usually re-traumatized during trials, claims for compensation etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Efficiency</th>
<th>7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are they in line with the contract and the implementation plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project is closed. All project activities were implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the project well managed and monitored?</td>
<td>No specific monitoring, on-the-spot visit reported or problems reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much of the grant is disbursed?</td>
<td>All. The difference between planned and disbursed budget is 1,455,33 EUR or 2,89% of the budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
No.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
ASTRA reported it did not have enough paid positions within the project budget, so it involved other members of ASTRA who were paid from other project and in reality the number of working hours are significantly hire, then it was planned/paid.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Yes.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Beneficiary was satisfied with the support. No monitoring or on-the-spot visits were reported.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
No.

**IV. Effectiveness**

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
The 50-strong network of 30 psychotherapists across Serbia is functional via a mailing list, database and the practical guide is being used by them in their work.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
The State (Special Unit or Center for Fight against THB at the Ministry of Interior) has used the network of psychotherapists for referral to victims and has financed support for at least one victim.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
There were no formal project partners. However, ASTRA developed cooperation with Group 484, a CSO dealing with the issue of migration for the need of the organization of one of the international conferences “Human trafficking and migration” organized on 15th March, 2013.

**V. Impact**

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?
The practical guide developed is being actively used by psychotherapists and since it is published both in English and Serbian language, it is being shared with psychotherapist and other professionals dealing with THB victims beyond Serbia (e.g. Albania, Kosovo). There at least one case of reported use of the network of psychotherapists for referral to victims and has financed support for at least one victim by the State (Center for the protection of human trafficking victims at the Ministry of Interior). The knowledge shared in the training for psychotherapists and the practical guide are being actively used and thus, psychotherapy is available to THB victims across Serbia.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?
Probably not.
22. Is the project likely to result in major socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

While it is hard to evidence socioeconomic benefits of psychotherapeutic support to THB victims (interviews/access with a victim of THB was not possible), access and availability of such support for the first time to THB victims in Serbia should improve the possibilities of such persons to integrate and re-establish a healthy, productive life. This possibility is all the more likely, since ASTRA is working on further elements of assistance to THB victims such as the right of the victim to damage or compensation regardless of the outcome of penalizing/sentencing the perpetrators.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realization of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Project efforts are in line with the National Strategy to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings, where one of the strategic goals is also to “…provide psychosocial support, assistance and protection to all victims of trafficking in persons, regardless of their willingness to cooperate with state bodies in the procedure of investigation and presentation of evidence;” (section 9.1.)

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

During the period of the Conference preparation ASTRA established cooperation with Group 484 as a partner in organization of the Conference. They provided a list of CSOs that are dealing with problem of irregular migration on the migration route. Established cooperation could lead to a large joint project of ASTRA and Group 484 that aims to illuminate the issues of migration, human trafficking and related social phenomena.

There is an ongoing project by ATINA- Citizens’ Association for Combat Trafficking In Human Beings and All Forms of Gender-Based Violence titled “Opening Dialog Within Local Communities – Migrants and Citizens Towards Tolerance and Non-violence” (funded by IPA CSF 2012) which deals with capacity building of local CSO and stakeholder in border communities to recognize and address the risk of THB in illegal migrants and asylum seekers.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

ASTRA applied under the following EIDHR call for follow-up activities, but did not receive funding. ASTRA is managing Balkan Act Now project, regional project funded under the IPA Framework Partnership Agreement, but this is not specific to the psychoterapeutical support.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Yes. The therapist network is active. Based on the interview, therapists are applying gained skills and are in communication with ASTRA (mailing list) etc. ASTRA is a member of monitoring coalition PrEUgovori consisted of 6 CSOs to oversee the implementation of policies in the field of Judiciary and Fundamental Rights (Chapter 23) and Justice, Freedom and Security (24) and propose measures to improve the reforms, using the process of EU integration to achieve substantial progress in the further democratization of Serbia. ASTRA is working on further issue in the area of assistance to THB victims, such as reparation of damage to the victims etc. As a member of Working group for the preparation of National Strategy to Prevent and Suppress Human Trafficking and Protect Victims 2013 – 2018, ASTRA was able to use expertise and knowledge gained through the implementation of this project, and integrate it in the Strategy, specifically in relation to the Goal 4 – Improved system of identification, protection, assistance and support to victims of human trafficking through long-term and sustainable programs of
social inclusion.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

At minimal yes (e.g. continuation of mailing list, distribution of practical guide), but for replication of trainings, active investment in therapist building of capacities further funding would be needed.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

No follow-up grant, but ASTRA is managing an IPA Multi beneficiary 48 month project “Balkan Act Now” with the aim to enhance capacity of CSOs independent and objective analysis and monitoring; legitimacy and accountability; influence over policy in Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and FYR Macedonia, in efforts to contribute to combating of human trafficking and aligning justice sector policies with standards, norms and values of the EU.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

No formal partners, but cooperation developed with Group 484 is likely to last.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

According to ASTRA, THB is not in the focus of many donors so they ask not to exclude victims of violent crimes from the list of beneficiaries/target groups in the future CfP. In line with above, ASTRA deems it important small grants to be available as this allows them potential access to grants by the EU (either IPA, EIDHR).

Human trafficking issues are not considered in the Action Plan for Chapter 23: Judiciary and fundamental rights. ASTRA’s opinion is that problems connected with human trafficking, i.e. protection of victim’s rights, need to be included in the Chapter 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) as a part of Fundamental rights, not just to be considered as a part of organized crime and migrations in the Chapter 24 (Justice, freedom and security).

With regard to Serbian legislation it is necessary to adopt new Strategy on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and Action plan for implementation. Further measures are required to foster a human rights based approach and to step up measures to identify and protect victim. Trafficked persons need to have effective access to compensation of material and non-material damages through compensation fund regardless of the outcome of criminal proceeding and whether the identity of the perpetrator has been established. Non-punishment of victims for their involvement in unlawful activities while they were exploited should be explicitly envisaged in Article 388 of Criminal Code of Republic of Serbia.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project piloted establishment of psychotherapeutic support for THB victims, by developing specific skills and knowledge of psychotherapists across Serbia. As a mature, developed, recognized organization, who is experienced in management of EU projects, ASTRA managed the project efficiently. Project was effective in achieving recognition of the State (Special Unit or Center for Fight against THB at the Ministry of Interior) via use of the network of psychotherapists for referral to victims and has financed support for at least one victim. The network is still active and ASTRA is working on the reparation of
damage to the victims and other aspects of re-integration of THB victims to society so the prospects of sustainability are high. These prospects are amplified by Astra's advocacy work via PrEUgovori coalition and continued cooperation, but it will take significant amount of time and efforts for project results to become sustainable via institutionalization and automatic referral to psychoterapeutical support to all THB victims. It is interesting that a developed organization as Astra opted for and considers small grants as an extremely valuable type of support for its work. Nevertheless, while short project like this one are useful for piloting of services, its long-term impact and especially impact of its advocacy work on behalf of THB victims can become effective on the long-term with a longer-term support, such as Astra is receiving under the IPA FPA regional project (48 months).

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/10/2014</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>2012/293-444</td>
<td>Tamara Vuksanovic, Co-ordinator, Astra Marija Andjelkovic, President, Astra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/10/2014</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>2012/293-444</td>
<td>Biljana Slavkovic, psychotherapist, Institute for Psychodrama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Project Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>EIDHR CBCC 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2012/293-457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Dignity, integrity and safety for women – joint action by women’s organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>AWC-Autonomous Women's center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>47,807 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>45,416,65 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>95 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>07.06.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>06.06.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Summary**

*(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To contribute to promoting human rights, gender equality and democratic reforms in public institutions as to reinforce state responsibility for more efficient protection of women from gender based violence (GBV) and protection of their economic and social rights (ESR).</td>
<td>• To strengthen capacities and role of women’s CSOs in Serbia for influencing institutions and the State for more efficient protection of women from GBV and protection of their ESR in accordance with national strategies and international obligations of Serbia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Two-day trainings for representatives of women’s CSOs on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional exchange of experiences (6 women’s CSOs from Croatia and BIH);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Application of acquired knowledge on individual and institutional advocacy by trained women CSOs and summary up results (satisfaction of beneficiaries (women victims of violence) and creation of individual reports of local women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- At least 15 women CSOs specialized in GBV issue have improved knowledge for the application of individual and institutional advocacy for women (beneficiaries) in the institutional procedures in two public services, which increased women’s safety and encouraged supportive attitude of professionals;
- At least 20 women CSOs in Serbia have improved knowledge on methodology for monitoring of human rights, international human rights (HR) instruments and mechanisms and created a report for at least one of the selected areas.
I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

Yes. Both are well articulated.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

OVIs are clear. Some OVIs at the level of overall and specific objective are set very high and target impact, which is beyond the timeframe of the project (e.g. Better national reports on the implementation of laws, strategies, action plans and protocols on women human rights and gender equality; Larger number of reports of acts of violence; Shorter procedures and a more supportive approach by professionals and institutions)

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives?

Very relevant. The project focused on developing network’s and individual’ women CSOs monitoring and advocacy capacities as a base to improve standards and practice in combating GBV and ESR of women.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

Very relevant and has been planned with full inclusion and consultation of target group/beneficiaries. The needs of target groups were identified in a participatory process at 2 meetings: (a) a meeting of women’s CSOs dealing with GBV at the initiative of RWF, held 2nd July 2011 in Belgrade. It was confirmed that the processes of monitoring and representation of beneficiaries rights is a priority and the desire for joint actions and exchange of information was expressed; (b) meeting of the network Women-Poverty-Development at the initiative of AWC, held 22nd July 2011 in Belgrade.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are they in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The project is closed. All project activities were implemented. There were additional activities (e.g. mentoring support) included with approval of the Contracting Authority.
8. **Is the project well managed and monitored?**

Yes. No specific monitoring, on-the-spot visit reported or problems reported.

9. **How much of the grant is disbursed?**

All.

10. **Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?**

No.

11. **Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.**

No. Change of timing of some events occurs with previous approval of Contracting Authority. E.g. change from August to June of timing of regional exchange due to summer holidays, the two trainings were co-joined and realized as one 4 day seminar in September. AWC proposed change in activities schedule because of the late start of project realization and in order to avoid summer months.

12. **Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?**

AWC did not report problems in staff engagement.

13. **Are the activities achieving value for money?**

Yes. Fewer participants than planned, but additional mentoring activities were implemented with approval of Contracting Authority.

14. **Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?**

Yes. Local organizations reported 148 contacts with media, plus overall 97 AWC media reports and of those 13 of reports regarding topics covered by the project. Organizations prepared 9 local reports on effects of the meetings, reached agreements with professionals and overall description of the situation regarding protection from GBV. Issues detected in the local reports were incorporated in Shadow report CEDAW (revised version for the 55th session of the Committee). 10,000 informational leaflets were printed (covering jurisdiction of CSW and the police, and necessary contacts of CSO, CSW, police and complaint mechanisms) and distributed to organizations.

15. **Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?**

During the project, cooperation with contact person from the Delegation was excellent. Communication was clear, timely and with mutual understanding.

16. **Is there any issue with the co-financing?**

No.

### IV. Effectiveness

17. **Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?**

There was lesser number of participants at the trainings and regional exchange (e.g. 22 representatives from 19 women’s CSOs out of planned 25 representatives/20 CSOs or planned 18 instead of 30 CSO representatives) as a result of limited human resources in targeted women CSOs and external factors achieved. Nevertheless, quite tangible results have been achieved in a very short period of time.

**Local level:** Approximately 30 issues (information on problems) determined by women advocates in local communities and addressed through organizational activities and actions, 24 documents were sent to institutions (7 more prepared) by AWC and 10 local CSOs. Two joint initiatives were realized: improving visibility of women’s organizations services for women affected by GBV (five organizations) and analysis of financing of women’s CSOs (26 organizations). 15 women’s organizations had 35 contacts with key
authorities on local level and 148 media presentations on the issues in local media and AWC held 3 meetings with national authorities, with participation of 7 institutions and 13 media presentations. During the period of 6 months AWC and 9 women’s organizations provided services/registered 848 women beneficiaries. Signing of 17 agreements and initiatives were reached in 9 local communities and 3 protocols were signed among CSOs and local institutions.

National and international level:
As part of national CSO coalition AWC submitted a Serbia NGO Shadow Report to the UN CEDAW Committee and was able to report specific GBV issues into it due to information collected during the project by local women CSOs. Committee has included great number of recommendation submitted in NGO Shadow report, acknowledging and addressing situation of multiple discriminated women. Moreover, the Committee requested Republic of Serbia to provide, within two years, written information on the scope on the steps undertaken to implement the recommendations. Additionally AWC submitted 4 reports to different international bodies and organizations. AWC consider that submitted reports have contributed to final documents by international bodies, and influence made can be seen in regard to research conducted by Marije Cornelissen, Member of the European Parliament, where AWC respond, has been included in her initiative Report on this issue in the Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality in the European Parliament.

At national level, project coordinator acted as expert consultant in March 2013 for thematic group women and projects assistant member of the same thematic group formed by Department for human and minority rights for creation of Strategy for combating discrimination. Within ex ante analysis is a proposal of Regulation on minimum standards for SOS help lines, created by AWC team in cooperation with women’s CSO. In May 2013, AWC proposal of the Regulation on minimum standards for SOS help lines was presented to wider working group formed by the Ministry for work, employment and social policy, as a proposal agreed among women’s CSOs.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
It has helped mostly service provision local women CSO gain new knowledge and expertise on research and advocacy as a key asset in helping them get engaged successfully with responsible institutions (local authorities, police, center for social services, shelters etc.) to improve services for their beneficiaries. The research and advocacy approach will cater for improved capacity to lobby for basic financial resources for such services in local budgets, improved services for victims. Ultimately, it is catering for raising awareness and nurturing empowerment of victims (esp. women) and putting pressure on local authorities to provide needed services to its citizens. An example of such change has been reported by Roma women CSO Osvit from Nis, who runs an SOS line for the area of Nis (only SOS line both in Serbian and Roma language) and has for the first time engaged with local authorities in advocacy. They reported that this has enabled them to be taken serious by local stakeholders and improve their work for their beneficiaries-mostly Roma women.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
Reconstruction Women Fund had a minor but essential role in outreach and inclusion of smaller, local women CSOs, involvement in monitoring and has financially supported local meetings organized by CSOs, and in relation the project.
## V. Impact

### 20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Local women CSOs involved come together on permanent basis via two national networks - Women against violence specializing in issue of GBV and Women-poverty-development specializing in issues of ESR of women. The project methodology has been directly used and extended to the neighboring countries via IPA CSF Multi-Beneficiary regional “Coordinated efforts - toward new European standards in protection of women from gender-based violence” project (Contract number: 2012 / 306-568), where the local dimension of this project is fully incorporated and expanded activities related to strengthening capacity of local organizations to individual and institutional advocacy (information of beneficiary, representation in institutions, analysis and monitoring of local policies and services, and advocacy actions), connecting them with the implementation of Council of Europe Convention for preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. Number of local organizations directly involved in Serbia is increased, also the experience and model of work in the region (Croatia, BiH and Macedonia) has been transferred.

### 21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

The capacity building component and outreach to women local CSOs would have been less probable, while advocacy vis-à-vis international and national mechanism (e.g. Serbia NGO Shadow Report to the UN CEDAW Committee) would probably take place without the grant.

### 22. Is the project likely to result in major socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

The project has been among other devoted to access of women to ESR and has had an overall outreach to 848 women beneficiaries and at least 9 local authorities indicate high possibility of improved access by women victims of GBV access to ESR (e.g. alimony, financial aid).

### 23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realization of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

The project activities are in line with National Strategy for preventing and combating violence against women in the family and in partner relations and the General Protocol on procedures and cooperation of institutions to protect women from GBV, which encourages cooperation at local level. At the time when project was active, CoE Convention on combating and preventing violence against women and domestic violence was ratified (31 October, 2013) and enter into force on 1 August, 2014). Role and jurisdiction of Commissioner for protection of equality and Ombudsman as well as monitoring of Law on combating discrimination were also incorporated in the project activities.

### 24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

Synergy has been developed with AWC project “Initiative for monitoring social policy”, funded by Norwegian Royal Embassy, with a goal to secure more efficient implementation of new Law on social protection and measures adopted in order to suppress social exclusion. AWC target group were 5 women’s CSOs dealing with GBV and socio economic rights of women. Five analyses of implementation social policies – services for women victims of violence on local level were created, round table organized with participation of Ministry for labour, employment and social policy, and publication on monitoring of social policies measure from the perspective of the target group of women. This work on local analyses
was complementary with advocacy activities of local CSOs within the Action, and result of the analyses used for advocating for institutional changes.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

AWC implements for 2 years now regional project "Coordinated efforts - toward new European standards in protection of women from gender-based violence" (Contract number: 2012 / 306-568) The local dimension of this project is fully incorporated and expanded activities related to strengthening capacity of local organizations to individual and institutional advocacy (information of beneficiary, representation in institutions, analysis and monitoring of local policies and services, and advocacy actions), connecting them with the implementation of Council of Europe Convention for preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. Number of local organizations directly involved in Serbia is increased, also the experience and model of work in the region (Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Macedonia) has been transferred.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

AWC coordinates national network Women against Violence, and fosters a cooperative relationship with both women's organizations in Serbia and in the region (not just the project activities). Also, through the education of professionals, AWC maintains partnerships with representatives of public agencies responsible for support to women survivors of violence.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Yes, in terms of AWC capacity and knowledge on advocacy at national level, but more resources and a longer timeframe is needed to empower and continue strengthening capacities of local women CSOs on issues if GBV and ESR as a way to secure a longer-term, minimum institutional support to basic services with regards to victims’ needs.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

AWC has been implementing a regional project "Coordinated efforts - toward new European standards in protection of women from gender-based violence" (Contract number: 2012/306-568) for 2 years now. The local dimension of this project is fully incorporated and expanded activities related to strengthening capacity of local organizations to individual and institutional advocacy (information of beneficiary, representation in institutions, analysis and monitoring of local policies and services, and advocacy actions), connecting them with the implementation of Council of Europe Convention for preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. Number of local organizations directly involved in Serbia is increased, also the experience and model of work in the region (Croatia, BiH and Macedonia) has been transferred.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Mutual interest for continued cooperation has been expressed. Cooperation with local women CSOs continues via the 2 national networks: Women against Violence, Women-poverty-development.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Special area of women's human rights and specified women as a target group in all areas. In the area of violence against women such as support services for women survivors of violence, advocacy for funding of services for women victims of violence with the national and local budgets, working on issues of security of women and girls and their direct participation in the planning and improvement of safety,
monitoring the implementation of ratified international documents and recommendations of international bodies.

Overall, advocacy for harmonization of laws and policies with the standards of the Convention of the Council of Europe activities and monitoring the implementation of international agreements. Also, participation in the pre-accession negotiations with respect to Chapter 19, 23 and 24. Particularly, the process of adoption of the Rulebook on standards for SOS helpline service for women survivors of violence, licensing of providers, monitoring the implementation of the General and Specific protocols on the treatment of women in relevant services, monitoring the implementation of local agreements and the creation of proposals and recommendations for improvements at local level and achieving visible positive results in the protection of women from violence.

AWC stressed the need to observe deadlines set for the project approval. When planning activities and time line, the applicants maintained deadlines stated in the invitation. When delays happen, it leads to a shift activity in the months when it is difficult to realize and requires additional shifts (e.g. activity in seminars or round table cannot be implemented during the summer months with same effect.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project is relevant to both the programme and target group, i.e. local women CSOs working on issues of GBV and ESR. AWC is an example of a mature organization, recognized by institutions for its expertise and proven track record of results. Efficiency of the project was on good level, but some activities had to be rescheduled and changed in order to be able to meet short deadline, targeted results. Basing its work on existing networks of local women CSOs and focusing on their monitoring and advocacy capacity building to enable effective change for their target groups enabled positive and concrete improvements. However, project timeframe and small grant limited possible impact so this is mainly facilitated by the fact that the networks existed before and after the project intervention and that AWC relied on other donor support (e.g. Norwegian grant, IPA Multi-beneficiary FPA) to consolidate achievements. Prospects for sustainability of AWC work on the issue of capacity building on local women CSOs on GBV and ESR are good, but sustainability of advocacy and monitoring actions of women local CSOs are fragile and will depend on their further support via networks, funding and especially responsiveness of relevant institutions to their advocacy actions.

Project carries all important elements of a successful intervention, i.e. mature, respected, recognized, expert lead organization, but the intervention on capacity building of local CSOs and network requires longer time and bigger funding commitments (as also expressed AWC). Since it is a strongly mission driven organization, AWC was able to offset this with combination of several projects, but for concrete impact and sustainability at local level where funding situation is extremely fragile a strategic project could improve these prospects.
VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2014</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Roma women CSO Osvit, SOS telephone office, Nis</td>
<td>Ana Sacipovic, Coordinator, Roma women CSO Osvit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/10/2014</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Tanja Ignjatovic, Project Coordinator, AWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slobodanka Macanovic, Director/Financial Manager, AWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jelena Keserović, Project Assistant, AWC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Increase competences (level of knowledge, skills and experience) of NGOs (Coalition for the prison reform) in the field of prison system reform;</td>
<td>- Increase level of education and skills of NGOs, members of Coalition in the field of: anti-corruptive analysis of the law and integrity plans, European practices in the area of self-injuring and practice of European Court related to violation of prisoners’ rights, better understanding of reasons that cause remand;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contribute to the prison reform (concerning combating corruption, discrimination of female and minority prisoners in wider sense, rights on proper medical care and legal aid.</td>
<td>- Increase level of (NGOs’ coalition) experience in contribution to the process of prison system reform in line with European standard;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establish some of preconditions for future parliamentary adoption of legal acts produced by Coalition;</td>
<td>- Contribute to the reduction in the level of corruption in prisons;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve situation of prisoners who were denied proper medical care;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide legal aid to prisoners, potential victims of torture and ill treatment, in disciplinary procedures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase the sensibility of widest public regarding prisoners’ rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expected results

- Increased level of education and skills of NGO (anti-corruption measures, European practice in 2 fields)
- Increase level of NGO experience in prison reform
- The reduction of corruption in prison contribution
- Improved situation of prisoners in terms of medical care
- Legal aid provided to potential victims of torture
- Established some of preconditions for legal aid
- Increased sensibility of wider public in relation to prison reform

### Main outputs

- Easily accessible corruption reporting mechanisms; Extent and quality of implementation of Anti-corruption Action Plan measured;
- Medical care improved; lacks in work of medical services (3 prisons) detected; Protected rights of 30 prisoners through the procedures of submitting complaints; Information about contents for Book of medical Protocols collected. Collected inf. about practice of use of torture and ill treatment in current conditions; Ensured legal protection for 15 prisoners, potential victims of torture and ill treatment, through disciplinary procedures; Protection for other prisoners, potential victims; Indirect monitoring of prison conditions;
- Systemized new knowledge which are currently not available, that will be base for further argumentation (content of the publication);
- Coalition (NGOs) members gained new knowledge which are in the function of the efficient prison system reform;
- Creation of pre-conditions for the adoption of the amendments to laws and sub-legal acts, produced by Coalition; experiences for Coalition in creation of reform steps;
- Contribution to the reduction of stigmatization of prisoners in public.

---

### I. Conceptual Design

1. **Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?**
   
   Yes. Very detailed in taxative, legal-like style in line with primary expertise of the organizations (HR lawyers).

2. **Is it easy to understand the project logic?**
   
   Very detailed, could be more focused (2 overall objectives, 7 specific objectives, 7 expected results). Specific objective and expected results are at the same level of intervention, where expected results expresses the state/situation and specific results contribution made to its improvements.

3. **Are there clear OVIs?**
   
   Yes, but they are not quantified in terms of targets to be reached by the project.

### II. Relevance

4. **How relevant is the project to the call for proposals' objectives**
   
   While targeting prison reform and improving services to prisoners (esp. legal aid and medical care), the project is ultimately aimed at dealing with one of key challenges in Ch 23 & 24 sector: corruption.

5. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**
   
   Project documents (lack of) respect for basic HR under international and regional obligation by Serbia.
and prompts changes accordingly.

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**

Yes.

### III. Efficiency

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are they in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**

The project has been closed for 11 months before this evaluation. All project activities have been implemented, although there are slight inconsistencies in reporting in the Final project report with regards to number of prisoners complaining to the work of medical service to which legal aid has been provided. E.g. the summary reports that “Thirty prisoners requested legal aid due to inadequate medical care and in nineteen cases the representation was provide.”, while 12 individual prisoner cases are documented in the report and in attached annexes. However, these reporting inconsistencies did not jeopardize the achievement of targets set at up to 15 prisoners provided with support. Publication based on the analysis and legal aid provided publication “Monitoring of the work of the medical services in prisons” was published. Legal aid/assistance to prisoners/ potential victims of torture and ill treatment was planned and provided cases were analyzed in such direction, but no case for advocacy and analysis could be established. Based on the analysis of the European practice three reports were prepared: “Practice of individual treatment programs implementation (2013)”, “Practice of the European Court in relation to imprisonment aspects”; “Research on self-injuring in prisons”. Two capacity-building seminars for the Coalition for prison reform system were implemented: “Integrity plans and anticorruption risk analyses” on 28th May, 2013 on issues of anti-corruptive analysis of the law and integrity plans, European practices in the area of self-injuring and practice of European Court related to violation of prisoners' rights, better understanding of reasons that cause remand for 12 members of the Coalition. Second seminar “New contents: researches and monitoring” was conducted on 28th September, 2013 on the reform of prison system (related to selected topics) as a search for best solutions by which existing lacks will be changed with adequate solutions that respect prisoners' rights, in line with CoE Recommendations for 16 participants of the Coalition. Publication of collected activity results that deal with prisoners was prepared based on survey conducted among prisoners in 200 copies covering: monitoring of the work of medical services in prisons, researching prisoners' views on the corruption and anti-corruption actions within the system for the enforcement of criminal sanctions in Serbia, practice of individual treatment programs implementation (2013), practice of the European court in relation to imprisonment aspects. Two copies of the publication, subject to prior communication and agreement, were sent to the library of the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. The publication has received praise from two Ombudsman offices (Croatia and Slovenia), a member of the CPT from Montenegro while, additional ten copies were sent to the Head of Niš Penitentiary, at his request. Key advocacy activity included presentation of results and gaining support for sub-legal acts from parliamentary committees and groups of MPs for the change of the Law on the Enforcement of Criminal Sanctions and adoption of sub-legal acts. Focus was on the Parliamentary Commission for monitoring the enforcement of criminal sanctions with which 2 meetings of the extended Coalition were held (18th March, 2013 and 15th December, 2013) and regular information was sent to them about project progress. The same is also for the Directorate for the Enforcement of Criminal Sanctions. A round table “Five reports Center for Human Rights -Niš and Coalition for the Reform of Prison System” was organized in Belgrade with 26 participants attending. Six press conferences or information announcement were held in the course of the project. Finally, most of the energy during the project was devoted to assistance to a group of Penitentiary Niš staff who report a number of years long abuses and corruption to Anti-corruption Agency and to try to protect their rights from the pressure (and consequences) to which they were exposed for that reason. Due to the limitations arising from the relatively recent adoption of the Law on the Agency, a good part of the reported abuse was happening earlier than that year; only one from the group was given protected status of
whistleblower (Ms Valentina Krstic) but without further effective protection.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
Yes. No monitoring visits were reported. Participation of TM to project event was reported.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
Project was realized at 95,788.83 EUR and the final EU contribution was 76,631.78 EUR.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
No, just minor changed of the budget.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes. CHR-Nis has an experienced legal team who has worked on several consecutive projects dealing with processing prisoners’ complaints and prisoner reform issues.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes. Very detailed, quality legal research, documentation and concrete proposal for improvement of regulatory framework, but the project was underspend (around 20%).

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
All 6 planned visibility activities were implemented, although some as press conferences and some as public announcements via website of CHR-Nis and partners. The media reports derived from these activities have been mainly focused on the case of whistleblower Valentina Krstic. Daily Danas also published a full-fledged page under the daily supplement Justice Danas (Pravo Danas) funded by the IPA Strengthening Media Freedom grant on 3rd September, 2014 about the state of prisons reform. All press conference and announcements were published by both local and national media, but no information exists on air time, number of media appearances.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Yes. No issues reported. No spot visits reported. As partner in another IPA CSF project, support from the Grant Manager of TA was reported as very useful.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
Yes. Problems in securing co-financing, mostly shown via project staff time.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
The project has reached expected results in all its components. The most significant and concrete achievement is the legal (and moral) support given to the group of whistleblowers from the Nis Penitentiary and Correction Facility who reported wide-spread corruption and who has resulted in securing a formal whistleblower status granted by the Anti-corruption agency to Ms. Valentina Krstic, Head of Training and Employment Department, Penitentiary and Correction Facility, Nis and remains in her position as the Head till today (interview performed with her) despite attempts to discredit and degrade her (e.g. she is being sued from mobbing of a person involved in corruption dealings).

Second concrete achievement is the preparation of ready-made proposal of sub-legal acts developed by the Coalition for the Reform of Prison System: Regulations on the execution of criminal sanctions in Serbia from the perspective of gender equality: Potential discrimination against female prisoners,
Proposed Regulation on the treatment of a prisoner on hunger strike at institutions for execution of criminal sanctions, Proposed Protocol for the treatment of services for health care in case of hunger strike at institutions for execution of criminal sanctions, Proposals and changes to bylaws to which prisoners are members of minority groups in a broader sense (the national community, persons with disabilities, small religious community) bring in an equal position, gender dimensions of the rules in the field of criminal sanctions; Gender dimensions of the rules in the field of criminal sanctions. The proposed regulatory acts are based on lessons-learned identified via individual legal cases thane on during the project duration as well as based on existing international standards and case law. While CHR-Nis and the Coalition planned to introduce these proposals to institutions, it really did not get adequate reaction in terms of willingness and interest and it was felt that it might be too early and advanced to push the initiatives through.

Finally, while the documentation and case stocking is a commendable exercise undertaken which is to be taken advantage in all available forms, esp. with regards to reporting mechanism under Serbia’s international obligations (e.g. CPT country visit expected in 2015) an important project contribution is the investment made in capacity-building and knowledge sharing in the Coalition for the Reform of Prison System formed from Sandzak Committee for Human Rights and Freedoms, Committee for Human Rights Bujanovac, Committee for Human Rights Leskovac, Dialogue Valjevo and partner organization, Bureau for Social Research (BIRODI).

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

The project is of extreme importance of providing basic human rights to prisoners, esp. in terms of proper legal representation and medical care. Additionally, tackling the issue of corruption in prisons is an attempt to root out the causes of why prisoners are often and systematically not provided the basic human rights entitled to through international and national legal documents.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

BIRODI (Bureau for Social Researches) is a national level organization working on issues of corruption and has worked with CHR-Nis with specific focus on that issue on terms of prison reform. Its role was focused on surveying prisoners on issues of corruption and analysing these with the aim of formulating indicators of risks to the corruption and indicators of anti-corruptive activism on the level of the system for the enforcement of criminal sanctions that would be followed up and which would be subject to additional verification and change during the observed period in the sense of introduction of new ones. Partnership with BIRODI proved to be very effective in terms of actions in support of the whistleblower group from Nis Penitentiary and Sanction Facility.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Serbia EC Progress Report for 2014 mentioned for the first time ‘’difficult access to treatment programs and proper medical care’’ in prisons. As a wide-spread societal phenomenon, corruption is especially hard to tackle in isolated system such as prison and especially in situation where prisoners do not have power, control or access to compliant or remedy mechanism. The case of Valentina Krstic is thus a real success and she has herself reported that corruption is a phenomena that is not a tabu any more in the Nis Penitentiary. CHR-Nis has also reported improved cooperation and reaction on
suggestion given to the new head of the Nis Penitentiary Facility.

These problems are so deep and authorities so willing to cover their existence, that it may be considered as real success when some improvements come as direct result of publicly presented reports. According to CHR-Nis, influencing policies belongs to their long-term goals.

### 21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Probably the cases of corruption would be reported in Krstic & co case, but the support the project was able to offer was (in her words) extremely important to withstand the pressure and obtain the status of 1st whistleblower in Serbia and remain on the same working position as Head of Training and Employment Department, Penitentiary and Correction Facility, Nis.

### 22. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Access to prisoners was not possible and CHR-Nis did not report a specific case of change for prisoner and family, but the case of Valentina Krstic is a possible sign of change toward the attitude of corruption and will likely results in similar cases being reported and sanctioned in the future.

### 23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realization of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

It has contributed towards Serbia meeting of obligations on European standards on prisons treatment, international obligations with regards to torture, inhuman and degrading treatment (CPT) and EU standards with regards to fight against corruption within Chapter 23 and 24 related to Anti-corruption strategy and legislation.

### 24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

CHR-Nis has extended cooperation with project partner BIRODI on issues of corruption and Lawyers Committee for Human Rights (YUCOM) on issues of human rights abuses related to prisons.

### 25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

No. In fact, the project leader is currently for the first time without a running financial support/grant.

### VI. Sustainability

### 26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible/likely to last?

Yes. Change has been reported by whistleblower Valentina Krstic, project beneficiary in Nis Penitentiary and Sanction Facility that it is possible to report corruption. While no sanction for perpetrators have been taken, the fact that she withstand the pressure and attempts to have her removed, she remain in positions of Head of a department and demonstrates to all employees and prisoners that it is possible to blow the whistle and that corruption is not something that one should fear to report.

CHR-Nis is key reference point for prisoners with different problems and complaints and they continue to turn to them for advice, support etc. CHR-Nis is at the moment without a running grant, which is additionally made difficult by the fact that they are far from Belgrade and are working on solely voluntary basis.

### 27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Not at the moment. CHR-Nis is at the moment without a running grant for the first time in their existence and is not able to offer more than moral support or short advice to prisoners or potential whistleblowers in penitentiary and sanction facilities.
28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
Only at ideas stage.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
Yes.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
That they would be able to continue documenting situation with HR in prisons, esp. support to whistleblowers among prison staff and prisoners.
CHR-Nis interest is in the field of Chapter 23 and 24, especially in prison reform, including activities providing support/ protection of rights/ assistance to provide medical care, protection of torture, of corruption,... for individuals and activities providing information about real capacity of employees in the system of execution of prison sanctions.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project is relevant to the call for proposals and extremely important for the target group, i.e. prisoners. It is probably one of the few projects dealing with the issue of access to legal and medical care for prisoners, esp. those with disabilities and monitoring of possible cases of ill-treatment and torture. Although CHR-Nis is an experience organization, which has managed EU projects, it nevertheless faces problems in project design and efficiency (management, staff, underspending etc.), since the organization is composed of highly-qualified lawyers specialists and since their main efforts and time were devoted to the substance of the project. Effectiveness was also smaller the expected, but the project acted as a catalyst to uncover the root of the problem that it was trying to address, i.e. corruption and was this successful in offering effective legal and moral support for the 1st case of whistleblower in Serbia. Although only one case, the fact that CHR-Nis was able to provide support to a whistleblower and overcome the tabu surrounding corruption in Penitentiary and Correction Facility Nis is an important contribution to impact of this project. However, CHR-Nis is currently without funding and a set of prepared bylaws to improve access to legal and esp. medical care have not raised enough interest by relevant institutions making the project with little chances of sustainability.
CHR-Nis should focus on further advocacy on improved access and provision of legal and medical care in prisons, but prioritization of monitoring and reporting on cases of abuse and corruption might be more effective as on the case of Valentina Krstic. Projects related to strengthening capacities of Anti-corruption agency as well as other relevant institutions on prisoner reform might be complementary and provide for the building up of responsive institutions needed to take on proposes by CHR-Nis project. It is essential that follow-up and more long-term support is found to achieve credible impact on such basic human rights and democracy issues.
VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2014</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Center for Human Rights-Nis office, Nis</td>
<td><strong>Lidija Vuckovic</strong>, Project Coordinator/President, Center for Human Rights-Nis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2014</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>Nis</td>
<td><strong>Valentina Krstic</strong>, project beneficiary/whistle-blower, Head of Training and Employment Department, Penitentiary and Correction Facility, Nis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance social inclusion and exercise on the rights of children with disabilities (developmental, emotional and behavioral difficulties) and those from disadvantaged groups, particularly Roma children.</td>
<td>• Strengthen capacities of social welfare representatives in Inter-Sector Committees (ISC) to equalize assessment standards/practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Trained and licensed members of 46 ISCs to apply the new holistic child-centered assessment methodology (ROD);</td>
<td>• Three training/seminars for the 46 members of ISCs who represents social welfare system, for applying new child-centred holistic assessment methodology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supported inclusion of 46 children through implemented assessments/plans, which are based on new holistic methodology;</td>
<td>• Supervision activities for all 46 trainees, completed in small groups, each with up to 6 trainees/ISC members;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disseminated 1000 copies of the Manual (which contains survey of the children needs, recommendations for providing necessary support and other relevant information for efficient ISC operating) to each ISCs member (137 ISCs x 4) and other relevant stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Writing, publishing and disseminating the Manual for ISCs members;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media conference with promotion of the Project results and the Manual with policy/decision-makers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project visibility and accompanying/supporting activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?
   Yes. Action plane format is not standard applied in project proposal format.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?
   Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?
   OVIs at the level of overall objectives, specific objectives are unambitious and formulated at the level of expected results, outputs.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives
   Project directly targeted two themes/sectors of the CfP: theme 2 (Initiatives to enhance the inclusiveness and pluralism of civil society) and theme 4 (Building towards consensus on disputed or controversial areas of policy in deeply divided societies).

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?
   Improved, individual-specific treatment and services of children with disabilities (including their families) and those from disadvantaged groups, such as Roma children by the State by introducing the ROD (Parent-Environment-Child) assessment tool.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?
   Yes.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?
   Project has been finished for 7 months at the time of evaluation. All planned project activities have been implemented in line with the project action plan. Some of activities were slightly postponed, but all activities have been realized within the project duration. Originally, 3 seminars for 46 participants were planned, while 4 seminars for 60 participants were implemented to the need to include additional ISC members as establishment of ISC in 14 additional municipalities from the time between project application and its approval for funding. This was necessary in order to achieve project objectives – that all members of ISCs from social welfare are licensed to apply ROD assessment methodology.

   Four trainings for 60 ISCs members: 2 in June, 2013 (Novi Sad, 10-11 June; Belgrade, 17-18 June) and 2 in September, 2013 (Belgrade, 17-18 September; Kragujevac, 24-25 September) were implemented. ROD methodology has been applied on 60 children with disabilities/difficulties and their families, accompanied with individual support planning with 58 individual protocols - (documenting practical work/assessment with an individual child) completed and analyzed. Supervisory sessions for reviewing 27 protocols with defined plans of support for 27 children were realized for 27 ICS members in November, 2013 (12th, 13th, 26th and 27th of November) out of planned 46. Supervisory sessions for remaining 25 ISCs members who sent protocols are realized in February 2014 (20th, 21st, 24th, and 25th
of February). Additional supervisory sessions for all who were delayed or did not meet the criteria in previous ones were organized in March 2014 (4th, 5th, 27th, 28th of March). 1000 copies of the manual "Children with difficulties" was published and disseminated to every ISC in RS and relevant stakeholders (each Centre for Social Welfare (CSWs), Centres for Fostering and Adoption - CFAs, Government Representatives, relevant CSOs...). Final conference with promotion of the Manual took place on 20 March, 2014, incl. all relevant stakeholders (Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MoLSP), State Secretary on the Family and Social Welfare Sector, UNICEF, Republic Institute for Social Protection (RISP)) and approx. 70 practitioners participated.

The overall result, achieved in synergy of current project and previous Familia’s activities (between 2011-2014, funded by EU, MoLSP and UNICEF) is that representatives of social welfare in all ISCs in Serbia have been trained to apply ROD methodology for assessing children’s need and planning individual support for them. Additionally, every CSWs and recently established CFAs in Serbia (except Belgrade CFA) have at least one child-care practitioner licensed on ROD Assessment tool – in total 350 professionals. By that, specific objective of the project (which is: Strengthening capacities of social welfare representatives in Inter-Sector Committees to equalize assessment standards/practice) is accomplished.

| 8. Is the project well managed and monitored? | Yes. No external monitoring reported. |
| 9. How much of the grant is disbursed? | All. Financial report stands at 47,836 EUR, while the external financial audit performed verified the project total expenditures at 47,810 EUR. |
| 10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs? | No. |
| 11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose. | No. |
| 12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project? | Familia reported no problems in terms of sufficient staff. |
| 13. Are the activities achieving value for money? | Yes. More ISC member trained than planned, but less children incl. 27 out of 46 planned. |
| 14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project? | Project activities have been promoted through Familia’s Facebook page and website. Promotion on ROD and Project activities took place on the Faculty of Philosophy (on 19th April, 2013 and project results on 11 April, 2014). Promotion of ROD Instrument and project activities took place on on DEAPS Congress (on the 25th of May, 2013). ROD and project activities have been promoted to among colleges on Institute for Mental Health (on the 23rd of August, 2013) and in Brcko (Association of Psychologist, Bosnia & Herzegovina, University of Pale and Banja Luka) in period 23rd -24th August, 2013. Promotion through communications with relevant organizations: RISP and MODS. Promotional material consisted of paper bag, notebook, paper folder and poster-calendar was disseminated to all relevant stakeholders. In total, 500 paper bags, 200 poster-calendars, 500 notebooks and 1000 copies of leaflets, and 1000 issues of publication; “Children with difficulties”, all with the same design which refers to Project results and EU support. Through further dissemination of promotional material, visibility of the action and EU contribution will be continued. |
15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

Cooperation and support from Contract Authority was assessed positive. Familia received prompt answers for every question, meetings and help in resolving problems such as with the issue of VAT exemption by the Tax Agency. They reported receiving help in better coordinating activities and to adjust planned budget with real activity costs.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

Securing co-financing has been the major problem in applying for EU grants. For this project purpose, co-financing was obtained from Familia’s staff, which previously realized seminars and gave up their fees.

**IV. Effectiveness**

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

Members of 60 ISCs, who represent social welfare system are trained and licensed to apply the new holistic child-centered assessment methodology-ROD. With previously licensed ISC members, a total coverage of 100% ISCS has been reached. This provides equalization of assessment standards/practice and it is the major project outcome, i.e. defined, implemented, followed-up and evaluated Individual, support Plans for 60 children in need for additional support by ISC; developed and published 1000 copies of the Manual for ISCs, which contains survey of the children needs, recommendations for providing necessary support and other relevant information for efficient ISC operating.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

According to the law, the only way for children with difficulties to obtain necessary support and be fully integrated in educational system (and in society) is through recommendations given by ISC. ISC are mandated to recommend any type of support including medical, financial, educational, psychological, etc. Before Familia developed ROD model of assessment and educated ICS members, recommendations were based on the knowledge and experience of ISC members, no standardized procedures were used. This project was crucial for providing standardized assessment practice based on real needs of children and their families. That helped children and families to gain support and exercise their rights and professionals to be more competent and make valid, reliable decisions. According to Familia, at least 3 perpetrators of child abuse have been identified and sanctions (convicted and punished) for their behavior as a result of use of ROD assessment methodology.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Has there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

There is no formal project partner. Familia was responsible for implementation of all project activities. They nevertheless cooperated with all relevant state institution including CSWs, Regional Centres for Fostering and Adoption, MoLSP, Republican Institute for Social Protection and Institute for Mental Health. Familia has established long-lasting and satisfactory cooperation with all of them, based on mutual respect.

**V. Impact**

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Social workers within Serbian child protection practice are dominant educational profile, but with lacking
basic knowledge on child’s development (they have not learned *Developmental Psychology*). It means that they are not sufficiently equipped for both, to recognize children’s needs in context of their ages and stages and to make appropriate, timely decisions. The project enabled them to improve their competencies on the issues and to become particularly aware of the importance of early childhood development, early decisions, interventions/support and stimulation. An adequate, small-scale support to a child and/or its family is far more effective, than wide, expensive intervention in puberty and adolescence. This esp. important in current Serbia, which is a poor country without well-developed specialized services. Project promotes and provides conditions for knowledge-based practice that saves money and makes the most positive impacts on children – early detections of their needs and early interventions/support. It also contributes for uniformity/standardization of child protection practice in the country. ROD assessment has passed state accreditation system and is now part of the pool of education options that social workers have at disposal to improve their skills and advance in their career.

### 21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Change achieved is at the level of social welfare representatives of all ISCs in Serbia. In order to preserve/maintain the achievements, it is necessary to obtain ISCs members continuous support, consultations and/or trainings. Improved knowledge and skills in dealing with detection of abuses and development deficiencies in early childhood would probably take place, but not as effective, timely and cost-efficient as it has with the EOD standardized assessment standards.

### 22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Yes. It is realistic to expect that children with developmental issues will receive appropriate treatment in early childhood and thus greater chances of recover or support to leave a normal and healthy life as possible. Moreover, in situation of poor, transition society such as is Serbia it is expected that developmental issues will continue to persist or rise with other kinds of deviant behavior so ROD methodology enables for quick reaction to detected problems and ultimately increased rate of sanctioning of perpetrators (3 documented cases reported so far by Familia).

### 23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realization of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Project is in line with reforms in the area of de-institutionalization and social inclusion of vulnerable groups of children (e.g. disabled, Roma).

