

**Final Evaluation of the Regional Project on 'Advancing Inclusion of Vulnerable  
Groups in Southeast Europe: Minority Rights Advocacy in the EU Accession  
Process 2006-2010'**

**Implemented by Minority Rights International**

Zehra Kačapor-Džihic

January 2011

## Contents

Executive summary .....	3
Achievement Rating Scale .....	3
1. Introduction .....	9
1.1. Introduction to the Project .....	9
1.2. The evaluation methodology .....	10
1.3. Evaluation Methodologies and Techniques.....	11
1.4. Implemented activities.....	12
1.5. Challenges in evaluation process.....	12
2. Glance at the logical framework of the Project .....	13
3. Evaluation Findings.....	15
3.1. Relevance .....	15
3.2. Equity .....	16
3.3. Efficiency and effectiveness .....	17
3.4. Impact prospects .....	25
3.5. Sustainability .....	26
3.6. Potential for replicability .....	27
3.7. Lessons learned .....	27
4. Conclusion and recommendations.....	30
Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation .....	32
Annex 2: List of interviewed persons .....	35
Annex 3: Evaluation schedule.....	38
Annex 4: Documents consulted .....	39
Annex 5: Excerpt from the Revised LFA: Outputs, activities, OVIs .....	40
Annex 6: Analysis of the Output Indicators according to the SMART criteria .....	43

## ***Executive summary***

The Minority Rights Group International (MRGI) implemented a regional project on '**Advancing Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups in Southeast Europe: Minority Rights Advocacy in the EU Accession Process 2006-2010**' aiming at elimination of discrimination and ensuring minority protection by contributing to the inclusion and effective participation of SEE minorities in the economic and social development processes. The Project that covered six South-East European countries (Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Kosovo) sought to utilize the opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe through *evidence-based* advocacy activities towards the EU and building capacity of partners and their networks to proactively participate in decision-making processes.

The advocacy targets included primarily the relevant EU institutions; political advisors and sector managers of the EU Delegations in the target countries; Members of the European Parliament working on minority issues; and the respective national government ministries dealing with development, EU integration and human rights issues.

The Project was finalised in October 2010, and the MRGI commissioned Independent Evaluator, Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic to conduct the Final Evaluation of the Project. The Evaluation process included four of the six countries: Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Croatia. The Evaluation process began in October 2010 and was finalised in January 2011. Evaluation process and Evaluation report format have been developed as per the DfID Evaluation guidelines<sup>1</sup>. Besides the set questions as per the DfID guidelines, the standard evaluation methodology including qualitative indicators was applied in the evaluation process and assessment of achievement of envisaged Expected results. Synergy of **techniques** has been applied while conducting the evaluation, such as desk research, semi-structured interviews, and phone interviews.

### **Evaluation findings**

The Evaluation process was comprehensive and included assessment of both the conceptual and technical aspects of the Project.

On a conceptual level, the evaluation confirmed that the Project was a very relevant vehicle for promoting and utilising the opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe, and also increasing the

---

<sup>1</sup> DfID evaluation guidelines may be found at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/funding/civilsocietycf-lesson-guidelinespdf>

capacities of minority organisations in the Western Balkans to actively work on mainstreaming minority issues in decision making processes. Through the contact building and advocacy activities with the EC in Brussels, EU Delegations and government in the respective countries, the Project has succeeded in stimulating an inclusive process of consultations and provision of inputs by local partner organizations in the important policy documents of the European Union. Publication of shadow reports on minorities and other relevant studies was also an important tool for evidence based advocacy and awareness raising of the Project. However, the evaluation indicated that these publications were not used to the extent desirable in order to reach the target audience, and the failure to do this is considered as a missed opportunity of the Project. Partner organisations invested efforts in building civil society - government dialogue during the drafting of relevant minority related legislation in target countries, which was very important both for ensuring that rights of minorities are tackled, but also that the credibility and role of the partner organisation are recognised.

On a technical level, the Project struggled with the design of both its vertical and horizontal hierarchy of results which was reflected in the difficulty to relate the project achievements with corresponding outputs, due to weak Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) and too broad output statements. During its implementation, the project has had significant challenges, primarily of financial nature but also in terms of internal issues such as staff turnover and internal communication between partners that hindered the achievement of project objectives. Due to poor strategy of tackling these challenges, the Project faced the halting of activities for quite a significant period of time (June 2009-February 2010), and losing the important momentum of the Project. Nevertheless, the MRGI and Partners resumed project activities in a proactive manner to restore links and build up on the Project achievements before June 2009, so the project managed to be finished with a positive balance.

The evaluation findings point to the **main recommendations**, as follows:

- It is important to invest more efforts in developing strong results framework, applying SMART<sup>2</sup> criteria.
- Monitoring and Evaluation should be integral part of the Project and should be based on well defined baselines.
- Considering the slow progress in developing measures and policies for minority protection in the South-East Europe, MRGI should consider continuation of its support to empowerment of the local partners from this region for ongoing advocacy and input provision in consultation process both with the EU and country governments.

---

<sup>2</sup> SMART - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Bound

## ***Achievement Rating Scale (for the entire project period)***

- 1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
- 2 = largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings
- 3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
- 4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
- 5 = not achieved

*Note: the Project does not have developed baselines, therefore the column with baselines is not included in the scale.*

	<b>Achievement Rating</b>	<b>Log frame Indicators</b>	<b>Progress against the indicators</b>	<b>Comments (changes over the project, including unintended impacts)</b>
<b>Purpose</b> To utilize the opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe	<b>2</b>	Representation of members of minorities and minority women in key political and developmental programs and strategies at all levels is clearly agreed and implemented. The position of minorities, and in particular minority women, in SEE countries is strengthened and benefits from inclusion in political and developmental processes are recorded.	- local partner organisations have been empowered to take more active part in EU programming processes  - Project provided opportunities for partners to develop their capacities and knowledge, participate and provide input in policy making at governmental and EU levels.	no changes
<b>Output 1:</b> Minority communities, civil society organizations, European Union and governments jointly identify and use opportunities for minority and civil society input into the EU policy in SEE through the EU's	<b>2</b>	In Serbia, partner input considered by policy makers and referred to in EU country reports In Croatia, partner organization in cooperation with civil society and minority organizations successfully advocate for implementation of the Constitutional Law for Protection of Minority Rights provisions and fulfilment of relevant international	The log frame indicators have been largely met	No changes occurred within this Output.

	<b>Achievement Rating</b>	<b>Log frame Indicators</b>	<b>Progress against the indicators</b>	<b>Comments (changes over the project, including unintended impacts)</b>
reporting procedures.		<p>treaties commitments; this effort is reflected in EU country reports</p> <p>In Kosovo, partner is consulted by local and international officials on status talks; recommendations are taken forward by authorities</p> <p>In BiH, partner organization and grass roots organizations are consulted by governmental and EU officials</p> <p>In Montenegro, partner organizations hold consultative meetings with EU officials; government officials take up policy recommendations put forward by partners</p> <p>In Macedonia, reports/documents on Roma, employment of minorities in judiciary and participation of women in minority communities produced by project partners are referred to in EU country reports</p>		
<b>Output 2.</b> “Actions, policies and programmes of national authorities reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women”.	<b>3</b>	<p>In programme countries, national decision-makers hold consultations at least 6 times with partner and minority NGOs</p> <