### 24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

This project relies on results of previously implemented project “From Individual Needs to Diversity of Support”, funded by the EU in cooperation with UNICEF and MoLSP, during which ROD methodology has been developed (5 ISCs members were trained than). In addition, in the period from December 2011 to December 2012, Familia was supported by MoLSP and UNICEF to train additional 86 representatives of social welfare system who are engaged into 86 ISCs. In synergy of above mentioned projects, 91 ISCs members in total were educated on ROD assessment methodology, which can result, with additional 60 ISCs educated through this project, in 100% coverage of ISCs. This ensures reaching the project objective as well as sustainability of its results. It is also connected with UNICEF’s Project (funded by EU) “Transforming Residential Institutions and Finding Alternatives for Children with Disabilities” (in cooperation with MoLSP), as well as with activities of the Ministry of Education for supporting inclusion of Roma and children with disabilities, that includes...
establishing Inter-Sector Committees.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

MoLSP has given additional funds to Famila for issuing electronic version of ROD batter to be published in December 2014.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

As the main project result, all ISC members, representatives of social welfare, are certified by Republican Institute for Social Protection to apply new child-centered model of assessment, which ensures sustainability of ROD methodology within the ISCs every-day practice. Famila has developed accompanied programmes (that can support developing services at local level), such as “Programme for Supporting Children with Conduct Problems/Attachment Disorder (109/2011)”. FAMILIA can be a resource centre for further support and improvement of ISCs practice and services for children from vulnerable groups, but its financial sustainability is very questionable, due to the fact that as a CSO, it has no stable funding.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

The following conditions should be met to ensure sustainability: stable financial funding of ISCs and Famila support on ROD methodology; further state funding of local service providers (including state and independent organizations); changed to the law and by-laws by defined scope of services for children from vulnerable groups that each municipality should develop. Obligatory services should be financed by state budget, not from local communities (because some of them are extremely poor) and specialized, tailor-made services for children with disabilities and their families, at central and regional levels should be developed.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Promotion of the project results and outcomes, regarding children with disabilities was organized on the 11th of April, 2014. Branka Radojevic introduced the Project to 50 master students of psychology and education on the master course on special needs children. Also, a research on functioning ISCs realized and ROD data base in Access programme has been formed for collecting data.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Familia is funded by the State on project-by-project basis, but it is recognized as competent and respectable organization. In compliance with that, its cooperation with relevant stakeholders is satisfying. Reported issue of political and personnel changes are constant factor of uncertainty.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Support to implementation of ROD methodology is needed. Familia expectation is that it should be funded by the state, since it requires stable funding, due to necessity of maintaining standardized assessment and support planning practice within both, ISCs and Centres for Social Welfare (CSWs), in relation to Roma and children with disabilities. In evaluation of the project, beneficiaries emphasized the need to rely on independent resource centre (such as FAMILIA) for consulting, improving their skills (and training beginners in case of fluctuation), as well as for preventing burn-out syndrome.
The Ministry (MoLSP) did not stipulate provision under which the ROD methodology should be obligatory programme that each ISCs social welfare representative should attend. In that way, fluctuation of ISC members may ruin, in the future, achieved results.

According to Familia, the system of firm professional and scientific criteria and control should be built and the reform process should be left to (new and politically) independent experts and child-protection professionals. In the same manner, managing structures of residential care facilities mustn't have leading role in transformation of institutions - it is beyond their competences and motivation. Services for vulnerable groups of children and citizen should be majorly excluded from de-centralization process.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

This was the first EU grant for the organization. Project is relevant to the programme and especially the target group. It was quite simple in design and provided for completing of institutionalization of a child-centered assessment methodology (ROD) started in previous project. Efficiency was good, although some quantitative indicators were under level planned. Effectiveness and impact were high and concrete since the developed methodology is now part of pool of basic trainings for social workers, Familia is certified to perform trainings, thus making ROD as part of institutional approach to social care, esp. children with developmental difficulties. Evidence shows that project was able to help in at least 3 cases of identification of and sanctions of pedophiles. Sustainability of the ROD methodology is good, however this is only small step towards reform in social care in Serbia and prospects for the long run are according to the grantee challenging.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/10/2014</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Familia office, Belgrade</td>
<td>Branka Radojevic, Project coordinator, Familia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maida Stefanovic, Familia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/2014</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>MoLSP office, Belgrade</td>
<td>Ana Vukmirovic, Advisor, Ministry of Labour,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social and Veteran Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Identification

Programme name: European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call for proposals:</th>
<th>EIDHR CBCC 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2013/316-606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Equalize me!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>86,430 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>69,144 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>16.04.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>15.06.2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>12 (+2) months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance the inclusiveness and cultural pluralism in the region of South Serbia by sensibilizing local communities on minorities’ rights.</td>
<td>• Raise the awareness of local communities about the importance of respecting the following minorities’ rights: national minorities (Serbs, Albanians and Roma), LGBT population, women and people with disability in classroom, in media, on the street; • Empower young people and public institutions to take pro-active role in protecting minorities rights in South Serbia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

- Up to 5000 people receive information about minority rights through a promotional campaign;
- Increased awareness of at least 250 high school pupils about minorities’ rights through panel discussions;
- 24 young people increased their knowledge of human and minorities rights, and enhanced local activism skills;
- 6 high schools and 4 Youth offices gain experience in organising activities on human rights;
- 4 local actions promote minorities rights;

Main outputs

- Public awareness campaign (400 posters, 4,000 postcards, 2000 badges, 2000 flyers, 100 calendars, 350 T-shirts, 1 roll-up banner and 8 billboards)
- 6 newspaper supplements covering minorities’ rights, 3,000 copies of supplement per month / 18,000 in total;
- Trainings on 3 topics: basic human rights (HR), youth activism and independent journalism;
- Provision of support to youth in 6 schools and 4 Youth Offices;
I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

Yes. Expected results are formulated at the level of target with concrete quantified targets.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes. LF made available in Word (standard in Excel).

3. Are there clear OVI's?

Yes. OVI's are concrete and quantitative.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals' objectives

Project aimed at raising-awareness at the level of objectives but at the level of results and activities the projects has focused on improving inter-sector cooperation on issues of HR and inclusion of vulnerable groups as well youth activism.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

Raising-awareness is important in insuring inclusiveness of all societal groups and realization of equal rights of every citizens in Serbia, regardless his/her ethnic, religious, social, economic etc. status. The project is contributing to this aim in Vranje, Bujanovac and Vladičin Han. Concrete results such as inter-sectoral cooperation and youth activism are probably more relevant achievements and appropriate tools to achieve very concrete results both in the short and long run.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The project has been completed for 4 months at the time of the evaluation. In total, the project conducted 63 actions in four different towns in the south of Serbia (Vranje, Bujanovac, Preševo and Vladičin Han), including 15 meetings of youth activists with Youth Offices and teachers, 3 engaged-art workshops, 16 meetings with 60 different stakeholders from institutions, as local teams of professionals, 3 different trainings for youth activists and 29 public actions as a part of public campaign: 1 press conference, 12 panels, 10 public events marking all important UN - international days (such as International Day of Women, International Day of Roma, International Day of Tolerance and so on), 4 local youth actions, 1 regional meeting and 1 final event.

The most complex, but most effective for influencing the general public, was conduction of public campaign incl. public events, panel discussions, production of 6 local newspaper different supplements and designing and distribution of planned public campaign materials (400 posters, 4.000 postcards, 2.000 badges, 2.000 flyers, 50 calendars, 100 letters of appreciation, 350 T-shirts, 1 roll-up banner and 8 billboards, which were seen by at least 10.000 of people).

Generator is most proud of high level cooperation through local teams local institutions and CSOs dealing...
with minorities and HR through their active engagement in public campaigns through public events. In total, 16 CSOs and 44 of institutions delegated the practitioners, as well as regional and national stakeholders who all participated in the project and public events and public discussions (offices of Ombudsman, Coordination body, City councillor Vranje, NUNS, Association of Students with Handicap, Vice-major Vlađin Han, regional ombudsman from Vranje, NGO Urban In).

Among the results achieved, 290 young people increased their knowledge of human and minorities’ rights, and enhanced local activism skills, while more than 30 local and national media reports on the project activities.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
Yes.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
Heading 8 Contingency reserve has not been spent. Project closed at 80.805,28 EUR.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
Yes. The project has been extended for 2 months due to large volume of activities, i.e. the overall duration changed from 12 to 14 months.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Project main output was raising-awareness campaign, thus visibility was extremely important element of the project. All planned campaign elements

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Yes, Generator received sufficient support and guidance every time requested. No on-the-spot visits reported.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
Co-financing secured from City of Vranje, as a part of their annual call for proposals in the field of social assistance. The other costs that were co-financed were supported through the matching funds.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
Yes, the project achieved all the planned results and more. Some of the results were higher than expected, for example the number of young people involved in the local youth actions, or the number of staff from schools and youth offices that took part in the project activities.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
Empowering local institutions for inter-sector cooperation on issues of HR and minority rights. A good example is the Office on Roma Issue established in 2005 as the first and only such office at the municipal level in Serbia which has the task to support and facilitate access of Roma citizens in realizing their rights before institutions and deal with their everyday problems. It was that with the inter-sector cooperation
established during the project that the marking on the 8th April—International Roma Day took place with participation of all local stakeholders in Vranje municipality incl. kindergartens, elementary and high schools, CSO and institutions working on Roma issues. Most importantly, activities incl. children, youth and citizens of different ethnicities to learn about the Roma culture, tradition, language and position of Roma community.

19. **Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?**

Project did not incl. official partners but some of the target groups had a partner-like role. This was the case with the Youth offices in Presevo and Vladicin Han. Some of the youth activities were coordinated by Youth office and CSO AWO in Bujanovac and 1 public event was substantially supported by Sveti Sava school in Bujanovac. In Vranje, the most active partners were institutions, such as the Roma Office coordinated the full event dedicated to the celebration of 8th April and HR Committee coordinated some events in the field of gender rights.

V. Impact

20. **Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?**

Marking and celebration of several international days, such as Roma or HR day will probably continue to be marked in a significant way. The development of inter-sectoral cooperation in the field of social inclusion will continue after the project ends. The local teams are up-dated regularly via e-mail; some of the teams will continue work under new coordinating organization (Centre for social welfare in Vranje). Generator has active project within domain of youth issues with some of the target groups; such are CSOs, youth groups, Youth offices and schools.

21. **Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?**

It would probably take much longer to improve specific inter-sector cooperation in the domain of social inclusion and anti-discrimination. While project activities have instigated this cooperation and demonstrated to all stakeholders its added-value it is to be seen in the coming period if concrete actions take place. Such expectation and readiness has been expressed by the interviewee from the Vranje municipality, who expects initiative on concrete by CSOs while he sees the role of LSG in financing such activities.

22. **Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.**

It has been only 4 months since project close. The likely major benefits are at the level of improved inter institutional and inter-sector cooperation in issues related to social inclusion and anti-discrimination which should potentially lead to improved services for citizens from such target groups.

23. **Is the project likely to contribute to the realization of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.**

The project is indirectly contributing towards national objectives related to respect of HR, minority rights, anti-discrimination and social inclusion.

24. **Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.**

As a founder and Assembly member, Generator participated to the creation of Connection center - the
new training centre in Vladičin Han, specialized to host people with disabilities which was built by funds from the European Union in the framework of cross-border cooperation with Bulgaria.

“OK radio” from Vranje (IPA Strengthening Media Freedom grantee) held a series of interviews with local stakeholders in Vranje about the rule of law in Vranje and Serbia included an interview with Generator Project Manager Gordana Ristic about the rule of law through perspective of minorities and presented project results focusing on the work of local teams of experts and professionals and stressing out the importance of inter-sectorial cooperation and coordination in order to reach higher standards in the implementation of laws related to the human and minorities rights.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Study visit to Austria in March/April 2014 for Generator staff about overview of the Austrian model of very high level of inclusion of minorities through the work of State and Regional institutions, as well as local CSOs and companies took place. The study visit served as a basis for future project proposal with the Austrian partner YiA.

The project joined two world-wide campaigns: ONE BILLION RISING campaign has started in 14 February 2013 when one billion people in 207 countries rose and danced to demand an end to violence against women and girls and the 16 Days of Activism Against Gender Violence is an international campaign that has been used as an organizing strategy by individuals and groups around the world to call for the elimination of all forms of violence against women.

**VI. Sustainability**

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Yes, the development of inter-sectorial cooperation in the field of social inclusion will continue after the project ends. The local teams are up-dated regularly via e-mail; some of the teams will continue work under new coordinating organization (Centre for social welfare in Vranje). Generator is implementing youth activities with some of the target groups; such are CSOs, youth groups, Youth offices and schools.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

LSG has expressed (in the interview) willingness and readiness to financially support further concrete spin-off activities in improving concrete services to target groups of the project beyond raising-awareness, but expects CSO to be pro-active and put forward concrete proposals, projects.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Just spin-off activities described above.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Yes, in terms of partnerships created within the local teams of experts and professionals. The old partnerships that continued during the project life and after the project ends are those with high-schools and youth offices. Cooperation with LCSG Vranje will also likely continue as LSG is financing activities of Generator in different areas.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Investment into development of human resources such as capacity building of a wide range of people through trainings, seminars, study visits, internships etc. should be funded. Exchange of knowledge and experiences and sharing the best practices with the colleagues from EU should be also considered as a need of professionals coming from both, public and civil sector.

Additional support to development of inter-sectorial cooperation and coordination of the local activities in
the field of anti-discrimination and social inclusion in South Serbia, as well as to: decentralization within the sector; capacity building; cooperation between public and civil sector.
VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project was relevant to the call for proposals and the target group. Project reached high efficiency and there was a case of more outputs than originally planned. Effectiveness was on high level and although raising-awareness was one of key objectives of the projects, Generator achieved in step further in giving positive experience on importance of inter sector cooperation by local stakeholders in Vranje. The basis for this is positive and good cooperation of City of Vranje, which also co-financed part of the project. Raising awareness campaign good tool for public promotion of HR, values, but it is hard to expect long-term or deep impact in terms of respect of HR and minority rights. Issue of capacity of local institutions (e.g. Roma office sees its primary role in addressing humanitarian not developmental needs of Roma population, no capacity and awareness to develop annual plans, organized large-scale activities, develop projects and ideas) need to be addressed directly. LSG has personal commitment and engagement of City Counselor, but CSOs are expected to be proactive which is over-rated and it is unfair to expect CSO to be able to provide ideas, solutions to every problem, service needed etc. of citizens at the local level. Prospects for sustainability depend on both Generator and LSG to further promote inter-sectoral cooperation and capacity building of key institutions in the area of HR and minority rights. Building up on youth activism is an extremely important added-value of the project.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/10/2014</td>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Gordana Ristic, Director, Generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2014</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Office for Roma Issues, Vranje</td>
<td>Altena Asanovic, Head of Office for Roma Issues, Vranje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2014</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>City Hall, Vranje</td>
<td>Branimir Stojancic, Vranje City Councilor responsible for NGOs and social welfare, well as coordinator of Roma office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>EIDHR CBCC 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2013/316-491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Heartefact Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>44,397 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>60.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>04.04.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>03.08.2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>16 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to the empowerment of LGBT community and their inclusion into the Serbian society</td>
<td>• Raise public awareness that LGBT community is an integral part of the regional and Serbian society not only today but also throughout the history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Relevant material which deconstructs and challenges the “official” histories and creates space for new history readings has been provided. The material is accessible to the public via HF website, virtual Unstraight museum (<a href="http://www.unstraight.org">www.unstraight.org</a>), at the Centre for Visual History of the Faculty for Media and Communication, and in libraries and bookstores across Serbia;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New insights and information concerning LGBT community’s history had reached a substantial amount of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publication consisted out of 8 - 12 in-depth multidisciplinary research studies on the history of homosexuality, homophobia and misogyny in Serbia/Yugoslavia;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Digitalized and archived material (documents, pictures, notes, letters, newspaper articles etc.) provided during the research process in the virtual Unstraight Museum (<a href="http://www.unstraight.org">www.unstraight.org</a>);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10 - 15 oral history recordings (interviews) with LGBT community representatives/members of the community. The recordings will be available at the Center for Visual History of the Faculty for Media and Communication, Singidunum University. The recordings will also be used as the material for the planned project’s follow-up activities i.e. the regional exhibition on the history of homosexuality in SFRY;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least 2 round tables/public panels discussing the history of LGBT community and its presence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Serbia/Yugoslavia;
- A series (3-5) of lectures and book promotions at different faculties: Faculty for Media and Communication (Singidunum University), Faculty of Philosophy (Belgrade University), Faculty of Political Science (Belgrade University);
- Parts of the publication i.e. specific research studies/articles published in form of sequels in daily and/or weekly written media, TV documentary form (series of interviews with researchers) in the cooperation with PG Mreza. The entire publication will be available for download at Heartefact Fund's (applicant's) website and available for purchase in bookstores around Serbia (follow-up activities presented in project proposal).

## I. Conceptual Design

1. **Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?**

   Project proposal is clear. Logframe is unambitious in terms of level of results and design of activities. Unconventionally, project includes proposal of follow-up activities to be implemented after the end of project.

2. **Is it easy to understand the project logic?**

   Yes. Clear, concise, simple. Possibly SOVs are unrealistic (e.g. CSO reports, evaluation reports, media reports, public opinion pulls).

3. **Are there clear OVIs?**

   Clear, but defined not as targets but as type of OVI (Number of audience at public events/panels, number of studies published in newspapers)

## II. Relevance

4. **How relevant is the project to the call for proposals' objectives**

   Focus is on improving of HR and position of LGBT community in Serbian society. Project is intellectually ambitious as it aims at challenging “official history” of LGBT as a new, Western, imported concept and state in society, rather than historically present, rooted, local phenomena. Designed activities and expected results are relevant to the topic, but can only be expected to contribute to the specific and overall objective in indirectly and on the long term.

5. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**

   Project is specific in not challenging official societal history, but it also challenges notions, understanding, conceptualization of LGBT community by itself both in Serbia and region-wide. It might be more effective to include additional campaigns, promotion activities etc. to achieve direct mobilization of HR/LGBTI organizations or have longer project duration.

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**

   Yes, although project is specific as EIDHR grant functioned as co-financing to other sources to publish the book “Between Us”. Also, the project is more a research than mobilization and advocacy project typically funded under EIDHR.
III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are they in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The project has ended 3 months before evaluation has commenced. It has implemented all planned activities according to the implementation plan. The main activity/output: publication “Between Us: Untold Stories of Gay and Lesbian Lives” has been published including in total work by 22 researchers, highly esteemed academics on 25 specific research areas. The book containing the relevant research findings has been published on 454 pages and printed in 1000 copies.

Two main promotion events took place as planned: “Building Strategy for LBGT Activism” event held on 28th March, 2014 brought together 20 participants, mainly representatives of LGBT community to discuss the publication findings and implication for LGBT community in Serbia and wider. Representatives of several international and human rights organizations also attended. On 30th July, 2014, a presentation of the publication for wider public was held and gathered 60 participants.

Three lectures were held in total, in compliance with the defined action plan. The lectures were held by participating researchers for the students of the Faculty of Media and Communication (the Singidunum University), the Faculty of Philosophy (the University of Belgrade) and the Faculty of Political Science (the University of Belgrade). 25-30 students attended the lectures.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?

Hartefact Fund did not report any problems. Internal monitoring procedures were in place during the project implementation. External audit of final financial report has been performed.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?

The full grant amount was 73,970 €, while the final report was approved/verified by external audit at 73,704.39 €.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

There was one addendum with regard to correction in the project budget with main transfer of budget items for heading 1. Human Resources to heading 5. Other costs, services and transfer of heading 8. Contingency reserve to heading 5.9.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

Project implementation has been supported by both paid project staff and developed network of associates and volunteers.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

Considering esp. that the project has very high co-financing rate (39,985 from other sources) it has achieved value for money.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

The book received excellent critics and comments both from the LGBT community members and general public. All events received widespread media coverage with 2 reports covered by local TV stations, 5 radio shows dedicated to the publication, 12 newspaper articles and more than 20 online reports at both informative and lifestyle resources. The book generated numerous comments on social networks such as Facebook and Twitter. So far the publication was sold in 33 copies, and according to the grant contract the collected funds have been directed toward the project follow-up activities.
The material is distributed free of charge to all relevant LGBT organizations, HR organizations, government institutions, libraries, universities, cultural centers and other interested parties that may benefit from the research studies. The distribution is envisioned in a way to ensure the reach of wider public with special focus on LGBT community.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

Hartefact Fund reported timely, effective and professional support by the EUD team. HF esp. valued is the contribution by the EUD Head of the Political Section, Mr. Luca Bianconi, who spoke at both public events organized by the HF and has been extremely supportive of the project goals throughout the implementation period. This support has ensured additional audience presence and media attention.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

Apart from the support received by the EIDHR grant, additional funding was secured from Heinrich Boell Stiftung, YUCOM (Lawyers’ Committee for Human Rights) and the British Embassy in Belgrade. Hartefact Fund encountered some small delays regarding the payments from other donors, but no major issues.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

Expected results have been achieved according to the project proposal and in terms of planned outputs and activities. In line with first expected results, relevant material which deconstructs and challenges the “official” histories and creates space for new history readings has been provided, including the research activities and texts written, digitalized material and recorded interviews. Total of 22 researchers have provided contribution in 25 specific research areas of the book. The book containing the relevant research findings has been published on 454 pages in 1000 copies, and the promotional event was held. The book received positive reviews and media attention as well as a good response from the general public.

In line with 2nd expected result: promotion and information dissemination activities were conducted, including 80 participants overall (incl. representatives of LGBT, HR organizations, international organizations, diplomatic corps). Also, 25-30 students participated at the three (out of planned 3-5) lectures at the aforementioned faculties. All the events had good media coverage with two reports covered by local TV stations, five radio shows dedicated to the publication, 12 newspaper articles and more than 20 online reports at both informative and lifestyle resources. 33 copies of the book have been sold by end of project period, and according to the grant contract the collected funds have been directed toward the project follow-up activities.

While above results are commendable at the level of achieved outputs, it is hard to assess the “success” and achievement rate as the logframe did not have target OVIs and SOVs presented were unrealistic in terms of receiving and access to date (e.g. CSO report, public opinion polls).

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

Both the general public and the members of the LGBT community now have a valuable source of information on the history of homosexuality in Serbia, which shows that the LGBT community has been an integral part of Serbian society throughout history. As far as researchers and academics are concerned, this research is possibly the only valuable source of information on this topic available, which
adds to scientific and social importance of the publication. Visibility of LGBT community and issues has been improved through the book and its promotion, but mostly in indirect and general way.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Centre for Visual History at the Faculty for Media and Communication (Singidunum University) was in charge of implementation of activities related to the oral history component of the project, formation of oral history research team, including methodology and questionnaire development, communication with regional partners about questionnaire, implementation of the preliminary and final interviews (oral testimonies) and evaluation and reporting on the issue. Partners have signed and agreement that defined mutual roles and responsibilities and has held regular monthly partner meetings where addressed all concerns and challenges to project implementation.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Project did not directly target public institutions and decision-makes although change of attitudes and treatment of LGBTI community has been set as the overall objective of the project. Project was successful in potentially changing the expert and public discourse on the role of LGBT community historically. It has used an interesting approach to generate income from the book, although small in sum, it is a commendable in its approach and idea to generate income for further activities. Hartfact Fund has involved primarily on academic community and to a lesser extent on the LGBT activist to document, systematize and make available the oral history of LGBT community. Thus, the project is expected to have impact on any further research and documentation of life and history of LGBT community in Serbia and the region.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

The change would not have happened in such a manner without the implementation of the project Intruders since no scientific research of this type has ever been conducted neither in Serbia nor the region.

22. Is the project likely to result in major socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Probably not. It is more likely that it will allow for framing of the expert and advocacy discourse of LGBT community and institutions interested in collecting historical legacies.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realization of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

The project contributes to national priorities in relation to human right and implementation of anti-discrimination legislation. The project complements the efforts of Serbian government directed towards enabling the respect of right of free assembly to LGBT population which was demonstrated recently when the successful Pride Parade was held in Belgrade during which Hartefact Fund have organized a side event to further promote the book “Between Us” to the wider audience.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

Hartefact Fund has connected with the initiative led by the NDI and the coalition of human rights
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>organizations including Civil Rights Defenders, YUCOM (Lawyers’ Committee for Human Rights), OSI and Forum for Ethnic Relations, in order to facilitate the process of building a sustainable platform for cooperation among LGBT organizations in Serbia which is expected to result in a joint strategy to be signed by all organizations in late 2014.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

At the time of evaluation, planned follow-up activities (e.g. TV documentary on the research results, an exhibition on the history of homosexuality in the region are also planned as follow-up to this project) were still being planned. The exhibition is to show collected oral histories but also personal items and artefacts acquired through the research process. The exhibition is planned to tour the entire region of former Yugoslavia. This action is to lead towards a permanent exhibit of LGBT history in Serbia/Yugoslavia. These plans have already been discussed with institutions such as the Museum of Yugoslav History.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible/likely to last?

The project had a realistic and concrete sustainability approach to the main output of the project—the book “Between Us” and data collected in the process of its preparation, which has consequently been implemented. The material collected through the research, including letters, documents, books, pictures etc. have been digitalized and are stored online in virtual Unstraight Museum. This should make them available permanently to the general public. The collected material is archived at the Centre for Visual History at the Faculty for Media and Communication (the Singidunum University) and indexed within the search mechanism of the archive with specific keywords. Material will therefore be accessible at all times to public, researchers, LGBT community members, artists and other interested organizations and individuals. The book “Between Us: Untold Stories of Gay and Lesbian Lives” is printed in 1000 copies and has been archived in the National Library of Serbia and is a unique source of information on this topic for academics, historians, researchers and other interested parties and will be so for some time. The book is available for purchase in bookstores across the country and the generated revenue will add to financial sustainability and also help fund some of the project’s follow up activities such as additional book promotions. Finally, institutional sustainability is ensured through cooperation with the Faculty for Media and Communication, the Faculty of Philosophy and the Faculty of Political Science which were directly involved in the project activities to make sure that results of the action stay in place upon project’s completion and that they will in turn motivate new researches on the topic.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Generated revenue from book sale adds to financial sustainability and already helped fund some of the project’s follow up activities such as additional book promotions. Additional grant through a regional EIDHR project Korak grant scheme has been obtained for some of the regional activities.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

There are plans to publish the book containing transcripts of the interviews collected during the research process (oral histories) to be available for download from the Hartefact Fund website and available for purchase at bookstores across the country. Next, a TV documentary on the research results and an exhibition on the history of homosexuality in the region are also planned as follow-up to this project. The exhibition is to show collected oral histories but also personal items and artefacts acquired through the research process. The exhibition is planned to tour the entire region of former Yugoslavia.
29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
The partnership is likely to continue as both partners plan similar initiatives. As the Centre is a part of the Faculty for Media and Communication the partnership has transferred to other parts of the Faculty. The archive of collected material is available to students at any time. Moreover, the HF has introduced a special internship program for students of final year or recent graduates of the Faculty of Media and Communication.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
Because of the constantly changing political and social reality in Serbia, Hartefact Fund expressed expectation that more flexibility in the grant scheme, as well as less red tape would be useful. Duration of the project period should be longer, as serious scientific research of this magnitude is difficult to conduct in this timeframe, especially since they have expanded the research process to the whole region of the Western Balkans.

According to the grantee, there is a strong need for funding of human rights related projects with a special focus on LGBT issues. Second, there is a need for a more regional approach, especially aimed at Kosovo – Serbia relations and lastly, more support should be provided to those forces in Serbia who are still eager to openly and publicly criticize government policies, thus supporting freedom of expression and the media.

Except for the already mentioned coordinated financial support and more flexibility, there is a need to promote philanthropy, philanthropic practices and practice of individual giving, which is to make the sector more sustainable in times to come.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project is relevant to the call for proposal and target group and it is the only funded project on the issue of LGBT under the programme evaluated. Project is very atypical in that it is supporting development, printing and promotion of a book on oral history on LGBT issues. Project has been efficient with smaller management issues dealt with without effect on the overall project. It is the first EU funded project for Hartefact Fund. Efficiency is not strong in that it had good, but small and indirect approach to outreach to the citizens on a very complex issue such as is LGBT. Project has had some traces of impact and had a good design and implementation of approach to sustainability, i.e. selling of the book as a self-financing measure and introduction of all materials, documents etc. used for development of the book at the academic and historical relevant institutions. While it is likely that the project has bearing on the LGBT community and its advocacy on its rights and position in society, it will not be possible to achieve larger raising-awareness impact.

Project approach to raising awareness of citizens should have been different to allow for better effectiveness and impact, i.e. producing a documentary as a easy form to reach to ordinary citizens to that of a book.
### VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Heartefact Fund office, Belgrade</td>
<td><strong>Danko Runic</strong>, Project coordinator, Heartefact Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Identification

Programme name: EIDHR
Call for proposals: EIDHR
Contract number: 2013/316-601
Contract name: Women of Sandzak: Applying the Existing Gender Equality Mechanisms in Practice
Beneficiary: Cultural Center Damad
Contract total: 49.476,80 €
Contract amount EU: 47.000,00 €
Co-financing: 95%
Contract start date: 15/04/12
Contract end date: 30/06/14
Contract duration: 12 months (+2 months no-cost extension)

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Advancing the role of women in political processes on local level in Serbian region of Sandzak | (i) To advance implementation of existing gender equality mechanisms in local governments, public institutions, and media  
(ii) To raise participation of women in the public and political life in 3 local communities  
(iii) To increase public awareness of women's rights and gender equality in the region |

Expected results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Public institutions integrate gender sensitive approach and perspective in decision-making, and gender sensitive policies and practices become an integral part of local public institutions’ and media’s work  
• Budget lines assigned for implementation of European Charter on Gender Equality and/or Local Actions Plans for women in |
| • 5-day long Strategic Capacity Building Training for Councils for Gender Equality from 3 towns  
• Three 1-day seminars for representatives of public institutions (judiciary, police, medical centers, universities and schools, centers for social work, employment bureaus) and media  
• Three 9 one-day seminars (three modules per each of three towns) for local parliament members (women and men) |
Novi Pazar, Sjenica and Tutin
- Novi Pazar, Sjenica and Tutin sign a joint Declaration of Support to Gender Equality and participation of women in public sphere
- Issue of and information about gender equality and participation of women are publicly discussed, widely disseminated and accessible to the general public.
- Organize six lobbying meetings with decision makers
- 1-daysRegionalConsultativeInitiative–RegionalForum
- Implement a regional awareness raising campaign
- Develop a web-portal in cooperation with municipalities/institutions to centralize information about gender equality in local decision making processes
- Produce, publish and disseminate a guide on public participation for women in local communities

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?
The project proposal is clear and has elaborated results framework.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?
It is.

3. Are there clear OVIs?
OVIs are not SMART.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives
The project is relevant to the call for proposals’ objectives as it is contributing to promotion of human rights in the field of gender equality by advancing the role of women in political processes on local level in Serbian region of Sandzak.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?
As the role of women in political and public processes in small communities in Serbia like in Sandzak is still marginal, the project and its actions are very relevant to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries. The project provided in-depth assessment of the situation in Sandzak, which is suffering from widespread gender inequality, outlining the need to support women in Sandzak along three directions: policy and capacity-building, advocacy and raising public awareness.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?
Yes. As the project is targeting a marginalized and underdeveloped region focusing on a topic relevant both for the Call as well as for the beneficiaries the selection is justified.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?
The following set of activities envisaged in the project and completely in line with the contract and the implementation plan has been carried out:
- 5-day long Strategic Capacity Building Training for Councils for Gender Equality from 3 towns;
- three 1-day seminars for representatives of public institutions (judiciary, police, medical centers,
universities and schools, centers for social work, employment bureaus) and media;
- three 9 one-day seminars (three modules per each of three towns) for local parliament members (women and men);
- organize six lobbying meetings with decision makers;
- 1-day Regional Consultative Initiative – Regional Forum;
- implement a regional awareness raising campaign;
- develop a web-portal in cooperation with municipalities/institutions to centralize information about gender equality in local decision making processes;
- produce, publish and disseminate a guide on public participation for women in local communities;
- design and implementation of a media campaign (twitter, Facebook, you tube + press, TV, radio, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the project well managed and monitored?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much of the grant is disbursed?</td>
<td>The total fund was disbursed and the project was finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.</td>
<td>There was a 2 months no-cost extension for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are the activities achieving value for money?</td>
<td>Yes. The set of activities was well designed and able to achieve relevant impact in the region of Sandzak and among beneficiaries in accordance with the amount of grant and timeframe. As per the final evaluation report, the project demonstrated resourcefulness and flexibility combined with the ability to involve stakeholders and to engage them in the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?</td>
<td>Yes. As per the final evaluation report, visibility of the actions was excellent in relation to the size of the project. All relevant stakeholders in three communities were covered by and included into the project, achieving high visibility within the relevant stakeholder circles. Furthermore, by the implementation of the awareness raising and media campaign as well as by re-designing the web-page the project was able to keep the topic of the project high on the agenda during the project implementation phase. Particularly the focus on social media and here on Facebook communication was important as huge groups of population were achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?</td>
<td>Yes, the support from DEU was significant for the organization and matched the need of grass roots, local organizations for support in representation and work with local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?</td>
<td>The organization struggled to ensure co-financing but managed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. Effectiveness**
17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

Yes. The project reached several tangible results according to the plan. All actions, workshops, meetings, etc. took place. Awareness and media campaign were carried out. The educational part of the project gathered estimated 225 direct beneficiaries (incl. local stakeholders and decision makers, representatives of local governments, public institutions and the media; members/representatives of the Councils for Gender Equality from 3 towns in Sandzak area; and local parliaments). Awareness and media campaign managed to attract more than 20,000 website hits directed through the facebook page of the organization/project, 90,000 unique users were registered, and the ads were displayed over 5 million times to users in Sandzak.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

The project assisted the women leaders in the target communities to raise voice and advocate for the need of gender equality mechanisms. This is important particularly from the point that strategies/action plans/budgets bring important measures for empowerment of women to the forefront of the work on gender equality.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Yes.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

The Project support resulted in the following structural changes:

- all three participating municipalities have adopted gender equality dedicated budget lines for the implementation of gender action plan, including additional funding lines for the work of gender quality councils themselves in Tutin, Sjenica and Novi Pazar.
- Novi Pazar, Sjenica and Tutin Parliamentary parties (and most prominently among them SDA) instituted a party directive stipulating that all official delegations, press conferences, distribution of seats etc will be based on as close-to-possible equal numbers of men and women.
- more structured approach to gender equality in target communities. In Novi Pazar, today there are 5 policy documents/annual work plans adopted by public institutions in Novi Pazar (which include gender perspective in deliberation and designing of approaches.

The final evaluation states that “there was clear stakeholder recognition that the project has managed to raise awareness about an important, yet neglected issue. The raised awareness at institutional level complemented with the raised awareness of the general public are two obvious and mutually reinforcing effects”.

The Project resulted in stronger fos

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

The organization works on these issues, but would not be in position to achieve results to the extent they were achieved without funding.

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.
It is hard to estimate the extent of socio-economic benefits of the policies and measures improved with assistance of the project. However, it is clear that policies accompanied by budgets do provide window of opportunity for measures directly supporting women empowerment to be implemented.

| 23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences. | Yes. Local action plans for gender equality fit well with the national priorities and objectives. |
| 24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences. | DAMAD cooperates with other civil society organisations active in the field of human rights and women empowerment. |
| 25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant? | The Grant initiated more focused work of local governments resulting in policies/budgets which is a spin-off of the intervention. |

## VI. Sustainability

| 26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last? | Policies and budgets are still operational. It is not clear if the extension/update of Action plan will follow the currently established custom. |
| 27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results | Yes, through the budgets for local action plans. |
| 28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities? | Not in this scope or size. |
| 29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run? | Yes. |
| 30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs? | DAMAD will continue competing for the grant scheme. |

## VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project intervention is very relevant to the region and to target communities. The Project is well designed and contains a variety of actions to address the issues of gender equality. However, the scope and time-frame of the project does not allow for greater impacts and more investment in ensuring stronger sustainability of the achievements. Recommendation: Follow up actions and cooperation with stakeholders need to be continued in order to maintain commitment and sustainability of results.
Democratic Transition Initiative

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>EIDHR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>EIDHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>12EIDHR01/01/11/139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Belgrade Nova Platform - Strengthening Cooperation of Institutions and CSOs in Belgrade to Support Inclusive Education for Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Democratic Transition Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>105,456.00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>84,365.00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>4/16/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>8/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>16 months +1 month extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the role of civil society in promoting human rights and democratic reform, as well as strengthening political participation and representation</td>
<td>(iv) Strengthening cooperation between civil society and institutions to provide high quality education and schooling for Roma children, by increasing capacities of both the system and beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result group 1: Recommendations report on Roma education in Belgrade communities produced</td>
<td>Work package 0: Project and partnership management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result group 2: 150 Roma children involved in educational activities (compensatory classes); 20 school teachers and assistants trained and involved; 4 modules of adult Roma education (including economic activities); 2 modules of media training</td>
<td>A0.1 Project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result group 3: 30 representatives of local/national government institutions, local CSOs and international organizations networked and planning together through Belgrade Nova Platform; 12 coordination</td>
<td>A0.2 Project financial management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A0.3 Communication plan for external use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A0.4 Project monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A0.5 Project sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work package 1: Research in targeted schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.1 Forming of a working group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.2 Defining the objectives and methodology of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.3 Conducting research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.4 Processing results, development of recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meetings held, with participation of main stakeholders
Result group 4: 5 community centers equipped and adjusted for educational purposes
Work package 5: Promotion, visibility, production of the documentary

Work package 2: Preparation and execution of educational activities (children, teachers, adults, students, media)
A2.1 Seminar for 20 teachers and 20 University students
A2.2 Educational support for Roma children from 5 settlements
A2.3 Informal education for Roma women - empowering
A2.4 Economic development of Roma community through recycling industry
A2.5 Media training
Work package 3: Establishing standing cooperation and social dialogue between the civil sector and the City
A3.1 Formal stakeholder coordination
Work package 4: Equipping and adjusting the community centers
A4.1 Provision of school furniture and teaching aids
Work package 5: Promotion, visibility, production of the documentary
A5.1 Documentary and media campaign
A5.2 Leaflets and posters

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

Proposal is elaborated and outlines the results logic and justification of the action.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes, to great extent.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

OVIs are very general and not SMART.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

The project is relevant to the CfP as it addresses the needs for cooperation between different sectors of society towards protection and promotion of human rights.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

The project, its educational activities, are very relevant to the beneficiaries as they tackle critical issues of Roma education and empowerment.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

To great extent.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The project has been completed on September 15, 2014 after 17 months of implementation.

The project established cooperation with target groups and initiated social dialogue between the civil
society and public sector, particularly with representatives of the City of Belgrade administration - City of Belgrade – Agency for EU Integrations and Cooperation with Civil Society, Secretariat for Education and Child Protection and Secretariat for Social Welfare. Supplementary/remedial classes were implemented as a regular routine, school supply kits were disseminated to 150 pupils and each community centre was equipped with new furniture in five settlements. These activities were accompanied by activities for animation and education of parents, in two forms: informal education (training) of Roma men in the field of recycling and entrepreneurship and informal education of Roma women (workshops). The Project also conducted research and comparative study in targeted schools. Continuous promotional activities were implemented.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
Yes.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
Entire grant was disbursed and project is finished.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
There was one addendum, to extend the duration of action.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes, to great extent.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Yes.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Yes. The project received good guidance and support from DEU.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
The issues related to co-financing as with other organisations.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
The Project implemented all activities as per plan and reached envisaged results. Report with recommendations on Roma education in Belgrade communities was produced. It demonstrated quite strong progress of the students covered by the project activities.

The Project involved 150 Roma children involved in educational activities (compensatory classes); trained and involved 20 school teachers and assistants; created 4 modules of adult Roma education (including economic activities); and 2 modules of media training. Besides teaching/learning support, children have been provided with a full set of school supplies (including a school bag with a generous supply of note-books, pencils, crayons, markers, erasers, rulers, compasses, cutters, sketchbook etc.). Besides, 5 community centers were equipped with school desks and chairs, closets, hangers, air-conditioning, teachers' desks, blackboards.

Through 12 coordination meetings of the Belgrade Nova Platform, the Project gathered a total of 30 representatives of local/national government institutions, local CSOs and international organizations networked and conducted planning together. The platform meetings proved to be a useful meeting point...
for representatives of institutions and of civil sector, particularly when it comes to organizations and institutions dealing with Roma issues. Among participants, there were also complementary donor funded initiatives, such as one implemented by OSCE, but also Government bodies, such as Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Unit (SIPRU), Office for cooperation with Civil Society, Office for Human and Minority Rights, Ministry of Education and many other local/regional level institutions and organizations.

Finally, the project conducted all envisaged media activities with support of the City of Belgrade, assisting the project became more visible to general public.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

The Project reached out to and involved 150 Roma children age between 7-15 in five local Roma settlements. The project helped Roma children to study and learn more efficiently, resulting in better performance at school, as evidenced in the comparative report. The project applied holistic approach, focusing on the whole family, in order to support children properly. It included 50 Roma families in different educational and awareness raising activities.

20 schoolteachers and assistants were sensitized and their skills for work with marginalized children were increased, also they were prepared for conditions and learning difficulties of Roma children. The project reached out to and included 30 representatives of local and national government institutions, local CSOs and international organizations in networking activities within the Platform. The platform succeeded in raising funds for snacks and refreshments to Roma children during their classes in community centres from one of partner organisations.

The project involved 15 representatives of media in a training held in one of the five targeted Roma settlements, in order for the participants to develop a better understanding on Roma issues and challenges.

Finally, the project involved 20 university students as volunteers to work with the children who need additional learning support. As evidenced in a very detailed report by one of the volunteers, this was a "life-changing" experience for her, since being able to witness regularly lives of these children and their families puts a whole new light on teaching profession, but also on understanding human priorities and values are universal, regardless of the economic and social status.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Yes.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

The project was effective and supportive to the final beneficiaries. However, no impacts on structures and policies happened.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

There are different activities and projects focusing on Roma children.

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

The project tackled only a small number of people with related activities and had a local character. No significant impacts on socio-economic benefits for the target groups are expected due to the fact that the project was limited in scope and time frame.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.
The project does contribute to overall national development objectives for Roma inclusion and empowerment. The Project evidenced strong participation of Government bodies: Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Unit (SIPRU), Office for cooperation with Civil Society, Office for Human and Minority Rights, Ministry of Education, Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities, etc.

24. *Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)?*  
   *Provide evidences.*  
   The implementing organization coordinated activities with OSCE mission in inception/starting of their project European Support to Roma Inclusion in Serbia.

25. *Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?*  
   No.

### VI. Sustainability

26. *Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?*  
   The activities, particularly education, have stopped upon finalization of the project, and were not taken up by the City of Belgrade. The equipped community centers, documentary film, produced comparative report, visibility, training materials etc. remained.

27. *Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project's outputs/results*  
   No. The City of Belgrade nor the organization maintained the activities or results.

28. *Are there any follow-up projects or activities?*  
   No.

29. *Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?*  
   Cooperation with City of Belgrade will continue but will depend to large extent on funding.

30. *What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?*  
   Organisation will compete for EIDHR resources again.

### VII. Conclusions & findings

*What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?*

The Project was successful in implementing all envisaged activities and achieving set results. Continuous work with Roma children in complementary classes and involving parents in awareness raising activities was a good investment in their empowerment and prevention of dropouts by children. Nevertheless, the sustainability of the project is not strong. The Project could not succeed to ensure that the City of Belgrade create financial mechanisms for sustaining educational activities or ongoing meetings of the Platform.
Incest Trauma Center

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: European Instrument for Human Rights
Call for proposals: EIDHR
Contract number: 11EIDHR01/01/11/08
Contract name: 3D Childhood Sexual Assault Free Zone
Beneficiary: Incest Trauma Center
Contract total: 48,947.00 €
Contract amount EU: 46,499.65 €
Co-financing: 95%
Contract start date: 6/12/2012
Contract end date: 6/11/2013
Contract duration: 12 months

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To strengthen the role of civil society in promoting HR of the child and women and supporting democratic reform processes aimed at reduction of gender-based violence (GBV) in Serbia</td>
<td>To increase capacity of civil society organizations, to influence and participate with government and other stakeholders, in development and promotion of effective Childhood Sexual Assault (C)SA prevention mechanisms in Serbia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results | Main activities
--- | ---
1. Increased number & accessibility of high quality SA prevention educational & promotional materials and services through four 3D CSA Prevention tools and production and broadcast of 3 short documentaries on SA | 1. Production of four 3D CSA Prevention tools
2. At least 100,000 young people, women, educational stakeholders and other citizens informed on GBV reporting and prevention through SA Prevention Week and ITC Annual Excellence Award Competition for primary and secondary schools | 2. Production and broadcast of 3 short documentary films on SA (cca 8-10 min) followed by debates in Vojvodina and Sandzak
3. Increased capacity of at least 35 ed. institutions and HR NGOs to co-operate and participate in development & promotion of | 3. Organizing SA Prevention Week and Excellence Award Competition for schools
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>effective (C)SA Prevention mechanisms</strong></th>
<th><strong>4. Realizing PROMO Campaign in 4 towns in Serbia (Belgrade, Subotica, Novi Pazar and Tutin)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. At least 40 educational decision makers at national and local level are informed on the SA Prevention tools in 3D and short films and 60% of them are willing to support its incorporation into practicing the national curriculum</strong></td>
<td><strong>5. Door-to-door lobbying for introducing GBV-sensitive national curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Visibility actions (according to EU Visibility guidelines)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7. Project monitoring and evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I. Conceptual Design**

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

The logframe is well defined with articulated objectives, results and activities.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

The project logic is easy to understand.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

OVIs are clear and helpful to measure the success of the action.

**II. Relevance**

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

The Project is relevant for the call for proposals’ objectives as it contributes to empowerment of civil society to protect human rights. Its activities towards strengthening networks and enhancing capacities for Sexual assault (SA) prevention have been relevant for protection and fulfillment of rights.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

The project was very relevant for the needs of beneficiaries. On one hand, it strengthened capacities of relevant actors in education and CSO sector, while it also contribute to raising awareness on SA and related issues.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes.

**III. Efficiency**

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

Incest Trauma Center has been active since 1990ies and it operates on programme стратегический base. This means that the project funded through EIDHR was continuation/addition to the ongoing activities of the Center. The Project was implemented as planned with only minor changes to the original plan. Within project efforts, the ICT has produced a number of printed/video educational materials that were widely distributed to a network of public/private kindergartens. Exhibition “The me nobody knows” was presented to audience both in public space and online, and as per Center’s feedback is still active as online presentation.

Through its outreach to children and adolescents, the Center worked with other NGO partners from Vojvodina and Sandzak to organize info days and educational sessions on issues of gender based violence and prevention. These activities presented an opportunity to reach out and inform a wide range of children and youth about the issues of sexual assault and GVB.
The project also worked with professionals on information sharing and providing training and exchange opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Is the project well managed and monitored?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The project team implemented the project well. It worked with its associates, even though this relation could have been further improved in terms of proactively involving partners in each step of the project. There was no external evaluation and monitoring of activities was conducted by the Incest Trauma Center (ITC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. How much of the grant is disbursed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Entire grant was disbursed and the project is finished.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Are the activities achieving value for money?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Yes. This project falls within the LOT 1 (up to 50,000 EUR) and its activities and timeframe were realistic for such type of action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Yes. The Project included some unexpected/additional visibility actions which contributed to achievement of planned results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The Project team finds support and guidance from EUD as positive and helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
No.

**IV. Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The Project resulted in a large number and variety of educational material for SA prevention, including handouts, tools, documentaries, promotional materials, etc. Materials were widely distributed and shared among kindergartens and schools while also being made available online. The accessibility and free distribution were important for wide outreach and access to materials by various stakeholders, including children.

Promotional activities of the ITC were important tools and participation of children and youth in the competition was ensured.

ITC has long experience of cooperating with other NGOs and educational institutions. These relations and work with partners resulted in a number of events for policy-makers, Brochure for parliamentarians “My Vote FOR the Recovery of the Child Survivor of Sexual Trauma”. The work with government and
long term relations resulted in a change in RS legislation for the benefit of Child Sexual Assault Survivors whereby the Statute of Limitations was rescinded.

18. **How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences**

Educational materials produced are of high quality and are adapted to age groups that the materials are targeting. Also, information and focus of awareness raising is relevant and helpful to a wide array of target groups (from children and educators, policy makers and media).

19. **Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?**

The Project was lead by ICT with no immediate partners but two associates. Interviews with one of the associates reveal that the ICT did not extensively include associates into decision-making and the entire cycle of the project.

### V. Impact

20. **Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?**

One of the immediate outcomes of the work of ITC was adoption of the changes in the Statute of Limitations, which was rescinded to the benefit of benefit of Child Sexual Assault Survivors. This is the biggest tangible difference that occurred.

There is no clear evidence on the changes occurring within educational institutions as a result of the project or within the children or youth population.

21. **Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?**

The ITC has been working on these issues since the start up of the organization, and as the prevention of GVB and sexual assault is in their mission, the actions and related results would be part of the work also without the grant.

22. **Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.**

It is likely that the Project has resulted in higher awareness and knowledge among children and youth population about issues of GBV and sexual assault, as well as prevention.

23. **Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.**

The Project contributes to overall initiative for fight against GBV and sexual assault in the country.

24. **Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.**

The project is part of the larger strategy for the organization. It works with other NGOs and initiatives active in this sector.

25. **Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?**

As mentioned above, the project is part of the overall ITC strategic programme and many of the activities have been followed up by the organization as part of their ongoing work.
VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Majority of the products/materials are still available in hard copy and in the website. Their distribution among various stakeholders/educational institutions assisted visibility and also continued use of materials by interested parties.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

The ITC continues working on these issues and cooperating with partners. The organization is funded through various channels so there are funds that ensure sustainability of initiatives.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

See above.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

ITC has long term partnerships with partners and it is going to continue.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

The organization is interested in applying again for EIDHR grants.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The Project has succeeded in mobilizing large number of members of various groups (children, youth, educators, decision-makers (parliamentarians) through its activities. Wide distribution of material produced within the project has contributed to raising awareness on the issues of GBV and sexual assault and bringing this issue to the forefront of working with children and youth.

Main lesson from this action is that it is a good approach to combine various promotional/awareness raising activities with educational initiatives when discussing important issues such as GBV. Another lesson is operational: it is important to actively involve partners/associates in the entire cycle of project, and not only for implementation of limited number of activities only in the target area of the project.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16/10/14 | 12.00| Office of the Incest Trauma Center | **Ljiljana Bogavac**, Deputy Director  
**Dusica Popadic**, Director |
| 24/10/14 | 10.00| Urban Inn           | **Aida Corovic**, Director, MP of the Serbian Assembly  
**Sead Biberovic**, Deputy Director |
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**Project Identification**

Programme name: European Instrument for Human Rights
Call for proposals: EIDHR
Contract number: 2012/294-327
Contract name: Beneficiary: Media production house “Pescanik”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract total:</th>
<th>46,030 €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>41,284.31 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>89.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>6/19/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Summary**

*(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To promote human rights within the Serbian judicial system by raising awareness of the authorities and the public of the large number of rulings against Serbia by the European Court of Human Rights and to urge reforms of the local system. | To inform Serbian citizens about the work of the court in Strasbourg and its applicability to them.  
2. To initiate public debate in Serbia (both at an expert level and at a general level) by presenting an analysis of the cases lost by Serbia before the court.  
3. To initiate expert discussion on the competence of Serbian courts and the quality of their work.  
4. To urge the state to establish the legal responsibility of local courts whose judgements are overturned by Strasbourg.  
5. To urge the state to pass legislation providing for Strasbourg verdicts to be executed.  
6. To further urge full implementation of Serbian judicial reform. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Availability to citizens of information on their right to appeal to Strasbourg and the mechanism for so doing.</td>
<td><em>Analysis of Strasbourg judgements involving Serbia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advancement of the Serbian judicial system through reform.</td>
<td><em>Publishing</em> of reports on judgements against Serbia and full statistical analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### I. Conceptual Design

1. **Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?**

   The logframe struggles with horizontal logic, probably due to the fact that the project is mainly advocacy initiative and the logframe did not entirely succeed in capturing this perspective. Still, the activities and results to be achieved are understandable.

2. **Is it easy to understand the project logic?**

   The proposal provides better overview of the projects goal and purpose than the logframe as a stand-alone document.

3. **Are there clear OVIs?**

   OVIs are not SMART and so are not very helpful to measure the success of the action.

### II. Relevance

4. **How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives?**

   The Project is relevant for the call for proposals’ objectives as it contributes to development and consolidation of the rule of law, and respect for human rights. Its activities towards sharing practices of the EU Court for Human Rights and its rulings of relevance for Serbia have been a tool for awareness raising and setting policy agenda regarding issues of importance for protection and fulfillment of rights of Serbian citizens.

5. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**

   The project was very relevant for the needs of beneficiaries. On one hand, it raised awareness of important rulings of the European Court for Human Rights (ECHR) among persons and groups seeking justice by filing cases against the state of Serbia before the ECHR in Strasbourg. On the other, it initiated discussion among professionals and public on Court rulings and the current state of Serbian judiciary.

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**

   Yes.

### III. Efficiency

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**

   The Project was implemented as planned with only minor changes to the original plan. The following activities have been implemented within the project:

   **Activity 1: Analysis of Strasbourg judgements involving Serbia.** The Project created a team of legal experts and journalists to select a pool of representative cases for detailed study against established criteria for selection. Total of 15 representative cases were selected for further analysis, and 9 representative cases were selected to be used as audio, video and textual materials. The 15 cases were selected based on their relevance to violation of rights, marked as far more widespread than the number of filed cases, and these serve as a basis for other lawsuits to be filed. The 9 representative cases deal with various forms of violations of human rights – the right to a fair trial, protection of property, the right to an effective legal remedy, the right to private and family life, freedom of expression, right to freedom and security, protection from torture, protection from discrimination, the right to life.
These case studies were all published on Pescanik’s website as well as in the printed publication.

Activity 2: Publishing of reports on judgements against Serbia. The Project published 15 articles with stories based on legal analysis and interviews with citizens who have won suits against the state of Serbia, with the aim to familiarise wider public with the ECHR practice and the significance of the Court’s adjudications, but also to demonstrate the existing problems in Serbia’s judiciary and to encourage citizens to file suits to the ECHR if their rights were violated. The focus of the articles was to explain state’s obligations as regards the legal and practical consequences.

The representative cases and the articles, along with information on initiating a case before the ECHR, were been printed with a circulation of 4,000 copies and distributed to citizens and stakeholders. 350 copies of the publication titled “Europe does not live in Babusnica” have been distributed to citizens in Vranje, Novi Pazar, Pozarevac, Uzice, Kikinda, Pancevo etc. Also, in cooperation with 4 bookstores in Belgrade, 160 free copies have been distributed; 350 copies have been distributed to a number of civil society organizations in Serbia dealing with the topic of human rights (Citizen’s action in Pancevo, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Serbia, Heinrich Boell Stiftung etc.) as well as to the library of the University of Law – Union. The remaining copies will be distributed at the upcoming Book Fair in Belgrade. A PDF document of the publication has been downloaded from Pescanik’s website 512 times. Audio programme and books were also distributed to interested listeners of local radio stations which aired the audio materials from the project), local bookstores and local NGOs in 11 communities across Serbia.

Activity 3: Web activism. The project included a blog which, shared a guide for filing a complaint to the ECHR, a legal form of the complaint, a summary of all cases, expert analysis of the 15 selected cases and the journalist’s contribution. Social media, such as Twitter, Facebook, Vimeo, were used besides the Pescanik website. The Project also tasked 2 legal expert to discuss with and answer citizens’ questions.

Activity 4: Videos. The Project produced and distributed 8 short documentary videos on individual cases and 4 reports from public discussions held in Novi Sad and Belgrade, and specials edited for TV stations and websites. Video material on 8 individual cases of citizens who have won cases before the ECHR has been created and made available via Pescanik’s website, the thematic video album on Vimeo, as well as via a great number of local media stations across Serbia, upon their request.

In addition, the 30-minute audio production on 4 representative cases was aired in prime time on 11 radio stations in Serbia, Kosovo, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Project team estimated that the airing of the audio material has reached 150,000 citizens in total.

Activity 5: Public debates in 3 cities of Serbia on the verdicts and recommendations the State of Serbia by the ECHR were organised in Novi Sad, Pancevo and Belgrade, with participation of legal experts. The public debates gathered approximately 150 citizens in total, including representatives of the media and civil society organizations dealing with the protection of human rights.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
The Project was well managed and monitored. The project team proactively sought support and networked with a range of actors from media, NGOs and academia to promote, support and enhance results of the project.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
Entire grant was disbursed and the project is finished.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
There were two requests for approval of deviations from the original project proposal:

A. Request for non-cost extension – for extending project duration to July 19, 2013 that was approved by EUD.
### B.

Request for contract modification submitted on March 17, 2013 and approved by EUD for defining in
details the costs specified under the budget line 1.1.1 in order to introduce specific budget lines;

- Reallocation of costs under 1.3.2. Local (staff) to the newly introduced budget line 1.1.1.6. Local
  coordinators and changes in budget lines 3. 3.5. and 4. 5.1.1.

There were no deviations in terms of the realization of planned activities – all activities were realized according to the timeframe.

12. **Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?**

   Yes.

13. **Are the activities achieving value for money?**

   Yes. This project falls within the LOT 1 (up to 50,000 EUR) and its activities and timeframe were realistic for such type of action.

14. **Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?**

   Yes.

15. **Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?**

   The Project benefited from very good guidance and support from EUD. The EIDHR do not fall under ROM monitoring so no systematic monitoring was conducted except from project monitoring conducted by EUD. EUD Team in charge of the project was very helpful and open to explain and guide discussions on any changes in the project.

16. **Is there any issue with the co-financing?**

   Pescanik used co-financing opportunity from Norwegian embassy for this project. This was very useful assistance to the organization.

### IV. Effectiveness

17. **Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?**

   The Project has provided good material for citizens to inform themselves and take action towards appealing to Strasbourg for cases against state of Serbia. Distribution and airing produced materials, public debates and expert discussions have generated public debate on cases lost before the ECHR, but also initiated further discussion on the competence and responsibility of domestic courts in Serbia.

   A selection of representative cases based on their frequency, topics and relevance has been made so as to bring forth the issue of the high number of cases against Serbia before the ECHR (estimated at ca. 6,000) as well as the high percentage of cases Serbia has lost. The reports and case studies were made available to the broad public in an understandable and accessible way, for the citizens to better understand their rights, and possible ways for seeking justice via the existing appeals mechanism. Some of the cases stirred public debate, particularly the case of missing babies from 1980ies, which was high topic in media thanks to the project.

   The project estimates that the action reached ca. 250,000 citizens (data collected through Google Analytics, local media feedback, press clippings and media reporting analysis, citizens’ feedback, participation in public debates etc.).

18. **How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences**

   The target group of the project were citizens of Serbia. The Project aimed at raising awareness on the ECHR rulings and informing citizens on procedures to file cases against the state before the ECHR. The materials produced within the action were widely distributed as a tool for information sharing. Public debates were also a space for citizens to become more informed and familiar with procedures, cases and their follow up actions.

19. **Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?**
The Project was implemented by Pescanik itself. There were networks and cooperation established and/or maintained with media, academia and other NGOs (e.g. Association of parents of missing babies) within this action. For example, cooperation with the Association of parents of missing babies was very beneficial for the association as it helped the members to learn in timely fashion about the ECHR ruling and to lobby for remedial actions together with the project.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

The Government of the Republic of Serbia has, in April 2013, established a specialized body for cooperation with the ECHR in Strasbourg in order to address the matter more ardently – the Council for Relations with the ECHR, decision which may, to some extent, be also attributed to the Project.

Also, the project, through its materials and media content, was able to reach out to wide audience across Serbia, thus raising awareness and familiarization with the Court and its role. While it may be assumed that this action contributed to better information of citizens about their rights, and the possibility to seek justice via the ECHR, this cannot be evidenced within this Evaluation.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

The focused action on awareness raising and information sharing on rulings of ECHR would not happen without the grant, at least not by Pescanik at the time of the project.

It is not clear whether the government decision to establish the Council for Relations with the ECHR would have happened without the project’s pressure.

22. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

The Project is an advocacy action and it is not possible to estimate clear socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

The project directly contributes to the Chapter 23 and 24 of the EU acquis communitaire. Therefore, through sharing evidence on cases and the role of the ECHR among general public in Serbia, it does contribute to the Serbia’s accession aspirations.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

N/A.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

At the moment, there are no extra funding/budgetary resources. However, Pescanik has continued researching and presenting cases of interest.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible/likely to last?

The cases brought forward through analysis and public distribution are still relevant and are discussed sporadically.

The Council for relations with ECHR is still in function.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

The actions of Pescanik are funded through various donors (e.g. NED, Civil Rights Defenders).

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
Pescanik initiates cases and articles on subjects as they raise, and there is a mobile team of journalists and cameramen who can cover a story in an efficient and timely manner.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
The action itself was implemented solely by Pescanik.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
Pescanik covers its work through donor assistance. It looks for various opportunities, including EIDHR potentially.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?
The project was well managed and contributed to awareness raising of general public in Serbia on issues relevant to access to justice. The project also aimed at contributing to reforms of judicial sector, but its design, time span and outreach did not allow for extensive work with this sector.
The Project piloted the model whereby legal analysts and journalists work together towards bringing closer legal cases to ordinary citizens and some lessons learned worthwhile for some follow up activities may be summed up as:
- joint work of legal experts and journalists help bringing complicated language, complex cases closer to ordinary citizens
- agenda setting through expert meetings, public debates is possible and distribution of materials through established partner media channels is excellent for advocacy and awareness raising
- 12 months duration was practically sufficient for advocacy activities but more focused approach on also working closely with judiciary would require longer duration and more significant funds, as well as partnership with European institution and/or civil society organization dealing with such issues.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/10/14</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>Pescanik office</td>
<td>Svetlana Lukic, Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Svetlana Vukovic, Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/14</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>Pescanik office</td>
<td>Ivan Kuzminovic, Associate of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aleksandra Calosevic, Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/14</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Pescanik office</td>
<td>Vesna Rakic Vodinelic, University professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/14</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Pescanik office</td>
<td>Iva Martinovic, Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zelko Bajic, Video producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/14</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Pescanik office</td>
<td>Mirjana Novokmet, Association of parents of missing babies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To develop sustainable and comprehensive judiciary implementation of antidiscrimination legislation that will be achieved by preparation of specialized curricula, trainings, focus groups discussion for development of indicators for monitoring, preparation of Casebook on European Court of Human Rights and European Court of Justice Practice and in cooperation with the Judicial Academy in order to enable sustainability.</td>
<td>1. to define and accustom best practice and EU experiences of protection to victims of discrimination 2. to create a specific training curricula for sensitized approach of public prosecutors and judges in the cases with victims of discrimination 3. to strengthen the role of legal professional associations from Serbia in promotion of antidiscrimination 4. to create legal network with CSOs from the local level in order to advocacy for comprehensive protection from discrimination 5. to raise awareness on importance of protection from all forms of discrimination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results |

Main activities

1. Developed model for better protection of | 1. Identification of focal points in 4 regions,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders and Selection of Participants and Institutions;</th>
<th>Stakeholders and Selection of Participants and Institutions;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Capacity building of judiciary for antidiscrimination issues;</td>
<td>2. Capacity building of judiciary for antidiscrimination issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capacity building of CSOs for monitoring;</td>
<td>3. Capacity building of CSOs for monitoring;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design of indicators and monitoring rules;</td>
<td>4. Design of indicators and monitoring rules;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organising of Pilot for newly developed indicators and development of data base;</td>
<td>5. Organising of Pilot for newly developed indicators and development of data base;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dissemination and Promotional Activities</td>
<td>6. Dissemination and Promotional Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>victims of discrimination trough creation and implementation of training methodology / curricula for sensitized approach of public prosecutors and judges in the cases with discrimination victims</th>
<th>victims of discrimination trough creation and implementation of training methodology / curricula for sensitized approach of public prosecutors and judges in the cases with discrimination victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. raised capacities of CSOs for monitoring in the field of protection of discrimination victims based on the EU best experiences</td>
<td>2. raised capacities of CSOs for monitoring in the field of protection of discrimination victims based on the EU best experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. developed model of indicators for monitoring of implementation of antidiscrimination legislation in 4 regions</td>
<td>3. developed model of indicators for monitoring of implementation of antidiscrimination legislation in 4 regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. piloted newly developed indicators and Rule book for monitoring in 4 regions</td>
<td>4. piloted newly developed indicators and Rule book for monitoring in 4 regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. creation of data base with discrimination cases based on monitoring reports</td>
<td>5. creation of data base with discrimination cases based on monitoring reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. established new partnerships and networks with local CSOs, local self government, business sector and judiciary trough civil dialog and focus groups</td>
<td>6. established new partnerships and networks with local CSOs, local self government, business sector and judiciary trough civil dialog and focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. raised level of citizens knowledge and motivation, essential for citizens’ awareness</td>
<td>7. raised level of citizens knowledge and motivation, essential for citizens’ awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. produced and broadcasted of 4 TV debates on protection of discrimination victims</td>
<td>8. produced and broadcasted of 4 TV debates on protection of discrimination victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. maintained and regularly uploaded web site of the project</td>
<td>9. maintained and regularly uploaded web site of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Conceptual Design

1. *Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?*

   The proposal is clear and well elaborated. The logframe outlines the project logic.

2. *Is it easy to understand the project logic?*

   It is easy to understand the project logic.

3. *Are there clear OVIs?*

   The OVIs are rather general and abstract, so they do not fulfill the criteria for SMART OVIs.

### II. Relevance

4. *How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives*

   The Project is relevant to the Call as it contributes to the overall efforts of sensitisation of public prosecutors and judges in the cases with discrimination victims, thus contributing to protection and promotion of human rights.

5. *How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?*

   The Project is relevant for the beneficiaries/sector as it focuses on capacity building of representatives of judiciary and CSOs from Serbia dealing with antidiscrimination issues, in order to strengthen mutual cooperation and increase legal capacities of CSOs so that they can be a partner to judiciary in cases where discrimination (may) occur(s). These interventions contribute to higher level of protection of human rights and raised awareness on discrimination problems in Serbia.
### III. Efficiency

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**

The project has been concluded, therefore all envisaged activities were delivered within the set timeframe. The Project belonged to the LOT 1 projects, and focused primarily on providing the floor to judiciary and CSOs to discuss, exchange experiences and knowledge and network towards better recognition and protection of rights of marginalised groups.

Within the project framework, four seminars, four focus groups, two seminars for CSO’s representatives and final round table were organized as space to present and discuss various issues pertaining antidiscrimination, while also sharing comparative and domestic practice/case law and legislation. These events assisted raising awareness of prosecutors and members of judiciary on importance of protection from all forms of discrimination.

The Project also resulted in a production of a Case book of European Court of Human Rights and European Court of Justice (ECJ). The Case book presents an overview of cases against Serbia that are pending in front of European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), The PAS presented selected ECHR and ECJ cases in the anti-discrimination area.

8. **Is the project well managed and monitored?**

The project was well managed and was based on good partnership between involved parties.

9. **How much of the grant is disbursed?**

Entire grant was disbursed.

10. **Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?**

No.

11. **Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.**

No.

12. **Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?**

There was sufficient staff to manage the project.

13. **Are the activities achieving value for money?**

Yes.

14. **Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?**

Yes, the number and extent of visibility actions are adequate in relation to the size of the project.

15. **Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?**

The Project team confirmed that they got sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority,

16. **Is there any issue with the co-financing?**

No.

### IV. Effectiveness

17. **Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?**

The Project has fulfilled the set objective of sharing best practices and EU experiences of protection to victims of discrimination with wide range of CSOs and judiciary representatives to raise awareness and
sensitise them about issues of discrimination. The Casebook produced within the project was widely disseminated among public prosecutors and other participants of trainings and other events and is still available on the PAS website. The Project created a network of CSOs from the local level in order to advocate for comprehensive protection from discrimination. The network is still active and organisations cooperate in issues of importance for antidiscrimination.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

The project activities raised awareness and sensitized the target groups (judiciary and CSOs) about the issues of discrimination of marginalized and vulnerable groups.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Yes.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

The project size and duration did not allow for stronger investment in durable changes in the judicial system. Therefore, significant impact on this area has not been achieved, except that now materials are available for prosecutors and judges in cases related to discrimination or where discrimination may occur.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

The PAS would not be able to implement such project without funds from EIDHR.

22. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

As this is a small project with short time span, it focused mainly on raising awareness and sharing best practices. It could be assumed that better treatment of vulnerable groups (persons with disability, minorities, etc.) are now receiving better treatment as a result of the project intervention, but this cannot be evidenced by this evaluation.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

The project added value to raising awareness and offering materials to judges, prosecutors on discrimination. In such manner, the project contributed to the law on anti-discrimination and to the reform of justice sector.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

The project is part of the work of Association and its activities fit well to the Association’s activities and its cooperation with other actors.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Not at the moment.
VI. Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?</td>
<td>Materials produced within the Project are still available and could be downloaded from the PAS website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results</td>
<td>No specific resources were needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?</td>
<td>Not at the moment. Project idea is currently being developed to follow up on the results of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?</td>
<td>The beneficiary is planning to submit the proposal to DEU for follow up project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Conclusions & findings

- **What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?**

  The project is a small grant intervention with very limited timeframe and activities included. In terms of efficiency and effectiveness, the project achieved good results and implemented all envisaged activities. The impact and sustainability prospects are not high as the project provided opportunity for in-depth discussions on the issues of importance to only limited number of stakeholders (through round tables, workshops, etc). Material produced was widely distributed but no follow up on the use of such material was conducted, so there is no tangible evidence that there was some substantial impacts from that.
Sandzak Committee for Protection of Human Rights and Freedoms

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: EIDHR
Call for proposals: EIDHR
Contract number: 11EIDHR01/01/11/10
Contract name: Strengthening the participation of women and marginalized groups in creation of local policies in multiethnic areas
Beneficiary: Sandzak Committee for Protection of Human Rights and Freedoms
Contract total: 53,015.41 €
Contract amount EU: 49,898.10 €
Co-financing: 94.12%
Contract start date: 6/12/12
Contract end date: 6/11/13
Contract duration: 12 months

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of women’s participation and other underrepresented groups in creation and monitoring of local policies in multi-ethnic areas.</td>
<td>(v) Strengthening of NGOs, minority interest groups and individuals that represent the interests of their communities in development of public policies in the local and national level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Increase awareness, of local state authorities and other public institutions on the need of participation of members of the marginalized groups in public life;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vii) Economic and social empowerment of women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

- The association of women is established;
- The Forum-Women of Pozega is established;
- Coalition of NGOs is formed;
- The capacities of weak organizations are strengthened;
- Individuals receive legal aid,

Main activities

1.1.1. Selection and hiring of project team
1.1.2. Selection and hiring of local coordinators
1.1.3. Preliminary contacts with beneficiaries and target groups
1.1.4. Giving advice to women in villages in Pester related to establishment of woman association of Tutin and Sjenica;
- Improved cooperation among women’s NGOs and local governments;
- Public campaigns, research and analyze on the structure of unemployed women is completed;
- Recommendations to local government regarding unemployed women is completed; analyze of legal and fiscal local legislation is completed;
- The Social Cooperative in village Pozega in Novi Pazar is established

| 1.1.5. | Organize establishment of association assembly and legal acts; |
| 1.1.6. | Implementation the registration procedure; |
| 1.2.1. | Giving advice to women in village Pozega in Novi Pazar related to establishment of Forum-Women of Pozega; |
| 1.2.2. | Organize establishment of association assembly and legal acts |
| 1.2.3. | Implementation the registration procedure; |
| 1.3.1. | Signing of memorandum on establishment of NGO coalition |
| 1.3.2. | Organize working meetings with the stakeholders and adoption of a mutual platform; |
| 1.4.2. | Organization of meetings with stakeholders |
| 1.5.1. | Providing legal aid to NGOs and individuals; |
| 2.1.1. | Organization of four public debates in Sjenica and Priboj |
| 2.2.1. | Design and distribution of posters and leaflets |
| 2.2.2. | Broadcasting of TV shows |
| 2.2.3. | Three press conference |
| 3.1.1. | Signing agreement with Partner |
| 3.1.2. | Implementation of research and analysis on unemployed women in Novi Pazar and Prijepolje |
| 3.2.1. | Making of recommendations requalification and post-qualification of unemployed women in towns Novi Pazar and Prijepolje |
| 3.3.1. | Make an analysis of local statutes and other legal documents |
| 3.4.1. | Implementation of research on the possibilities and measures of support in development of women’s entrepreneurship in the local level |
| 3.4.2. | Making of recommendations for measures for support of in development of women’s entrepreneurship in the local level |
| 3.4.3. | Organization of round table discussion where results of all research and recommendations shall be presented |
| 3.5.1. | Organization of meetings with women in the local community of Pozega |
| 3.5.2. | Organization of meetings with the local government of Novi Pazar for advocacy and proposals on establishment of Social Cooperative of women |
| 3.5.3. | Giving advice to women in village Pozega in Novi Pazar related to establishment of Social cooperative |
| 3.5.4. | Organization of founding assembly and legal documents for Social cooperative |
| 3.6. | Two - days training for woman regarding business startup |
### I. Conceptual Design

1. **Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?**

   The proposal and the logframe are clear, and the project logic responds to the size and duration of the intervention.

2. **Is it easy to understand the project logic?**

   Yes.

3. **Are there clear OVIs?**

   The OVIs are clear, even though they could benefit from further refining.

### II. Relevance

4. **How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives?**

   The Project is relevant to the Call as it contributed to better representation of women in decision-making processes, while at the same time providing opportunities for socio-economic empowerment of women, particularly from rural areas.

5. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**

   The Project addresses important issues of women representation in local affairs as well as the marginalization and social exclusion of women, particularly from rural areas. Particularly important is the fact that the project addresses multidimensional deprivation of women in Sandzak, which is generally extremely poor and disadvantaged area.

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**

   Yes.

### III. Efficiency

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**

   The project implemented all activities planned within the proposal. Outputs delivered include the following:
   - The project managed to establish the Association of Women for promotion of women’s rights and interests in rural areas of Tutin and Sjenica. The association’s work primarily focuses on advocacy and providing space for women to gather, exchange experiences and work together.
   - The project supported establishment of the Women’s Forum of Village Pozega and the association of women in village Melaje (municipality of Tutin).
   - The project lead the initiative for establishing a Coalition of CSOs for advocacy of higher participation of women in creation of local economic and social policies. The coalition gathers CSOs from Novi Pazar, Prboj, Sjenica and Prijepolje.
   - Trainings provided within the project contributed to increasing capacities of weak organizations dealing with rights of women and marginalized groups, representatives of media and members of political parties. Promotional activities implemented within the project were successful and were well received by public and media partners.
   - Importantly, the project managed to transform the CSO Women of Pozega village into a Social Cooperative and to support its work throughout the duration of the project.
8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
The project was managed well.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
The entire grant was disbursed.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
No addendum.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Yes.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Support and guidance from DEU was valuable and highly praised by the Project team.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
Organisation does face challenges to ensure co-financing for EIDHR projects and this is the main challenge of the organization.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
The project has achieved all stated results from the proposal. Most importantly, the project established the social cooperative in Pozega, as important means for socio-economic empowerment of rural women in the region. The cooperative was active and managed to conclude some contracts (for sale of goods produced) while the project was ongoing.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
The Project’s social cooperative gathers 10 women from rural areas who work on reviving old crafts, which was important socio-economic empowerment measure. Also, the Project gathered over 40 women from rural areas in trainings and other activities which was important investment in their empowerment.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
Cooperation with partners (European Movement) remained good throughout the project.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?
Working with women through trainings, inclusion in various activities and also in local CSOs and coalition
provided strong voice to women, particularly in rural areas. The Social cooperative was a good initiative providing business opportunities to women from rural areas. Social cooperative got the material from Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency (TIKA) as a donation and municipalities of Tutin and Sjenica supported the project by buying the products for the needs of Touristic organization.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?
Not to the full extent.

22. Is the project likely to result in major socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.
The social cooperative brought the opportunity to women from rural areas to earn some income for their work. However, the numbers of engaged women are rather small so the socio-economic benefits to the entire female population in the region is limited (project falls within LOT 1 and has limited budget and timeframe, so the impacts correspond to the value for money).

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.
It contributes to the overall national strategy for women empowerment but to a very limited extent.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.
Yes, Sandzak Committee cooperates with other organisations working on these and connected issues.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?
No.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?
Established cooperative now struggles with funds for its work, and leadership is weak and negatively affects the sustainability of the cooperative.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results
No.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
The Cooperative did organize follow up activities of fundraising and promotion of the old crafts and Cooperative’s role in this promotion.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
The Sandzak Committee and European Movement still cooperate.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
The Sandzak Committee will continue competing for EIDHR and other EUD grants.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The Project intervention was realistic and corresponds to the funds and timeframe set. The Project worked closely with women, particularly those from rural areas and succeeded in empowering them and
giving them the voice through structured organizing of their work (as a CSO). The project resulted in establishment of the social cooperative which gathers 10 women from rural area, active in old crafts. These efforts were important investment in women empowerment and promoting the role of women in society, and this is the strong impact: more empowered women to take active role in community affairs. While investment is positive, the sustainability of the cooperative is in question due to weak leadership and lack of commitment.

Recommendation: support the cooperative to revise the leadership structure and invest in establishing more committed and capable leadership of the cooperative.
Save the Children

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>EIDHR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>EIDHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>11EIDHR01/01/11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>SCORE - Setting an agenda for Child Oriented Social Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>124,972.68 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>99,978.14 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>06/11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children on the move in Serbia are supported and provided for by child rights based social protection system (SPS).</td>
<td>(viii) CSO’s and institutions with child protection mandate are strengthened and networked to develop child friendly assistance, services and policies grounded in the best interest of children on the move</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A comprehensive analysis on characteristics and consequences of children’s movement in Serbia, complemented by mappings of services and other programs available to children on the move is conducted.</td>
<td>• Conducting desk research on characteristics and consequences of children’s movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capacities of 40 direct service providers from CSOs and institutions with child protection mandate are strengthened to develop child rights based programs and services with a gender perspective.</td>
<td>• Conducting 2 focus groups and at least 5 interviews with at least 20 professionals with child protection mandate on mapping of the services available for children on the move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100 key stakeholders with child protection</td>
<td>• Consulting at least 40 children on the move, beneficiaries of service providers on children’s views on quality of services they receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing at least 5 case studies, documenting children’s experience and practices and recommendations for further improvement on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mandate endorse the importance of introducing child rights based approach in their programs and services of relevance to children on the move

- child protection mechanisms for children on the move
  - Finalising and publishing the Analysis on characteristics and consequences of children’s movement in Serbia with recommendations for further improvement of child protection system
  - 2.1. Translating and adapting practical guide on child rights programming for institutions and CSOs with child protection mandates
  - 2.2. Developing comprehensive training programme on child rights based programming
  - 2.3. Conducting four 2-days trainings for at least 40 professionals with child protection mandate
  - 2.4. Submitting developed training programme for accreditation to the Social Welfare Institute
- 3.1. Organizing national conference to present and advocate for child friendly assistance, services and policies
- 3.2. Developing policy paper based on conducted research, with recommendations for improvement of child protection system
- 3.3. Regular meetings with key decision makers for mainstreaming child rights programming
- 3.4. Organizing public event with children to raise public awareness on the position of children on the move

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

   The project proposal and the logframe are very well articulated and the logic is clear.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

   Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

   Yes, OVIs are well defined and elaborated.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

   The project tackles a very important human rights issue – rights of children on the move (asylum seekers and migrants) in Serbia. The project thus fits in and is relevant to the CfPs objectives.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

   The project is very relevant to the final beneficiaries as it works towards strengthening capacities of service providers and government institutions to adequately address the needs of children on the move and their vulnerability. The evaluation report produced for the Project also states that “the Action’s activities are highly relevant in the following aspects: dealing with lack of recognition of the issue and its importance; lack of data and educational programs for professionals and lack of beneficiaries'
participation practices (direct data/information from children on the move).”

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**

Very much so.

### III. Efficiency

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**

All envisaged activities have been implemented in timely and good quality manner. Capacity building of officials and service providers on issues of child friendly assistance, services and policies grounded in the best interest of children on the move gathered professionals from different institutions dealing with children on the move. There were slight changes and adaptations of training approaches and structure in order to respond to the needs of participants.

Activities under the research component were implemented as planned and resulted in published research offering comprehensive analysis of the aspects relevant for children on the move in Serbia. Interestingly, the research also included component of direct discussions with children on the move. Save the children applied child-friendly approaches to the research and interviews with children according to the internationally recognized standards of dealing with children in such circumstances.

Importantly, advocacy component of the project focused on raising awareness of the need to recognize the multiple vulnerabilities and needs of children on the move, and the requirement of multisectoral approach to addressing these vulnerabilities. The project focused a lot of attention into promoting the terminology “children on the move” to the public and particularly public institutions dealing with this group.

8. **Is the project well managed and monitored?**

The project had a very well defined structure and ways of working with partners. As per evaluation report, “Internal monitoring system and effective organisational structure were well set, while achieved functionality of coordination and management mechanisms among core project team and partners were well established. The Action managed resources successfully, primarily the financial resources, but also the human resources. In spite of some difficulties primarily related to time availability constrains, project team, due to high level of effort and commitment, managed to implement all planned activities successfully.”

9. **How much of the grant is disbursed?**

The project is finished and the entire grant is disbursed.

10. **Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?**

No.

11. **Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.**

No.

12. **Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?**

Yes.

13. **Are the activities achieving value for money?**

Yes.

14. **Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?**

Yes. The Project invested a lot into visibility actions within its advocacy component. Also, due to the importance of the topic, Save the Children also presented lessons learned and research at international and national events.

15. **Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout**
the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

Yes.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

No.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

Yes. The capacity building efforts of the Project contributed to strengthening CSOs and institutions’ awareness and recognition of special needs children on the move have. Also, trainings provided the space for strengthening networks between different institutions and sectors towards setting up solid basis for child friendly assistance, services and policies grounded in the best interest of children on the move. Published research presents a strong and rather unique evidence base on the current status and needs of children on the move. Advocacy efforts resulted in recognition of the term “children on the move” and what it includes. This is important due to the fact that this group needs special attention and treatment by state institutions in order to protect them from abuse or violation of rights.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

Children on the move face multiple threats of abuse ad violation of rights. The intervention addresses the needs for special treatment of this group, which will in the medium term be better treated thanks to the initiative.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Yes. All partners agree that the partnership was genuine and enabling for transfer of know-how and exchange of experience.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

The Project evaluation states that “The topic Children on the move has been opened in the public and among relevant professions, institution and other interested parties. As the topic “opening” was done in comprehensive way, based on real needs and tackled different aspects of this phenomena, it is realistic to expect that the topic’s actuality will remain. All actors agreed that the Action put ground layer-fundament for all further actions related to Children on move and in that sense its impact is almost unquestionable.” The project was followed up by further actions of Partners which is a strong contributory factor to increased impact prospects of the Project.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Save the children would work on this issue in any case. However, the grant provided space for more focused action and stronger partnerships.

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Improvement of mechanisms and approaches to dealing with children on the move is expected to
contribute to better socio-economic benefits for children on the move.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

The project contributes to overall government priorities of establishing strong and rights based migration management policies.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

Yes. It connects to other Save the Children and other Agencies’ activities on enhancing rights of children.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Yes. The Project received follow up EIDHR grant.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Evaluation report’s conclusion regarding sustainability is still valid: “Main sustainability elements identified during the Action implementation are: the Children on the move topic is put on the agenda in Serbia and any reversible process is not likely to happen; save the Children, as strong internationally wide recognized organization will keep dealing with Children on the move topic; Project Advisory board members influence is high and they will mostly keep advocating for the topic; training program accreditation and the Research paper availability as a future resources of information for professionals both from institutions and CSOs.”

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

The follow up Project is under implementation.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

As above.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Yes.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

The beneficiary received follow up EIDHR grant.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project was a well-designed partnership based action that dealt with important issue of protecting rights of children on the move. Raising awareness and capacities of professionals dealing with children on the move and general public was important investment in changing attitudes and approaches to children on the move. Basing all activities on strong evidence base was a good investment to targeted interventions in best interest of children.
Student cultural centre Novi Sad

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: EIDHR
Call for proposals: EIDHR
Contract number: 12EIDHR01/01/11/216
Contract name: All for Rights – Rights for All!
Beneficiary: Student cultural centre Novi Sad
Contract total: 54,992.48 €
Contract amount EU: 49,262.26 €
Co-financing: 89.58%
Contract start date: 4/16/13
Contract end date: 7/15/14
Contract duration: 15 months

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the active and dynamic education on human rights of young people in Vojvodina, thus to raise awareness on the importance of the protection of the human rights and provide supportive environment for intercultural encounters, dialogue and learning.</td>
<td>All for Rights – Rights for All! aims to contribute to the active and dynamic education on human rights of young people in Vojvodina, thus to raise awareness on the importance of the protection of the human rights and provide supportive environment for intercultural encounters, dialogue and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

Main outputs

- Strengthened capacities of young people and teachers from Vojvodina to promote respect, understanding and appreciation of human rights and cultural diversity through capacity building, new didactic tools and creative expressions;
- Activity 1.1 Organisation of Human Rights Workshops and Didactic Laboratories/Research
- Activity 1.2 Development, launching and promotion of the All for Rights – Rights for All! Facebook Game
- Activity 1.3 Realisation of the online All for Rights – Rights for All! Competition;
- Activity 1.4 Summer workshop atelier - 1) Production of a theatre play – “All for rights – rights for all”; 2) Production of Short Movies on Human Rights in Vojvodina (from youth
I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

The project proposal and the logframe are well drafted and contain articulated results framework.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

Yes, the OVIs are SMART and well defined.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives?

The project is highly relevant for the objectives and priorities 1, 3 and 4 of the Call. It if focussing on contributing to the capacity building of young people in Vojvodina in the sphere of human rights, strengthening their understanding and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, but also developing attitudes and behaviours that will lead to respect for the rights of others (through educational activities and awareness raising campaigns).

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

The project is very relevant given that the awareness of youth for sensible questions of human rights and thus societal development in Vojvodina is still limited. The environment for intercultural encounters, dialogue and learning is not always supportive and it is definitely one of the fundamental needs of the younger generation in Vojvodina. By focussing on a group of young people and their environment with a very well designed set of actions and activities the project helped leading to active young citizens and decrease of the violations of human rights in Vojvodina.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes. The project with its explicit focus on youth and human rights is targeting a relevant field of human rights development in the region and thus deserves to be supported.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

All implemented activities are in line with the contract and the implementation plan. All activities can be grouped in two major groups. The first one has focused on strengthening capacities of young people and teachers from Vojvodina to promote respect, understanding and appreciation of human rights and cultural diversity through capacity building, new didactic tools and creative expressions. The project implemented inclusive workshops and didactic laboratories, as well as developed the All f or Rights – Rights for All! Facebook Game and Online ARRA! Competition for children. Besides, the project organized Winter workshop atelier, working with children on production of a theatre play – “All for rights – rights for all”; and
a Short Movies on Human Rights in Vojvodina (from youth perspective).

The second group of activities focused on raising awareness about human rights in Vojvodina and fostering interethnic, inter-religious and intercultural dialogue through cultural events, awareness raising campaign and integrated marketing communications in cooperation with Ombudsperson office for Vojvodina.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
Yes. The Project was well managed and ensured cooperation with partners was mutually beneficial.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
The project is finished and the total grant is disbursed.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
No.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes, the project closely cooperated with ombudsperson office and the school, which added great deal of quality and relevant expertise to the project.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Yes.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Yes. The project had good cooperation and guidance from DEU.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
SKC, as other organisations, struggles to ensure co-financing but managed for this project.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
Inclusive workshops, didactic tools and creative expressions contributed to the strengthened capacities and importantly awareness of young people and teachers from Vojvodina to promote respect, understanding and appreciation of human rights and cultural diversity. According to the project data, around 400 secondary school students from Vojvodina, 40 teachers/pedagogists/psychologists employees of targeted secondary schools in Vojvodina and 10 local, regional and national media: TV, radio, web, newspapers and relevant magazines were involved in and benefited from the project activities. PR campaign and other project activities were visible on the territory of AP Vojvodina (population 2.1 million) and it may be expected that awareness was raised among the population on rights and inclusion.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
Through awareness raising and inclusive educational activities, the Project contributes to higher inclusion and participation of young people with special needs into the society.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
Yes.
V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

The project was limited in scope and timeframe and thus has limited impact prospects. Stronger impact may be found on lives of mainstream young people and those with special needs who had the opportunity to engage together in activities and exchange. The online game and other activities also provide floor for substantial change in attitudes of young people on issues of human rights.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

No. SKC would not work on such project without grant.

22. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Not to a large extent.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

The project contributes to overall national inclusion policies.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

Yes, to some extent.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

No.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible/likely to last?

The online game and other materials produces are still available and used. Knowledge and changes in attitudes of young people are expected to last.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

No.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

No

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

SKC, the School and Ombudsperson still cooperate and inform each other on activities and initiatives.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

None.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?
The project was very creative and addressed young people in youth-friendly and positive manner. Inclusion of young people in joint activities and creative workshops dealing with human rights was important for raising awareness and changing attitudes on important issues of discrimination and rights.

2. Refugees & IDPs

Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Deutschland

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 11/11/2014

Project Identification

Programme name: Refugees & IDPs
Call for proposals: Support to the improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of collective centers
Contract number: 2013/336-432
Contract name: Support to sustainable return and reintegration of IDPs to Kosovo
Beneficiary: Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Deutschland
Contract total: 1152156.44
Contract amount EU: 1071427.47
Co-financing: 92.9%
Contract start date: 03/02/2014
Contract end date: 02/02/2016
Contract duration: 24 months

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To contribute to resolving the problems of IDPs in the Republic of Serbia through the provision of adequate support | 1. To support sustainable return of IDPs to Kosovo
2. To support sustainable reintegration of IDPs and the strengthening of their Communities in Kosovo |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1: Increased awareness on potential to return achieved within the IDP population in Serbia through conducted outreach campaign activities</td>
<td>Food and non-food parcels distributed to at least 110 families to facilitate their sustainable return to Kosovo (R1 &amp; R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2: At least 110 families realized sustainable return through provided Return Assistance Activities</td>
<td>5 grants of 50,000 euros and 5 grants of 20,000 euros to support economic activity and strengthen local minority communities in 10 municipalities (R3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3: Between 7-10 Returnee Communities in Kosovo strengthened their socio-economic stability through provided Returnee Community Business Start-up Support</td>
<td>Meetings and events (R4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**I. Conceptual Design**

1. **Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?**
   - Yes, the project proposal is well drafted

2. **Is it easy to understand the project logic?**
   - The project logic is clear and easy to understand but logframe could be simplified i.e. the project consists of two main components (rather than 4): 1. Return of 110 families supported with food and non-food parcels 2. Support to 10 local communities through income-generation grants

3. **Are there clear OVIIs?**
   - Yes

**II. Relevance**

4. **How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives**
   - Yes, but components 1&2 can only work if there is also other forms of support available to accompany the return of supported families, in particular housing support. Component 3 will require a lot of support to selected beneficiaries during the design/implementation of business plan (the latter is foreseen). There is likely to be failures. Not every business idea will turn viable. The project builds on the experience from IPA 2009 when a similar project was implemented by ASB. This time however, the economic component is granted to communities rather than families. This was advocated by the Office for Kosovo and Metohija which considers that the priority should be to strengthen existing communities in order to create the conditions for further return (families will not return to locations where there are no Serbs). In addition, compared to IPA 2009, the project puts more emphasis on direct support to beneficiaries with their business idea to raise the chances of success.

5. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**
   - Very relevant. Beneficiaries have no resources to ensure the conditions of their return. Existing communities are often isolated and lacking stable livelihoods.

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**
   - Yes

**III. Efficiency**

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**
   - The project is on track:
     **Components 1 and 2**: 10 public presentations across Serbia (municipalities with a large proportion of refugees\(^1\)) were held to explain the support potential returnees can get through the project (food and non-food parcels). In addition, the project has disseminated information through the press and radio/TV broadcast. ASB is holding individual meetings to understand the situation of interested people and

---

\(^1\) Vranje, Niš, Smederevo, Jagodina, Kruševac, Kraljevo, Kragujevac, Arandjelovac, Čačak and Valjevo.
assess the likelihood of returns to be sustainable. There are linkages to the EU funded Return and Reintegration in Kosovo phase IV (RRK IV). Selection of beneficiaries is done by a selection committee consisting of the Office for Kosovo & Metohija, Serbian, the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration, UNHCR and ASB. Co-financing from the Government Office for Kosovo & Metohija is distributed through income-generation grants to returnees, which helps sustainable returns. A tender has been launched and evaluated and a contract signed with two companies for the delivery of food and non-food parcels.

**Component 3:** The project developed the methodology and application package in cooperation with the Office for Kosovo and Metohija. There are two types of grants. Type-1 grants (50,000 EUR) are larger and must include at least 5 unrelated individuals wishing to start a business. Type-2 requires only two individuals but for a smaller amount (20,000 EUR). The first months of the project were devoted to the design the methodology in partnership with the Office Kosovo & Metohija, the Serbian Commissariat for Refugees and Migration and the EUD. Meetings with representatives of municipalities and institutions and NGOs representatives were held as well as presentations and information sessions. Type-1 call was launched in 15/09 with a deadline on 15/10. Information sessions were held in all 10 targeted municipalities shortly before the call was launched and once more during the call. 13 applications have been submitted by the deadline. They are currently evaluated by the selection committee. The most important criterion is the viability of the business idea (social situation only marginally taken into account). ASB has also carried out field visits to check that communities really exist and to understand better their needs.

The 7 best ideas will receive further support to develop a full business plan (with the help of independent consultants) on the basis which the final selection of 5 grantees will be made.

Beneficiaries will then receive assistance during implementation. No money transfer is involved. All tendering is under the responsibility of ASB, which will monitor the implementation of the grant.

Good coordination with the Ministry of Community and Return, which coordinate Kosovo’s support to returnees. Previous projects enabled to clear the way for importation of goods purchased in Serbia free of VAT and custom duties. This is a difficult project because it is implemented in Kosovo with Serbian IPA funds.

DRC implements a similar project targeting the same municipalities but different size of grants. Projects are well coordinated.

There is also a very strong coordination with the Office for Kosovo & Metohija to ensure that applicants are genuine and there are no overlap in terms of support e.g. somebody returning to Kosovo is not eligible for support in Serbia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the project well managed and monitored?</td>
<td>Yes. Many trips to eligible municipalities in Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much of the grant is disbursed?</td>
<td>EUR 61,000 or approximately 6% of the total grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?</td>
<td>Yes, the staff is very experienced given that ASB implemented a similar project under IPA 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are the activities achieving value for money?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes, depending on the number of returnees and families who eventually stayed in Kosovo.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Yes. Leaflets/brochures to present the project have been designed and distributed during the presentations.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Eptisa is providing general guidance and support.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
No.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
The project has not yet reached any result but it is on track. It is therefore too early to pass judgment on the results but the success of component 3 depends on the quality of the consultancy provided to draft business plans and the support during implementation. If success rate for components 1 & 2 is achieved (i.e. 80% are still there when evaluation was carried out six months) it could be considered a success. There is a risk that people come back to Serbia because there are not enough opportunities to earn a living in Kosovo + over the years, beneficiaries have created links in the places where they were displaced.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
The project is instrumental in creating the conditions for sustainable returns of Serb families in Kosovo. Without support, it is highly unlikely that these families would return to Kosovo. Likewise, the assistance to existing communities of Serbs is crucial to ensure that they can maintain themselves in the long-run.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
N/A

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?
No but the project was not designed to bring changes of that nature. On the other hand, the day-to-day cooperation between Serbian and Kosovar institutions have been good, which can be put to the credit of the project.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?
N/A

22. Is the project likely to result in major socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.
The project is likely to strengthen Serbian communities in Kosovo either by contributing to the return of families who fled in the late nineties or providing existing communities with a livelihood so that they can sustain themselves. However, the project in itself cannot ensure that major socio-economic improvement occurs. For that to happen and for communities of returnees to thrive, stable relationships between
Serbia and Kosovo and a safe environment are needed in the long-run.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

The project contributes to the process of returns as agreed between Serbia and Kosovo.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

Yes, the project links to IPA Kosovo, in particular the housing programme which is being implemented there.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

No

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

No outputs are visible yet

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Sustainability of results is not dependent on resources but on stable relationships between Serbia and Kosovo, a safe environment, mutual efforts to cooperate, and a sufficient amount of tolerance on both sides i.e. the willingness of Albanians to welcome returnees and Serbs to integrate into Kosovo by learning Albanian, etc.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

There are plans for IPA 2014. The component 1 is likely to be more difficult to implement as time goes by (probability of interest in return becomes limited) but further need is required to help local minorities to prosper. This could be done also under IPA Kosovo.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

The key cooperation is actually performed by ASB, which liaise between the Serbian and Albanian sides.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Returnees are very much dependent on further support from Serbia and the international community to ensure their long-term livelihoods, which remain precarious given the political and economic situation in Kosovo.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project is on track and well-managed. Given the experience of the applicant in carrying out a similar project under IPA 2009, it is likely that all activities will be implemented according to plan. However, it is too early to judge the results.

Components 1 & 2 (food and non-parcels to support returns) is in progress. The risk of unsustainable returns is to be avoided by combining the assistance from the project with other initiatives (RRK IV).

Component 3: grantees will need much support from consultants to succeed (the quality and dedication of consultants will be key in that respect). There are likely however to be a few failures as it is often the case with this kind of project. However the approach of helping recipients of income-generation grants...
makes sense and increase the chances of success (compared to the support without any work/contact with potential beneficiaries as is sometimes the case with EU GS).

There will be further need for support since those minorities are very vulnerable. Ultimately, the success of the project depends on stable relationships between Serbia and Kosovo and mutual tolerance among Serb and Albanian communities.
VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/10/14</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Zorica Zivojinovic, Project Coordinator ASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivan Marin, Project Coordinator ASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/14</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Nenad Robajac, Office for Kosovo &amp; Metohija</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Danish Refugee Council

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 11/11/2014

Project Identification

Programme name: Refugees & IDPs
Call for proposals: Support to the improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of collective centers
Contract number: 2013336-438
Contract name: Supporting livelihood enhancement and closure of collective centres
Beneficiary: Danish Refugee Council
Contract total: € 2,113,289.59
Contract amount EU: € 2,001,707.9
Co-financing: 94.7%
Contract start date: 01/01/2014
Contract end date: 31/10/2015
Contract duration: 20 months
Field visit: Kladovo

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

Overall objective
To provide adequate living conditions and integration of forced migrants who choose to stay in Serbia realising their durable solution

Specific objective
To support the closure of the remaining CCs and realise improvement of living conditions for vulnerable refugees, IDPs and returnees

Expected results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• R1: Individual housing solutions provided to vulnerable refugees, IDPs and returnees, moving out from CCs by supply of prefabricated houses</td>
<td>• 46 refugees, IDPs families and returnee families / approx.134 individuals will move out from targeted CCs and will be provided with prefabricated houses (R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• R2: Enhanced living conditions ensured to extremely vulnerable refugees, IDPs, returnees moving out from CCs by provision of apartment units in socially supported environment (SHSE)</td>
<td>• 47 refugees, IDPs families and returnee families / approx.141 individuals will be provided with apartment units in socially supported environment (SHSE) in the municipalities of Pancevo, Racsa and Bela Palanka. 38 will be refugees/IDP/returnee families and 9 will be extremely vulnerable domicile families (R2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs
and activities?
The activities and results of the project are very clear. It focuses on the closure of four collective centres across the country.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?
The project logic is clear and easy to understand.

3. Are there clear OVs?
Yes

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives?
The project is contributing to the closure of collective centres, which is considered a priority for Serbia. The project is also contributing to the integration of refugees and IDPs by providing them with housing solutions without which this integration is unlikely.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?
Very relevant. Living conditions in collective centres are poor and occupants are completely dependent on the support received from the state. They have difficulty in leading an independent life within the society and are afraid of moving out of the centre.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?
Yes.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are they in line with the contract and the implementation plan?
DRC has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the four municipalities. Joint Commission have been set up. Potential beneficiaries in all four municipalities are well identified. DRC assessed their situation and the needs they will face once they are provided with a housing solution. Contracts of cooperation are already signed with three municipalities, which mean that plots are available and the municipalities will grant their support with all the necessary authorisations. In all four targeted collective centres (Pancevo, Raca, Bela Palanka and Kladovo), the application process for all forms of housing support (prefabs on private or municipal plot and apartment units in socially supportive environment) took place in September. Apart from Raca, the process was successful. DRC social workers and engineers helped these families define their housing needs and fulfil all the conditions for receiving assistance. The biggest issue is the purchase a plot of land. Much time is also needed to help families gather all the necessary authorisations and documents. The project is cooperating well with local authorities, local CSW, local trustee, collective centre manager and the host families (in case of SHSE). The project has already launched tenders and awarded contracts for both prefabs.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
DRC has experienced staff which manages the project very efficiently. Given its experience from similar projects and its knowledge of the issue, DRC has a very clear idea of the process and is well aware of the possible obstacles from the municipal sides (plots, authorisations, etc.) and beneficiary sides (fear of living the collective centres).

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
EUR 126,000 or 6% of the total allocation
10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
No

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
There were a few visits to sites from donors and officials.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
The project is well monitored by the Eptisa, which keeps regular contact with DRC and carries out regular field visits.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
No

### IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
Yes, contracts of cooperation with municipalities are signed and needs of beneficiaries are assessed.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
DRC knows each family living in the centres with which it has been in contact sometimes for years. The project is therefore able to provide them with a housing solution taking into account their needs.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
N/A

### V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?
The project is helping the closure of the collective centres which was due for a long time and it offers solutions which will contribute to the integration of refugees and IDPs population.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?
Very unlikely given the lack of resources at municipal level, which is a major obstacle for solving the problem.

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.
Very much so. The housing solution provided by the project will immensely improve the living conditions of the target group.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.
Yes, it will enable the closure of the last collective centres, which is one of the main priorities set by the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration. The project contributes to the integration of refugees and IDPs in line with the national strategy.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)?

The project is building on previous experience from past IPA programmes.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

No

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

There is no visible result yet. Construction works have not yet started on housing units and the selected beneficiaries are still in the collective centres. Provided the municipalities ensure the maintenance of building (as they commit to in the cooperation contract) and there is sufficient support for from the Centres for Social Work to help beneficiaries with their transition to their new environment, there is every likelihood that the project results will be sustainable.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

See above

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

No

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

N/A

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Given that the aim of the project was the closure of collective centres will be achieved by the project, there is no need in this regard. DRC however considers essential to address the issue of informal centres with similar projects.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project is on track and well managed. Final beneficiaries are almost all selected. There is a good cooperation with the four municipalities. Municipal plots for building pre-fabricated houses and sheltered apartments are almost secured in all 4 municipalities. DRC is well experienced with the process ahead problems around permits/technical requirements should be resolved with the help from municipalities. The technical phase of the project is also progressing well with 1 tender already awarded and another two are launched while design for remaining housing solutions ongoing.

As for past projects, continuing commitment on the part of the municipality is essential to ensure the sustainability of results, including maintenance of buildings and support from the Centre for Social Work to the occupants of the new houses/apartments.
### VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/10/14</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>Eptisa office, Belgrade</td>
<td>Sanja Tesic, Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zivorad Popovic, Lot 1 Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/10/14</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>DRC office, Belgrade</td>
<td>Marina Cremonese, DRC Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serbia/Monenegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miodrag Jovanovic, DRC Programme Coordinator, Chief shelter Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verica Recevic, DRC Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/10/14</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Municipality of Kladovo</td>
<td>Darko Madzarević, DRC Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Radovan Arezina - President of the Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boris Popovic, Trustee for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ljubiša Stojanović, Director of the Center for Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mica Jovanovic, Chief Shelter Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verica Recevic, DRC Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karatas Collective Centre, Kladovo</td>
<td>Stojanovic Zivana, beneficiary of IPA 2011 housing unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Damjanić Mićo, resident of Karatas collective centre, potential beneficiary of IPA 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 01/11/2014

Project Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>Refugees &amp; IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>Support to the improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of collective centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2013/336-420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Support to the improvement of living conditions of forced migrants and closure of collective centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>€ 2,795,265.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>€ 2,655,502.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>03/02/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>02/02/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visit</td>
<td>Kragujevac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide adequate living conditions and integration of forced migrants who choose to stay in Serbia realising their durable solution</td>
<td>To support the closure of the remaining CCs and realise improvement of living conditions for vulnerable refugees, IDPs and returnees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• R1 – “Residential facilities are provided to the most vulnerable forced migrants currently accommodated in collective centres and domicile poor families of targeted municipalities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• R2 – “Residents of targeted CC increased their livelihood capacities through the individual psychosocial support”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 61 prefabricated houses supplied and installed: up to 160 vulnerable individuals provided with an appropriate housing solution until the end of the project(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 61 apartment in social supportive environment built: up to 150 vulnerable individuals assisted(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Psychosocial support provided for at least 150 vulnerable families currently accommodated in targeted CCs: approx. 400 individuals increased their livelihood capacities (R2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs
The project logframe is clear but the scope of the project was modified at the outset when it was found out that there was overlap with another grantee (UNHCR). As a result, the project originally designed to deal with the closure of the collective centres in Šabac, Kragujevac, Raća and Vranje had to be adapted to cover only the collective centre in Vranje and provide housing solutions to refugees and IDPs in Kragujevac and Belgrade. The refocus was agreed with the EUD.

### II. Relevance

#### 4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals' objectives

The project was very relevant to the call before it was refocused. The decision to extend activities to refugees/IDPs outside collective centres means that the project strictly speaking is not in line with the objectives of lot 3 (Provision of residential facilities for the most vulnerable categories of refugees and IDPs in the collective centers). However, the project remains in line with the objective of the call to provide adequate living conditions and integration of forced migrants who choose to stay in Serbia.

#### 5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

The project is very relevant to the needs of refugees and IDPs and disadvantaged groups of targeted municipalities, which are often lacking decent living conditions.

#### 6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes, the project proposal submitted by Help was fully in line with the objectives of the call. The decision to refocus the project is well justified and agreed with the EUD.

### III. Efficiency

#### 7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The efficiency has been low since the beginning. This is mostly due to the fact that the call resulted in overlapping proposals and the commitment of larger municipalities to solve the problem is fragile given the lack of suitable construction plots. As a result, the beneficiary was obliged to refocus the project in agreement with the EUD. However, the project is well managed by an experienced and dedicated team.

The project experienced three months of delays due to the need to refocus its activities in order to avoid overlap with another grantee (UNHCR, which is focusing the same collective centres in Belgrade and Kragujevac). As a result, it was jointly agreed with the EUD that the project will only deal with the closure of one centre (Vranje) and refocuses its activities on the needs of other refugees and IDPs, in particular those occupying informal collective centres.

There is a close and good cooperation established with the Commissariat for Refugees, which is crucial in order to avoid further overlap, in particular regarding housing solutions funded under the Regional Housing Programme.

Progress is being made in Vranje where the municipality is cooperating well. 11 social housing in
sheltered environment are to be built. First session of the Joint Commission has been held in Belgrade on
the 20.10.2014 and Rule Book for the selection of beneficiaries has been adopted as well as Call for
application, which is to be sent by the end of the month. The tender is prepared but being delayed as
there are issues around the issuance of the location permit.

The situation is in a stalemate in Kragujevac. Despite signing a contract of cooperation earlier on in the
project, the city is not willing anymore to provide the plots necessary for building pre-fabricated houses.
The project suspended its activities in agreement with the EUD. As a result, several settlements of Roma
IDPs in Kragujevac risk being left without any housing solution. Their living conditions are precarious and
unsuitable.

In Belgrade, the project is targeting 49 pre-fab houses which would cover 16 of the 21 informal collective
centres in Belgrade (it is estimated that there are 930 people living there). While 39 IDP households own
land where houses can be built, there is no solution for the remaining 10. For the time being, the city of
Belgrade has not yet agreed to grant the necessary plots and has not signed the MoU. A meeting
between the city and the EUD is to be organised. If no solution is found, the project could redirect once
more its efforts towards informal settlement in other municipalities.

As a result of these problems, the project has currently about 50 unallocated housing solutions (out of
122). The EUD is envisaging re-directing the project towards other municipalities (not included in the
original proposal). These would be Ub, Sjinica, Kraljevo and Krusevac. Help is therefore carrying out a
needs assessment (due for 17/11/14) in order to verify how many IDPs/refugees live there and which
housing solutions are suitable for them. The municipalities are interested and willing to cooperate.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
Yes, the project is well managed by an experience and dedicated staff. However

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
EUR 148,400 or 5.3% of the total project costs

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No major procurement so far

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
Yes, addendum of the Grant Contract to define allocation of the assistance in prefabricated houses was
signed in August 2014.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
It is too early to say. For the time being no.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
No visibility events held but all documents are in line with the visibility requirements.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout
the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits)
helpful?
Yes, the PMU run by Eptisa is providing effective supervision and support.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
No
### IV. Effectiveness

17. *Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?*

It is too early to pass judgment on the results. Despite difficulties, the project has still every chance of meeting its objectives albeit most likely with reduced targets.

18. *How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences*

The project target groups have been expanded to include refugees/IDPs outside formal collective centres and in new municipalities. Foreseen housing solutions will significantly improve the living conditions of target groups if solutions are found with participating municipalities.

19. *Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?*

- 

### V. Impact

20. *Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?*

The project is not designed to achieve changes of this nature.

21. *Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?*

No, municipalities have limited resources to address the issue.

22. *Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.*

Provided agreement can be found with participating municipalities, the project will help solve housing problems for the target group. However, there is a need for socio-economic support to ensure that the beneficiaries are capable to meet the costs of living in their new accommodation.

23. *Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.*

The project will contribute to the closure of collective centre in Vranje and provide housing solutions to IDPs/refugees in line with the national strategy\(^2\). Given the current stalemate in Belgrade and Kragujevac, however, the contribution of the project to these objectives is likely to be reduced.

24. *Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.*

Not mentioned

25. *Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?*

No

### VI. Sustainability

26. *Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?*

There is no visible result yet.

\(^2\) National Strategy For Resolving Problems Of Refugees And Internally Displaced Persons For The Period From 2011 To 2014
27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results?
Municipalities have committed to maintain the buildings.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
IPA 2014 includes an Action Document for further support to refugees and IDPs

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
N/A

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
Help considers that needs are still great in informal collective centres, where there is a mixed population of refugees/IDPs and other social-disadvantaged groups. There is also a need for economic support to ensure that housing solutions are complemented with jobs and/or income-generating activities.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The efficiency of the project has been low since the beginning of the project. This is mostly due to the fact that the call resulted in overlapping proposals, which meant that the project had to be refocused before it started. The reason is that the situation with IDPs/refugees is evolving continually. From the time of the design of the programme (under which the call is launched) to the start of the project, many refugees/IDPs have found a solution. As a result, there are more housing solutions offered by grantees than households left in collective centres. Hence, the need to refocus the project on informal centres and new municipalities. This however resulted in significant delays which have knock-on effects on all other activities.

Another issue is the weak commitment of larger municipalities (Belgrade and Kragujevac) to solve the problem given the lack of suitable construction plots.
Help is doing its best to find alternative solutions together with the EUD and the Commissariat for Refugees. Given that the process of selection of beneficiaries/preparation of application and the issuance of necessary permits for the construction works are time-consuming, there is a risk that the project will not achieve all its targets within the time allocated.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 02/10/14   | 15.00| Help office, Belgrade | Anna Molnar, Deputy Programme Coordinator  
                      Milka Djurdjevic, Project Coordinator  
                      Andrej Terzic, Programme Coordinator |
| 24/10/14   | 09:00| Kragujevac    | Vladan Jovanovic, City Council Member in charge of Social Policy & Child Care  
                      Nikola Ribaric, Secretary for Health, Social Policy & Child Care  
                      Andrej Terzic, Help Programme Coordinator  
                      Dragomir Spasic, Help Grant Officer |
|            | 10:30| Kragujevac    | Potential beneficiaries of pre-fabricated houses  
                      Zoran Pavlovic, Roma representative  
                      Andrej Terzic, Help Programme Coordinator |
Dragomir Spasic, Help Grant Officer
Municipality of Batocina

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 25/10/2014

Project Identification

Programme name: Refugees & IDPs
Call for proposals: Support to the improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of collective centers
Contract number: 2013/336-711
Contract name: Integration of refugees and IDPs in the municipality of Batocina
Beneficiary: Municipality of Batocina
Contract total: € 93,406.74
Contract amount EU: € 83,132
Co-financing: 89%
Contract start date: 03/02/2014
Contract end date: 02/02/2016
Contract duration: 12 months

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

Overall objective
Improving the position of refugees and IDPs in the municipality of Batocina

Specific objective
1. Improving the living conditions of IDPs and refugees;
2. Economic empowerment of refugee and IDP families

Expected results
- R1: 15 refugee and IDP families permanently resolved the issue of housing,
- R2: 9 refugee and IDP families improved the standard of living by starting their own business

Main outputs
- 15 refugee and IDP families that received the construction material packages and conducted construction works on their objects
- 9 refugee and IDP families who are economically empowered by obtaining income or agro packages and who have started business or established agricultural households.
- 12 persons from 9 refugee and IDP families will successfully complete the training on starting and managing business or agricultural households.

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?
Yes, the project proposal is well drafted. All activities lead to results, which lead to objectives. There are clear outputs identified at result-specific objective levels but not at overall objective level. It would have been good to make a link to the objectives and targets of the local action plan in the project logframe. As a result, it is not easy to understand to what extent is the project contributing to solving the situation of refugees and IDPs in the municipality of Batocina. Moreover, the exact number of refugees and IDPs in the municipality is not clear. It is estimated that there are 1,000 of them left. The number is reducing over time as people gradually integrate into the society.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?
The project logic is clear and easy to understand

3. Are there clear OVIs?
There clear OVIs but none is define at the overall objective level i.e. which should have made a link to the local plan for refugees & IDPs

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives
The project is providing housing solutions and improving income and standards of refugees and IDPs in line with the objectives of the call.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?
The project helps some of the local refugees & IDPs acquire decent housing conditions and gain a way of living

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?
Yes.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?
The project is progressing well but activities are delayed compared to the proposed implementation plan and there is a serious risk that the last activities will require more time than is now available to the project. The applicant has set up the selection commission in charge of selecting the final beneficiaries i.e. either families in need of housing support (type 1 building materials) or families eager to start an economic activity (type 2 grants for economic empowerment). According to the Guidelines for Applicants, only IDPs are eligible applicants for income-generation grants. However, the municipality the call was first opened to refugees. This contravened the guidelines for applicants which specify that economic empowerment grants should only be for IDPs (it was later clarified with the EUD and the Commissariat that refugees could also be eligible but only if it could be proved that no IDPs needed support in the municipality. This was not the case in Batocina). The call was suspended when the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration was informed about it.

The public call was renewed on 25 June, 2014 on the internet/municipal board to inform the target group about the opportunities under the project. The call could not be launched earlier because the grantee was waiting for the regulation from the Commissariat (obtained on July 1). 20 type-1 applications and 11 type-2 applications were received by the deadline in August 15, 2014. The grantee and its partner carried out field visits in order to check the eligibility and estimate needs of applicants. It was agreed with the EUD that the project would finance all applications as their overall
estimated costs were within the total available budget. Applications were scored by the selection commission based on criteria defined in the regulation. The final list was sent in late July to the Commissariat of Refugees which only granted its approval after two applicants were removed from the list, allegedly because they had already received financial help in the past (from UNHCR and Vision). The grantee objected that the poor housing conditions of the two applicants justified their selection. The issue resulted in further delay. The list of selected beneficiaries (18+9) with respective scores was published on the municipal information board in September. Two tenders have been launched (one for type 1 and another for type 2 grants) and are currently being evaluated. The fact that Serbian procurement rules are being applied means that the procedure is lengthier. Delivery of materials should start in late November 2014 after signature of contracts between the project and the selected contractors and the municipality and the final beneficiaries. Given that the winter season is starting this could endanger the timely completion of project activities (in particular, monitoring of works performed by the selected families) by the project end date of 2 February 2015.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?

Overall, the project is well managed despite some issues which were resolved. The responsible municipal and partner staff is well aware of their responsibilities and the demands of the project. The project is monitored by Eptisa which is in regular contact with the beneficiary providing useful advice and guidance.

However, given that the project deadline is nearing, the evaluator suggests that the grantee should request an extension of the project duration of at least three months in order to ensure the completion of activities as originally planned in the proposal.

The project does not have a budget line for training the beneficiaries of economic empowerment grant. It was recommended to use expected savings from the construction materials/supplies to ensure that this is activity is carried out in line with the proposal.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?

EUR 14,000 or 16% of the total allocation

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

No. The Municipality applied Serbian procurement rules.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

No but an addendum for extending the project deadline is very likely

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

Yes

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

Yes.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

The project has developed the main visibility tools in line with EU guidelines (posters, bags, etc.)

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

Eptisa is providing general guidance and support

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

No
### IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

No, not yet. The project is likely to achieve its results provided an extension of project duration is granted to ensure completion of all activities.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

Final beneficiaries will benefit from improved housing and living conditions.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

There is a good cooperation between the applicant and its partner (NGO Viktorija)

### V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

The grant is helping the municipality improve the living conditions of refugees & IDPs and stimulate their integration but it does not transform the way the municipality is otherwise operating in this field. For example, support for business start-up is not part of the regular policy tools for refugees & IDPs.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

N/A

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Regarding the housing component, the project is helping the target group meet some of their needs but it does not solve the precariousness of their life (low wages, job insecurity, undeclared work, etc.). The economic empowerment component is more likely to deliver long-term impact.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Yes, it does help to improve the situation of refugees & IDPs in line with the objectives of the national strategy for resolving problems of refugees and IDPs (“to offer help and concrete solutions to all the refugees and IDPs in order for them to be able to independently decide on their future”)

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

Yes, it is linked to other activities, in particular support from the Commissariat of Refugees and other donor-funded initiatives

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

No. The municipality is otherwise addressing the issue through support from the Commissariat of Refugees, social work and other donor-funded initiatives.

### VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

The housing component is temporarily improving the living conditions of final beneficiaries, whose
lifestyle remains often precarious. The income generating component will have a more long-term impact enabling recipients to start an economic activity and break dependence on social welfare support. However, the fact that many IDPs from Kosovo are eligible to monthly cash benefits (if they were employed in the public sector) as long as they are not engaged into entrepreneurial activities means that support was only granted to support subsistence agriculture (bee-keeping, greenhouse) which is compatible with the cash benefits.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results
The sustainability of housing repairs falls on the final beneficiaries which may not have sufficient resources to maintain their dwelling in the long-run without further support. The sustainability of the economic activity initiated thanks to economic empowerment grant will depend on the success of the business idea. From this point of view, the applicant would have preferred to have more resources for business start-up activities than housing repairs.
The municipality otherwise help disadvantaged groups through social welfare and unemployment support but it has no funding for income-generating activities.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
Not for the time being

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
N/A

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
The municipality is considering applying to other grant schemes.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?
The project is overall satisfactorily managed except for one or two hiccups. The selection of beneficiaries was done in line with the criteria indicated in the regulation although a first call for proposals had to be suspended (because of wrongly including refugees into eligible target groups for income-generation grants). The project is on its way to achieve its results. However, it is unfortunate that the beneficiary did not foresee more time for implementation when designing the project (Batocina is one of the two shortest projects under lot 3). It is now clear that the project will need a few additional weeks to complete activities and that a no-cost extension will be mostly likely required.
If completed successfully, the project will contribute to the implementation of the local action plan (LAP) for Batocina’s refugees and IDPs although it is not clear to which extent i.e. the applicant was unable to link the project outputs/results to the plan’s targets.
While housing support is certainly needed and contributes to improving the living conditions of the target group, it is temporary by nature. The economic empowerment grants are more likely to have a lasting impact but their number is not sufficient to modify significantly the economic situation of the refugees and IDPs in Batocina. Moreover, the economic environment in Batocina is hard for all categories of citizens.
VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24/10/14| 12:00 | Batocina, Municipal Office | Radiša Milošević, Mayor  
Milos Nedic, Project Manager NGO Viktorija  
Jasmina Mladenovic, Coordinator  
Radmila Milutinovic, Finance Manager  
Darko Ignjatovic, Agriculture attaché  
Lazar Zivadić, Trustee for Refugees |
| 24/10/14| 13:30 | Batocina               | Selected beneficiary family for reconstruction materials  
Selected beneficiary family for business start-up grant                       |
Municipality of Ruma

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Paul Georis
Date: 20/10/2014

Project Identification

Programme name: Refugees & IDPs
Call for proposals: Support to the improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of collective centers
Contract number: 2013336-774
Contract name: Improving living conditions, building livelihoods: comprehensive assistance to IDPs in Ruma
Beneficiary: Municipality of Ruma
Contract total: € 107,607.31
Contract amount EU: € 95,770.5
Co-financing: 89%
Contract start date: 03/02/2014
Contract end date: 02/02/2016
Contract duration: 24 months

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

Overall objective
To contribute to durable solutions of forced migrants in Serbia, thus contributing to implementation of the National Strategy for Resolving the Problems of Refugees and IDPs.

Specific objective
To improve living conditions and increase opportunities for sustainable livelihoods of refugee and IDP families in Ruma municipality

Expected results
- R1: Resolved urgent housing issues of the most vulnerable refugee and IDP families (80% of the target group)
- R2: Increased capacities for sustainable income generating of selected 20% of the target group
- R3: Empowered members of the target group for active approach in pursuing durable solutions
- R4: Increased awareness of the needs of forced migrants

Main outputs
- 24 refugee families/households received and utilized grants in building material (R1)
- 6 beneficiary households received and utilized grants for income generating activities (R2)
- at least 50% more motivated and active in solving everyday issues (R3)
- at least 5 stakeholders involved in activities (R4)

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs
and activities?

Yes, the project proposal is well drafted. There are clear outputs identified at result/specific objective levels but not at overall objective level. It would have been good to make a link to the objectives and targets of the local action plan in the project logframe. As a result, it is not easy to understand to what extent the project is contributing to solving the situation of refugees and IDPs in the municipality of Ruma. Moreover, the exact number of refugees and IDPs in the municipality is not clear. There were 16,000 of them in the early 90’s and it is estimated that there are 5,000 of them left.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

The project logic is clear and easy to understand

3. Are there clear OVIs?

There clear OVIs but none is define at the overall objective level i.e. which should have made a link to the local plan for refugees & IDPs

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

The project is providing housing solutions and improving income and standards of refugees and IDPs in line with the objectives of the call.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

The project helps some of the local refugees & IDPs acquire decent housing conditions and gain a way of living

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The project is on track: the applicant has set up the selection commission in charge of selecting the final beneficiaries i.e. either families in need of housing support (type 1 assistance in building materials) or families eager to start an economic activity (type 2 grants for economic sustainability). Two public calls were published in July 15, 2014 on the internet to inform the target group about the opportunities under the project. A local team of social worker/civil engineer/psychologist was recruited under the project. The team carried out information visits in order to stimulate application among the most vulnerable refugees/IDPs. 84 type-1 applications and 25 type-2 applications were received by the deadline in August 15, 2014. Type-1 applications have been already scored by the selection commission. The scoring is based on criteria defined in the regulation issued by the Commissariat for Refugees and the field report completed by the local team, which checks whether the data submitted by applicants are correct and scores each application. 16 type-2 applications have been pre-selected on the basis of the business plan. Fields visits have been carried out for 60 type-1 applications. All field visits will be completed by the end of October. The selection commission will establish the final list of the 24 type-1 applications and the 6 type-2 applications. The list will be sent to the Commissariat of Refugees for endorsement in November. One supply tender will be organized for each type of projects in December. Delivery of materials and works will take place in 2015.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
The project seems well managed. The responsible municipal staff is well aware of their responsibilities and the demands of the project. The project is monitored by Eptisa which is in regular contact with the beneficiary providing advice and useful guidance. Support might be required with some management tasks (e.g. reporting as the applicant was not aware of the financial report template). The selection of type-2 projects is made without using a scoring grid. As a result, the selection is not fully transparent. The evaluator suggested that the selection commission should use a scoring grid as it is done for type 1 application.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
About 10,000 Euros i.e. 10% of the total eligible costs

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No procurement to date.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
No

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Application bags have been distributed to potential applicants in line with EU visibility guidelines.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Eptisa is providing general guidance and support.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
No

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
No, not yet but the project is on track and likely to achieve its results.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
Final beneficiaries will benefit from improved housing and living conditions.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
N/A

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?
Besides the experience gained in managing donor-funded grant project (a first time for the municipality), there appears to be no other expected change regarding the way the municipality tackles refugees & IDPs.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>22. Is the project likely to result in major socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.</strong></td>
<td>Regarding the housing component, the project is helping the target group meet some of their needs but it does not solve the precariousness of their life (low wages, job insecurity, undeclared work, etc.). The income generating component is more likely to have a higher impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.</strong></td>
<td>Yes, it does help to improve the situation of refugees &amp; IDPs in line with the objectives of the national strategy for resolving problems of refugees and IDPs (“to offer help and concrete solutions to all the refugees and IDPs in order for them to be able to independently decide on their future”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.</strong></td>
<td>Yes, it is linked to other activities, in particular support from the Commissariat of Refugees, the Regional Housing Programme (of which Ruma is a recipient) and other donor-funded initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?</strong></td>
<td>No. The municipality is otherwise addressing the issue through support from the Commissariat of Refugees, the Regional Housing Programme (of which Ruma is a recipient, 71 housing units) and other donor-funded initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?</strong></td>
<td>The housing component is temporarily improving the living conditions of final beneficiaries, whose lifestyle remains often precarious. The income generating component will have a more long-term impact enabling recipients to start an economic activity and break dependence on social welfare support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results</strong></td>
<td>The sustainability of housing repairs falls on the final beneficiaries which may not have sufficient resources to maintain their dwelling in the long-run without further support. The sustainability of the economic activity initiated thanks to income-generating grant will depend on the success of the business idea. From this point of view, the applicant would have preferred to have more resources for income-generating activities than housing repairs. The municipality otherwise help disadvantaged groups through social welfare and unemployment support but it has no funding for income-generating activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?</strong></td>
<td>Not for the time being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?</strong></td>
<td>The municipality is considering applying to other grant schemes. It is particularly interested in income-generating support for disadvantaged groups of citizens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project is on track and well-managed. The applicant has a good knowledge of the target group with which it works for almost two decades and support is likely to be directed to those most in need. The project will contribute to the implementation of the local action plan to improve the situation of Ruma’s population of refugees and IDPs. While housing support is certainly needed and contributes to improving the living conditions of the target group, it is temporary by nature. The income-generating grants are more likely to improve the situation of their beneficiaries over the long run but their number is not sufficient to have a real impact on the economic situation of the target population. Moreover, the economic environment in Ruma is hard for all categories of citizens.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15/10/14 | 13:00 | Municipality of Ruma | Dejan Ivošević, Project Manager  
Biljana Damljanovic - coordinator assistant  
Dusan Barac - financial manager  
Tanja Peric - office for refugees and migrations of the Municipality of Ruma  
Čila Stojanovic - field associate |
| 15/10/14 | 15:00 | Municipality of Ruma | Selected beneficiary of housing reconstruction materials  
Biljana Damljanovic - coordinator assistant  
Čila Stojanovic - field associate |
3. Mental Health

Caritas Sabac

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: Mental Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call for proposals:</th>
<th>Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>11SER01/11/21/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Support to prevention of residential treatment of persons with mental and intellectual disorders in Mačvanski County through development of community-based home and day care services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Caritas Sabac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>167,321.48 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>141,386.65 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>24/06/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1 – &quot;Support pluralism of social care providers to lower the risk of mentally vulnerable becoming institutionalized &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Support to prevention of residential treatment of persons with mental disorders in Mačvanski County through development of home care and day centre services&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2 – “Maximize community integration of people with mental illnesses and intellectual disabilities&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3 – &quot;To sustain long term political will in order to make community care more the norm&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1 – &quot;Human and infrastructural capacities of project applicants built for delivery of new community-based services&quot;</td>
<td>A1.1 – &quot;Vocational Training for 15 people in home care through Italian model of OSS (operatore socio sanitario) &quot; (R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.2 – &quot;Vocational Training on community mental welfare of 20 professionals in Sabac&quot; (R1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.3 – A manual on integrated assistance in mental health care
A1.4 – "Renovation of an object for Day care centre" (R1)
A1.5 – "Creation of protocol on multi-sectorial cooperation and co-payment scale " (R1)
A1.6 – "Study visit to Italy for 8 people on multi-sectorial cooperation in community care" (R1)

R2 – " New home care and day care centre services for people with mental disorders successfully delivered and monitored"
A2.1 – "Delivery of welfare services at Day care centre during 12 months " (R2)
A2.2 – "Delivery of home care services during 12 months " (R2)
A2.3 – "Instructional coaching on home care and day centre welfare services"(R2)

R3 – " New social services of Caritas Sabac better communicated and promoted at all levels"
A3.1 – "Promotional Campaign on new local welfare services"(R3)
A3.2 – "Creation of promotional video on new Caritas Sabac services"(R3)
A3.3 – "Conference on innovative models and best practices in community care for 50 people "(R3)

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?
The Project proposal and logframe is very well drafted with articulated project logic.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?
It is easy to understand the project logic.

3. Are there clear OVIs?
OVIs are clear and SMART.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals' objectives
The project is very relevant to the Call’s objectives and goes in line with the overall work towards diversification of community based services and prevention of institutionalization of people with mental illnesses and intellectual disabilities.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?
The project is relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries, particularly in terms of offering new home care and day care centre services for people with mental disorders.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?
The selection of project seems justified.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?
The project is in initial stage of implementation. The central activity at this stage has been identification of the suitable space for the day center. CARITAS initially planned to renovate the space in the central
8. *Is the project well managed and monitored?*
   The project is well managed. Monitoring of the project is conducted by the PMU.

9. *How much of the grant is disbursed?*
   The organization received pre-financing of 74.37%, and until the time of the evaluation 3.62% was spent.

10. *Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?*
    There were no procurement issues. The PMU contested CARITAS in terms of fulfilling standards for location, accessibility and adequacy of proposed solutions.

11. *Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.*
    No addendum.

12. *Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?*
    There is sufficient staff to manage and implement the project.

13. *Are the activities achieving value for money?*
    So far, it is expected that the activities will achieve the value for money.

14. *Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?*
    Too early to assess.

15. *Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?*
    The Project is monitored by the PMU established for this scheme.

16. *Is there any issue with the co-financing?*
    Too early to assess.

**IV. Effectiveness**

17. *Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?*
    Too early to assess.

18. *How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences*
    Too early to assess.

19. *Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?*
    Caritas adequately involves its partners.

**V. Impact**

20. *Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?*
    Too early to assess.

21. *Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?*
    Too early to assess.

22. *Is the project likely to result in major socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and*
### Evaluation of Grant Contracts Implemented and Financed by IPA and EIDHR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.</td>
<td>The Project is part of the overall Mental health grant scheme and it cooperates with other initiatives towards advocating and finding solutions for community based services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

CARITAS Sabac has extensive experience and strong team to work on organization of community based services, which is a good prerequisite for implementation of the project.
Creative Educational Centre - KEC

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: Mental Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call for proposals:</th>
<th>Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>11SER01/11/21/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Community based services and employment for people with intellectual disabilities as well as those with mental disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Creative Educational Centre - KEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>63,729.20 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>54,169.82 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>85 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>13/06/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the prevention of institutionalization, improvement of social inclusion and quality of life for people with intellectual disabilities (PID) and people with mental disorders (PMD) and those with both (PID+PMD).</td>
<td>Implementing community - based services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Improving the existing Daily centre for PID and establishing a new one for PMD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Establishing Respite care service (RCS) for PID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Establishing work engagement and employment program for PID and PMD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Established daily centre for PMD-PID and Respite Care Service for PID;</td>
<td>1. Preparation for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professionals trained to establish capacity building for PID - PMD in order to prepare them for work on the open labour market.</td>
<td>2. Realization of two roundtables with media coverage to promote and inform the public about PID - PMD’s right and need to include to the society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Implemented capacity building program for PID and PMD in order to prepare them for work on the open labour market.

5. PID and PMD work engaged or employed.

6. A more integrated business environment that provides equal opportunities for PID - PMD including those that are not included under the current employment legislation.

7. Satisfied needs and improved quality of life for PID - PMD, and their family members.

4. Implementation of Respite Care Service (RCS)

5. Work placement and employment of PID- PMD on the open labour market.

6. Activities centred on project visibility.

7. Monitoring and evaluation of the project.

---

**I. Conceptual Design**

1. *Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?*

   The Project proposal and logframe are clear and have well articulated framework.

2. *Is it easy to understand the project logic?*

   It is easy to understand the project logic.

3. *Are there clear OVIs?*

   OVIs are clear at all levels. The overall objective indicators could benefit from better definition.

---

**II. Relevance**

4. *How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives*

   The project is very relevant to the Call’s objectives and goes in line with the government’s legislative solutions for PID and PM.

5. *How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?*

   The project is very relevant and targets well the needs and priorities of the PID, PMD and their families. Maintaining and improving deinstitutionalized services for the target groups offers good alternative to established public practices of caring for these groups and empowers the beneficiaries to take more active role in society. The services offered in KEC go well hand in hand with efforts to ensure employment for these groups, which is important step forward to empowerment and resocialisation of PID and PMD.

6. *Does the selection of the project seem justified?*

   The selection of project seem very justified.

---

**III. Efficiency**

7. *Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?*

   The Project has conducted all preparatory activities envisaged for the inception phase. The team of professionals has been strengthened by two nurses and 12 workshop leaders. Seminars for professionals were also implemented within preparatory activities. The Respite center has been established for PID, PMD and it is being used. Besides, the project already implements workshops to build capacities of PID/PMD beneficiaries for work placement and employment on the open labour market. The KEC is preparing the promotional material for its activities. The Center also started its
preparatory work for submission of request for licencing the social services implemented.
The Project faced challenges in strengthening relations with the partner, Clinic for mental disorders “Dr Laza Lazarević, Belgrade” at the beginning of the project, resulting in signing a very general MoU. The new management of the clinic has facilitated improvement of the relations, and better agreement on interventions and approaches to be taken.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
The project is well managed. Monitoring of the project is conducted by the PMU.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
The organization received pre-financing of 80%, and until the time of the evaluation 18.86% was spent.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No issues with procurement of ineligible costs.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
No addendum.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
There is sufficient staff to manage and implement the project.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
So far, it is expected that the activities will achieve the value for money.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Too early to assess.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
The Project is monitored by the PMU established for this scheme.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
Too early to assess.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
Too early to assess.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
The focus group with beneficiaries shows great appreciation of the activities implemented within the Center and all beneficiaries shared their positive experiences with the Centre. The beneficiaries state that the creative activities organized in the center are helping them to empower themselves and become more engaged and included in the society. Particularly the drama workshops have been praised. The beneficiaries also highlight the Centre’s efforts to link them with the labour market. Some of the beneficiaries have succeeded in finding employment and keeping it.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
There have been issues in partnering with the Clinic (as mentioned above), but the issues are being solved by the new management.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a
result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?
Too early to assess.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?
Too early to assess.

22. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.
Too early to assess.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.
Too early to assess.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.
The Project is part of the overall Mental health grant scheme and it cooperates with other initiatives towards advocating and finding solutions for deinstitutionalization of social services for PID and PMD.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?
Too early to assess.

### VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible/likely to last?
Too early to assess.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results?
Too early to assess.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
Too early to assess.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
Too early to assess.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
Too early to assess.

### VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The Project is still in its initial stage. It has already implemented a number of activities and achieved first outputs.

The Center should conduct detailed analysis and costing of its services per person, which will help them establish good budgetary framework. This will assist the licensing process.
Institution Sveti Vasilije Ostroski Cudotvorac

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: Mental Health

Call for proposals: Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness

Contract number: 11SER01/11/21/28
Contract name: Independent community-based living for people with mental disability and mental health disorders in the Municipality of Novi Becej
Beneficiary: Institution Sveti Vasilije Ostroski Cudotvorac
Contract total: 212,368.13 €
Contract amount EU: 178,028.20 €
Co-financing: 83.83 %
Contract start date: 02/07/2014
Contract end date: 18 months

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

Overall objective | Specific objective

O1 – "To contribute to enhancing the social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental health disorders in Serbia"
O2 – "To improve the quality of life for people with mental disability and mental health disorders in Serbia"

SO1 – "Support of de-institutionalisation of persons with mental disability and mental health disorders in Residential Institution “Sveti Vasilije Ostroski Cudotvorac” in Novi Becej Municipality";
SO2 – “Preventing institutionalisation and separation from families for persons with mental disability and mental health disorders in Novi Becej Municipality”;
SO3 – “Raising the level of awareness of local communities about the needs of persons with mental disability and mental health disorders, and their families, in Novi Becej Municipality”.

Expected results | Main activities

R1 – “Set up the units for independent community-based living for persons with mental disability and mental health disorders in Novi Becej Municipality”

A1.1 – "Setting up the units for independent community-based living" (R1)
A1.1.1 Ensuring the necessary construction permits,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Area</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.1.2</td>
<td>Preparation and opening of tender for buying the prefabricated houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.1.3 Installation of prefabricated houses and setting up the infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.2 Selection of 2 houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.2.1 Adaptation of 2 houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.2.2 Equipping the houses with furniture and appliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 – “15 newly employed caretakers and occupational professionals”</td>
<td>A2.1 – “Relocation of 16 residents from Residential Institution “Sveti Vasilije Ostroski Cudotvorac” to independent community-based living units” (R2, R3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2.1.1 Selection of the residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2.1.2 Preparing the residents for relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2.1.3 Selection and employing of 15 caretakers and occupational professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2.1.4 Providing community-based service to the residents at the independent community-based living units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 - “Enhanced quality of life for 16 persons who are transferred from institution to independent community-based living units”</td>
<td>A3.1 - “Launching local mobile team unit for providing support and preventing the separation from family care for persons with mental disability and mental health disorders” (R4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3.1.1 Establishing the cooperation with health and social institutions at local level (MoU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3.1.2 Selection of the members for the mobile team unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3.1.3 Developing the activity plan of the mobile team unit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3.1.4 Delivering the mobile team unit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3.1.5 Regular meeting of the mobile team unit on a monthly basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 - “Launched local mobile team unit for providing support and preventing separation from family care for persons with mental disability and mental health disorders in the Municipality Novi Becej”</td>
<td>A4.1 - “Public campaign about the needs of persons with mental disability and mental health disorders in Novi Becej Municipality” (R5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4.1.1 Developing the plan of public campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4.1.2 Designing, printing, and distributing promotional material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4.1.3 Holding press conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4.1.4 Implementing community promotional actions (door-to-door, special events, media appearance, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R5 – “Raised level of awareness of local
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>communities on the needs of persons with mental disability and mental health disorders in Novi Becej Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

   The Project proposal and the logframe are clear and well defined.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

   It is easy to understand the project logic.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

   OVIs are clear and strong.

### II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

   The project is very relevant to the Call’s objectives and goes in line with the overall work towards deinstitutionalization of people with mental illnesses and their resocialisation in local community.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

   The project is relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries, especially in terms of offering community based living unit and mobile team services, as well as awareness raising activities for destigmatisation of beneficiaries.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

   The selection of project seems justified.

### III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

   The project is in initial stage of implementation. So far, the Project succeeded in ensuring municipality approval for use of the land for needs of the community based living units. This approval assisted ensuring construction permit. The construction starts in November, to add to the unit that is already under construction.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?

   The project is well managed. Monitoring of the project is conducted by the PMU.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?

   The organization received pre-financing of 78.12%, and until the time of the evaluation 29.9% was spent.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

    No issues with procurement of ineligible costs.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

    No addendum.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

    There is sufficient staff to manage and implement the project.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

    So far, it is expected that the activities will achieve the value for money.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

    Too early to assess.
15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

The Project is monitored by the PMU established for this scheme.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

Too early to assess.

**IV. Effectiveness**

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

Too early to assess.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

Too early to assess.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

N/A

**V. Impact**

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Too early to assess.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Too early to assess.

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Too early to assess.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Too early to assess.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

The Project is part of the overall Mental health grant scheme and it cooperates with other initiatives towards advocating and finding solutions for community based services.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Too early to assess.

**VI. Sustainability**

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Too early to assess.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Too early to assess.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
Too early to assess.

29. *Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?*
Too early to assess.

30. *What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?*
Too early to assess.

**VII. Conclusions & findings**

*What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?*

The Project has started on good terms and the construction of units is going as planned.
Serbian Association for promoting Inclusion -SAPI

*Project Evaluation Report*

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic  
Date: November 2014

**Project Identification**

**Programme name: Mental Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call for proposals:</th>
<th>Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>11SER01/11/21/48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Towards living in the community and further: supported housing for persons with intellectual and other disabilities in Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Serbian Association for promoting Inclusion -SAPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>168,066.21 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>142,856.28 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Co-financing:** 85 %  
**Contract start date:** 13/06/2014  
**Contract end date:**  
**Contract duration:** 15 months

**Project Summary**  
*Brief description of objectives, results, and activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To contribute to the improvement of social inclusion of persons with intellectual and other disabilities through development and improvement of the supported housing service for persons with disabilities in Serbia, in accordance with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020 and the Law on Social Welfare of the Republic of Serbia (2011).</td>
<td>De-institutionalisation and prevention of institutionalisation of 30 persons with intellectual and other disabilities by improving and providing the sustainable functioning of the supported housing service for persons with disabilities in Belgrade 2014-15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected results**  
**Main outputs**

| R1 - Provided continuity of using the supported housing service for 22 persons with intellectual and other disabilities, who were de-institutionalised from Home in Sremčica; | A1.1. Creating the Project team and Project team meetings (R1-R8)  
A1.2. Renovation of apartments and technical preparation for offering service (R1, R2)  
A1.3. Informing, choosing and preparation of new beneficiaries (R2, R4) |
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| R2 - Increased availability of the service – new 8 persons with intellectual and other disabilities have started using the service; | A2.1. Educating the assistants according to an accredited programme (R1, R2, R3)  
A2.2. Continuous staff education (R3) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3 - Improved quality of the supported housing service, as well as the quality of work of SAPI as a service provider and provided sustainable functioning and realisation of the service;</td>
<td>A3.1. Researching the needs and possibilities for establishing the service – producing a study (R5, R6, R8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R4 - Increased level of integration into the community of 30 persons with intellectual disabilities through providing the supported housing service; | A4.1. Preparation for providing SH service (R2, R4)  
A4.2. Providing housing service (R1, R2, R4)  
A4.3. Providing support in everyday activities (R1, R2, R4)  
A4.4. Providing self-advocacy support (R1, R2, R4)  
A4.5. Supported employment (R1, R2, R4) |
| R5 - Established Network of service providers for persons with disabilities on a national level; | A5.1. Networking-meeting with network members (R5, R7, R8)  
A5.2. Networking-Formation of a National network of service providers (R5)  
A5.3. Creation of an action plan for establishing the service (R6, R7) |
| R6 - The Action plan for the development of the supported housing service was created and proposed to the decision makers; | A6.1. Presence in the media (R1-R8)  
A6.2. Leaflets (R2, R4, R8)  
A6.3. Publication (R5, R6, R7, R8)  
A6.4. Round table (R5, R6, R7, R8)  
A6.5. Press conference (R5, R6, R7, R8) |
| R7 - A good practise model regarding the development of the supported housing was created and promoted on a local level. | A7.1. Supervision (R3, R7)  
A7.2. Monitoring (R1-R8)  
A7.3. Evaluation (R1-R8) |
| R8 - A dialogue of all interested stakeholders regarding possibilities for further implementation and expanding of the supported housing service was created. | |
The project is very relevant and targets well the needs and priorities of persons with intellectual, mental and other disabilities. SAPI has been offering and maintaining deinstitutionalized services for their beneficiaries throughout their work, and this project continues the programmes and practices and extends them to larger group of beneficiaries. The services are targeting persons who have prerequisites and willingness to socialize and integrate in the society, with support by professionals who make this integration happen though care, mentorship and follow up. Such services are empowering and have positive effects on the target groups.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?
The selection of project seems very justified.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

As already mentioned, the Project is continuation and extension of strategic activities of the organization towards ensuring deinstitutionalized services to larger number of persons with intellectual, mental and other disabilities. So far, the project has implemented ongoing support and care of already deinstitutionalized persons. At the same time, the Project is working on identification of further group of beneficiaries and space for settling these persons in deinstitutionalized setting.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?
The project is well managed. Monitoring of the project is conducted by the PMU.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?
The organization received pre-financing of 78.79%, and until the time of the evaluation 0% was spent.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No issues with procurement of ineligible costs.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
No addendum.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
There is sufficient staff to manage and implement the project.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?
So far, it is expected that the activities will achieve the value for money.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Too early to assess.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
The Project is monitored by the PMU established for this scheme.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
Too early to assess.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
Too early to assess.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
Interview with a group of beneficiaries of the project show positive effects and impacts such services have on persons with intellectual, mental and other disabilities. The beneficiaries agree that such possibility to be able to make decisions and organize their life outside of institutions is life-changing opportunity. Beneficiaries feel empowered to make decisions and to take active part in everyday life.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Public institutions are partners of the project, but there are issues with partners in terms of ensuring the space and deinstitutionalization of persons with intellectual, mental and other disabilities.

### V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Too early to assess.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Too early to assess.

22. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Too early to assess.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Too early to assess.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

The Project is part of the overall Mental health grant scheme and it cooperates with other initiatives towards advocating and finding solutions for deinstitutionalization of social services for PID and PMD.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Too early to assess.

### VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible/likely to last?

Too early to assess.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Too early to assess.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Too early to assess.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Too early to assess.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Too early to assess.
VII. Conclusions & findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Project has a strong foundation and experience with deinstitutionalization, which is a great starting point for the project. Yet, the project, in cooperation with PMU and DEU, needs to ensure more sustainable framework and system for keeping the deinstitutionalized services continually funded by the government within the legal framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential Institution for adults "Srce u Jabuci"

Project Evaluation Report
Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification
Programme name: Mental Health
Call for proposals: Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness
Contract number: 11SER01/11/21/33
Contract name: Increasing capacities for independent living in the community
Beneficiary: Residential Institution for adults "Srce u Jabuci"
Contract total: 153,160.00 €
Contract amount EU: 130,186.00 €
Co-financing: 85%
Contract start date: 17/06/2014
Contract end date: 17/06/2014
Contract duration: 18 months

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of the social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental health disorders in Serbia</td>
<td>SO1 de-institutionalisation of 8 persons with mental disability and mental health disorders in Residential Institution for adults &quot;Srce u Jabuci&quot; Jabuka, Pancevo, Republic of Serbia SO2 Raising awareness of local community about needs and difficulties of people with mental disability and mental disorders and their families and also about positive effects of community based service SO3 Preserving and enhancement of potentials of persons with mental disability and mental health disorders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1 - Built and furnished 2 units for independent community based living for 8 persons with mental disability and mental health disorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2 - 8 persons with mental disability and mental health disorder are prepared and relocated to units for independent community based living</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

The Project proposal is clear but the logframe could benefit from further strengthening.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

It is easy to understand the project logic.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

OVIs provide information on items to measure even though they could benefit from strengthening.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

The project is very relevant to the Call’s objectives and goes in line with the overall work towards deinstitutionalization of people with mental illnesses and intellectual disabilities.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

The project is relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries, especially in terms of ensuring careful transition from residential care to deinstitutionalized housing solutions.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

The selection of project seems justified.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The project is in initial stage of implementation, but at the moment of this evaluation the houses envisaged to be built are in their final stage to be finished. Site visits to the houses shows rather good work done by the project so far. Besides, transitional housing for beneficiaries to be deinstitutionalized is organized within the residential center in order to build skills of beneficiaries how to live in their own houses.
### Evaluation of Grant Contracts Implemented and Financed by IPA and EIDHR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project well managed and monitored?</td>
<td>The project is well managed. Monitoring of the project is conducted by the PMU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much of the grant is disbursed?</td>
<td>The organization received pre-financing of 73.13%, and until the time of the evaluation 40.02% was spent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?</td>
<td>No procurement issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.</td>
<td>One addendum related to contingency reserve to purchase furniture for houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?</td>
<td>There is sufficient staff to manage and implement the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the activities achieving value for money?</td>
<td>So far, it is expected that the activities will achieve the value for money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?</td>
<td>The Project is monitored by the PMU established for this scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any issue with the co-financing?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.</td>
<td>Too early to assess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
   - Too early to assess.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
   - Too early to assess.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
   - N/A

### V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?
   - Too early to assess.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?
   - Too early to assess.

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.
   - Too early to assess.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.
   - Too early to assess.
### 24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)?

**Provide evidences.**

The Project is part of the overall Mental health grant scheme and it cooperates with other initiatives towards advocating and finding solutions for community based services.

### 25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Too early to assess.

---

**VI. Sustainability**

### 26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Too early to assess.

### 27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Too early to assess.

### 28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Too early to assess.

### 29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Too early to assess.

### 30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Too early to assess.

---

**VII. Conclusions & findings**

*What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?*

The Project has been well defined and has realistic results framework. The Project is on track and is already finalizing the housing for final beneficiaries. Also, the beneficiaries are accommodated at the transitional accommodation in order to help them transition to their own houses. At the moment of finalization of this evaluation report, the Project has realistic chances of achieving its results and contributing to positive impacts on the final beneficiaries.
Hospital Dr Slavoljub Bakalovic

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: Mental Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call for proposals:</th>
<th>Support for de-institutionalisation and social inclusion of persons with mental disability and mental illness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>11SER01/11/21/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Improvement of mental health protection in Vrsac municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Hospital Dr Slavoljub Bakalovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>155,836.19 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>132,460.76 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>85 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>08/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing conditions for de-institutionalization of patients from the Special Hospital for Psychiatric diseases Vrsac, destigmatisation and social inclusion of people with mental disabilities.</td>
<td>SO1 - Creating conditions for improvement of social inclusion of the people with mental disabilities in the municipality of Vrsac, by improving preventive services that enable relocation of current hospital patients in their families and the local community SO2 - Increased awareness on importance of population’s mental health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.1 - Preparatory activities for project implementation and project management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.2 - Preparation of monitoring and evaluation plan. Monitoring of implementation of project activities and the degree of task progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1 - Preparation of monitoring and evaluation plan. Monitoring of implementation of project activities and the degree of task progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R1 - Established and fully functional MH Centre. |
| R2 - Hospital for Psychiatric diseases Vrsac released from stationary treatment to become beneficiaries of MH centre, Patients with mental disorders who benefited from daily care of the special hospital will be transferred to the MH Centre, Patients with mental disorders who are in need of daily special care but are unable and/or lack the means for daily visits to MHC will become beneficiaries of MHC mobile teams. |
I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

The Project proposal is clear. The logframe language is often unclear and there is a mix up between indicators and results.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

While it is easy to understand the project logic, the logframe would benefit from further strengthening.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

OVIs are not SMART.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

The project is very relevant to the Call’s objectives and goes in line with the overall work towards
deinstitutionalization of people with mental illnesses and their de-stigmatization and social inclusion in local community.

5. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**  
The project is relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries, especially in terms of offering out-of-institution care through Mental Health Centre and promotional activities for destigmatisation of beneficiaries.

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**  
The selection of project seems justified.

### III. Efficiency

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**  
The project is in initial stage of implementation, and initial activities towards establishment of the Mental Health Centre have been implemented.

8. **Is the project well managed and monitored?**  
The project is well managed. Monitoring of the project is conducted by the PMU.

9. **How much of the grant is disbursed?**  
The organization received pre-financing of 60.82%, and until the time of the evaluation 7.94% was spent.

10. **Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?**  
No issues with procurement of ineligible costs.

11. **Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.**  
No addendum.

12. **Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?**  
There is sufficient staff to manage and implement the project.

13. **Are the activities achieving value for money?**  
So far, it is expected that the activities will achieve the value for money.

14. **Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?**  
Too early to assess.

15. **Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?**  
The Project is monitored by the PMU established for this scheme.

16. **Is there any issue with the co-financing?**  
Too early to assess.

### IV. Effectiveness

17. **Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?**  
Too early to assess.

18. **How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences**  
Too early to assess.

19. **Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?**  
N/A
V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Too early to assess.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Too early to assess.

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Too early to assess.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Too early to assess.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

The Project is part of the overall Mental health grant scheme and it cooperates with other initiatives towards advocating and finding solutions for community based services.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Too early to assess.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Too early to assess.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Too early to assess.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Too early to assess.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Too early to assess.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Too early to assess.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The Project has started on good terms.

The main recommendation for the project team is to work on revising and strengthening the logframe of the project.
4. CBC

Public Utility Service Company "Dunis" Ub- Serbia

*Project Evaluation Report*

Written by Tanja Hafner Ademi
Date: 15th November, 2014

**Project Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>IPA Cross-border Programme Serbia-Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>IPA 2009, 2010 &amp; 2011 Cross-border Programme Serbia – Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2012/306-858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Improved waste water and environment management in the areas of Ub and Eastern Sarajevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Public Utility Service Company &quot;Dunis&quot; Ub- Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>137.498,5 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>100.593,9 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>73,16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>03.12.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>02.12.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Summary**

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve environment protection and human health through the cross border cooperation between Serbia and BiH.</td>
<td>• Promote environmental awareness on sustainable water use and protection at municipal level through the cross border cooperation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Successful implementation of joint CBC actions for reducing the negative effects of pollution on human health and environment caused from municipal sewer networks;</td>
<td>• Project management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equipment for improved maintenance of water supply and sewerage networks procured and staff trained on its use;</td>
<td>• Equipment procurement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transfer of knowledge and good practice between the Applicants demonstrated on the use of equipment and measures to improve water supply and sewerage maintenance;</td>
<td>• Study tour to each Applicant institution;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cooperation established and strengthened with Slovenian counterpart institution for transfer of knowledge and EU related</td>
<td>• Presentations and education of citizens of Ub and Eastern Sarajevo municipalities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Study visit of Applicant institutions to Slovenia;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public awareness and media campaigns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Conceptual Design

31. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

Both are well articulated, clear. The project combines so called soft (raising awareness) and hard (equipment purchase) activities which are relevant but do not equally contribute to achieving overall and specific objectives.

32. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

The project logic is clear, but the mix of soft and hard measures at the activity and result level do not lead convincingly to proposed overall and specific objectives.

33. Are there clear OVIs?

OVIs are clear, both quantitative and qualitative and targeted.

II. Relevance

34. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

Project is directly linked to maintaining the high quality of the environment of the eligible area as an economic resource by cooperating in joint protection and exploitation initiatives objective of the call for proposals.

35. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

Project is extremely relevant and practical for the citizen of Ub municipalities as it provides for improved health, safety of drinking water and treatment of waste waters in the municipalities.

36. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes.

III. Efficiency

37. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The project has been closed for 11 months. All activities have been implemented according to the implementation plan, incl regular project management activities, equipment procurement which consisted of procurement of equipment for proper waste water management. Training sessions between the Djunis and V BiH applicant Vodovod i Kanalizacija a.d. E. Sarajevo, were organized trough study tours. First study tour was in Ub Municipality, compiling training module for the staff of Djunis and was elaborating the usage of equipment for detection of losses in water supply network from experts from Vodovod i Kanalizacija a.d. E. Sarajevo. Second study tour was in E.Sarajevo, where experts from Ub were lecturing on GIS standard (network of underground water and sewer installations) to the staff from E. Sarajevo. Study tour to Slovenia took place for both Djunis and Vodovod i Kanalizacija a.d. E. Sarajevo staff at the Celje Waste Water Treatment Plant allowing for gaining knowledge on comprehensive waste water treatment. Public awareness and media campaigns included 2 media conference (on each side of
the border), final project conference which took place on 25 November 2013 and gathered 150 people. A total of 3,500 brochures and 4,000 leaflets were distributed with water consumption bills on the territory of Ub municipality. 300 project posters were spread all over municipality, 2 roll up banners were used for the final conference, and a billboard was posted in front of the waterworks company since June 2013. 200 masks for children were distributed during children masked ball to the participating children.

38. Is the project well managed and monitored?
There were at least 3 monitoring visits by JTS (the last on 19 November, 2013) and additional monitoring visit for IPA CBC Serbia project by Integration (26 February, 2014).

39. How much of the grant is disbursed?
Disbursements are in line with the contracts. Djuni is reported still waiting for final installment of 15,000 EUR, although it has been 11 months since its close. The reported problem lies with the Ministry of Finance and the delay is due to responsible staff change as a result of parliamentary elections.

40. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No.

41. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
No addendum was requested. Djuni is reported submitting a request for the use of Contingency reserve, but we did not get a response from the Contracting Authority.

42. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes. While this is the second EU-funded project for Djuni, they have used external support (firm and this time the partner CSO (association “Safe Life”) for project design and implementation. During the project, permanent Djuni staff took over effective management project and they expressed the readiness and confidence to be able to both design and manage project by themselves.

43. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes.

44. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
A total of 3,500 brochures and 4,000 leaflets were distributed with water consumption bills on the territory of Ub municipality. 300 project posters were spread all over municipality, 2 roll up banners were used for the final conference, and a billboard was posted in front of the waterworks company since June 2013. 200 masks for children were distributed during children masked ball to the participating children.

45. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Yes. Djuni is reported sufficient support from the EUD and Uzice JTC in the course of project implementation.

46. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
Djuni is a public utility company and has its own funds at disposal. They report on having an annual allocation co-financing of projects.

IV. Effectiveness

47. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
The effects of the procured equipment were directly visible at the time of monitoring visits (end of project) and have increased at the time of the evaluation. The new faecal pump installed in month 6 of the project,
resulted with 30% higher capacity and had thus direct impact on Djunis functionality. Congestion problems were decreased shortly after the pump installation. The utilization of Speed frequency pump controller ensured that the flow of rainwater mitigates disposal of faeces in the river, causing underwater pollution. The investment in equipment compensating water losses had accumulated savings of 30% in the period when measurements were conducted (last six months of the project). In line with the monitoring report, the transfer of knowledge and skills in utilizing the procured equipment was incorporated in the project activities, ensuring capacity development through cross-border partnership. High visibility and outreach insured information to citizens on improved services; however it did not directly contribute to specific objective of promoting environmental awareness on sustainable water use and protection at municipal level through the cross border cooperation.

48. **How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences**

The project is providing more safe and healthy water to approximately 30,000 citizens in Ub region, better efficiency of utilizing natural resources (drinking water). The ratio between invoiced and delivered water has in December 2012 (start of project) been at 45.9%, this has increased to 64.5% in December 2013 (end of project) or decrease in water loss by 18.6%. This is below targeted 30%, but the trend in each month is decreasing so it can be expected that the target should be reach in the coming period.

49. **Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?**

According to the monitoring report, the project teams on both side of the borders have acted in real partnership, but there was no interaction between the target groups. Vik” has had no experience in the realisation of similar projects financed by EU, while Djunis realised a project from the first call of cross-border projects between B&H-Serbia. During the realisation of the project they got an insight into procedures and administration used in the EU, and the workers who worked on the project acquired the necessary experience for further applications for similar projects and other EU funds. A good practice applied in the environmental protection in one of the EU members – Slovenia – was introduced. Also, the way of functioning of refinement of waste water plant was also introduced together with the general institutional approach in solving the problems common for these public utilities companies. The procurement of specialized equipment for maintenance of sewerage network, the level of service that PUC “Vik” Eastern Sarajevo offers, was raised to a higher level, and a higher level of health care was provided with the decreased number of accidents on sewerage system. Cooperation with association “Safe Life” from Opovo has been reported as good, but it clear that the association helped in project design and supported project management, rather than acted in true partnership.

**V. Impact**

50. **Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?**

Purchased equipment and training for their use has produced immediate and visible results and are continuing positively impacting the decrease in loss of water via sewage system as well as providing mitigation of waste water management. Comprehensive solution to overarching waste water treatment requires much larger investment, so only first step in this direction has been made through the study tour in Slovenia.
### 51. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Procurement of equipment is the reason for this change. Since Djunis is not able to buy the necessary equipment, the goal would probably not been achieved without the grant.

### 52. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Yes. The project is providing more safe and healthy water to approximately 30,000 citizens in Ub region, better efficiency of utilizing natural resources (drinking water). The ratio between invoiced and delivered water has at the end of the project decrease in water loss by 18.6%.

### 53. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Preservation of the environment is of national importance, not just a local or regional.

### 54. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

No.

### 55. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Department for detecting faults in the water supply network of Djunis was formed after the acquisition of equipment.

### VI. Sustainability

#### 56. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

In line with the monitoring reports, institutional sustainability is very high as the procured equipment became the property of Djunis, and the framework for its utilisation and maintenance has been incorporated in its workplan. The adequate levels of trained Djunis personnel would make supplementary benefit, if the roll out and training plan are incorporated in the Djunis job description. The savings arising are to be used for further capital investments, e.g. expand of the water supply network in the suburban village and include new users, new equipment, new water treatment projects etc.

The environmental aspect, however, needs to be further developed, beyond the project scope. The campaign conducted in schools indicated that raising awareness among children was one of many successful activities of the project, gaining the understanding of the environment protection in continuous manner. Djunis is considering motivating campaign for its consumers, focusing on environmental recycling and disposal which might be able to motivate the population of Ub of environmental mainstreaming throughout the year.

#### 57. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Yes. Minimal resources should be needed for equipment maintenance, while savings due to decreased loss of water could be utilize for eventual repairs of equipment, its amortization etc. However, further financial resources and time needs to be invested in awareness-raising and needs to include further local stakeholders, e.g. local authorities, schools.

#### 58. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Department for detecting faults in the water supply network of Djunis was formed after the acquisition of equipment.

#### 59. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Institutional/municipal partnership between municipalities Ub and Eastern New Sarajevo has been created through twinning cooperation memorandum between the two. Partnership with association “Safe
life” from Opovo was a pragmatic, project one and will probably not last.

60. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

The ability to conduct procurement under national legislation. Bidders would have fewer problems.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project design has been not be appropriate and any weakness is derived from its design not implementation. The project achieved expected results and has substantially contributed to reaching the overall objective. It has had very concrete and tangible results, where by the effect of purchased equipment for detection of leaks in water supply system has been able to decrease in water loss for 18,6% till the end of project. The project is providing more safe and healthy water to approximately 30,000 citizens in Ub region, better efficiency of utilizing natural resources (drinking water). The raising awareness component delivered all expected results, but it will significant further investment to contribute to sustainable water use and protection and additional/other activities might need to be included to achieve these. As a public utility company situated in rural area of Ub, Djunis has become matured in EU project implementation. While the project is not directly flood protection related, the purchase of waste water pumps was extremely useful in autumn 2014 floodings in Ub, but more needs to be done esp in appropriate fortification, emergency preparedness, early warning system and multi-stakeholder cooperation as well as purchase and installation of comprehensive waste water treatment facility to prevent leaking of waster to drinking water. Finally, project has good prospect for both institutional, financial and technical sustainability and CBC MoU has been signed with Easter New Sarajevo municipality. Djunis can be showcased as a best practice in public utility company management, use of EU-funded project and leveraging its inclusion into more strategic national project on planning an managing of natural resources.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22/10/2014 | Public Utility Service Company "Dunis" office, Ub | Zoran Sitarica, Director, Public Utility Service Company "Dunis"  
Jelena Matovic, PR and Project Coordinator |
Nature Conservation Movement of Sremska Mitrovica

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Tanja Hafner Ademi
Date: 14th November, 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: IPA Cross-border Programme Serbia-Croatia
Contract number: 2012/307-997
Contract name: Living Danube - strengthening capacities for the protection of Middle Danube ecosystems - Road to Sustainability of the Croatia - Serbia Cross Border Region
Beneficiary: Nature Conservation Movement of Sremska Mitrovica (Pokret gorana Sremske Mitrovice)
Contract total: 101,556,61 €
Contract amount EU: 119,478,37 €
Co-financing: 85%
Contract end date: 13.12.2014
Contract duration: 24 months

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Protect Danube River and other cross border natural assets at Eastern Croatia and North-Western Serbia. | • Establish cross border cooperation in protected areas management and planning processes in Danube region of Eastern Croatia (Osijek – Baranja and Vukovar - Srijem County) and North-Western Serbia (Zapadna and Juzna Bačka, Srem).  
• Increase public awareness and development capacity of local stakeholders for nature conservation and sustainable development in Danube region of Eastern Croatia and North-Western Serbia. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Increased capacity of local communities and stakeholders for sustainable use of natural resources in Eastern Croatia and North-Western Serbia;  
• Increased awareness of local communities and raised public support for nature and | • Joint action plan for Middle Danube;  
• Workshop for protected area managers, CSOs, local governments and relevant ministries from both countries;  
• Seminars for local communities;  
• Photo guide book “Danube for people and |

210
biodiversity protection in the region;
• Cross border and cross sector cooperation established in the area of Middle Danube concerning the nature protection.

nature*;
• Exhibition “15 solutions to preserve Middle Danube” - exhibitions in local communities
• Public awareness campaign
• International conference on cross border nature management

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?
Yes, both are written clearly, concise.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?
Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?
Clear, quantified, but some OVIs are unrealistic in terms of targets set and SOVs (e.g. Pollution in Middle Danube basin is 20% lower due to increased awareness about nature as development resource).

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives
Project has been targeted to the overall objective of Priority Axis 1: “To stimulate cross-border cooperation in order to diversify and improve the regional economy in a socially and environmentally sustainable way, whilst at the same time, improving good neighborly relations across the border” and contributes mostly to its 3rd specific objective: “To protect and safeguard the natural assets on the cross-border region by taking joint actions and by increasing public awareness”. It is the first comprehensive project to tackle the issue of strategic, cross-border, long-term approach to nature protection, conservation and development of the Middle Danube area (Osijek - Baranja and Vukovar - Srijem County in Croatia and Zapadna and Juzna Bačka, Srem District in Srbija).

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?
Project is relevant for both target group (national and local stakeholders responsible for nature protection and development) and final beneficiaries (citizens of targeted regions), whereby targeting establishment of cross-border cooperation initiated by environmental CSOs between institutions for long-term management of natural, mainly water resources in line with EU legislation, strategies (EU Danube Strategy and Action Plan) and standards. For citizens, the project should on the long-term provide for environmental, health and economic benefits (e.g. improvement of attraction of local tourism offer).

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?
Yes.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are they in line with the contract and the implementation plan?
Project is in its final month of implementation at the time of the evaluation. In line with the 2 regular monitoring visits performed by JTS (last on 20.06.2014) and an additional monitoring visit organized for IPA CBC Serbia projects (12.06.2014), the evaluation found all activities are being delivered as planned with smaller delays due to extended situation analysis (Analysis of legal, institutional, organizational and
socio-economic framework) in Croatia-Serbia Middle Danube region, regarding management and development of protected areas and due to extraordinary circumstances (fire at the Croatian exhibition and project management facility Eco centre Zlatna greda and flooding in the Serbian territories in May 2014). The “Situation analysis for the Action plan development has been completed, presented and discussed with 25 representatives of relevant stakeholders working on management of protected areas such as experts, CSOs, local authorities and relevant ministries from both countries at a workshop on 19 September 2013 in Sremska Mitrovica as inputs for further seminars and development of the action plan. Five informative seminars organized in Sombor, Apatin, Odžaci, Bač and Bačka Palanka between 26 November to 13 December 2013 have had the purpose of explaining to over 100 local stakeholders the concept of nature protection and sustainable development opportunities in UNESCO Biosphere reserve, and EU case studies in management of cross border natural resources. Photo guide book “Danube for people and nature” has been developed as planned, exhibition “15 solutions to preserve Middle Danube” were organized after each local seminar with at least 10 billboards installed in Serbia, 10 reports on local municipalities websites produced, 10 articles in media, 250 people visiting the exhibition. To insure project visibility and availability of information after project end, 10000 project leaflets have been printer (5000 in each language), 2 banners Middle Danube, 2 Newsletters produced and distributed and a web site designed (http://www.zeleni-osijek.hr/living-danube/).

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?

In line with all monitoring reports, not management issues have been spotted or reported by Nature Conservation Movement of Sremska Mitrovica. 3 monitoring visits have take place before evaluation finding project well implemented and on track.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?

In line with the monitoring reports, disbursement are processed in accordance with the contract (two payment requests were processed).

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

No.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

Yes. Nature Conservation Movement of Sremska Mitrovica has previous experience in managing EU funded projects as well as both the Serbian partner (Union of Ecologist -UNECO) and Croatian partners.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

Yes.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

In line with the monitoring reports, media events were adequately covered by the press and electronic media coverage (2 local TV stations were broadcasting activities of the project, several press articles were published in local newspapers, and web-portals of Sremska Mitrovica and Nature Reserve “Zasavica” introduced sections on the project and its objectives). A specific web-site has been created as one of project outputs (http://www.zeleni-osijek.hr/living-danube/) presenting the project’s activities and main objectives. According to media coverage of nature conservation problems increased for 30% incl. 33 press clippings and 600 downloads of on-line Newsletter was reported.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits)
Both the lead applicant Nature Conservation Movement of Sremska Mitrovica and the Serbian partner (Union of Ecologist - UNECO) have previous experience in managing EU funded projects so they did not report any problems as well as no problems in management were noted in 3 monitoring visits.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

Nature Conservation Movement of Sremska Mitrovica has been the manager of Zasavica nature reserve it is able to generate its own income (up to 40% of the budget), which is a stable source for co-financing of these and any other projects as well as pre-financing if needed.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

All outputs on the Serbia side of the border have been achieved. There is a delay only in the permanent installation of the exhibition “15 solutions to preserve Middle Danube” due to the fire at the Croatian exhibition and project management facility Eco centre Zlatna greda.

In line with the latest monitoring report, the project is well progressing towards the achievement of results. Project partners have been able to initiate cross border cooperation through implementation of several seminars for project managers in nature conservation, mobilising different stakeholders from government and civil society, Directorates and Public Utility Companies in exchanging experiences and opinions to address sustainable utilisation of the natural resources. During the main workshop (September 2013 in Sremska Mitrovica), the key results of the Situation Analysis were discussed, in order to use them as inputs for Seminars and Action plan. In addition, 5 informative seminars organised from the Serbian part have had the purpose of explaining local stakeholders the concept of nature protection and sustainable development opportunities in UNESCO Biosphere reserve, and EU case studies in management of cross border natural resources. Seminars were organised in Sombor, Apatin, Odžaci, Bač and Bačka Palanka, gathering more than 100 representatives of local government, NGOs, tourist organizations, fishermen’s associations and local population.

This can concretely be seen on the case of the Zasavica nature reserve which has benefited from the project in terms of its promotion, continuation of its work and long-term sustainability.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

Project increased capacity in the field of planning and sustainable use of natural resources in cross border region. In line with the latest monitoring report, project’s immediate impact is observed at the local level: capacity building activities, like Introductory workshop and local seminars, contributed in strengthening wide array of local government officials, CSOs representatives, nature managers, educational and research institutions and public utilities companies working in nature protection sector from both sides of the border. The major change should be expected in their operational actions, focusing on more efficient measures in nature protection sector, thus contributing to more effective protection of the Danube River and other cross border natural assets in the targeted region.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Yes. The project partnership on Serbian side has been genuine and the contact person for the project is at the same time the responsible person from the partner organization UNECO.
V. Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While the project is at its final stage and immediate impact to the lead applicant and partners both in terms of management and effort towards introduction and localizing EU standards and practices in nature conservation, environment protection (e.g. EC Danube Strategy, Water Directive) is evident, longer-term impact depends on how successful will they be in insuring implementation of joint action plan for Middle Danube and engagement of state and local institutions in this. Outputs, esp. joint action plan for Middle Danube. This project is providing for initial step in the direction of Serbia’s adoption and implementation of EU environmental standards in the wider Danube area (incl Sava and other Balkan region smaller waters).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia is at the start of EU negotiations, incl. alignment of environment related Acquis. Steamed from and organized from bottom-up (CSOs), this project provides for excellent local base to enable input to both negotiation and implementation of EU environment standards in the coming years taking into consideration local environment, socio-economic specificities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For example, Zasavica nature reserve employs approx. 10 full-time staff, all from surrounding area of Sremska and Macvarska Mitrovica making it an important for the local economy. Located 10 minutes from the main highway, it is able to attract substantial number of tourists from spring to autumn and week-end visits from the near-by larger cities. As part of the practical side of the curriculum and proximity esp to Belgrade and Novi sad as 2 largest cities, Serbian elementary school children are often brought to learn about nature, meet the endemic Balkan and local species, some of which are only living in the reserve is providing for long-term raising-awareness and importance of existence of nature reserve as ways to protect the nature and biodiversity. It is conclusive that at the 80% coverage of state and institution level via capacity-building and information sharing activities should contribute to improved capacities in nature resource management, ecosystem protection. In terms of flood prevention and protection, the project was probably able to highlight the importance of wetlands and nature reserves such as Zasavica as part of a nature-friendly and less-expensive (to e.g. fortification efforts) approach to long-term flood prevention and alleviation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project directly contributes to the National Strategy on Sustainable Development and National Strategy on Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and EU Danube Strategy and Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, with projects implemented by WWF concerning establishing of UNESCO Biosphere Reserve Mura Drava Danube.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

No.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible/likely to last?

Project is in final month of implementation. In line with the last monitoring report, prospects for short-term and local-level sustainability are good, while sustainability at the policy and institutional level is under question. Full scale of capacity building conducted during project, high level of ownership of wide range of stakeholders, coupled with their high accountability (awareness, understanding and proactive attitude) towards the nature preservation and requirements needed for sustaining project benefits. On the other hand, a long-term assessment takes into account the continuous lack of policy and financial support for similar type of interventions, placing viability almost exclusively under local context, and support of the local government. Such context is recognised as feasible (and gradually developed as a local brand of Sremska Mitrovica), but recent flooding affected its functioning, causing severe disruptions of eco-tourism flows due to floods in May 2014 (it is estimated that the number of visitors dropped by 90%). The water rising at the Nature Reserve has not endangered the usual tourist offer – on the contrary – it has revitalised the biodiversity and overall habitat preservation that is based on humid zones. The recent anonymous Internet rating of the Nature Reserve camping was placing it among the 10 best camping places in Europe (http://stunningplaces.net/where-to-find-the-best-camping-in-europe) –which is certainly a sound basis for further support, overcoming local boundaries.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results?

Basic outputs can be sustainable at very low cost or on voluntary level, i.e. website incl. the action plan, exhibition, project information. Since project was focused on establishing CBC cooperation, capacity building and raising-awareness, continuation of such activities strengthened with advocacy for the action plan at national level and linkage to local sustainable economic development will be needed to achieve sustainable level of results and objectives.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Follow up activities will be create in December 2014 at Follow up planning workshop organized by the Croatian partner who’s part of the project will finish in February 2015 (2 months extension).

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

It is expected to be sustainable partnership gathered around implementation and innovation of the action plan.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Investment in ecosystem restoration and adaptation to climate change, sustainable flood management.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project presents an excellent, bottom-up base and can provides the necessary input for the harmonization of EU environment Acquis to Serbia-specific needs.
Local actors, esp. CSOs need to use this as a base for advocacy for the action plan implementation at national level and link it to national/local sustainable economic development needs, e.g. implementation of National Strategy on Sustainable Development in order to insure their recommendations are implemented at local and national level taking into account local and environmental needs. Local authorizes and environment-friendly business can be an important supporter in this and the project needs to be presented also for how it economic development and nature protection can go hand in hand with showcasing examples such as is Nature reserve Zasavica in Macvarska Mitrovica. Finally, the project can take advantage of the recent floods to demonstrate how nature protection can go hand in hand in addressing long-term approaches to flood alleviation and protection.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2014</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Zasavica natural reservat, Mocvarska Mitrovica</td>
<td><strong>Marijana Bartula</strong>, Contact person, Nature Conservation Movement of Sremska Mitrovica (Pokret gorana Sremske Mitrovice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Slobodan Simic</strong>, Project Manager, Nature Conservation Movement of Sremska Mitrovica (Pokret gorana Sremske Mitrovice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jovan Vukadinovic</strong>, Managing Director, Zasavica natural reservat/ Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Water Management Company “SRBIJAVODE”

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Tanja Hafner Ademi
Date: 14th November, 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: IPA Cross-border Programme Serbia-Montenegro
Contract number: 2012/299-610
Contract name: Through Geographic Information System Towards Better Cross-Border Flood Risk Management in the Lim River Basin
Beneficiary: JVP SRBIJAVODE/Public Water Management Company “SRBIJAVODE”
Contract total: 211,627,86 €
Contract amount EU: 173,365,54 €
Co-financing: 81.92%
Contract start date: 02.10.2012
Contract end date: 01.10.2014
Contract duration: 24 months

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain the high quality of border area environment, as a relevant economic resource for both targeted countries, by developing joint, effective public institutions' systems of emergency preparedness in relation to flood prevention and control.</td>
<td>• Conduct a joint baseline research on existing water management master plans and water management legislation in the Lim river basin, provide exchange of know-how, and define recommendations for their modernization; • Conduct comprehensive capacity building of civil servants and technical enhancement of public institutions engaged in flood risk management; • Develop efficient, publicly accessible sets of services for all engaged in flood risk management; • Raise joint expert and public awareness on environmental issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

• (50 representatives of stakeholders informed on Action’s goals and results;
• 2 baseline researches on existing Water Management Master Plans (WMMP) and legislations in relation to Lim River Basin;
• Study on WMMP in the Lim River Basin;

Main outputs

• Opening Workshop;
• Baseline Research of the Lim River Basin;
• Capacity Building of Directorate for Water;
• Data Conversion and Loading for Directorate for Water;
• Cross-border Capacity Building;
I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

Both are clear, well-articulated. Formulation of expected results and activities is lacking statement on what the project is expected to do in relation to the overall and specific objective.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

Clear, both quality and quantitative but without targets or expected level of achievement.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

By developing and upgrading Geographic Information System (GIS) for the Lim river basin, which is affected yearly by frequent floods, the mitigation and prevention of consequences of floods such as economic, social damage and environmental consequences, this project directly contributes to Measure 1.1. of the call for proposal “Improving the productivity and competitiveness of the areas’ economic, rural, cultural and environmental resources”.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

Project is extremely relevant and timely for final beneficiaries (citizens in Lim river basin, local authorities, local communities, central authorities in charge for culture, spatial planning, urbanism, civic engineering, media) as it offers multi-purpose output (GIS) for planning and managing of water resources as well as a strategic, integrated and comprehensive tool that can save lives, property, health, environment in emergency situation initiating appropriate and timely response of relevant institutions.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes.

- Study visit of 3 Directorate for Water Montenegro representatives to SRBIJAVODE;
- 10 participants from Directorate for Water Montenegro trained and certified in basic GIS using;
- Functional Geodatabase developed in the Directorate for Water Montenegro;
- 20 people - 10 per country trained and certified for advance GIS usage;
- Digital maps of the Lim River Basin Flooding Areas;
- Geoportal for Lim River Basin online;
- 3,700 copies of 4 Info Publications;
- 7 workshops for 140 local stakeholders;
- Two policy recommendations

- Map Development;
- Geoportal Development;
- Promotion and Advocacy Initiatives;
- Closing Workshop.
### III. Efficiency

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**

Project is in its last month of implementation. The project has suffered from delays from the start, which were generated with insufficient project staff. The delay has been additionally aggravated by floods, since project staff and Srbijavode diverted its resources to the emergency response support to flooded areas. While the opening works successfully engaged representatives of seven target municipalities (Priboj, Prijepolje, Sjenica, Plav, Andrijevica, Berane and Bijelo Polje), hydro-meteorological services of both countries, environmental protection services of both countries, technical secretariat of the CBC Serbia-Montenegro programme, UNDP Montenegro representatives it only took place in the 5th, instead of 1st month of implementation. The workshop has provided the basis and agreement for the Baseline Research of the Lim River Basin that was conducted throughout the first year of implementation.

GIS basic training and the study visit to JVP Srbijavode have been delayed due to encountered hardware procurement problem – country of origin, which was solved in month 11. Cross-border capacity building in Serbia has been severely affected with floods in May 2014 as most of resources of Srbijavode have been engaged in activities to mitigate flood consequences. In parallel, geodetic companies have been engaged in collecting data about flood extent and flood depths in affected areas, so that the postponement of the geodetic survey of Lim riverbed has been necessary. The Field Prospection suffered a slight postponement, since the terms of reference for the procurement needed extensive reworking after consultation with experts from Srbijavode and after research of the market and land survey in Serbia. Advanced Training in GIS - on the preparation of the tender dossier has been delayed due to increased time spent preparing the Field Prospection procurement.

Due to the fact that Map Development depends on the results of Field Prospection, the activity has been delayed in order to incorporate geodetic survey data into maps. It is expected that these should be finalized in the coming weeks. Programming for Geoportal uses results from Map Development, thus interconnection and postponement has been inevitable. The last, but not the least important is production of promotional material, which was planned for these final months of implementation.

8. **Is the project well managed and monitored?**

At least one monitoring visit (9 September, 2014) has been performed. The monitors found that although the project team has been composed of dedicated and motivated team members (Project manager, 50% of working time allocated to project, Project Assistant – 80%, and Administrative assistant 100%), the insufficient human resources have been allocated for implementation. According to the monitoring report, the project has undergone a mid-term evaluation that has provided systematic overview of design and efficiency at the time.

9. **How much of the grant is disbursed?**

Disbursement has been in line with the contract. No problems have been reported.

10. **Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?**

According to the monitoring report, the project management team encountered hardware procurement problem – country of origin, which was solved at the end of the first year of the project (11th month). This activity has had direct implication to the implementation of the study visit to JVP Srbijavode, postponing it
11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

Based on monitoring report, one notification letter has been processed so far.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

No. The project team is dedicated and motivated, but insufficient human resources have been allocated in the proposal.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

Yes, but serious delays are being reported.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

Project has received adequate outreach in some of the activities. E.g. the Opening Workshop has been covered by electronic and paper press media, resulting in one broadcasting on television and with articles in two newspapers (TV Forum from Prijepolje, Javno informativno preduzeće POLIMLJE). Planned promotion activities such as information publication, publication of GIS database/geoportal have been seriously delayed and are scheduled to take place only at the end of the project, thus reducing its effectiveness.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

At least one monitoring visit has taken place (9 September, 2014). No complaints on the lack of support were expressed.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

No. The co-financing has been presented through salary of the project members.

### IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

Project is in its last month of implementation. The project has suffered from delays from the start, which were generated with insufficient project staff. The delay has been additionally aggravated by floods, since project staff and Srbijavode diverted its resources to the emergency response support to flooded areas.

While the opening works successfully engaged representatives of seven target municipalities (Priboj, Prijepolje, Sjenica, Plav, Andrijevica, Berane and Bijelo Polje), hydro-meteorological services of both countries, environmental protection services of both countries, technical secretariat of the CBC Serbia-Montenegro programme, UNDP Montenegro representatives it only took place in the 5th, instead of 1st month of implementation. The workshop has provided the basis and agreement for the Baseline Research of the Lim River Basin that was conducted throughout the first year of implementation.

GIS basic training and the study visit to JVP Srbijavode have been delayed due to encountered hardware procurement problem – country of origin, which was solved in month 11. Cross-border capacity building in Serbia has been severely affected with floods in May 2014 as most of resources of Srbijavode have been engaged in activities to mitigate flood consequences. In parallel, geodetic companies have been engaged in collecting data about flood extent and flood depths in affected areas, so that the postponement of the geodetic survey of Lim riverbed has been necessary. The Field Prospection suffered a slight postponement, since the terms of reference for the procurement needed extensive reworking after consultation with experts from Srbijavode and after research of the market and land...
survey in Serbia. Advanced Training in GIS - on the preparation of the tender dossier has been delayed due to increased time spent preparing the Field Prospection procurement.

Due to the fact that Map Development depends on the results of Field Prospection, the activity has been delayed in order to incorporate geodetic survey data into maps. It is expected that these should be finalized in the coming weeks. Programming for Geoportal uses results from Map Development, thus interconnection and postponement has been inevitable. The last, but not the least important is production of promotional material, which was planned for these final months of implementation.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

GIS is not yet on-line and available to the target group and beneficiaries.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

There were no formal partners on the Sorbian side. It would have been very adequate to involve local authorities and institutions in charge of the river basins and natural resources as partner, although the implementation confirmed their appropriate presence, as well as participation of hydrometereological services and environmental protection services of both countries.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Project is in its last month of implementation. GIS as the main output of the project has not yet been made available on-line.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Setting up of GIS/geoportal on the Montenegro side and update of the Serbian geoportal/GIS would probably take place inconsistently and at a later stage.

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Yes. If utilized by national and local authorities to transform data collated in the system into information for proper planning and management of Lim river as well as other natural resources, which could be added (e.g. forest, soil) and keeping it up to date, the project could improve the socio-economic life of more than 230,000 people living in the area considerably by providing reduced risks of floods or early warning system resulting in reduction in loss of life, property (mobile and immobile), health and environment as one of the primary assets and basis for existence (tourism).

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Project is in line with the “Water Law” (Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia 46/91), which ranges proceedings and measures for flood and ice protection, as well as protection from torrents and erosion. According to the law, Srbijavode is involved in regular and emergency flood defense activities for Central Serbia, south of the Sava river.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

The Lim River Basin is a sub-basin of the Danube River Basin, which is the subject of the ICPDR commission's regular work. The Drina River was considered by the World Bank this year, with the
intention to the preparation of management plans for the entire catchment area (including Lim River Basin).

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

No.

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Project is in its last month of implementation. The main output/result is updated GIS system for Srbijavode, which at the time of evaluation is available but not publicly on-line.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Srbijavode is a State institutions and (indirect) beneficiary of the State budget. This gives the project both institutional and basic financial sustainability to ensures that the maintenance of the outputs/results will be secured after the project end.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Project team is focused on finalizing the project and making up for the sever delays and insufficient management capacities.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

There were no formal partner, although local authorities were actively involved in the project. Continued cooperation can be expected as Srbijavode is responsible institutions to check and give its opinion on the local plans for water management and flood prevention.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Continued support for improved water planning and management capacities at country and local level, esp. change to the Water Law (division if responsibilities between institutions is not following the logic of waterways and nature) and improved cooperation in sharing and exchange of date and use of information provided by the GIS system covering the whole territory of Serbia.

VII. Conclusions & findings

While project relevance and maturity has proved to be in line and with anticipating the floods that affected Serbia in 2014. However, the project has so far underperformed and faced sever delays due to insufficient management capacities of project staff, who on personal level is motivate and dedicated to the project and external circumstances (flood in May demanded diverting of Srbijavode resources to flood emergency response). While Srbijavode is relevant as responsible institution and has the predisposition to provide both institutional and financial sustainability of the project, its underperformance could have been considerably mitigated if relevant local authorities and other stakeholder (e.g. CSOs) would have been involved in project design and implementation in allow for proper ownership, division of management and substantive tasks and provide for better impact. The project resources have been sufficient for the technical side (GIS) to have a permanent effect on the planning, management of water resources in Lim river basin and for flood alleviation, prevention, but its
utilization and use by local authorities, private companies, citizens and media in everyday life and accordance with its multi-purpose options is under question due to unstrategic approach and nature of how the project has been designed.
### VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 28/10/2014 | 12.00| Srbijavode office, Belgrade | Milos Mancic, Chief Engineer for Information System/ Project Manager, Srbijavode  
Mihajlo Ristic, Database Administrator/Project Assistant, Srbijavode |
Union of Ecologists (UNECO)

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Tanja Hafner Ademi
Date: 15th November, 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: IPA Cross-border Programme Serbia-Bosnia and Herzegovina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call for proposals:</th>
<th>IPA 2009, 2010 &amp; 2011 Cross-border Programme Serbia – Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2012/306-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Wise use of common natural resources - road to sustainability of the Serbia/BiH cross-border region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Union of Ecologists (UNECO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>134,958,35 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>112,825,18 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>83,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>01.01.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>20.11.2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>23 months 20 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to sustainable development of the Serbia - BiH cross-border region by fostering cooperation and multi-stakeholders approach in integrated natural resources management in the Drina River Basin.</td>
<td>• Increase capacities of local stakeholders to actively operate in environmental management in cross-border area; • Foster cross-border institutional partnerships through developing joint actions for protection and efficient utilization of the regional resources; • Increase public awareness and public support for protection and sustainable use of natural resources in the cross - border region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increased capacities of local stakeholders in 6 target municipalities (3 in BiH, 3 in Serbia) to actively operate in environmental management in cross-border area; • Developed the action plan for wise use and protection of natural resources in 6 municipalities in the Drina River Basin; • Increased public participation in environmental decision making through active involvement in action plans drafting; • Increased public awareness for protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and sustainable use of natural resources by implementing public outreach activities.

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?
   Both are well articulated, concrete and detailed. Results and objectives lack ambitions.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?
   Yes. It is clear and simple.

3. Are there clear OVIs?
   Clear, quantified, some of which are targeted. OVIs at the level of overall and specific objectives not ambitious enough.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals' objectives
   Project is in line with specific objective 5 of the call for proposals: Maintaining the high quality of the environment of the eligible area as an economic resource by cooperating in joint protection and exploitation initiatives. It is aimed at increasing capacities of all interested parties to deal with protection and wise use of natural resource through CBC in integrated natural resources management planning and degradation reduction and prevention, since the nature does not know administrative border and joined efforts are needed in order to preserve it and secure social and economic sustainability of the CBC region.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?
   Project has demonstrated its relevance and added-value to needs of the local stakeholders in management of nature resources via increased interest (some were reported to be sceptic or resistant) and participation has been over expected. Project is laying a solid basis and facilitating long-term approach in participative way in management of water, land and other natural resources in the Drina CBC area.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?
   Yes.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?
   Project is in final month of its implementation at the time of the evaluation. Two JTS monitoring visits (of which last on 15th January, 2014) and additional monitoring visit (12th September 2014) were undertaken before the evaluation. The monitoring visit confirmed that the project is on well tracks in implementing activities and delivering planed outputs.

   According to the latest monitoring report conducted 1,5 month, from the management point of view, and allocation of inputs, the project has had significant administrative support, which has facilitated the implementation. The project Management Team has been composed of the Project Manager, Financial Officer, Project Administrator and PR officer. Throughout the implementation period, until May 2014, no constraints were observed affecting the implementation of activities. As for the management of inputs, there have been 2 minor reallocations concerning travel costs. The budget for catering for open forums has been reallocated to upgrading of Geographic Information System (GIS) database and new field visit after flooding in May 2014. The planned activities comprise formulation of the study on natural resources
and development of action plan, after which the first round of public debates have been organised (in January and April 2014), gathering Local Self Government (LSG) representatives, employees from Public Utility Companies (PUC) for the protection of water, forestry and natural resources, representatives from environmental NGOs, as well as citizens. The flooding occurrence in both regions of implementation has caused postponement of second round of public debates that targeted partnership municipalities (Bogatic-Bijeljina, Bratunac-Ljubovija, Mali Zvornik-Zvornik). These public debates have been shifted for the beginning of October 2014, in line with the extension of 3 months.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?

Project has a 4-team member project team with previous experience in EU project management. Two JTS monitoring visits (of which last on 15th January, 2014) and additional monitoring visit (12th September 2014) have taken place so far.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?

In line with latest monitoring report, one pre-financing and one interim payment have been processed so far.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

Yes, one Addendum has been processed, endorsing project extension, along with changes in timeframe of activities projected for May and June 2014. Extension was necessary due to extraordinary circumstances, i.e. flooding during May 2014, which lead to postponement of organisation of 2 public debates to October 2014.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

Yes. UNECO 4 member project team consists of the Project Manager, Financial Officer and PR Officer, that has previous project experience in EU funded projects.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

Yes. They are in line with planned budget.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

Yes. Local media present and reporting about consultations, meetings and development of action plans.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

Sufficient support was received. 3 monitoring visits (2 JTS, 1 Integration mission) were performed before evaluation.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

UNECO provides co-financing from its own resources through the Fund Futura, an external supportive mechanism for the UNECO and the Futura University, one of the Belgrade privately owned universities. Delays in salary payments for the duration of the interim report due to the inability to provide all the required co-financing were reported. However, the delayed salaries were paid by the time of the monitoring visit (JTS monitoring report, 15 January, 2014).

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

In line with the latest monitoring visit 1,5 before evaluation introductory workshop, stakeholder analysis, public debates and open forums that gathered more than 100 participants - representatives of local
government, public utilities companies, CSOs from target municipalities increased capacities of local stakeholders in 6 target municipalities (3 in BiH, 3 in Serbia) to actively operate in environmental management in cross-border area.

Stakeholder analysis incl. needs, potential and current capacities of all interested stakeholders to take part in environmental management in the cross-border area has been developed. The analysis included information regarding their interest and capacities for participation, data and documents they have, power in decision making as well as needed capacity building. Training on participatory integrated natural resources management planning has followed, gathering 45 participants from municipality working groups contributing to developing the Action plan for wise use and protection of natural resources in 6 municipalities in the Drina River Basin by collecting and analysing the data on natural resources potential and creating the GIS databases on natural resources.

As for Increased public participation in environmental decision making through active involvement in action plans drafting, 180 persons actively participated in public consultation process. The R4 - Increased public awareness for protection and sustainable use of natural resources by implementing public outreach activities – has been accomplished by dissemination and promotion of the project activities through promotion in media, development and maintenance of the web page, as well as through printing and distributing of project leaflets, posters, and brochures.

### 18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

The example of relevance of GIS demonstrates the direct value of the project to the target group (representatives/staff of local governments, environmental CSOs, public utility companies, private forest owners, cooperative farms, farmers, educational institutions, tourist organizations and local people). The municipalities are considering licencing of the GIS software, which is dependable on the availability of the municipal budget. The benefits that the partner municipalities observed during implementation relate to upgraded data on flooded areas, land sliding and damaged households, which have been incorporated to GIS database, and put to municipalities’ disposal.

### 19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

On the Serbia side, municipality of Bogatic and Zvornik and Mali Zvornik are project partners. They have not been assigned the role of team members, but are rather involved in the project activities through working group members, panellists, resource persons for compilation of data, study, etc. Project ownership has been reported to increase by having significant scepticism at the beginning of the project on the nature and needs of stakeholders articulated by the ‘third party’ (UNECO and BiH partner Center for Environmentally Sustainable Development (CESD)), developing to the actual pro-active attitude and excellent communication of stakeholders that supported the implementation.

### V. Impact

### 20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Again, the GIS will probably remain in use as capacity-building on its operation has been provided and as due to its multi-purposeness can be used beyond planning and managing of natural resources.

### 21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

No or probably very slow and in inconsistent manner and lacking strategic and fully participate approach.

### 22. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and
The project’s additional value lays is that partner municipalities gained a valuable instrument – GIS, and related training on its utilisation. If properly used, the GIS represents a spatial data management tool, a concept that has no such restrictive boundaries and that should substantially support local economic development planning in any aspect. Related by accurate spatial information, an incredible variety of real-world and projected past or future data can be analyzed, interpreted and represented. This key characteristic of GIS has begun to open new directions of scientific inquiry into behaviors and patterns of real-world information that previously could not be systematically correlated.

By placing the governmental (LSG officials, PUC employees) and non-governmental representatives and citizens to participate in open forums and public debates on natural resources, the intervention managed reconciling differences in viewpoints and opinions. The stakeholder analysis served as a starting point for introducing valuable information on levels of concern, capacities for participation, available data and documents, as well as defining powers in decision making. The analysis has provided an overview of the needed capacity building, which served as a guiding tool for strengthening of various entities during project on their role and importance of proper environmental management.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Sustainable use of natural resources is part of key national priorities in national Strategy for Sustainable Development and Biodiversity Strategy.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

UNECO is partner in IPA CBC Serbia-Croatia project “Living Danube - strengthening capacities for the protection of Middle Danube ecosystems - Road to Sustainability of the Croatia - Serbia Cross Border Region”

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

UNECO has running project with local CSOs (Our Ljubovija, Edokrina) in targeted municipalities Ljubovija and Mali Zvornik “Dialogue for prevention of Natural Hazard” funded by SIDA

VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Project is in final month of its implementation. Therefore, project outputs and results are still directly visible. At local level, Geographic Information System (GIS) offering multipurpose use in terms of management, identification, monitoring, analysis of natural resources to local authorities and other relevant actors (e.g. public utility companies) is expected to be the key added-value that has been recognized by the local stakeholders. Moreover, while the project did not aim at adoption but only development of action plans it is expected that even in event they are not adopted, the capacity-building, information sharing will contribute to local level a more strategic and appropriate management (not only exploitation) of natural resources. Finally, the participative approach taken to development of local development plan has the potential to demonstrate to local authorities the added-value and continuation of such practices in preparation of local plans in other sectors.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Depending on weather local action plans will be eventually adopted by participating municipality. It is highly likely that the GIS due to shown high relevance and usefulness to municipalities will be maintained
and utilized via municipal budgets.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
Not at the moment.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
UNECO has running project with local CSOs (Our Ljubovija, Edokrina) in targeted municipalities Ljubovija and Mali Zvornik “Dialogue for prevention of Natural Hazard” funded by SIDA. The purpose of the project is to contribute to sustainable development at the local level through the creation of conditions for effective participation of CSOs in policy creation and implementation of management of natural hazards.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
Continuation of available funding for biodiversity, nature conservation projects. In terms of geographical area, UNECO expects possibilities to support protection of delta of Drina river basin.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project is in its last month of implementation. Project has substantially contributing in laying solid ground to overcoming lacking institutional capacity, expertise and long-term strategic and participative approach of local governments, environmental CSOs, public utility companies, private forest owners, cooperative farms, farmers, educational institutions, tourist organizations and local people towards sustainable planning and management of natural resources (e.g. water, forests, land) in the Drina river basin (concretely municipalities Ljubovija, Bratunac, Zvornik, Mali Zvornik, Bijeljina, Bogatić). The project is lacking ambition in terms of sustainability as it only envisaged development (not adoption) of local action plans for wise management of natural resources. Training and development of Geographic Information System (GIS) has demonstrated the multi-purposes and added-value of the project to the local authorities incl. how it can be used for flood prevention, alleviation and prevention purposes and it has in this respect considerably insured sustainability beyond the project close as well as a buy-in for the local authorities to potentially adopt the action plans. Project is only a good starting point for the work ahead in which national-level and local authorities must be in the driving seat and pro-active. A strategic approach is needed to deal with such complex and long-term issues such as natural resources management and for this longer-term (36 or even 48 months) project with a much substantive investment in terms of institutions and financing is needed to have appropriate results. Finally, in terms of flooding situation, the value of projects dealing with strategic and local level management and planning of natural resources is obvious as appropriate water, forest, land etc. management consequently lead to existence of information, knowledge and capacities to anticipate, plan emergency scenarios and restoration, alleviation etc. at local level enabling minimal hazard to life, property and nature.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30/10/2014</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>UNECO office, Belgrade</td>
<td>Marijana Bartula, Project coordinator, UNECO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Project Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>CBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>CBC Serbia-Montenegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2012/298-351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Cross-border Flood Protection and Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>372,201 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>316,371 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>15/08/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>4/14/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>20 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Summary**  
*(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the risks of disasters caused by natural hazards in Serbia and Montenegro.</td>
<td>(x) To improve the capacity of the cross-border area and 6 municipalities in Serbia and Montenegro to reduce the risks of floods through cross-border cooperation and a coordinated approach including technical and personnel capacity building process and raising awareness of general population about flood prevention and management within the period of 20 months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. National and local plans for protection and rescue of floods prepared and adopted</td>
<td>1. Meetings of the cross-border team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improved capacity of SEMs (sectors for emergency management), local PRUs (protection and rescue units) and other operational units in target municipalities</td>
<td>2. Trainings for the employees of PRUs from Niksic, Berane, Pljevlja, Prijepolje, Prijob and Nova Varos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improved cross-border cooperation between Montenegrin and Serbian SEMs</td>
<td>3. Workshops on flood management and control for the employees of protection and rescue units from target municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Established cooperation between PRUs</td>
<td>4. Trainings for other operational professional and voluntary units from target municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Lectures for primary school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cross-border essay competition for primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from target municipalities

5. Population in the cross-border area and target municipalities familiarized with preventive actions against floods and necessary actions in case of floods

6. Standard Operational Procedures (SOP) for border crossings of the professional units in case of floods defined and adopted

7. National plans for professional education and training for protection and rescue from floods developed in Montenegro and Serbia

school students

7. Prepare, print and distribute brochures on topics related to floods

8. Prepare, print and distribute promotional leaflets

9. Procure necessary equipment for protection and rescue from floods

10. Prepare and adopt national and local plans for protection and rescue from floods

11. Seminar on best EU practice in protection and rescue from floods

12. Define and adopt standard operational procedures (SOP) for border crossings of the operational units in case of floods

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

The proposal is well articulated and with defined actions.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

OVIs are well defined and clear.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

The Project fits within the Measure 1.1. of the call for proposals “Improving the productivity and competitiveness of the areas’ economic, rural, cultural and environmental resources” and contributes to the overall priority of protection from natural hazards and environment protection.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

The project is extremely relevant to the final beneficiaries (people of the regions targeted in the action, but also wider population of both countries), particularly as investment in raising capacities and awareness on how to act in hazard situation. Target areas (but also wider territory of both countries) have majority of population living in proximity of rivers, so floods are a great threat to their lives and material assets, as well as to agricultural land and crops. The action also contributes to the achievement of the specific objectives of the Montenegrin National Strategy for Emergency Situations. At the same time, the project takes into account and addresses the main shortcomings that the local Emergency response Departments face– insufficient capacity of local teams to address the potential risks from natural flood disasters, and scarce and outdated equipment to support the rescuing operations.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes.

III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are they in line with the contract and the implementation plan?
The Project was finalized recently in an efficient manner with all planned activities implemented in timely manner. Meetings with project team and CBC Secretariat confirm the findings of the final MR report that “regular CB team meetings, organisation of specific training sessions for ED officials, as well as for other operational structures in local government representatives [were conducted]. The awareness rising for local population and pupils in targeted municipalities was achieved through preparation, printing and distribution of the promotional material, as well as with media coverage. A highly praised and important activity that gathered the main ED stakeholders from the region was the seminar on EU best practices in protection, as well as rescue simulation exercises from floods. The set of actions implemented almost at the end of intervention focused on the definition of national and local action plans, and the adoption of Special Operating Procedures for border crossings in case of flooding. All planned outputs have been produced, from the implementation schedule, organisation of training sessions, workshops and seminars, to the certification of 43 officials, whose capacities have been acknowledged as skilful and relevant in disaster management.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the project well managed and monitored?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much of the grant is disbursed?</td>
<td>Total grant was disbursed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?</td>
<td>Almost entire set of procurement procedures were successfully conducted, except for a minor part: the tender for IT equipment and the car registration were unsuccessful, indicating low responsiveness of retailers to participate in a closed tender call, who considered these procedures as bureaucratic and complicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.</td>
<td>Contract amendments have been done through two Notification Letters, enabling reallocation of budget in the sections 1, 2, 3, and 5 (Letter No1), and section 3.1.1. (Procurement of 2 vehicle instead of 1 – Letter No.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?</td>
<td>Yes. The Project team was composed of respective officials, responsible for undertaking the planned activities: the Project Manager (25% of working time assigned to the project), Finance Officer (15%), Expert Fire-fighter (30%), and an Administrative Assistant (50%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are the activities achieving value for money?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?</td>
<td>The project team received positive guidance and support by the CBC secretariat but also SEIO office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?</td>
<td>The Project has been highly effective and reached their stated results of equipping and capacitating teams to effectively and efficiently address hazard situations, which had its first demonstration during the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
catastrophic floods in Serbia in spring 2014. The entire teams from both countries were on the forefront of rescue and relief operations in most affected communities in Serbia. Purchased equipment, capacities of professionals have been valuable assets during the rescue/relief operations. In total, more than 50 employees of Serbian Emergency department, with over 100 members of civil protection units from both sides of the border were benefiting from the project along with several hundred children as literary candidates.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

As discussed above, the regions targeted by the action are prone to natural hazards (floods) and equipping and capacitating rescue teams affects in positive way the entire population of the region of 6 municipalities, amounting to over 200,000 final beneficiaries, safeguarded by the best rated Emergency department’s unit in Serbia (four years in a row the ED Prijepolje was granted this nomination, according to assessments done by the Ministry of Interior).

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Yes, the monitoring reports and the evaluation interviews conducted confirm that there was genuine partnership in this action.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

As mentioned above, positive impacts of the action showed up even during the project implementation: instant mobilisation of 6 trained officers in the specific rescuing operations in the endangered municipalities, which was rated as extremely valuable in the rescue/relief operations as the team was independent, proactive and highly efficient. For example, their contribution in rescuing missions only during the first day resulted in saving more than 70 people.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

The change would not be achieved to this extent without the grant due to the shortcomings in funds for investing in equipping and capacitating Emergency departments to adequately address emergency, rescue and relief situations.

22. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Investment in adequate rescue and relief actions in situations of natural hazards has immediate effect on socio/economic and environmental benefits for target groups.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Yes, the project responds to national priority of ensuring adequate response to rescue and relief from natural hazards.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

The project had links with other CBC project working on GIS for Lim (Through Geographic Information System Towards Better Cross-Border Flood Risk Management in the Lim River Basin, implemented by Srbijavode).

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by
At the moment, the Ministry of Interior (Emergency department) is planning to scale up this action to a strategic project that would increase the number of units able to act promptly to natural disasters.

**VI. Sustainability**

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible/likely to last?

The sustainability prospects of the intervention are positive. Investment in the Emergency department unit and its staff brought positive motivation and dedication of the team. Also, the project and the overall theme have strong commitment of the management, which are important investments in sustainability of the project results.

Evaluation findings confirm the conclusion of the Monitoring report: “The intervention enabled significant improvement of working conditions, and facilitation of their professional activities in disaster control. The level of appreciation and ownership over the benefits was evident even during implementation, since sharing of knowledge, lessons learned and best practices with other colleagues from the region was initiated during and maintained after project implementation, reflecting the significant stakeholders’ commitment invested in the intervention.”

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results?

Direct responsibility for maintaining procured equipment falls under the Ministry of Interior and is budgeted through EDs, so the maintenance of the procured equipment is ensured.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

The project includes several follow-up activities for target groups, such as share of experience, skills and knowledge among personnel of professional and voluntary rescuing units, lectures in schools on natural disasters, organised upon the project finalisation, as well as literary competitions, on the subject of preventing disasters.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Yes.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

The MoI plans to bid for further funding for this/similar interventions.

**VII. Conclusions & findings**

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The Project is very relevant to the needs of the final beneficiaries and the Call for Proposals. Addressing properly the need to act promptly to natural hazards is of utmost importance to the target region, but also both countries as a whole.

The project was efficient and effective, achieving results in timely and quality manner. First impacts of the project were visible in quick and efficient response of the team in rescue/relief from floods in spring 2014 in Serbia. The Ministry of Interior is committed to maintain the capacities and purchased equipment from their budget, while the teams are dedicated and well trained, which is strong input for sustainability of action.

Recommendation for MoI and EUD:

- explore opportunities for extending and scaling up this action to wider network of Emergency department units across Serbia and neighbouring countries to enable coordinated response to hazard situations.
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Project Identification

Programme name: CBC
Call for proposals: CBC Serbia-Montenegro
Contract number: 2012/298-351
Contract name: Tourist organization of Priboj
Beneficiary:
Contract total: 188,277 €
Contract amount EU: 152,098 €
Co-financing: 84,3%
Contract start date: 10/06/2013
Contract end date: 11/06/2014
Contract duration: 12 months

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The continuation of improving the communication and cooperation between the local communities and the organization of local communities of these cross-border regions, Priboj and Rudo.</td>
<td>(xi) To create necessary preconditions – strategic and infrastructural – for boosting sustainable development of agriculture of border area by way of establishing ground for sustainable and efficient water management and irrigation systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Improvement of the existing International Lim Biathlon manifestation through the new joint manifestations and strengthening of technical capacity for rafting and cycling.</td>
<td>1. Organizing the coordination meetings of the project team with the partner’s staff form Rudo and Priboj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Established joint organizational committee of manifestation and planned calendar of activates</td>
<td>2. Organizing and carrying out the training for the skippers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Increased security of participants through enhanced training of skippers</td>
<td>3. Improvement of the old plateau and the arrival plateau (Regatta for the persons with special needs) in Uvac as the revitalization of the access staircases on Valine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Improved technical conditions for organizing the manifestation</td>
<td>4. The procurement of 81 protective suits and boots of neoprene and three rafting boats for equipping the clubs in order of environmental cleaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Organization and holding the Regatta where the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Improved technical capacity of rafting clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Promoted integration of persons with special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Raised environmental awareness of the participants in the manifestation through holding the environmental regatta within the manifestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Improved technical conditions for the development of cycling in the cross-border regions and popularized number of participants of cycling caravan to 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Advanced technical conditions for holding the music-entertaining part of the manifestation but through the purchase of acoustics and organization of the concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>persons with special needs participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Organization and holding of the environmental regatta in order to clean the banks of the river of Lim and raising the awareness of all participants and the other citizens but about the importance of preventing from the pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Establishment of two cycling roads and the procurement of the bicycles and the protective equipment in order to increase the number of participants in cycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. The procurement of the professional equipment for the acoustics in Priboj and the organization of the concerts before the beginning of the manifestation and the procurement of the professional equipment for the acoustics in Rudo and the organization of concert of the affirmed rock group. The cycling caravans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. The works on the media promotion of the manifestation and the whole project with the preparation and printing of supporting publications as well as building of different billboards and the boards with the organizer’s signs and the labels of donor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

The proposal is well articulated and with defined and realistic actions for the timeframe of the interventions.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?

OVIs are clear.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives?

The project is relevant to the CfP, particularly to Measure 1.2., as it creates the opportunity of cross-border initiatives targeting the exchange of people and ideas to enhance professional cooperation.

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

The project is implemented in a very impoverished border area of two countries, with negative prospects for economic development. The region has strong tourist potential with attractive landscape and river for sports and recreation, and this is one of the sectors of economy, investment in which would bring much needed benefits for the population.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes, to great extent.

III. Efficiency
7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

The Project implemented all activities in timely and efficient manner. Purchase of equipment for water sports and security was conducted according to the established plans and procedures. The project team organised small works to improve conditions for rescue at the river plateau and construct staircases to improve safety for organisation of regatta for persons with disabilities. Safety equipment and fences for the safeguard of the plateau of the manifestation in Priboj were purchased and installed for the persons with special needs. Tables and benches, tents and rafting boats were purchased as well. Trainings for skippers and their certification was conducted in the best educational courses for such type of sports. Additionally, the project purchased sound equipment in order to diversify the tourist offer.

The project was linked to the (now) traditional Lim fest, which usually takes place during the third weekend of August. The project was approved much later than anticipated which meant that the Lim fest 2013 could not be organized in a manner planned initially (with full equipment and safety in place), but the project team managed to organize it in the good manner, also ensuring that the next regatta would be organized in accordance with rules and safety procedures.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?

Interviews conducted within the evaluation and monitoring reports show that the project was well managed and monitored.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?

The project is finished and the entire grant is disbursed.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

There were no procurement issues or ineligible costs.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

None.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

Yes.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

Yes.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

The project was very conducive for visibility of the EU.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

Yes.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

No.

IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

Most importantly, the Project contributed to ensuring full safety of the manifestation and diversification of the tourist offer. In such manner, the project purpose has been achieved, to technically improve the event both in terms of quality and number of available equipment for rafting and cycling as well as in terms of safety of the regatta trails and variety of touristic offers. The project offered the opportunity to train 31
persons to become skippers. The Project team organized a Regatta for persons with special needs for around 60 participants with special needs and their personal assistants (total around 200 participants). Additionally, the project organized a traditional two-day environmental “eco” regatta, this time with better equipment and longer trail for cleaning the banks of Lim from Priboj to Rudo, which resulted in more than 20m3 of solid communal waste collected by around 120 participants.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

The project has assisted the local NGOs and sports associations in terms of capacitating them to adequately offer regatta services to tourists, but also other sports activities in the region. Available sports and safety equipment provides attractive offer for tourists to visit the region and enjoy the nature and sports opportunities.

Organising regatta for persons with disabilities was a valuable event for this group as they could enjoy a sports activity that would not otherwise be possible for this group.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Yes.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Using valuable natural resources and tourist potentials for economic development is important investment for such an impoverished area. The Lim Regatta has a large significance and touristic potential for the region. Creating structures and procedures to ensure safety and variety of sports is being recognised by the extreme sports enthusiasts and each year the event brings more participants and visitors. It is estimated that the participants of the main regatta was increased by 15%, from 700 to 1000 participants.

It is estimated that visitors of the event were from all over Serbia with significant number of visitors from Belgrade, Novi Sad, Valjevo, Pancićevo, Novi Banovci, Ljubovija, Caćak and Subotica and from abroad: Slovenia, Croatia, Germany and England.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

Not to this extent.

22. Is the project likely to result in major socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Creating conditions to ensure safe environment for persons with special needs to enjoy the sports, particularly such sports as regatta, has important impacts on their livelihoods and positive views to life.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

The project contributes to the Serbian efforts to improve tourist potential, particularly in smaller communities.

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

The Project had cooperation with other projects in the region, like EU Progress and others.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?
VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Purchased equipment is in place and is being maintained by local NGOs and municipality. The municipality is committed to continue organizing the Lim manifestations so the results are likely to last.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

See above.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

The biathlon and regatta will be organized on yearly basis.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Yes, this project is the follow up of the previous projects of partners, funded through CBC.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

N/A

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project was efficient and achieved all the set results. The project results contribute to better and more diversified tourist offer in the region, which is attractive to sports enthusiasts from the countries and internationally. The project with its improved safety procedures also has benefits to the vulnerable groups like persons with special needs.
EVALUATION OF GRANT CONTRACTS IMPLEMENTED AND FINANCED BY IPA AND EIDHR

Public Enterprise Vodovod "Bistrica"

Project Evaluation Report

Written by: Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic
Date: November 2014

Project Identification

Programme name: CBC
Call for proposals: CBC Serbia-Montenegro
Contract number: 2012/300-310
Contract name: Strengthening of Economic Development through Sustainable Management of Water Resources
Beneficiary: Public Enterprise Vodovod "Bistrica", Bijelo Polje
Public Utility Enterprise "Vodovod i kanalizacija" Novi Pazar

Contract total: 230,934.57 €
Contract amount EU: 419,194.72 €
Co-financing: 82.09%
Contract start date: 17/09/12
Contract end date: 16/09/14
Contract duration: 24 months

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

Overall objective
With joint efforts of all relevant actors of the society to improve quality of environment and management of water as a main precondition for sustainable development of agriculture and economy in cross border area; to introduce and to promote relevant EU standards and practices in the respective area.

Specific objective
(xii) To create necessary preconditions – strategic and infrastructural – for boosting sustainable development of agriculture of border area by way of establishing ground for sustainable and efficient water management and irrigation systems.

Expected results
1. Created strategic framework for sustainable and efficient water management and irrigation system;
2. Created necessary infrastructure to facilitate implementation of strategic framework for sustainable and efficient water management and irrigation system;
3. Improved administrative capacities of and

Main outputs
1.1. Signing a MoU among key project stakeholders.
1.2. Organising expert meetings prior to drafting of strategic documents
1.3. Organising public consultative hearings in Bijelo Polje and Novi Pazar.
cooperation among the relevant stakeholders;
4. Increased knowledge and awareness of population in the cross border area on the need and the importance of preserving water resources particularly in the context of climate change, intensive agriculture, various irrigation systems;
5. Project smoothly coordinated and successfully implemented.

1.5. Developing and adopting Action Plans providing concrete instruments and measures to implement the mentioned Strategies.
1.6. Public debate process in Bijelo Polje and Novi Pazar
1.7. Organising Conference entitled “Sustainable and Efficient Water Management Serving Environment, Public Health and Agriculture”.
2.1. Initiation of works on water captation in Bijelo Polje
2.2. Purchasing mobile chlorinator
2.3. Installation and changing of 5 stations for water pumps in Novi Pazar.
3.1. Redrafting project action plan and assignment of staff.
3.2 Developing and adopting Code of Conduct on Water Management.
3.3. Organising a study visit to Slovenia.
3.4. Creation of publication on EU relevant standards and norms in the area of efficient management of water resources, sustainable agriculture and irrigation systems, protection and preservation of environment.
3.5. Conducting 4 modules of total of 8 specialised seminars for relevant stakeholders from Bijelo Polje and Novi Pazar.
4.1. Creation of social media marketing plans for Bijelo Polje and Novi Pazar.
4.2. Creation of Applicants’ websites.
4.3. Conducting 2 public awareness campaigns.
5.1. Organising regular coordination meetings of project team.
5.2. Evaluation of the project focusing on both Applicants’ sides.

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?
The project proposal and logframe are clear and well drafted.

2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?
Yes.

3. Are there clear OVIs?
The OVIs are realistic and mostly measurable.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives
The Project falls within the Measure 1.1. Improving the productivity and competitiveness of the areas’ economic, rural, cultural and environmental resources as it addresses the need for improvement of usage
of natural resources (water) and thus improving economic and environmental resources, while at the same time diminishing the health risks.

5. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**

The Project is very relevant to both partner local communities. In Novi Pazar, Serbia – app. 30,000 people in some town areas did not have access to water for days any time the outdated infrastructure would break down. This is due to the fact that the spare parts were not being produced any longer, and it would take days for the Water Utility company to find them and replace them. The Project enabled the Company and the local government to replace the outdated infrastructure with new and more efficient one.

In Bijelo Polje, there were areas without/scare water accessibility and this posed health risks for local population.

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**

Yes.

### III. Efficiency

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**

The project followed the implementation plan diligently and provided all planned inputs provided on time. Early in the project, the Serbian side team revised the workplan in order to ensure that reallocation of supply related activities are implemented in the first implementation year. This resulted in ensuring quicker access and quality of water for citizens and improved efficiency and effectiveness of the Project as a whole. With savings made in the process of procurement (around 26,000 EUR), the Utility company in Novi Pazar purchased additional water pump station, which resulted in total of 17 water pumps and six water pump stations in place as a result of the project.

Besides the hardware, the project also included trainings for employees of public utility companies and municipal staff, including researchers and inspectors; two public debates and one cross border conference and media campaign which included printing of materials which promoted the project, as well as training textbook, code of conduct for the applicants and individual consumers. City of Novi Pazar also adopted the Strategy for Development of Water Supply.

8. **Is the project well managed and monitored?**

The Project was primarily technical in nature and was well managed. The CBC Secretariat conducted regular monitoring of the Project.

9. **How much of the grant is disbursed?**

The project is finished and the grant is disbursed.

10. **Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?**

No.

11. **Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.**

No.

12. **Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?**

This project was the first one for Public utility company to implement from EU funds. Still, the team managed it well and no problem occurred during the implementation.

13. **Are the activities achieving value for money?**

Very much so.

14. **Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?**

The project included a campaign for citizens, which was implemented in accordance to EU guidelines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. The support from the CBC secretariat and guidance, particularly in the initial stages of the project were positive and useful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project succeeded in achieving results set within the Action. Installation of water pumps and other technical infrastructure assists setting up infrastructural preconditions to establish “ground for sustainable and efficient water management and irrigation systems”. The Project also resulted in adoption of the Strategy, which also includes a three-year Action Plan. Also, the project succeeded in increasing capacities of 20-30 public utility company staff on issues of maintenance of the water supply system through trainings, debates and international conferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved infrastructure and strategic framework for improving the water supply to the city is a good investment in ensuring permanent water supply to citizens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, this evaluation and the project monitoring reports confirm good cooperation and partnership between partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Project resulted in adoption of long term Strategy for improvement of the water supply. It also improved local water supply system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Improvement of the water supply system has important positive impact on livelihood of citizens of Novi Pazar, with at least 30,000 citizens now being in position to get quality water on permanent basis. The quality infrastructure also has positive influence on economic development and environment as improved water system prevents wasting of water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Project contributes to the overall national priority of ensuring healthy environment and access to services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Not at the moment.

### VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

The new infrastructure is in place and will last as it is done according to the standards of the sector. The Utility company will now be able to maintain it easily from its budget sources.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Yes.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Not at the moment.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

N/A.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

None at the moment.

### VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project was very relevant for the Call and the target groups affected by it. The Project was efficient in achieving all set outputs, which contributed to achievement of results set by the project. Through the action, a total of 14 water pumps and six water stations were replaced resulting in improvement of water supply to at least 30,000 citizens of Novi Pazar. Improved infrastructure will be maintained from the budget of the Public Utility company, which provides solid sustainability prospects.
5. Civil Society

NGO Atina – Citizens’ Association for Combat Trafficking In Human Beings and All Forms of Gender-Based Violence

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Tanja Hafner Ademi
Date: 10th November, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Identification</strong></th>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Summary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall objective**

- Increasing capacities of community based organizations to facilitate intercultural dialogue between migrant population in Serbia and local communities by promoting equality, cultural diversity and tolerance

**Specific objective**

- Development and piloting effective models for addressing xenophobia and discrimination within local communities

**Expected results**

- Comprehensive analysis of the position of migrants in Serbia with the special emphasis on women migrants and unaccompanied minors, complemented by analysis of attitudes of citizens in 5

**Main outputs**

- A comprehensive study on the position of migrants in Serbia;
- Training curriculum and programme for piloting cultural mediation model;
communities towards migrant population;
• Capacities of 5 migrants (incl. 1 woman) are raised to serve as a cultural mediators and capacities of 10 community based CSOs are strengthened to support migrants’ inclusion and promote intercultural tolerance;
• Capacities of 340 asylum seekers and 150 irregular migrants are raised for the purpose of better adapting to the local culture and benefiting from the protection system;
• Improved intercultural dialogue in 5 receiving municipalities / communities.

• Training curriculum and programme for 3-day training community based CSOs and 2 trainings;
• 10 workshops and outreach activities for asylum seekers/regular migrants;
• Documentary and promotion event;
• 5 cultural diversity fairs;
• 2 national press conferences;
• 15 local media broadcastings;
• Atina’s and APC’s (partner) updated web-sites and FB pages;
• Monitoring and evaluation reports.

I. Conceptual Design

1. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?
Yes. Results are in some cases description of activities.
2. Is it easy to understand the project logic?
Yes
3. Are there clear OVIs?
Yes. OVIs are a combination of quantitative and quality ones. Ambitious targets esp with regards to available source of information.

II. Relevance

4. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives
Projects targets theme 2 of the Call for proposals: Cultural diversity. Project addresses themes issues in supporting promotion of cultural diversity in the fields of culture and education and increase the intercultural dialogue among different ethnic and religious communities. It does so by engaging in capacity-building of local CSO in communities most exposed to illegal immigrants and asylum seekers (e.g. where collective centres are situated).

5. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?
Project was designed based on the results of the qualitative research EIDHR “Children on the Move” project, carried out by Atina in cooperation with Save the Children. Within the consultations with children and their parents- asylum seekers carried out within this research, migrants explicitly expressed their views on the lack of support from the system, possibilities for interactions within the communities, and fear caused by rise of animosity and prejudices towards them. While addressing the needs of migrants, the project challenged the perceptions and needs of local/receiving communities and citizens in these communities in attitudes towards and interaction with migrants.

6. Does the selection of the project seem justified?
Yes, although such project might be also or better placed within EIDHR scheme.
### III. Efficiency

7. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?

Project is in its 12 month of implementation. Atina reported a delay a possible delay of 2-3 months due to very ambitious plan presented in the project proposal and due to unresponsiveness of the institutions because of the floods effort. Atina is currently considering submission of request for extension of the project.

8. Is the project well managed and monitored?

Monitoring visit on 18th June, 2014 by the Senior Grant and Monitoring Office under the TA tasked to assist and monitor IPA CSF projects was performed. No issues were reported in terms of management, Atina is experienced in management of EU-funded projects including under previous IPA CSF and EIDHR calls.

9. How much of the grant is disbursed?

According to the monitoring report, around 40% of expenditures have been made in first 6 months of the project. Atina expects to disburse all the funds by end of project.

10. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

No.

11. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

No.

12. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?

Atina reported that more staff time is engaged on the project than planned.

13. Are the activities achieving value for money?

Yes, so far.

14. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?

All planned visibility activities have been implemented thus far. Project presentation press conference was held with participation of relevant state authorities (Mr Mitar Djuraskovic, Coordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Being, Ministry of the Interior, Commissariat for Refugees and Migration). One of cultural diversity fairs in local communities planned for end of the project was organized in Subotica on 18th October on the occasion of EU Anti-trafficking Day. Atina reported intensive cooperation with national and local media. Visibility of the project is strong in social networks. Documentary movie that will be promoted at the end has been under preparation.

15. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?

Atina was satisfied with the cooperation with the PMU, including their monitoring methodology and guidance.

16. Is there any issue with the co-financing?

One portion of co-funding was secured through the Office for Cooperation with Civil Society Organizations and the other through the Atina’s Contingency Fund. Atina has faced some difficulties in securing co-funding in terms of shot deadlines and different donor approaches.
IV. Effectiveness

17. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

Project is in the last month of implementation. Comprehensive analysis of the position of migrants in Serbia with the special emphasis on women migrants and unaccompanied minors was published in high quality and with alarming results on the increasing growth of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers and pressure it exerts especially on local authorities and communities. Capacities of 5 migrants (incl. 1 woman) were enhanced and their services as cultural mediators have been used by Atina and Doctors without Borders on pilot basis, but further utilization of trainer mediator is under question as some are quite unstable and unsecure with regards to their continued stay in Serbia. Project presentation press conference was held with participation of relevant state authorities (Mr Mitar Djuraskovic, Coordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Being, Ministry of the Interior, Commissariat for Refugees and Migration). One of cultural diversity fairs in local communities planned for end of the project was organized in Subotica on 18th October on the occasion of EU Anti-trafficking Day. Atina reported intensive cooperation with national and local media.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

Project idea of developing local networks and cultural mediator is based on successful cases of addressing the acute situation with basic health, social, HR needs of illegal migrants and asylum seekers in Italy and aimed at identifying risk of GBV, THB and other risk migrants and asylum seekers are exposed to on their move from to another country. Atina and Center for social care in Sremska Mitrovica reported of cases of especially women and children being assisted in accessing basic medical care.

Atina reported local CSOs’ and professionals’ level of satisfaction, as per their knowledge, is rather high (in comparison with the satisfaction with cooperation with other CSOs) as a consequence of their continued cooperation with them apart from the project cycle. Their competences have been improved and level of motivation raised. As beneficiaries, migrants have been actively included in the process of developing supporting mechanisms which could influence/advance their position in future.

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Strengthen of partnership with APC for Atina has been their prior contacts and access to representatives of asylum system. APC reported less involvement in the project activities as expected and planned per action plan.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

The most relevant change for Atina is “giving the voice” to the marginalized and discriminated population. Their inclusion in the process of making decisions about the programs and process regarding their position will hopefully become a standard in CSOs and other professionals’ future approaches.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

There have been continued projects in the area of support and advocacy on basic needs and tolerance towards illegal immigrants and asylum seekers through EIDHR and IPA CSF, in which interventions Atina
was often involved. Change in terms of capacity building and direct support to migrants is taking place to large extent due to past and ongoing project, so the added-value and the urgent need for this project is much lesser and it is possible the expected result could take place as a results of other project interventions. Added-value is in developing the “brand” of cultural mediators a participatory practice addressing needs of migrants and asylum seekers, but due to the fact that mediators themselves are insecure about their future and stability in Serbia their capacity might be built in vain.

22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Again, project is ongoing and other projects funded via EIDHR (e.g. APC) are working on similar issue, which are resulting in significant increase of information on rights of asylum seekers and legal aid (thus incl. risks), legal, heath etc. support, so added-value of the project might be marginal.

23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Project is related to national anti-trafficking strategy. However, Atina stressed that at the moment support is only declarative in dealing timely, effective and appropriately with the issues and position of migrants (including the most vulnerable migrant groups).

24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

Besides previous IPA CSF project by Atina and EIDHR funded project in partnership with Save the Children (Redd Barna), Atina managed to coordinate all the activities with relevant stakeholders such as UNHCR, Group 484, Belgrade Center for Human Rights, Commissariat for Refugees and Migrants etc. and considered this cooperation very successful and sustainable.

25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Atina has ongoing cooperation with Save the Children on the EIDHR project, potentially new IPA CSF project (currently under consideration) and a few more possible funding in process of consideration.

### VI. Sustainability

26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Project is still on-going. The comprehensive study on the situation of migrants is probably unique as a mapping study of situation, position and challenges faced by both migrants and stakeholders. Capacity-building of local CSO and relevant authorities, promotion material will probably have a positive impact.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results

Atina reported fundraising on follow-up activities, but probably the key output/result that could be expected to be further used by relevant institutions and thus have impact in terms of issues identified and addressed by them is the comprehensive study on the situation of migrants.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Atina reported applying for further funding.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Atina expects to continue partnerships with various local and national stakeholders involved in the project.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
In terms of procedures, representatives of Atina think that organizations could benefit a lot from sharing proposal evaluation results and evaluators' comments. This also goes for those who are awarded grants. Reduce administrative burden and simplify the procedures. If there is any possibility for capacity development activities for the applicant to be included into the grant scheme, Atina would benefit a lot.

In terms of the themes and topics: promoting new innovative responses to social changes, Investment in social economy, esp. development of capacities for research and development for non-profits (including evidence-based policy making), “Intersectoral” cooperation within the sector/further profiling of the organizations and recognition of the skills (rather than exclusively organizations’ “traditional” target groups). For example – Atina has extensive experience in developing local intersectoral networks and this experience could be used for various topics and purposes rather than protection of migrants/vulnerable groups. This recognition of similar capacities of different organizations could lead to a new direction in the development, especially CSOs as social service providers with regard to the integration of vulnerable groups.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project is in its 10th month of implementation. The action plan has been made ambitious, so Atina is considering requesting an extension. The main contribution is in piloting participative approach of cultural mediators as an instrument for improving situation of illegal migrants and asylum seekers while in Serbia. While the project includes capacity building component and public promotion towards inclusion and tolerance in local communities where migrants and asylum seekers are most present, adding value to other IPA CSF, EIDHR and other donor interventions in the sector, the introduction of the concept of cultural mediators is interesting but will be very challenging to implement and utilize in practice. In this, both impact and sustainability might be only achieved on individual cases of migrants in prevention of risks they face while travelling and in access to basic case and rights while in Serbia. Since several project dealing with the needs of increasing number (still expected to rise to a critical level) of illegal migrants and asylum seekers funded within IPA CSF and EIDHR scheme, the intervention on the part of the EU might be more effective and bring about more sustainable and long-term impact if dealt with a strategic-type project bringing together state, local and especially civil society actors working on the same issues. Atina might benefit from further coordination and synergies with other CSO active on the issue and further utilization of expertise, access and hands-on knowledge of project partner APC to ensure lasting effects of its capacity-building and promotion component in local communities targeted in the particular project.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/10/2014</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>Belgrade, Hotel Metropol</td>
<td>Marijana Savic, Director, NGO Atina – Citizens' Association for Combat Trafficking In Human Beings and All Forms of Gender-Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2014</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Center for social care office, Sremska Mitrovica</td>
<td>Snezana Stanisavljevic, Director, Center for social care office, Sremska Mitrovica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Asylum Protection Center office, Belgrade</td>
<td>Rados Djurovic, Director, Asylum Protection Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Identification

Programme name: IPA Civil Society Facility
Call for proposals: EU Civil Society Facility Serbia
Contract number: 2013/333-331
Contract name: ISLANDS - Interconnecting Stakeholders in Learning and Drama in Serbia
Beneficiary: BAZAART
Contract total: 110,366.22 €
Contract amount EU: 99,329.6 €
Co-financing: 90%
Contract start date: 27.11.2013
Contract end date: 27.07.2015
Contract duration: 20 months

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance educational reform in Serbia by promoting intercultural drama learning in formal education, contributing to a plural, tolerant and inclusive school ethos, democratic learning processes with modern curricula and a responsible, integrated role of school in the society</td>
<td>• Strengthen local CSOs to support teachers who promote tolerance and diffuse intercultural drama on local and regional level; • Strengthen teachers on country level to democratize teaching practices and gradually become important stakeholder in the reform; • Improve initial teacher training introducing educational drama; • Make steps towards a more democratic school curricula reform.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results

| Minimum 3 CSOs operating in culturally complex communities in Serbia are strengthened to become local teachers’ resource centres (RC); | Capacity building of local CSOs and expanding the team; |
| Minimum 80 teachers are trained in intercultural drama method and skilled to develop creative theatre processes promoting tolerance; | Teacher trainings and diffusion of the intercultural drama method; |
| Minimum 200 teachers from Serbia are connected through a web-based support network in a national drama educators’ | Connecting teachers in a national network; |
| | Developing a web-based support platform for teachers; |
| | Survey of teachers needs and writing an assessment; |
| | Program design for different categories of |
association;

- Assessment of teachers’ needs and suggestions for drama-based learning is made and presented to HEI and curricula designers;
- A website is established providing communication & learning;
- Minimum 3 HEI work with CSOs on presenting drama-based learning approach to students – future educators;
- Minimum 3 formal dialogue frameworks are created, involving educational experts and authorities in dialogue on curricula reform;
- Recommendations on curricula reform in arts education – drama in particular – are composed & published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>teachers trained at HEIs;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Seminars for students – future teachers at HEIs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developing dialogue platforms: debates, conferences, a magazine;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developing recommendations for reformed curricula and publishing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public consultations and advocacy activities on arts education curricula reform initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Conceptual Design

1. **Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?**
   
   Yes. Both are well-articulated. Results are formulated as targets and are not overly ambitious.

2. **Is it easy to understand the project logic?**
   
   Project logic is clear, consistent and relevant.

3. **Are there clear OVIs?**
   
   Yes. Many quantified indicator. Quantitative indicators are relevant, but issue with access to and SOVi.

### II. Relevance

4. **How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives**
   
   Project is mostly aimed to address Theme 2 of the Call for Proposal, i.e. encourage CSOs initiatives promoting cultural diversity and regional reconciliations. It is addressing the issue of civic participation in policy design and implementation and cultural pluralism and empowerment of grass-root CSOs to become stronger interlocutors in policy making and public life in local communities.

5. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**
   
   Project is focused on providing non-formal education programs, especially those dealing with civic values. It hopes to instigate change in practicing teaching and targeting education as a key development factor for Serbia by offering concrete set of skills, know-how to teacher that can be easily applied in their everyday work. Teachers need intercultural sensitizing and learning; they feel helpless in situations of youth discrimination, lacking skills to transform violence into dialogue; they are not involved in syllabi development or any other strategic process; professional dignity of teachers is very low.

6. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**
   
   Yes.

### III. Efficiency

7. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**

Project is in its 12th month of implementation. According to the monitoring report, the structure of the project is composed more as programme based on the 4 components out of which, each can present separate project. This presents challenge, both for project implementation and monitoring of the action.

Currently, activities are running as planned and outputs are being achieved. There is a series of project activities held as public events (round tables, performances, book promotions, presentations of research results etc.) which attract excellent public and media attention. There have also been many media reports and appearances linked to public activities.

8. **Is the project well managed and monitored?**

Monitoring visit on 27th August, 2014 (9 months of project implementation) by the Senior Grant and Monitoring Office under the TA tasked to assist and monitor IPA CSF projects was performed. No problems reported. BAZAART has previous experience in EU project management.

9. **How much of the grant is disbursed?**

According to the monitoring report, around 40% of expenditures have been made in first 6 months of the project. BAZAART is confident that all the funds will be used.

10. **Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?**

No.

11. **Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.**

No.

12. **Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?**

Drama-in-education is a novelty in Serbian education as well as cultural space, so there is no academic program educating professionals in this field. BAZAART has “build” staff for this, it takes time, and it is not always successful. BAZAART is coping so far, but one member left for maternity leave and we are at present short of one strong person in the Belgrade local team.

13. **Are the activities achieving value for money?**

Yes.

14. **Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?**

Project has well-developed and updated website, as part of BAZAART's organization website. It is well linked with prevision activities includes articles of project activities. No data (press clipping) etc. was available at this stage of the project. CEKOM from Zrenjanin report having issues with media coverage as they experienced local media asking for payment to cover their activities, press conferences but this was only for local TV stations.

15. **Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?**

BAZAART is satisfied with the level of support and guidance.

16. **Is there any issue with the co-financing?**

BAZAART is benefiting from co-financing support by the Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society as well as Ministry of Youth and Sports, Ministry of Culture. Co-financing is fully secured.

### IV. Effectiveness

17. **Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?**

Project is only in the mid of its implementation. The project builds on EU-funded project, which initiated development of intercultural drama and the current project present a follow-up phase whereby
consolidating a support infrastructure (skills, web, resource centers etc.) to introduce intercultural drama as part of the curriculum and methodology work in education system in Serbia. In this respect, the project is expected to reach stated results.

18. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

Training workshops (in intercultural learning through drama) for teachers in formal education are the most actual help, having practical use (new teaching methods), the greatest outreach (speaking in numbers of teachers and pupils/students) and multiple effect (empowering both teachers and the CSOs who are conducting the trainings, affecting school routine, strengthening teams in schools etc.). Also source books and published material are an important help, supporting teachers to put their newly obtained skills into practice and carry on with a modified, more democratic teaching style. This direct help is especially important because the activities on policy level may take much longer to prove helpful, because of lack of continuity in policy making (frequent political changes).

19. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Project is a truly collaborative partnership confirmed by the partners. It functions as a network, whereby all partners are fully involved in tasks they have undertaken. In Zrenjanin, Smederevo and Niš, and also in Belgrade, partners are responsible for numerous local activities, e.g. trainings, meetings with experts and round tables, also collecting teaching resources (models etc.) for on-line publishing. BAZAART is providing continues support based on specific partners’ needs. Pedagogical Society has completed the research and is working now on its promotion. Young associates – Pedagogy Students’ Club – are immensely valuable to the project, systematizing results, networking with HEIs, volunteering in trainings etc. We can state that all partners are fully involved in the project and also gaining strong competences.

V. Impact

20. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Based on its continued work on introducing intercultural drama into Serbian education system, BAZAART expects that the project will contribute to a shift in the attitude of educators in Serbia towards their own capacities to induce a positive change in the educational routine. They also expect greater solidarity of educators to occur, in terms of teachers helping each other to modernize their teaching practice and working together with local youth theatre groups on improving educational practice.

Impact on students who are getting prepared in HEIs to become teachers will become obvious only when they enter teaching practice, but BAZAART have high hopes that with methods offered through the project, they will not so easily become absorbed in a static and outdated routine. They do not expect any immediate change to happen in HEIs, and do not believe that any change will be visible immediately; however, activities in this project are a test and preparation for a future project that shall focus more exclusively on universities and art academies.

Capital development in the area of policy making is at present beyond their reach, but certain improvement will definitely happen on lower levels, because the project is connecting schools with other local stakeholders and it will be able to sensitize them for implementation of drama as an interactive teaching method.

21. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?
Probably not. Intercultural learning or drama-in-education are yet to be recognized in the Serbian educational system and there are no formal mechanisms for their development and promotion. Also, the educational system is becoming more and more centralized and burdened with administration, so “emancipatory” activities for teachers are nowhere to be found.

### 22. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

Yes, but only indirectly and on the long run as it is trying to address the underlying principles and methods of education in modern democratic society.

### 23. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

It strengthens CSOs, enhances dialogue on all levels, empowers citizens for participation in public discussions on education as public interest, which also includes issues of legislation and its implementation, and empowers teachers to empower students for critical thinking and participation in community and society. Intercultural learning enables better inclusion of different (directly and indirectly vulnerable) social groups and contributes strongly to reconciliation processes in the country in the first place, but also in the region.

### 24. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.

BAZAART cooperates or acts as a partner in EU and locally funded projects in the sector, with the Cultural Centre of Belgrade, Centre for Promotion of Science, Aps Art etc. They exchange experience with colleagues who are also grantees in this call and invite many colleagues from the sector to present their work and cooperate in our activities – meetings with experts, round tables etc. This will become a priority in the last project phase MONET – Moderation and Networking – when we will also cooperate more closely with CZKD, especially in the city of Niš. They are striving to connect with similar projects conducted by the Ministry of Education and failing for time being. They would appreciate soft support from donors in that way as well.

### 25. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?

Applying the methodology, BAZAART was granted the EIDHR project MEDIATE – Method of Educational Drama for Inclusiveness and Tolerance, where BAZAART works in communities in need for social mediation and also develops tangible results, i.e. manuals for teachers. With this project BAZAART has entered communities where they have not worked before and gained new partners. The two projects support each other on country level (teachers are gradually getting connected; there are opportunities for exchange of experiences and cooperation etc.).

Also smaller spin-off activities are initiated, e.g. a small project in the municipality of Vracar in Belgrade that helps us test the program (intercultural learning through drama) with young people age 20-30 who are not any more in the educational system, e.g. graduated students, unemployed young people (they are not a target group in the ISLANDS project). The project goal is however different, i.e. strengthening a volunteer base in the municipality of Vracar.

Also, in other cities the program is a base for attracting more young people as members of youth theatre groups.

### VI. Sustainability
26. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?
Project is still on-going. Again, since the project is continuation of previous EU-funded project and aims at consolidating previous and current work to provide for its sustainability esp. via LOTRECs (resources centers for teacher in intercultural drama) it is realistic to expect that project outputs and results are to remain visual after project end.

27. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results
BAZAART has secured related EIDHR project (MEDIATE – Method of Educational Drama for Inclusiveness and Tolerance) and has several smaller spin-offs so again some basic resources already exist to continue the work. The effort funded in the project is the primary focus of BAZAART and it has invested in developing, spreading, empowering organizations, institutions etc. to use the approach so hopefully this would enable to secure further state and local funding in support in the future. Some of the partners, e.g. CEKOM from Zrenjanin has grown to a stable and mature organization with the support of BAZAART and is encouraged to secure its own funding and support for local level activities.

28. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
BAZAART has several projects in development or implemented: a regional project for developing a Western Balkan methodology for intercultural learning through drama, strengthening Local Resource Centers for Teachers (LOTRECs), improving the web platform DRAMAGOGIJA in-country and regionally, entering HEIs in a much stronger fashion, insisting that drama pedagogy should be introduced in the curricula, continuing public promotion of education and culture as public interest, composing community art projects in order to enhance civic participation in culture, promote cultural and civic education, culture of dialogue etc.

29. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
Yes, because there is a shared interest in the project subject and responsibilities are well distributed, so we can support each other in the future as well. Partnerships with some organization, e.g. CEKOM from Zrenjanin have continued for several years now.

30. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
Support to actions which are positive in spirit, enhancing solidarity, participation, active citizenship and values, e.g. community art and activities, youth camps, summer and winter schools for pupils/students and teachers, citizens, professional and youth exchange schemes, art work in local communities etc.
Cultural programs that enhance civic participation and are linked to real social needs should primarily be supported – street art, interactive exhibitions in open space, participatory programs, socially relevant programs followed by workshops or discussions in local theatres, museums and cultural institutions, online publishing, documentary filmmaking, animated film etc.
Cultural expression at large needs support – popular and large scale participatory programs for children and youth, teachers, citizens – enhancing cultural expression and promoting value of culture. If we do not appreciate culture, we will not be able to live together.
In-country and regional cooperation and exchange is also enormously important. People need to travel and gain immediate experience in interacting with others.
Media also need to be consolidated! Cultural columns and programs, both popular and professional, are very scarce; art criticism has almost expired.
Additionally, it would be very useful if all grantees would have a joint meeting dedicated to concise presentation of their projects, so we would know better what colleagues are doing. Also, if possible, Delegation or EU Info Centre could forward invitations to project public events, to other grantees.
VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project is in its 12th month of implementation. Project is a follow-up to previous funded activities by BAZAART and partners to introduce new, interactive and participatory methodologies in the mainstream education system in Serbia. Project is a true partnership and is realistically set in targeting change in practice whereby contributing towards a “critical mass” of teachers, educators, professors to introduce such methods into legislation and institutions education framework. This project is specific and important as aims to bring and develop together comprehensive and complex set of support structures to all stakeholders to enable such a systematic change. While project focus on key underlying principles in democracy strengthening and building modern citizens its sustainability and impact at the national policy level is questionable, something that is realized also by BAZAART.

BAZAART could benefit from developing more concrete and direct advocacy and policy measures addressed both to local (more practical) level and national (policy) level to enable any kind of sustainability of its efforts in education reform. For this, building coalitions beyond its partnership might be needed and for this participation to other network, e.g. SEKO could be utilized.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29/10/2014</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Bazaart office, Belgrade</td>
<td><strong>Suncica Milosavljevic</strong>, Programme Director, Bazaart&lt;br&gt;<strong>Dusan Strbac</strong>, Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/2014</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td><strong>Smiljana Tucakov</strong>, Project Coordinator, Centre for creative growing-up and multicultural cooperation – CEKOM, Zrenjanin&lt;br&gt;<strong>Aleksandar Dambas</strong>, trainers, CEKOM, Zrenjanin&lt;br&gt;<strong>Dusan Kaleski</strong>, trainer, CEKOM, Zrenjanin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Belgrade Open School
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### Project Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>IPA Civil Society Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>EU Civil Society Facility Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2013/333-329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>ReForce – Reinforcing the Role of Civil Society Organisations in Community Development and Public Administration Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Belgrade Open School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>110,017.40 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>98,740,62 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>89,75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>28. 11. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>28. 01. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>14 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Summary

*Brief description of objectives, results, and activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Support cooperation between CSOs and local public administration for systematic and effective cooperation in policy formulations and decision making process</td>
<td>• Develop institutionalized, result–oriented dialogue for reinforcing the role of civil society in local community development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve local CSOs granting procedures adjusted to needs and strategic priorities of local communities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase the role of CSOs in improving transparency and accountability of local public administration in effective management of local public funds assigned for civil society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Developed and implemented in at least 5 local municipalities mechanism for result-oriented and transparent process of financing CSOs projects from local public funds;</td>
<td>• Development of Cost Effectiveness Analysis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designed e-platform “Local Development Toolkit” as an e-service supporting policy making in community development;</td>
<td>• Advanced Capacity Building Programme Inclusive Policy Making at Local Level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduced new services of Advisory Centre of SCTM for sustainable cooperation</td>
<td>• Development of e-Services for Community Development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocacy Initiatives “Supporting Institutionalized Dialogue”, incl. Consultative Dialogue; Advocacy Campaigns in Five Municipalities; and implementation of Grant Support to Grass Roots Initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between CSOs and local administration;
- Developed Policy Analysis with recommendations for improvement of cost-effectiveness of local CSOs granting procedures;
- Improved capacities of local authorities and CSOs, for joined decision making process for local community development;
- Piloted grassroots initiatives of CSOs implemented through partnership of CSOs and local authorities in accordance with specific local needs;
- Increased effectiveness of public funds allocated to CSOs in at least 5 local municipalities;
- At least 50 000 citizens in 5 municipalities directly, positively affected by implemented grass root initiatives

I. Conceptual Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?</td>
<td>Yes. Both well-articulated, clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Is it easy to understand the project logic?</td>
<td>Yes, although it mixes measure on civil society development and public administration reform at local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Are there clear OVIs?</td>
<td>Yes. Both quantitative and quality, incl. target value. Some too ambitious in terms of SOVi and access to info to measure them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals' objectives</td>
<td>Project is addressed to 2 themes of the call for proposals: theme 1 (Public administration reform) and theme 3 (Development of CSOs at local level). Project aim is to strengthen participation of CSOs in public administration reform in Serbia at the municipalities in South Serbia and at the same time foster civic and capacity building initiatives aimed at reinforcing the role of civil society in community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?</td>
<td>Project addresses the lack of capacities, know-how by municipalities and grass-root CSOs. Public administration reform will hardly succeed without active monitoring and participation of civil society. Local public authorities suffer from lack of knowledge and capacities to provide services to the citizens based on good governance principles. Local CSOs have not enough capacities to promote and foster transparency and accountability as basic principles for public administration reform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Does the selection of the project seem justified?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Efficiency

**67. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are they in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**

Project is ongoing and it is in its 12 month of implementation. Project implementation is on track, but several activities had to be rescheduled due to cut to communication and overburdened LSG with the emergency situation. One training and several consultative meetings with CSOs and local authority representatives had to be rescheduled from June to August and September 2014. Delay was compensated in rescheduling other activities which were allowing to be reprogrammed.

**68. Is the project well managed and monitored?**

Monitoring visit on 18th June, 2014 by the Senior Grant and Monitoring Office under the TA tasked to assist and monitor IPA CSF projects was performed. BOS did not report facing any difficulty in managing the project except for above mentioned issues. BOS is experienced in managing EU-funded projects.

**69. How much of the grant is disbursed?**

According to the monitoring report, around 30% of expenditures have been made in first 6 months of the project.

**70. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?**

No.

**71. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.**

No.

**72. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?**

BOS has enough staff engaged in the project implementation, but the delays brought about increased engagement of the project staff in September and October.

**73. Are the activities achieving value for money?**

Yes.

**74. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?**

A project-related website has been developed ([http://paketpomociocd.bos.rs/](http://paketpomociocd.bos.rs/)) but some of the basic information, such as information on project activities are available only on organization's page. Media were present at consultative meetings organized, in August and September 2014, project activities were followed with 24 media releases on local and national level.

**75. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?**

Support from the TA staff (PMU) was useful, timely. There have been certain difficulties faced with the interpretation of the rules for the financial support to the third parties (sub-granting) but the clarification by Contracting Authority/PMU has been provided on time.

**76. Is there any issue with the co-financing?**

The percentage of co-financing is 10.25% or 11,276.78 EUR. Office for Cooperation with Civil Society of the Government of Serbia co-finances the project with an amount of 532,752.00 RSD or 4672 EUR cc. The difference is being co-finance by BOS with its own resources.

### IV. Effectiveness
77. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?

According to BOS, around 70% of expected results are already achieved. More concretely, Cost Effectiveness Analysis in the form of policy proposal was developed, more than 60 representatives of local CSOs and local authorities were introduced with result oriented strategic planning and transparent, inclusive and accountable policy making through capacity building activity, there is established institutionalized cooperation with 11 (expected number was 5) towns and municipalities in South and Southwest Serbia who are, through introduced mechanism for transparent financing of CSOs, participating in grant scheme for supporting CSOs projects, in the framework of grant scheme 39 local CSOs submitted their project proposals in all 11 towns and municipalities included, 11 towns and municipalities started organizing consultations for programming local budget for 2015 in cooperation with CSOs.

78. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences

BOS feedback from the target group is positive. Project is equipping target groups with skills and knowledge in the same time and gives target groups a chance to actively participate in this transfer providing them with an opportunity to actually learn by practicing their new skills and knowledge (learning-by-doing). However, the level of knowledge and skills of targeted CSOs is not sufficient for crucial reforms and building of partnership and mutual understanding. More efforts are needed to strengthen capacities of grass rooted CSOs in Serbia. Capacity of the local authorities varies, but the most challenging is strong political/partisans influence.

79. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities (SCTM) participates in the project and has a key role in establishing communication and cooperation with local authorities in South and Southwestern Serbia. They participated in preparation and implementation of consultative meetings with local authorities and CSOs, designing working documents for implementation of specific activities, participating in planning, designing and implementing of all steps of the grant scheme for local CSOs, etc.

V. Impact

80. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Expected change that the project is aimed at delivering is raised quality of life in local communities, where local actors will adopt and, in some extent, start to practice democratic, transparent and participatory process in creating and developing local development policies that are in compliance with local needs. In most of the targeted municipalities budget consultation has been conducted for a first time. The change will be based on established cooperation between civil society and local authorities. It is likely that in targeted municipalities: financing of the CSOs programmes will be more result oriented, cooperation between CSOs and local authorities will be improved, transparency and accountability of local authorities will be improved, but further improvement is needed. Local projects, supported within sub-granting scheme, will directly involve citizens in policy processes in local communities. The trust
among citizens and CSOs will be improved. Another aspect of change is, additionally, more effective public funds allocation to CSOs and more efficient implementation of CSOs projects that are in line with local strategic plan. It is expected for this change to be achieved in at least 11 municipalities and towns in the end of the project, but is expected that positive practice in these areas will influence the change to happen in other areas in Serbia.

**81. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?**

According to the current experience the conclusion is that it is not likely that this development would change without the grant. Areas in which the project is taking place are the most underdeveloped in Serbia, whose capacities and poor economic situation do not provide a fruitful environment for development without external grants and external help. Therefore, the grassroots change in these areas is almost impossible without a trigger. There is, beside the unwillingness from the state level to deal with this problem, the lack of knowledge on what is actually happening on local level. Additionally, focus on development issues in local communities has never been a political priority and is likely that it will become one in the future. Regarding other forces that can influence change, strong and experienced CSOs in Serbia are still not focused on working on local level and do not show interest on shifting their interest from dealing with policies on the national level to the policies on local level.

**82. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.**

Very scattered and unsystematic.

**83. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.**

ReForce project is in line with the Strategic Framework of the Office for Cooperation with Civil Society 2011–2014, where it contributes fulfilling national priorities number 1 and 3 (related to communication and cooperation of CSOs and government and improvement of CSOs granting procedures and effectiveness of their projects). Furthermore, project is in line with strategic goals regarding management of public funds in Public Administration Reform Strategy in the Republic of Serbia 2013 – 2016 (project ReForce through its activities improves procedures and develops and sets mechanism for result oriented and transparent process for financing CSOs). In the end, project is in line with the Action Plan for Fulfillment of the European Commission Recommendations under the Serbia 2013 Progress Report in the European Integration Process, specifically with the section 1.1 Democracy and Rule of Law (project ReForce defines and sets standards for cooperation of CSOs and Government and for participatory process).

**84. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.**

Project is related to the Strategy for an Enabling Environment for Civil Society Development, which is currently under consultation and is expected to be adopted in early 2015, Public Administration Reform Strategy which has been adopted in January 2014 and the Governments’ initiative for transformation of budgetary planning process, which dictates that LSG move to programme budgets as of 2015.

**85. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?**

Within sub-granting scheme 11 projects, developed by local CSOs, will be co-financed by their local municipalities with an amount of 30% of grants provided by BOS.
VI. Sustainability

86. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Project is still on-going. Capacity, easy-to-use tools and methodologies developed during the project as well as the Analysis are likely to be useful and used beyond the project duration since they directly relate to new obligations and priorities steaming for LSGs with the introduction of programme budgets as of 2015 as well as from the PAR strategy.

87. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results?

Continuation of allocation of LSG budgets to CSO activities is likely at least in municipalities highlighted as best practices and who have reported that they will continue the practice, e.g. Vranje, Nova Varos. Since the project started at the end of 2014, it missed the opportunity to influence the LCS budget cycle for 2014 and effect can only be expected with budget 2015, coinciding with introduction of program budget.

88. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

Not at the moment.

89. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Partnerships created by the grant proposal are likely to last. BOS and SCTM have established its cooperation for more than 10 years ago and it is based on Memorandum on Cooperation. Memorandum of cooperation has been signed between BOS, SCTM and 11 towns and municipalities.

90. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

According to BOS what is needed is support the grass rooted CSOs in the form of small scale grant should remain the important instrument for enabling environment for civil society development. Attention should be paid on the process of programme budgeting and strengthening of CSOs for monitoring and participation in the process. Development of the public administration as a service for the citizens and reduction of political/partisans influence. Local CSOs needs to be strengthened to actively monitor the budgetary processe on the local level for which they are not capable yet.

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

The project is taking advantage of 3 policy momentum (Strategy for EE on CSDev, PAR strategy and introduction of programmatic budgets) and is presenting a set of easy-to-use methodological solutions (templates) for the LSG to use in implementing their obligations and commitments. Thus, the project comes in timely and at a more mature stage of the process (not piloting for example such ideas). Nevertheless, its overarching approach and grand design might be too complex and ambitious for the short-time period, small budget and sub-granting scheme to make it possible to bring about substantial change across all municipalities. What will be crucial in this is the role of the LSG partner-SCTM and how strongly implementation of the said Strategies is going to be prioritized.
The project might also benefit from linking up to longer-standing and experience initiatives in the domain of transparency of public funding to CSOs and transparency and accountability of municipal budgets as well as linking with experienced local CSO to lead the advocacy and monitoring effort at the municipal level to provide for longer-term impact. Sub-granting scheme is still in early stage. It is proving to be useful to small, grass-root organizations and esp. municipalities with small budgets, but again this can only be final beneficiaries and probably do not have the capacity or interest to lead the advocacy and monitoring of how local budgets are spent and how local CSO are consulted in including in budget allocations.
### VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/10/2014</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Belgrade Open School office, Belgrade</td>
<td>Mirko Popovic, Project Coordinator, Belgrade Open School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vanja Dolapčev, Project Assistant, Belgrade Open School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/2014</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Natasa Paunovic, Project beneficiary/sub-grantee/CSO Kreativko, Raska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/2014</td>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Marijana Djokic, Project beneficiary/Head of Economy and Local Economic Development, Nova Varos, municipality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Media

Dan Graf d.o.o.,

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Tanja Hafner Ademi
Date: 14th November, 2014

Project Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>IPA 2012 Strengthening Media Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>IPA 2012 Strengthening Media Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2013/335-630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Pravda Danas (Justice Danas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary:</td>
<td>Dan Graf d.o.o., Limited Liability Company, Publisher of daily Danas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>172,053 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>106,397,58 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>61.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>01.01.2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract end date:</td>
<td>30.06.2015 (extended to 31.07.2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contribution to the better public understanding of the vital importance of the judicial reform in Serbia.</td>
<td>• To urge decision makers to carry out the necessary reform of justice system in Serbia and implement the recommendations of EU in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION OF GRANT CONTRACTS IMPLEMENTED AND FINANCED BY IPA AND EIDHR

- Independence and transparency in the work of judiciary.
- Efficiency on the execution of justice

Chapter 23 of Acquis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Main outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Standards from Chapter 23 of EU Acquis adopted by decision-makers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Process of EU accession more efficient by improvement of the specific knowledge on this issue of the decision-makers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved specific knowledge on this issue of civil servants from judiciary and Prosecutor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The knowledge of the media representatives improved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Civil society, expert organizations and educational institutions specific knowledge on the issue improved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generated public pressure towards the adoption of the standards from Chapter 23 of EU Acquis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meeting of the project team,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintaining the contact with relevant stakeholders, processing their feedback and introducing changes in the concept and content of the ‘Justice Danas’ accordingly,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Putting editions on the website <a href="http://www.danas.rs">www.danas.rs</a>,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Steering Committee sessions,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making the online questionnaire for the readers,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Getting the feedback by online questionnaire, mail and e-mail, introducing changes in concept and content of ‘Justice Danas’ accordingly,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publishing 468 daily editions of Justice Danas supplement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Conceptual Design

91. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

Yes, both the project proposal and the logframe are well explained and articulated.

92. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes.

93. Are there clear OVIs?

Yes. Most quantified OVIs are realistic, achievable, but some quantitative indicators do not have available
### II. Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives?</td>
<td>It is in-line with the specific objective of the call for proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?</td>
<td>Considering the overall situation with judiciary reform in Serbia, the project is relevant and fulfills the needs of the beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Does the selection of the project seem justified?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?</td>
<td>Project is 11th month of implementation. After composition of the project team, Danas started with publication of articles via supplement. Due to very ambitious plan, i.e. publish 468 daily editions, absence of the Chief Editor due to health reasons and delay due to early parliamentary elections, Danas had to rearrange the sequence and pace of publishing articles per project from supplement only to regular editions to make up for the delays as mentioned above. It remains to be seen if they are able to deliver (in quantity) the number or articles/supplements as per project design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Is the project well managed and monitored?</td>
<td>Danas has previous experience in managing EU funds. According to the monitoring visit conducted on 20th June, 2014 within the frame of TA assistance to the grant scheme, Danas is applying sound management to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. How much of the grant is disbursed?</td>
<td>According to the monitoring report, grant disbursement are in line with the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
101. **Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.**
Yes. Due to delays mentioned, addendum has been signed, incl an extension of the contract for 1 months, making effective end date of the contract 31 July, 2015.

102. **Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?**
Danas did not report any problem.

103. **Are the activities achieving value for money?**
Yes, if the planned number of article are delivered by end of the project.

104. **Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?**
This is a media project, so outreach and visibility is one of its main components. While the printed edition of Danas has a small circulation since it is one of the rare quality dailies existing in Serbia and a specific reader profile (young, urban, educated etc.), the on-line website is contributing to the outreach. This is demonstrated via the articles published within the Justice Danas section appearing in the “Most popular” engine on the Danas website.

105. **Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?**
Yes. The support from the TA has been useful, esp in helping overcome the issues faced and submit timely, effective requests to the EUD.

106. **Is there any issue with the co-financing?**
Yes. It is a general problem for Danas as it is not a commercial type of daily newspaper.

**IV. Effectiveness**

107. **Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?**
Project is on-going, but some promising results can already be observed. Several EIDHR grant related projects research findings and advocacy initiatives have been exposed via Justice Danas, such as the issue of corruption in Serbian prisons (CHR-Nis EIDHR project) and situation of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers (APC EIDHR project).

108. **How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences**
Due to the fact that on daily basis there are articles/stories or interviews on concrete cases, there is enough evidence that the target groups are receiving on the state of judicial reform.

109. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

There is no formal partner. Good cooperation with CSO working on Chapter 23 issues have been established via inclusion of their research work and advocacy proposal in Justice Danas.

V. Impact

110. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Danas has always used (as much as its financial situation allowed) quality investigating journalism as its primary method of work and it can be expected that this will remain so also after the project. While the paper is in a very unstable financial situation, it is not realistic to expect that it will be able to have large quantity or a 2-paged supplement devoted to issues under Chapter 23, but occasional article as much as its balancing act vis-à-vis authorities and financial situation allows (trade-off between adds and quality articles space).

111. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

No, or at least not in a comprehensive way as it is publishing extensive and variety of articles on issues of Chapter 23 on a continues (19 month) basis.

112. Is the project likely to result in major/socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

In the long-run, it should contribute to judiciary regain the trust of citizens, but short term effect are on the level of informed and knowledge citizens on standards and critical issues authorities need to address in order to fulfill criteria under Chapter 23.

113. Is the project likely to contribute to the realization of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.

Yes. Since the project involves also ‘best practices’ in implementing Chapter 23 by new EU member
states, this will contribute to the EU negotiation and accession process.

114. **Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.**

Yes. Several EIDHR-funded project had its research findings and advocacy action published in a series of articles and this is an important link that EUD could explore further in the future.

115. **Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?**

No.

## VI. Sustainability

116. **Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?**

Yes. Project is still ongoing. Outputs are very visible since the main activity is a publication of newspaper articles. After project end, articles will remain available via on-line Danas edition or Dana archive.

117. **Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results**

Very difficult. They will continue to cover stories on judicial reforms but this will not be possible with the same intensity and in this capacity. Although non-profit grants are not a typical source of financing for Danas, it resorts to grants to be able to operate and carry its daily operation.

118. **Are there any follow-up projects or activities?**

No. Danas applied for a grant at the Norwegian embassy to complement (co-finance) the project activities, but this has not been approved.

119. **Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?**

There were no formal partners in the project.

120. **What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?**

With support of EU they would continue to produce similar inner-pages, and activities within daily Danas on other EU issues and topics. Easier, more flexible cooperation and funding as well as lighter application documents.
VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Project is extremely relevant to the call for proposals and the needs of the citizens to have available quality, in-depth information about the standards and issues that authorities need to tackle within Chapter 23 (esp. judiciary reform) negotiations and accession process. Effectiveness and efficiency of the project are not optimal due to a mix of internal and external factors, but the impact of the project lies in providing quality, timely and appropriate information to the citizens. Project has been exemplary in converging of efforts between EIDHR grant beneficiaries working on Chapter 23 issues and the Justice Danas project. Project-by-project support is not optimal to achieve expected results as Danas resorts to grant support due to lack of other available funding resources and this brings about administrative and technical difficulties. The direct and quality approach taken by Danas provides for high visibility and possible impact on citizens and public institutions, but it is to be seen if this can have a larger effect since the prospect for sustainability without a further non-profit grant is almost impossible.

Due to the fact that daily Danas, had previous experience in promoting European values, and European Serbia, first through the project “Blue pages” and now with “Pravda Danas” a future support of daily Danas on a different EU topic/issue would have a multiplying benefit for Serbian society and citizens, as well for state institution who are in-charge of pushing forward the process of EU integration. The optimum approach would be to engage in a strategic, longer-term support including follow-up debates on issues and pressure on institutions to perform via cooperation with CSO or/and try establishing a partner cooperation with public institutions, esp. independent mechanism in charge of protection citizens’ rights etc.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/11/2014</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Dan Graf d.o.o., Limited Liability Company, Publisher of daily Danas office, Belgrade</td>
<td>Vladimir Lcina, Project Coordinator/Senior Editor, Danas Aleksandar Roknic, Editor of the supplement Pravo Danas/Journalist, Danas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monte Royal Pictures International doo

Project Evaluation Report

Written by Tanja Hafner Ademi
Date: 13th November, 2014

Project Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme name:</th>
<th>IPA 2012 Strengthening Media Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals:</td>
<td>IPA 2012 Strengthening Media Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract number:</td>
<td>2013/335-513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract name:</td>
<td>Gram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneficiary:</td>
<td>Preduzece za Kinematografske i Video Aktivnosti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monte Royal Pictures International doo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract total:</td>
<td>155,475.87 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amount EU:</td>
<td>139,928.28 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing:</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date:</td>
<td>26.12.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract duration:</td>
<td>10 (+2) months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Summary

(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to the fight against drugs in Serbian schools and related organized crime through quality TV production</td>
<td>• Increase the knowledge of Serbian parents in accessibility and availability of drugs, drug trafficking and fight against drugs in Serbian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expected results

- Parents able to be actively involved in the fight against drugs and organized crime in schools;
- Citizens better informed on the state of the play in the fight against organised crime and drug trafficking in Serbia;
- Citizens fully aware of the system improvements and deficiencies in this field;
- Serbian public able to monitor enforcement of criminal legislation related to drugs and organized crime;
- Positive Family and social values promoted;
- Demystification of so called “transitional heroes” such as members of crime groups at any level of the criminal organization.

### Main outputs

- Project set up,
- Production of the TV docudrama,
- Promotion,
- Broadcasting and Closure of the project and final report.

### I. Conceptual Design
### II. Relevance

124. **How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives?**  
Project is related to the theme/sector law enforcement and fight against all forms of crime, including organised crime and cross-border crime and has Ministry of Interior as its main target group/beneficiary.

125. **How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?**  
The priority of the call address issues that are relevant in Serbia, having in mind that overall number of teenagers drug users as well as the overall dynamism of the market of drug trafficking in Serbia, no matter the city or region and its consequences for drug users, drug dealers, institutions and society in general.

126. **Does the selection of the project seem justified?**  
Yes.

### III. Efficiency

127. **Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are there in line with the contract and the implementation plan?**  
Project is on-going and is being extended. All activities are implemented in line with schedule. Preparatory activities, setting up the team, filming, research.

128. **Is the project well managed and monitored?**  
Monte Royal has previous experience in managing EU-funded projects. According to the monitoring visit
129. How much of the grant is disbursed?
According to the schedule per contract.

130. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?
No.

131. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.
Delays occurred to recent floods in Serbia (main stakeholder, i.e. Ministry of Interior was unresponsive), two addendums were processed. In addition, an extension was requested and approved, but not related to the completion of the project but extending the duration of the contract so the TV drama can apply for various international festivals in Europe.

132. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes. This is the biggest project for Monte Royal presently, so all staff is focused on implementing the project.

133. Are the activities achieving value for money?
This will be clear once the project is finalized.

134. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
There is one main product of the project - 45 minutes docudrama and it has not yet been made public.

135. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Yes. Support provided by TA under the grant scheme is effective, timely and efficient.

136. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
No. Monte Royal is co-financing the project from its own resources.

IV. Effectiveness

137. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
Project is ongoing and the key product/output – docudrama - is still being developed. What has been one
of the main concerns of project is the lack of responsiveness and cooperation on the part of the relevant public institutions, i.e. Ministry of Justice and esp. Ministry of Interior that the project is ultimately targeting. Also a concern remains broadcasting of the docudrama once finalized.

138. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
This will be clear once the docudrama is screened.

139. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?
No formal partners were involved. Cooperation with MoI and MoJ is not effective and problematic.

V. Impact

140. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

The TV drama that will target in particular parents in Serbia and will tackle the issues of drug dealing and drug use in Serbian schools, enforcement of drug legislation, efforts of both Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Interior, personal and system deficiencies and initiate mobilisation of population in Serbia to act as watch dogs of the anti-drug enforcement policies. the TV drama wants to provide a realistic view to TV audience in Serbia regarding accessibility of drugs in schools, direct link with organised crime (in terms that their children are becoming objects of exploitation), positive changes in this field, highlight areas where more institutional support is needed and disrupt the glorification of members or organised crime groups, from the smallest drug dealer in the schoolyard to their supreme commander, often in media called as “controversial businessmen” (since they never been prosecuted) and finally stress the importance of the role of parents and promote family values and culture of civil reaction. Using the TV drama format shall assure wide audience, but will represent as well an adequate tool to provoke a change in view and opinions on the topic, ensure follow up and consistence of application of the rule of Law by institutions, specifically in terms of sentencing and suppression, provide information on many improvements as well area for improvement or change in the work of law enforcement agencies in this field and finally initiate a public debate that will aim to transfer ownership/responsibility of the fight on parents and families as well. In order to avoid typical cliché media products that focus exclusively on Belgrade, the TV drama will incorporate the story line in other cities in Serbia, with the aim to present the
problem as national and not urban or exclusively related to Belgrade. This is often perceived as such in the remaining parts of Serbia, but many smaller communities share the same problems and are probably substantially unaware of it. In addition, the TV drama will not treat experiences of drug users and their path to re-inclusion or justifications of authorities negligence, but will focus on the origins of the problem and how it can be mitigate in an early phase through collective actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>141.</th>
<th><strong>Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probably no, since the format (TV drama) concept has not been use previously for this type of awareness. Monte Royal might be able to do research and shoot the docudrama, but not with the needed quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>142.</th>
<th><strong>Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depending on the outreach and how much docudrama will be screened in Serbia and wider. Monte Royal expressed concerns with regards to readiness of RTS, national broadcaster and other national outlets to run the docudrama, regardless of the fact that it can be run without financial compensation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>143.</th>
<th><strong>Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and priorities? Provide evidences.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, it is contributing the nation strategy of fight against drugs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>144.</th>
<th><strong>Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same sector)? Provide evidences.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>145.</th>
<th><strong>Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered by the Grant?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI. Sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>146.</th>
<th><strong>Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The fact that the project will produce a docudrama which includes video that can be projected and distributed on DVDs, via social media etc., it will be visible and able to be used for raising-awareness and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
147. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results?
Production of docudrama is a one-off activity. Sufficient resources have been made available through the grant to promote it and have it run in several international festivals to attract attention about the docudrama and the issue of drugs. Docudrama can be seen on YouTube and selected web sites for free; Based on real facts, it can be used numerous number of times since the messages are such that they can survive the test of time in amid term, until legislation and work procedures are changed; Be used for educational purposes for teenagers; Be used for information purposes for parents.

148. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?
No.

149. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?
No formal partners.

150. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?
EU integration and EU accession awareness and campaign for citizens
Continuation of the freedom of media programme

VII. Conclusions & findings

What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?

Monte Royal had a EU funded project funded under a previous media grant scheme. Its documentary movie won several international awards related to the topic (trafficking in human beings) and quality production. Project is relevant both to the call for proposals and the target groups. However, project has struggled in cooperation with 2 key public institutions, i.e. Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Justice, who are also main beneficiaries of the projects. So far, project has demonstrated elements leading to good efficiency, but effectiveness will depend on securing good broadcasting of the docudrama on the issue of drugs. Monte Royal has doubts about the national broadcaster (RTS) readiness to broadcast the docudrama, so contingency plan is being made for such event, e.g. registering docudrama at international festivals, publishing it via social media. Thus, impact and sustainability are fragile and little elements are in place to provide optimism.
Considering the topic addressed, it might be more effective to have several interrelated awareness-raising activities combined and thus disperse ability to provide for impact. Social media and website are crucial for longer-term impact and sustainability and should be used regardless of traditional broadcasting channels readiness to run the docudrama.

### VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29/10/2014</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Monte Royal office, Belgrade</td>
<td>Bojana Maljevic, General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bojan Maljevic, Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Summary
(Brief description of objectives, results, and activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Foster freedom of expression by promoting issues of rule of law and democratization, that will contribute to the capacity of Serbian</td>
<td>● Achieving high level public visibility of the issues addressed by the radio and TV production, public debates, experts’ columns across wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected results</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main outputs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Enhance media contribution to strengthening the rule of law and democratic transformation in Serbia by improving the quality and outreach of programming and investigative reporting in Vojvodina media.  
• Increase the quality, scope and outreach of investigative radio, TV and multimedia programming and production thematically focused on issues related to the rule of law;  
• Motivate active citizenship in Vojvodina to take part in monitoring the decision-making process and advocate for changes, through an improved understanding of costs the citizens of Serbia pay for the lack of reforms in judiciary system.  
• Strengthen capacities of media at the local level in Vojvodina to investigate and convey key information to their listening and viewing audiences on the meaning and | • Airing of the 47 radio and 3 TV programmes on Radio 021, five affiliate stations and TV Vojvodina;  
• Organize 18 public debates hosted by six Vojvodina radio stations;  
• Publishing of 8 expert columns;  
• Project Web page: design and posting of project outputs; regular updating with produced programming; interactive platform for bloggers and other social media Facebook, Twitter, etc., banners, and other project-related material);  
• Promotional, advertising and visibility activities (i.e. jingles, TV previews, print advertisements, city wall advertising, etc.); |
| society to participate in the European partnership and to prepare itself for EU membership | communication channels – radio stations, TV broadcaster, Internet, public appearances.  
• Raising public awareness of the need for reforms in the judiciary and full implementation of relevant laws;  
• Facilitating fruitful public discussion and exchange of different views and initiatives in the direction of reforms in the area of judiciary and media, resulting in solutions/recommendation for changes identified and agreed on by stakeholders for further pursuit. |
importance of the changes that need to occur in the judiciary system

I. Conceptual Design

151. Are the project proposal and logframe well drafted with well-articulated objectives, results, outputs and activities?

Both, the project proposal and logframe are very well drafted, clear and with straightforward objectives and outputs. There is broad range of activities planned, with good design and with lot of substance in it.

152. Is it easy to understand the project logic?

Yes. Clear and straightforward objectives, both general and specific.

153. Are there clear OVIs?

Yes. OVIs are quantified and targeted.

II. Relevance

154. How relevant is the project to the call for proposals’ objectives

Based on the project proposal where concrete cases, for each topic of interest, are presented, the project is very much in line with objectives of the call for proposal.

155. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries/sector?

Radio 021 together with its 5 partners-local stations covers a wide territory of Vojvodina and is able to reach out to citizens on daily level on very concrete topics of their concern. Project is not only designed to enable radios to undertake quality investigative journalism but is doing in a way to engage and address concrete problems of citizens in semi-urban, rural areas.

156. Does the selection of the project seem justified?

Yes.

III. Efficiency

157. Which activities have been implemented and which outputs have been delivered to date? Are
The project is in 11 month of implementation. According to the monitoring report of 18th July, 2014, activities are being implemented on time. During the February and March, preparation activities commenced and production of radio shows started in April. First show was broadcast on April 3, 2014 and it represented an introduction to the whole project and shows on the first topic media freedom commenced through the summer. In some cases, topic of particular show were changed and adapted according to interest of citizens and current developments (e.g. topic of professional standards in Vojvodina media was replaced with the censorship and self-censorship). All shows so far were produced and broadcast on time and according to the schedule agreed based on a standardized protocol and format of the show. 5 radio debates were organized in the following towns: Ruma: Importance of local media was evident during the floods; Becej: Media supported by local self-governments (LSG) get everything, others get meaningless portions, Becej: They are working without license and they still get support from the state, Zrenjanin: Uncertain fate of the famous city Radio, Sombor: Good and bad examples of the privatization of municipal media. An added-value component to the projects is that all audio recordings of all shows are put on the radio website (http://www.021.rs/Sigurnost-za-buducnost) joint with the text that represents a sort of a summary of main points made in the show. In addition, all of the affiliate stations are posting news on their web portals by downloading them from the portal of Radio 021.

158. Is the project well managed and monitored?

Based on the face to face interview with the team who implements the project, as well as based on conclusions from the monitoring report from 18th July, the project is well managed and monitored. An issue of the display of salary costs in reporting was raised in the monitoring report, but this is not expected to jeopardize the project as it is an issue of methodology not payment or eligibility.

159. How much of the grant is disbursed?

According to the monitoring report, the speed of spending of funds is appropriate. Radio 021 expects to disburse all funds.

160. Are there procurement issues and ineligible costs?

There are no procurement issues. No ineligible costs.

161. Was there any addendum? If yes, indicate for which purpose.

Yes. Radio 021 had a change 1 partner (co-applicant) in March 2014 and subsequently addendum has
been signed. Instead of the Radio Subotica the beneficiary proposed to work with the Radio YuEco (also from Subotica), as a result of change of management in the aftermath of parliamentary elections in March 2014. In April 2014 a change of the budget was approved, whereby a new budget line was introduced to allow of update and modernization of Radio 021 website, which was increasingly used to access project materials and thus resulted in slowdowns and technical problems.

162. Is there sufficient staff (both in terms of quantity and experience) to manage the project?
Yes.

163. Are the activities achieving value for money?
Yes.

164. Are the number and extent of visibility actions adequate in relation to the size of the project?
Yes. Radio 021 is the highest-rated radio station in Novi Sad and has wide audience outreach especially in rural, semi-urban area of Vojvodina, especially as it works in collaboration with locally-based radios in the Vojvodina region. The case of the large audience accessing project materials via the radio website is an example that visibility and outreach of the projects is appropriate for to the expected.

165. Is the project receiving sufficient support and guidance from the contracting authority/PMU throughout the project? Is the monitoring from the contracting authority/PMU (reporting, on-the-spot visits) helpful?
Yes, the monitoring performed by the TA to the grant scheme (by EPTISA) helped them to solve some minor issues that they were facing during the implementation.

166. Is there any issue with the co-financing?
No. Radio is using its own company funds to co-finance its activities.

IV. Effectiveness

167. Has the project reached any of its stated results? Provide evidences. Is it likely to meet them?
The project is ongoing, i.e. it is in its 11th month of implementation. The first thematic part of project -- media freedom is completed and as of October, Radio 021 started shows, debate on the 2nd topic.

168. How much is the project helping the target groups? Provide evidences
Provincial Ombudsman of Vojvodina, partner in the project reported that due to the work of Radio 012 on
the media freedom issue through debates, show has seen increase in interest of the work of the Ombudsman by citizens and has a key reference point for them to perform their mandate in terms of initiating requests, procedures etc. They are expecting that this will further increase once the topics of rule of law and corruption will be addressed. For Provincial Ombudsman, Radio 012 work is seen as crucial to perform their mandate and increase the awareness and overcome fear by citizens to use the Ombudsman institution.

169. Are the project partners adequately involved, both Serbian and EU? Is there been a genuine partnership with transfer of know-how and exchange of experience?

Yes. While the partnership with Provincial Ombudsman is new, cooperation with 5 local stations is based on previous cooperation. Journalists from affiliate stations with investigative stories and with received capacity building, while the Provincial Ombudsman is tasked to help Radio 021 access institutions in getting experts and public institutions representatives attend debates planned to be organized.

V. Impact

170. Are management structures, services, working methods and codes of conduct likely to change as a result of the project? Are there evidences that the change will extend to other departments than those tackled by the project?

Although the media situation is very fragile, esp. at the local level and in semi-urban, rural areas, the longer-standing cooperation within the Radio 021 network will continue its work and have capacities of affiliate non-Novis Sad based stations strengthened and give then the know-how on how to carry on investigative journalism. Moreover, the established cooperation with Provincial Ombudsman is also promising in relation to access to institutions and incurring presence of responsible officials participate to the debate and respond to investigative journalist issues and stories produced during the project. Ombudsman cooperation also gives possibility for follow-up towards institutions to insure follow-up to problems uncover and their potential resolution.

171. Would this change or development have occurred without the grant?

No. The situation on investigative journalism about issue on media freedom, rule of law, corruption, esp at the regional and local level is poor as all media outlets (radio, TV, newspaper) are currently reported to
be under political pressure and in precarious economic situation. This is also the main reason why a
media outlet resorts to apply for an EU grant, which is otherwise not a typical way of funding a media
outlet. According to Radio 021 staff, securing a non-profit grant is the only way to continue operation, to
balance the lack of commercial funding as well as to be able to devote time to quality investigative
journalism without being pressured from the politicians or businesses who have the power to cut funding.

172. Is the project likely to result in major /socio economic/environmental benefits for the target groups
and final beneficiaries? Provide evidences.

The main planned benefit of the project for citizens is that they are empowered to identify, report and
demand appropriate reaction from the institutions on cases of censorship, rule of law of corruption.

173. Is the project likely to contribute to the realisation of national development objectives and
priorities? Provide evidences.

Project is contributing to fulfillment of basic democratic standards as per Political criteria. Concretely, the
project is contributing to implementation of the Media strategy.

174. Is the project exploiting synergies with other related projects or activities (e.g. in the same
sector)? Provide evidences.

Yes, with experts, professors at the relevant faculties of journalism and journalists. Through is topics,
Radio 021 has developed cooperation with CSO, some of which are working on project issues within
other EU-funded projects.

175. Are there any new or extra funding/budgetary resources or projects or spin-off activities triggered
by the Grant?

No.

### VI. Sustainability

176. Are the outputs/results of the project still visible / likely to last?

Project is still ongoing. Prospects of sustainability are weak, since Radio 021 have financing issues and it
will not be able to continue the level and quality of production beyond the project.

177. Are there sufficient resources to ensure the sustainability of project’s outputs/results
EVALUATION OF GRANT CONTRACTS IMPLEMENTED AND FINANCED BY IPA AND EIDHR

This is a non-profit project and it is difficult to expect that the commercial way of providing some funds for such activities will be in the future. Radio 021 needs to generate non-profit grants to be able to continue investigative journalism.

178. Are there any follow-up projects or activities?

It is too early to say. It is realistic to expect that kind of activity in the spring of 2015 when the project develops.

179. Is the cooperation between partners likely to continue in the long run?

Yes. Partner radio networks have worked together before and the new partnership created with Provincial Ombudsman has been mutually beneficial to both side, so it is highly-likely to continue.

180. What are the expectations of the beneficiary regarding future grant scheme in terms of their needs?

Funding actions related to the public interest and strengthening the capacity of local multimedia platforms (radio and internet)

### VII. Conclusions & findings

**What are the main findings and recommendations? What did the project achieve in terms of addressing the overall objective of the call/the needs of the sector? What are the lessons for future support in the area?**

The project has demonstrated the role of (local) media, i.e. a radio plays its watchdog and facilitating role over public discussion on basis principle of democracy, rule of law etc.. Project effectiveness and efficiency are good, but it is obvious that short grant modalities are not modus of operandi of media and the short term project grants will not be able to secure a lasting impact due to the precarious economic and political situation in Serbia. Nevertheless, the project has been able to set solid but very fragile foundations for local-level media quality investigative journalism in response to concrete problems faced by citizens and has included an essential institution in its partnership-Provincial Ombudsman of Vojvodina. The added-value use of website to share, empower and take stock of quality investigative journalist stories on censorship, corruption, judiciary issues is extremely important to enable outreach to citizen beyond concrete broadcast and to be shared over Serbia.

**Strengthened cooperation with public institutions such as Ombudsman and LSGs would benefit in project activities follow-up and essentially contribute to balanced public debates on issues. More strategic, longer-term support and connection with other existing local radio stations (e.g. OK Vranje) also beneficiaries**
of the Strengthening Media Freedom support in capacity-building component, exchange of experience (e.g. P2P) and advocacy on issues of national importance could further strengthen the impact of the individual projects and the programme.

VIII. Meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2014</td>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>Radio 021 office, Novi Sad</td>
<td>Slobodan Stojsic, Director, Radio 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slobodan Krajnovic, Project Coordinator/Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Svetlana Tomov, Marketing manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2014</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Provincial Ombudsman office, Novi Sad</td>
<td>Aniko Muskinja Hajnrih, Provincial Ombudsman, Province of Vojvodina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 6. Recommendations

### 1. Flood relief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible institutions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Prioritise the execution of works taking into account the beneficiaries’ current living conditions</em></td>
<td>EU Grantees, Works contractors</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As contractors have limited capacities, the EU grantee should make sure that they prioritise the houses belonging to the most vulnerable households taking into account their temporary accommodation arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Ensure additional support for housing recovery in affected municipalities</em></td>
<td>EU, SEIO, EU grantees</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was obvious from the very beginning that the means provided through the EU programme would not be sufficient to cover all housing and economic regeneration needs in the affected municipalities. The programme has generated many reserve lists of households(^3), which are eligible and in need of support but could not be included due to a lack of funds. In addition, new needs – not identified when the municipalities drew up their preliminary lists – have arisen in the course of implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Perform a new needs assessment in affected municipalities to ensure that all households in need are thoroughly identified and covered</em></td>
<td>Beneficiary municipalities, EU grantees, ORFR</td>
<td>Prior to new round of funding (top-up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities should first perform a new needs assessment since the lists they originally established are already relatively old and in need of a cross-check to ensure that no potentially eligible beneficiaries have been left out or, on the contrary, that some households on reserve lists are not in need of support anymore. Such a needs assessment is also required to decide whether further funding from the EU is needed for housing and economic development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) There are lists for both the housing and the economic component.
regeneration beyond the envisaged top up. This process should involve municipal engineers to verify once more whether categories of damages were well assigned or are in need of revision. This is all the more necessary given that some buildings might have deteriorated since the first assessment was made.

4. **Consider reviewing the eligibility/selection criteria in particular regarding ownership issues to improve the programme’s coverage among the most vulnerable households**

Before implementing a new round of reconstruction/construction works, eligibility and selection criteria should be reviewed/revised to take the following issues into account:

More weight should be given to single or two–member families, especially elderly people

Exceptions regarding ownership issues should be made for households in great social needs:

- **Illegal construction.** Many vulnerable households are actually living in an illegal construction. Support should be available for these households if they can provide sufficient proofs of permanent residence in the absence of a legal act.
- **Place of residence.** Certified statement from households living in a damaged building but officially registered elsewhere should be counted as evidence of residence.
- **Rented building.** Households living in rented buildings damaged by the floods should be provided with the necessary building materials to restore their premises. In case of major works or construction, the programme should provide support in securing the consent from the owner.

5. **Transfer households living in particularly risky areas to safer locations**

In case a damaged house is located on a land particularly prone to floods, municipal authorities should provide public land in a safer location where new constructions can be built with EU support.

6. **Introduce some flexibility regarding decisions on new constructions**

---

4 in particular Roma families
Whenever EU grantees’ engineers consider that a building classified in category III, IV or V deserves to be included in category VI, it should be left to the discretion of the EU grantee to decide whether to build a new construction if it is considered safer or that estimated repair costs are in the same range as the cost of a new house. This should be possible even if the re-categorisation process fails.

7. **Consider reviewing reconstruction standards so that decent living conditions can be ensured to the most vulnerable households**

In many cases, the most vulnerable affected families lacked basic facilities even before the floods e.g. toilet in the house, water supply, safe roof, etc. Therefore, instead of limiting EU support to the repair of flood damages, EU grantees should be able to calibrate their assistance in order to ensure that decent living conditions are created for these households.

8. **Draw lessons learned and share best practices before the next round of support**

Before the start of a new round of housing/economic regeneration support, it would be worthwhile for the EU grantees together with the ORFR and the EUD to draw lessons learned from the implementation of the programme so far. This should cover issues already mentioned above related to the common implementation methodology and problems encountered during implementation. EU grantees have developed many implementation tools which would deserve being shared among each other. More generally, it should be ensured that the experience and know-how accumulated during the programme is effectively transferred to the ORFR.

9. **Provide additional support to the agricultural sector to deal with the consequences of floods and strengthen the viability of small and medium scale farms**

The May 2014 floods have caused extensive damages to agricultural lands. Many farmers having lost their crops in 2014 are at risk of further losses in the coming years given the poor state of agricultural areas in many municipalities. Funding is required for soil decontamination and clean-up operations in order to help restore
productive arable and grazing lands. Farmers also need assistance with the improvement of agricultural drainage, which is essential not only to increase their yields but also as a flood prevention mechanism.

This assistance should be combined with more general support for the modernisation of agriculture in flooded areas. Small and medium scale farms should be targeted with tools, technology and training in order to help them secure harvests and increase their productivity and environmental compatibility. Technical assistance combined with grant support would be an ideal delivery mechanism to which the EU could contribute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th>Improve the planning and coordination of flood prevention and management through effective systems and strategies in line with the EC Floods directive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | As an EU candidate country, Serbia is expected to adopt the Floods Directive (2007/60/EC), which complements the EU’s Water Framework Directive (WFD) with the overall aim of managing flood risks that pose threats to human health, the environment, cultural heritage and economic activities, and integrated with overall water management and pollution prevention. The Floods Directive is based on three steps: preliminary flood risk assessment; the preparation of flood risk maps; and the preparation of flood risk plans, based on prevention, protection and preparedness.  
According to the Directive, flood management strategies should be in place by 2015. The WFD obliges Serbia to prepare six-yearly flood risk management plans at both the central and local levels. Flood risk management must be integrated with overall water management and pollution prevention. This requires institutional and planning coordination on both an administrative (central/local) and natural hydrological basis.  
In this context, there is a need for further institutional support regarding flood prevention and management in Serbia (including coordination and demarcation of responsibilities) to ensure that risks are constantly and properly assessed and monitored, national priorities are defined in line with needs and the EU Flood Directive, investment into prevention/mitigation measures are planned and executed and nationwide arrangements to respond effectively to flood emergencies are in place |

| 11. | Support Serbia in expanding the total area of its territory protected against floods through investment into strategic flood prevention and mitigation infrastructure |
|     | Ministry of Interior, ORFR, SEIO, EU, IFIs, 2015-2020 |
The EU and IFIs should support Serbia in strengthening and expanding the total area of its territory protected from floods. Funding should be made available for strategic flood prevention & mitigation measures, including river regulation through the construction of dams and reservoirs to store flood waters and the development/strengthening of flood protection infrastructure such as dykes, levees, floodwalls, channel alterations, high-flow diversions and land treatment, in particular in areas identified as carrying significant flood risks.

12. **Build the capacity of local authorities to prevent and manage natural disasters, including flooding**

Although disasters are largely unpredictable, their worst effects can be partially or completely prevented by preparation, early warning, and swift, decisive responses. There is a need to help local self-governments (LSGs) get prepared for unexpected natural disasters by setting up the requisite structures and adopting the necessary plans while ensuring that resources are applied effectively. LSGs should be ready to mobilise all the relevant services on their territory to face unexpected threats. Fire services, ambulance services, emergency medical services, engineers, rescue workers and traffic services can all become involved in disaster management.

In this context, the first step consists in the adoption of a local disaster management plan, in particular for disasters that occur regularly – such as flooding of settlements, agricultural lands, and roads. The plan should include such needs as information campaigns/training for citizens to ensure that the population is aware of what they can do to prevent specific disasters and how they should react when they happen.

The central government should initiate, coordinate and support the efforts of LSGs to strengthen their capacity to prevent and manage natural disasters. The EU along with other international donors could contribute funding to finance the implementation of comprehensive local disaster prevention/management plans.

13. **Support investment into flood prevention mechanisms at the local level**

The total area in Serbia defended from flooding in 2012 amounted to 1,468,000 hectares, which was a 25% decrease compared to 2011. The vast majority of this protected land (86% in 2012) is agricultural, which suffered a marginally larger relative decline in defences (26%).
While there is a need to carry out large-scale investment on the main rivers and watercourses, flood prevention measures at the local level can make a real difference in times of floods. Investment into prevention measures can be very cost effective. Local self-governments should be encouraged to implement flood prevention/mitigation measures and support should be available for local investment into the construction of flood protection structures and clean-up operations of riverbeds and channels in line with national strategies and plans.

**14. Promote regional cooperation on flood prevention and management in particular through the cross-border programmes**

The cross-border programme is a well-suited instrument for promoting flood prevention and management at the local level given that state borders in the region often correspond to the course of major rivers. Moreover, less than 10% of all available surface waters in Serbia originate within its borders. The remaining 90% are trans-boundary waters entering Serbia through the Danube, Sava, Tisa, Drina and other rivers. It is recommended that specific calls of proposals be launched in the framework of CBC programmes to encourage cross-border cooperation in the area of flood prevention/management with the overall aim of contributing to a better level of preparedness to floods in border regions. Eligible actions should include:

- Capacity building of operational units in local authorities dealing with flood prevention and management
- Development of flood prevention and management plans
- Setting up flood forecasting and early warning systems
- Performing risk analysis and carrying out feasibility studies to address major risks
- Investment into local flood prevention mechanisms
- Investment into cleaning operations of local channels and river streams

**15. The government should take measures to encourage owners of properties in flood risk areas to take out insurance**

Only 3% of owners in Serbia have their properties insured against flooding. Given the frequency of floods in recent years, steps should be taken to encourage owners to take out insurance for their properties. The government could consider offering incentives to encourage owners to take out flood insurance. A good example of such a project is the IPA 2010 Cross-border Flood Protection and Rescue implemented under the CBC Serbia-Montenegro.

---

6 A good example of such a project is the IPA 2010 Cross-border Flood Protection and Rescue implemented under the CBC Serbia-Montenegro.
years and the costs of repairing damage to buildings and their contents, Serbia should consider setting up an insurance programme to encourage property owners in flood risk areas to purchase insurance protection from the government at subsidised rates.

### 2. EIDHR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Continue supporting programme objectives but with emphasis on areas directly linked to key challenges in Negotiation Chapters 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) and 24 (Justice, Freedom and Security)</td>
<td>EUD &amp; CSOs</td>
<td>Next call in 2015 &amp; continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the scheme should remain loose in defined sectors and themes to stay true to its objective and allow for initiative of grantees (i.e. demand driven), linkage to Chapter 23 and 24 would enhance prospects for programme impact and sustainability. Thus, identification of areas of Acquis Chapter 23 and 24 that are of key importance and under-represented in EIDHR project portfolio (e.g. corruption) could be encouraged such as including it as add-value activity in the grant scheme.</td>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>Next call in 2015 &amp; continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Initiate simplification of application documents and procedures for small grants</td>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>Next call in 2015 &amp; continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since small grants (EUR 10,000-50,000) are aimed especially to CSOs who have never managed an EU grant. Small measures such as adjustments of the original project proposals should be allowed at the beginning of the implementation, especially if there has been considerable time between the submission deadline and the project’s implementation starting date. Lighter application documentation or at least access of the General Conditions in the national language would facilitate the participation of a wider variety of CSOs in EIDHR grant scheme.</td>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>Next call in 2015 &amp; continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Small grants Lot 1 (EUR 10,000-50,000) should remain an important mechanism to allow for initiative and access to</td>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>Next call in 2015 &amp; continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While small grants by default have lesser chances of bringing about any significant effect and impact, they are nevertheless an important instrument for even mature and developed CSOs to advance and pursue issues of their interest under the broad spectrum of topics of Negotiation Chapters 23 and 24 (as well as other, e.g. Chapter 19 (Social policy and Employment). It allows access for more specific topics (e.g. anti-trafficking) and new CSOs who are managing EU grants for the first time. Small grants should be further used in 2 cases where such small budgets are most likely to achieve some effect and impact: 1) Service provision improvement or piloting of services to marginalised groups and 2) Small-scale action at the local level including monitoring and advocacy on Chapters 23 and 24.

| 4 | Ensure support from the Government (i.e. co-financing) to facilitate access to EU grant schemes: |
|   | 1) Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society (GOCCS) initiates introduction of EIDHR funded projects as eligible for co-financing support |
|   | 2) EUD and GOCCS synchronise calls and deadlines as much as possible given state and EU budget cycles |
|   | 3) Grantees utilise public calls for financing by Ministries and LSGs for co-financing purposes |
|   | It is recommended that state funding from the Office for Cooperation for Civil Society should be extended to EIDHR grant schemes as projects and activities supported are contributing to similar if not identical types of beneficiaries and issues that other (EU) civil society development programmes co-financed from the state budget. Furthermore, co-financing should also be possible from other Ministries (e.g. Ministry of Education, Ministry of Information and Culture) and LSGs. This is a best practice which has ensured sustainability of actions and the absorption capacity of CSOs in new EU member states such as Croatia. |
|   | GOCCS, EUD, Grantees/CSOs | 2016 |
|   | End 2015 |
|   | Next call 2015 & continuous |

| 5 | Synergise approaches, timing, duration, themes and size of grants between EIDHR to IPA CSF |
|   | It would be useful for the EIDHR and IPA CSF programmes to offer different but complementary types of support in terms of duration, volume of grant, co-financing etc. (e.g. piloting services via short-term projects of 12-18 months and strategic core projects with up to 48 months duration). While EIDHR could focus on tackling concrete |
|   | EUD | Next EIDHR and IPA CSF call in 2015 |
interventions on behalf of CSOs in specific sectors, especially in Negotiation Chapters 23 and 24, IPA CSF could focus on capacity development of CSOs and networks and activities linked to the enabling environment for CS development.

6. Encourage cooperation with independent bodies and mechanisms for protection of citizens and human rights through future calls for proposals

It is recommended that projects identifying concrete, targeted approaches, actions etc. towards public institutions should be more encouraged. Likewise, future calls for proposals should promote cooperation between independent bodies and mechanisms for protection of citizens and human rights. This will allow for greater sustainability of funded projects.

3. Refugees & IDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Further housing support is required for refugees and IDPs living in informal collective centres</td>
<td>CRM, EU, SEIO, LSGs</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the problem of collective centres is likely to be resolved thanks to assistance from IPA 2012, there are still many informal centres in operation across Serbia with substantial populations of refugees and IDPs, including Roma people. Given the extremely poor living conditions in informal centres, housing solutions are urgently required for them. Further support from IPA would be welcomed in this respect in particular targeting IDPs since the needs of refugees can be met through the ongoing Regional Housing Programme. However, it will be first necessary to get a clear understanding of the extent of the problem and a more accurate picture of needs to be covered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. With time passing, candidates for returns are likely to be fewer and fewer and the need for additional support limited. | GOKM, EU, SEIO          | 2015-2017       |

7 The latter is not covering IDPs
However, ongoing efforts to improve the conditions for returns of IDPs to Kosovo* may provide the rationale for further assistance to complement housing solutions devised under the EU assistance to Kosovo*.

The number of families interested in returning to Kosovo* is already low at present and without the efforts deployed by the IPA 2012 projects, it would have been still smaller. The reality is that there are no obvious candidates for return. The majority of households need to be convinced and supported in taking such a step. In these circumstances, it will become increasingly difficult for new projects to achieve sufficient results to make them worthwhile. However, in light of recent efforts to facilitate returns of IDPs to Kosovo*, it is recommended that the EU should explore the need for further support, which must be closely linked to housing programme implemented in Kosovo*.

### 3. Further livelihood and income-generation support is required for refugees and IDPs but will be best delivered as part of broader socio-economic development measures at the local level

With considerable investment into housing through the RHP and IPA, the emphasis at the local level should be laid on helping refugees and IDPs attain self-sufficiency through livelihood and income-generation initiatives. This is necessary to ensure that housing solutions are sustainable. However, these efforts are unlikely to succeed unless conditions for economic development are in place at the local level. Therefore, livelihood and income-generation initiatives should be part of broader socio-economic development measures to develop the local economy. Moreover, instead of targeting only refugees and IDPs, support should be made available to all categories of disadvantaged and vulnerable citizens. This would ultimately contribute to a better integration of refugees and IDPs into the society.

### 4. Improve the mainstreaming of refugees and IDPs into the social welfare system

Support in favour of refugees and IDPs has been numerous and varied. However, the fact that it often consisted in short-term donor-funded initiatives implemented in isolation from each other means that the overall impact is weakened. Durable results can only be achieved by a more pro-active approach by the social welfare system, in
| terms of access to employment, training, education and welfare support. This requires a national budget commitment and a policy of mainstreaming the needs of refugees and IDPs into the national system. |   |   |
### 4. Mental Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Support the licensing process for CSO social services.</strong></td>
<td>PMU, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Donor Community</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing process for CSOs providing social services should be supported throughout the project implementation in order to ensure sustainability of the achievements of the service providers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Ensure Government (relevant beneficiary Ministry) commitment and ownership for effective implementation and sustainability of grant scheme results</strong></td>
<td>PMU, DEU</td>
<td>Until June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence from this evaluation show that projects struggle to achieve planned results and ensure sustainability of efforts due to a lack of commitment by government institutions. Systematically devoting enough time and efforts in securing not only the consent but also the firm commitment from government stakeholders and formalising this commitment should be an integral part of mental health projects as it is an imperative in the complex political and administrative environment of Serbia. The primary focus of advocacy activities should be to lobby and put pressure on the Government to establish financing mechanisms for deinstitutionalisation and related social services for persons with mental disabilities. The main message of such efforts should be that “money follows beneficiary”, particularly those who are deinstitutionalised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Ensure long-term commitment and involvement of EU (and other donors) for this thematic area.**

Support to deinstitutionalisation of persons with mental illness is a long-term investment bringing positive impacts on people’s well being, their empowerment and fulfilment of their fundamental rights. However, de-institutionalisation is a long-term process, which demands structural changes in the approaches and mechanisms of government, but also of society as a whole. That is why; the donor(s) should ensure that investment in this area is long term.

NAD identifies indicative list of sectoral priorities for financial period 2014-2017 (with projections till 2020). Programming of IPA is structured process where line ministries nominate actions for support in close consultation with EUD. Also, Sector Planning Documents 2015-2017 contain indicative plan of IPA funding for the period 2015-2017. In light of these strategic documents, it would be beneficial that the following IPA schemes continue supporting this area.

| EUD, Government of Serbia | 2015 |

4. **Improve monitoring practices for the grant scheme.**

While monitoring visits are useful in the opinion of the beneficiaries’ themselves and necessary for ensuring accountability, the approach and the tone of monitoring visits should be more constructive and conducted in empowering manner with practical guidance and support, which beneficiaries need more than anything else.

| PMU | Immediately |

5. **Encourage and invest in capacities of rural or smaller communities’ CSOs to develop and implement social services for persons with mental illness in their local areas**

Service provision by local CSOs in rural areas and particularly in South West and South East Serbia to persons with mental illness is practically non-existent. That is why, the grant scheme only involved organisations from Central Serbia and Vojvodina. The Programme should invest in awareness raising on positive results of the CSOs work with persons with mental illness and experiences gained through implementation of projects to encourage CSOs in other regions to initiate pilot projects for such services. This could be done through reaching out to CSOs across the country through networks, events, meetings, etc.

| PMU, Government of Serbia | Until end of 2015 |
### 5. Civil Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Future grant schemes should address the goals of the Strategy for enabling environment for Civil Social Development and those of the Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 esp. monitoring, piloting activities by civil society on EE issues part of future grant schemes</td>
<td>EUD, Grantees/CSOs</td>
<td>Next call 2015 &amp; continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grant scheme is aimed at developing capacities with projects whose support ranges between 12-24 months and up to EUR 100,000 budget, making it a small-scale intervention. This inevitably hinders its effectiveness and impact. The EU is the biggest foreign donor for civil society in Serbia. It should use its support in a strategic manner to achieve tangible results and impact. Future calls for proposals should have priorities directly linked to the strategic EU framework (Guidelines for EU support to Civil Society) and the national Strategy, which is currently underpinned only by a Technical Assistance support. This would allow for greater impact on improving enabling environment for CS development and initiatives of CSOs to monitoring specific issues (e.g. tax environment improvement, social service provision, state budget Line 481 funding transparency and accountability) and piloting activities by civil society on EE issues part of future grant schemes esp. at local level.</td>
<td>EUD in coop with SEIO, Office for Coop with CS; SEKO</td>
<td>IPA II CSF Serbia action documents (mid-2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Consultation with SEKO on action documents and programme objectives and modalities of support are performed regularly and consistently</td>
<td>EUD in coop with SEIO, Office for Coop with CS; SEKO</td>
<td>End 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEKO (Sector civil society organizations) mechanism established in March 2011 by SEIO with support of DFID and SIDA should be further utilized to identify gaps and concrete needs for future specific themes and modalities for support under the grant scheme. As a mechanism developed to enable more systematic and structured inclusion of CSOs in IPA programming and bringing together variety of CSOs working throughout Serbia, this mechanism is best poised to bring together needs of diversified sector and allow CSOs from non-urban areas to have their needs proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 3 | **Provide strategic civil society sector-oriented, targeted and longer-term support, incl.**  
1) **Operating grants** or support to networks and coalitions via 24+24 (or 48) month grants measure for advocacy and monitoring networks and coalitions on EE issues  
2) **Single call for sub-granting** to support capacity-development of grass-root organizations and local level civic activism (optionally combined with IPA CSF Multi-beneficiary measure)  
3) **Short-term project calls** (12-18 months) for piloting and improving services of state institutions and LSGs related to areas of interest to CSOs/grantees  

One of key challenges for grantees working on monitoring and policy area is the short timeframe and in many cases limited budgets. Cost-effectiveness driven evaluations put pressure on grantees to present many activities and outputs. Properly designed, implemented projects need beyond 24 months implementation period to be able to produce impact and provide for possibility of sustainability especially in watchdog and policy area interventions and ideally their intervention should focus on impact, not only results and outputs. PRAG rules allow for more flexible approach in funding and IPA CSF 2011-2012 has identified flexibility in approach as a way to make the support to civil society useful and effective.

Strategic partnerships with network coalitions in areas linked to CSDev or other reform issues of concern to civil society (e.g. education, social services, democracy promotion, civic participation) especially those supporting or including local CSOs (SEKO and other existing ones), should be supported via networking grants with a duration of up to 48 months (24+24 moth) modelled after IPA CSF MB) to achieve results and impact at the national level or operation grants with more advanced (registered) networks. Sub-granting can be an option (but not a must) in cases where this is an instrument useful for achieving the proposed results and impact. |

| 4 | **Synergize approaches, timing, duration, themes and size of grants between EIDHR to IPA CSF**  
It would be useful for the EIDHR and IPA CSF programmes to offer different but complementary types of support in terms of duration, volume of grant, co-financing etc. (e.g. piloting services via short-term projects of 12-18 months and strategic core projects with up to 48 months duration). While EIDHR could focus on tackling concrete interventions on behalf of CSOs in specific sectors, especially in Negotiation Chapters 23 and 24, IPA CSF could focus on capacity development of CSOs and networks and activities linked to the enabling environment for CSDev. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EUD</th>
<th>Next call 2015 &amp; continuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>Next call 2015 &amp; continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EUD (Optional in case EUD recognizes such needs)</td>
<td>Next call 2016 &amp; continuous Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In consultations with SEIO and GOCCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>Next EIDHR and IPA CSF call in 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Ensure support from the Government (i.e. co-financing) is maximized via**

1) **EUD and Government Office for Coop synchronize calls and deadlines as much as possible given state and EU budget and cycles**

2) **Grantees utilize public calls for financing by Ministries and LSGs for co-financing purposes**

While contribution to co-financing from the state budget via the Office for Cooperation for Civil Society exists and is useful for grantees, challenge in its utilization remains due to different budgeting and funding cycle between the EU and the state. Furthermore, there have been successful examples of utilization of co-financing from Ministries (e.g. Ministry of Education, Ministry of Information and Culture) and LSGs and this should be further encouraged as a way to improve both cooperation between CSOs and public institutions at all levels and maximize absorption of EU funds. This is a best practice which has ensured sustainability of actions and the absorption capacity of CSOs in new EU member states such as Croatia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide support in project preparation, especially in elaboration of indicators. Introduce simplified application documents and procedures</td>
<td>TA to the Media Freedom Grant scheme</td>
<td>Next call 2015 &amp; continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide support in project preparation, especially in elaboration of indicators. Introduce simplified application documents and procedures</td>
<td>TA to the Media Freedom Grant scheme</td>
<td>Next call 2015 &amp; continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Continue supporting the stated objectives of the programme and the call</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability of quality media outlets and local media using investigative journalism as their modus operandi is currently almost impossible without project funding. This makes the programme and the grant scheme extremely important especially as all projects deal with key issues related to other EU-funded projects, thus enabling strong added-value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EUD</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Maintain TA support to grantees as it is essential for smooth project management and administration of grants</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Again, since project funding and thus project management and administration is not the typical operation for a media outlet or production, external support via TA is essential in ensuring smooth management and communication with the EU. There has been relatively high return rate of grantees from previous calls which demonstrate a learning curve, but additional measures such as trainings, mentoring etc. would be welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EUD, TA to the Media Freedom Grant scheme</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Facilitate further cross-fertilisation between EIDHR and IPA CSF grantees and media outlets supported via the Strengthening Media Freedom grant scheme</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects supported under the grant schemes are often covering same or similar issues as projects supported under EIDHR, IPA CSF and other grant schemes. It would be thus extremely useful to ensure better visibility and outreach of EU support to link up (e.g via TA desk, webplatform) media grantees with projects funded under other grant schemes, especially the ones dealing with the same sector/issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EUD, Grantees/CSOs &amp; media outlets</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Encourage but do not condition partnership with public institutions, especially independent bodies mandated to protect citizens and human rights</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation with independent bodies mandated to protect citizens and human rights should be encouraged whenever possible as it ensures effective response from the relevant institutions and is a logical follow-up to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EUD, Grantees/media outlets</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
media piece or story published by the media. This will effectively and concretely contribute to improvement of the media situation.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Encourage the use of tools such as websites, social media to help with sustainability and impact of media outputs beyond the project</strong></td>
<td>Grantees/media outlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Websites, social media and other new electronic tools are a very cost-effective way to distribute and ensure outreach of media contents and production developed within supported projects. Since the grant scheme prospects of sustainability are weak, the use of such tools should be encouraged to bridge this problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consider longer-term support for media to devise financial independence strategies</strong></td>
<td>EUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The programme would benefit of engaging in strategic and longer-term core support (up to 48 or 24+24 month or operational grants) for strategic investigative journalism and quality media outlets and production as a way to give them short- to mid-term security and help them devise strategies for long-term profitability while maintaining their media and editorial independence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support media production projects in accessing national and local public broadcasters</strong></td>
<td>EUD &amp; Grantees (only for production-related &amp; public broadcaster ones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For projects consisting of media production, access to national and local broadcasters, especially public ones is essential in achieving any effect of their work. They would thus benefit from EU support in facilitating and ensuring broadcasters to commit and follow through on this. Encouraging cooperation between investigative journalism projects and public broadcasters or ensuring public broadcasters projects under the grant scheme are possible directions to be considered. Alternatively, allowing for budgeting of cost for payment air time could also help in this direction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. CBC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Enable mutual learning and sharing best practices and models</strong></td>
<td>Operating Structure and National Authority</td>
<td>Until June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Structure/National Authority (Joint technical Secretariats/Antennas) have extensive knowledge and experience in managing and coordinating CBC and TN projects implemented with support of EU. Sharing this knowledge with other relevant EU IPA Units in Ministries and CFCU would be critical investment in strengthening their practices and approaches to increasingly relevant role in implementation of future IPA assistance. Knowledge sharing could be organised through a range of meetings, workshops, exchange of knowledge events, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Continue supporting comprehensive CBC programme to support development of mechanisms for natural disasters</strong></td>
<td>Government of Serbia, neighbouring countries; EU</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In light of the recent floods that affected a large part of CBC programming areas, it is recommended that comprehensive CBC programmes for the prevention and management of natural disasters should continue to be supported by the countries of the region. Actions related to natural disasters are introduced and integrated in each Operational Programme for financial perspective 2014-2020. Also, 3rd CfPs for CRO-SRB and SRB-BiH are targeted calls focused on flood prevention, recovery operations and emergency response. Such good practice should be continued, and EU and national governments’ should take into account best practices and lessons learned from past projects implemented in this field. Eligible support should continue including institutional capacity building, infrastructure and technical equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*The IPA CBC Serbia-Montenegro offers a good example of such project: 2012/298-351 Cross-border Flood Protection and Rescue*
3. **Establish the practice of sequencing projects.**

During the evaluation, examples were noted of stronger results for projects benefiting from more than one round of assistance over a long period. Some areas need longer-term framework to achieve the expected impact (flood protection and relief, environment and natural resources preservation and protection, tourism development, etc.).

For such areas of intervention, it is suggested to set a project document with overview of the overall needs in medium to long-term, in order to provide a holistic view of what is required to achieve the more sustainable and wider envisaged impacts. Ideally, this would be followed by the preparation of a pipeline of sequenced project interventions, with milestones, which could be presented as individual projects.

Another approach to ensuring sequencing of projects falling within different categories/sectors of interventions would be to emphasise the added value section of the proposal format to discuss more in details the a) multiplier effect and b) continuous partnership and its strengthening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Reduce the time for selection of projects and contracting and/or introduce the possibility of adjusting some activities to new context or risk</th>
<th>EU, JTS</th>
<th>ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant beneficiaries regularly complain about the huge time gap between the call for proposals and the start of project implementation. As situations and contexts change, the implementation of activities is put at risk or do not exactly correspond to needs. Some projects revolving around specific events are particularly affected by delays in the selection and contracting process since results are can only be partially achieved or are achieved prior to the project with less means and resources and eventually reduced impact. As for EIDHR (see recommendation 2), we recommend that adjustments to proposals should be allowed at the beginning of the implementation, especially if there has been considerable time between the submission deadline and the project’s implementation starting date.</td>
<td>EU, JTS</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EU, JTS, Government of Serbia, neighbouring countries

Until June 2015

---

9 The Lim Biathlon includes a Tourist event that happens in August. The project was planned to start at the beginning of the year to allow sufficient time to implement all activities that would improve the manifestation. However, the project itself started in June, which meant that the planned activities were moved and the activities were prepared ahead of the manifestation taking place one year ahead.
### Annex 7. Proposal for policy objectives and indicators for the next programming period

#### 1. Floods relief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To provide housing and livelihood support to the most disadvantaged and vulnerable categories of citizens in areas affected by the floods | • Living conditions and livelihoods in flood-affected municipalities are returned to pre-flood situation (needs identified in RNA and subsequent assessments are addressed)  
• Number of durable housing solutions for vulnerable households affected by floods  
• Number of small businesses owned by vulnerable categories of citizens revived through income-generation grants | • Reports from the Commission for Damage Assessment  
• Reports from the ORFR  
• Analysis from beneficiary municipalities  
• Project implementation reports | • A new recovery needs assessment is required to reassess reconstruction/construction needs. This new assessment should be used as a benchmark to implement new recovery activities  
• Data related to provided housing solutions to be obtained through project monitoring |

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. To support the agricultural sector of flooded areas in recovering from the long-term consequences of floods (including support for resilience building against floods) and reaching higher levels of productivity and environment compatibility | • % of damaged arable and grazing lands restored  
• Production capacities of small and medium farms in flood-affected areas restored  
• % of increase in productivity of small and medium farms in flood-affected areas  
• Level of environmental compliance among small and medium farms in flood-affected areas  
• % of export increase among small and medium farms in flood-affected areas | • Reports from the MAEP  
• Surveys from beneficiary municipalities/local agriculture extension services  
• Project implementation reports | • A baseline needs to be established before start of implementation. This will involve the MAEP and LSGs/local agricultural extension services  
• Data related to project results to be obtained through project monitoring |
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#### 3. To promote flood prevention strategies and plans and support strategic investment into flood protection infrastructure

- Number of soil decontamination and clean-up operations on flood-affected agricultural land
- Number of small and medium farms in flood-affected areas receiving support through the programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of soil decontamination and clean-up operations</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of small and medium farms receiving support</td>
<td>Under the Flood Relief Directive, Serbia undertakes to prepare flood risk assessment; flood risk maps and flood risk plans which can be used to monitor progress towards targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective planning and management systems in place to reduce and manage flood-related risks</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR, EC Progress Report, Project implementation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of territory protected against floods</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR, EC Progress Report, Project implementation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of flood protection infrastructure built (dams, reservoirs, dykes, levees, floodwalls, etc.) in line with national priorities</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR, EC Progress Report, Project implementation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of flood hazard/risk maps</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR, EC Progress Report, Project implementation reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. To support investment into flood protection mechanisms and improve flood prevention and management capacities at the local level

- % of territory protected against floods
- Supported LSGs have effective management capacities to deal with disaster management
- Disaster risk reduction plans developed and adopted in target LSGs
- Early-warning and disaster risk prevention solutions adopted in target LSGs
- Number of investment into flood prevention and mitigation infrastructure at local level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of territory protected against floods</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR, Local plans from beneficiary municipalities, Project implementation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported LSGs have effective management capacities</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR, Local plans from beneficiary municipalities, Project implementation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster risk reduction plans developed and adopted in target LSGs</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR, Local plans from beneficiary municipalities, Project implementation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-warning and disaster risk prevention solutions adopted in target LSGs</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR, Local plans from beneficiary municipalities, Project implementation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of investment into flood prevention and mitigation infrastructure</td>
<td>Reports from the Ministry of Interior, Statistics from Water Management Information System (Water Directorate), Reports from the ORFR, Local plans from beneficiary municipalities, Project implementation reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- MoI to compile information from LSGs monitoring of action plans
2. EIDHR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Availability/Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To focus support in areas directly linked to key challenges in Negotiation Chapters 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) and 24 (Justice, Freedom and Security) and Chapter 19 (Social Policy and Employment) | * Significant no of projects approved are in key target areas of Ch 19, 23, 24, e.g. corruption;  
* Improved assessment of Serbia’s performance in areas of Ch19, 23, 24 | * Award notice for EIDHR programme/CfP  
* EC Serbia Annual Progress Report  
* International watchdog HR & democracy annual reports (e.g. TI Corruption Index, AI annual report, Universal Periodical Review report) | * Publicly available (EuropeAid, EUD Serbia website)  
* Publicly available (EUD Serbia, DG ENLARG/NEAR website)  
* Publicly available ([TI website](https://www.transparency.org), [AI website](https://www.amnesty.org), [Universal Periodic Review website](https://www.un.org/depts/hr)) |

| To improve and make more effective the cooperation between CSOs and independent bodies and mechanisms for protection of citizens and human rights | * Increased no of reported cases by independent bodies and mechanisms, esp. those filed by CSOs,  
* Increased no of investigated and addressed by independent bodies and mechanisms, esp. those filed by CSOs,  
* No of proposals for improved regulatory framework or enforcement accepted by independent bodies and mechanisms,  
EVALUATION OF GRANT CONTRACTS IMPLEMENTED AND FINANCED BY IPA AND EIDHR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To improve the performance of Serbia in implementing international and regional commitment in the area of HR law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved HR track record in annual global independent watchdog reports and under UN Periodic Universal Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Periodical Review report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International watchdog HR &amp; democracy annual reports (e.g. TI Corruption Index, AI annual report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Refugees and IDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Availability/willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To promote better living conditions among IDPs and contribute to the closure of informal collective centres through durable housing solutions complementing the RHP</td>
<td>- Improved living conditions for IDPs and former occupants of informal collective centres</td>
<td>- Annual Report of the Commissariat for Refugees &amp; Migration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of durable housing solutions for IDPs and occupants of informal collective centres</td>
<td>- Project Implementation Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of informal collective centres closed down</td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires regular surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obtaining accurate data is resource-intensive as the population in informal centres are constantly evolving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To support local socio-economic development in municipalities with large populations of refugees and IDPs</td>
<td>- Improved living conditions and enhanced economic opportunities in targeted municipalities</td>
<td>- Annual Report of the Commissariat for Refugees &amp; Migration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of income-generation grants for vulnerable households in targeted municipalities</td>
<td>- Project Implementation Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of skills development training</td>
<td>- Local Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires surveys at local level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Mental Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Source of verification</th>
<th>Availability/willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. To provide housing and livelihood support to the persons with mental illnesses that are categorised as able to live independently and are currently institutionalised** | - Number / % of people belonging to group of persons with mental illness who benefit from targeted deinstitutionalisation services  
- Level of increase of available housing and accompanying structures for deinstitutionalisation of persons with mental illness | Government statistics          | forthcoming               |
| **2. To promote strategies and plans for full implementation of targeted social services for people with mental illness who are able to live independently** | - Number of targeted social services addressing the needs of persons with mental illness  
- Breakdown of the national budget, indicating allocation for social service provision  
- Number / % of people with mental illness | Government statistics          | forthcoming               |
### 3. Adjust the health care financing mechanisms to ensure sustainability of deinstitutionalisation and improve access to health care services for persons with mental illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Availability/Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessing licensed social services</td>
<td>Number and % of licensed social service providers of total number of institutions, Number of national minimum service standards adopted via by-laws</td>
<td>MoLSP statistics, Government policies, regulations and other legislative documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms to apply capitation method are in place</td>
<td></td>
<td>Government budget allocations, Health Insurance budget, EU Progress reports, Studies, analyses, reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown of the National Health Insurance budget, indicating allocation for deinstitutionalised persons with mental illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care provisions are compliant with EU standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Civil Society Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Availability/Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To promote quality inclusion of CSOs in policy- and decision-making by institutions, incl. programming of donor assistance (IPA via SEKO) and responsiveness of state institutions to their proposals</td>
<td>Mechanism for permanent dialogue with civil society developed and operational (the Council), Timely (between 14-30 days) proposals and information made available and response given by CSOs, No of trainings, capacity development programmes and events for CSOs on topics covered by SEKO, % or no. of (by)law proposals consulted with CSOs, No of suggestions by CSO proposed and ratio of their inclusion in final policy or</td>
<td>Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society (GOCCS) annual report, TA CS/SIPU project report, SEKO mechanism website, Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society (GOCCS) annual report, MM Serbian annual report, EC Guidelines for</td>
<td>Publicly available (SEKO mechanism website), Publicly available (GOCCS annual report), Publicly available (Office annual report, MM Serbian annual report), internal (EC Guidelines report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**6. Strengthening Media Freedom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Availability/Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To support investigative journalism in areas linked to key EU reforms | • Increased no of investigative stories linked to key EU reforms  
• Increased no of debates in different media about issues covered by investigative stories  
• Improved knowledge and support of citizens for key EU reforms | • EC Serbia Annual Progress Report  
• TA to Strengthening Media Freedom reports  
• Eurobarometer  
• ANEM special reports  
• SEE Media Observatory annual and special reports  
• Guidelines for EU Support to Media Freedom and Media | • Publicly available ([EUD Serbia](https://eudserbia.eu), [DG ENLARG/NEAR website](https://europa.eu), [ANEM website](https://anem.org)),  
• Internal reports  
• Eurobarometer survey on reform support  
• Publicly available ([ANEM](https://anem.org)),  
• Publicly available ([SEE Media Observatory website](https://see-media-observatory.org))  
• Internal |

**To enhance financial viability and sustainability of CSOs**

|  | • Tax legislation affecting CSOs esp. on individual and company donations improved  
• Diversified and balanced financial support obtained by CSOs (individual donations, support by companies, public financing)  
• State funding frameworks for civil society support regulated  
• Increased no of campaigns by CSOs successfully raise funds from individuals and companies | • Tax Administration reports  
• EC Progress Report for Serbia  
• USAID NGO Sustainability Index  
• World Giving Index (WGI)  
• Government Office for Cooperation with Civil Society annual report (incl on state funding for civil society), EC Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 monitoring reports, Monitoring Matrix Serbian annual report | • Publicly available ([Tax administration website](https://ec.europa.eu), [DG ENLARG/NEAR website](https://europa.eu), [USAID Sustainability Index](https://www.usaid.gov), [WGI website](https://worldgivingindex.org)),  
• Internal ([EC Guidelines report](https://ec.europa.eu)) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To enhance financial stability and editorial independence of quality media and public service broadcasting (PBS)</th>
<th>Integrity in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of filed bankruptcy of quality media and positive financial balance for PSB</td>
<td>• EC Serbia Annual Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decreased no of reported cases of pressure on editors</td>
<td>• Serbian Business Register Agency (SBRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SEE Media Observatory annual and special reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guidelines for EU Support to Media Freedom and Media Integrity in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publicly available (EUD Serbia, DG ENLARG/NEAR website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SBRA website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publicly available media reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publicly available (SEE Media Observatory website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To strengthen capacity of journalists in investigative journalism</th>
<th>Internal reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increased no of investigative</td>
<td>• TA to Strengthening Media Freedom reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Media attention paid to the relevant investigative issue/topic (=amount of coverage)</td>
<td>• Grant scheme project reports/evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased no of section in media outlets with investigative content</td>
<td>• EC Serbia Annual Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SEE Media Observatory annual and special reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guidelines for EU Support to Media Freedom and Media Integrity in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publicly available (EUD Serbia, DG ENLARG/NEAR website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publicly available (SEE Media Observatory website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. CBC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed policy objectives</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
<th>Source of information</th>
<th>Availability/willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To encourage cross-border cooperation in the area of prevention and management of natural disasters with the overall aim of contributing to a better level of preparedness to natural disasters in border regions | • Number of joint strategic cross border projects addressing the needs for prevention and adequate response to disasters  
• Number of early-warning systems in place  
• Number of investment into disaster prevention mechanisms  
• Number of training of local staff involved in disaster management | • EC, JTS statistics and data  
• Government legislative, institutional documents  
• Studies, analyses, reports  
• Government documents, budgets, statistics  
• EC, JTS statistics and data  
• Studies, analyses, reports | • forthcoming                          |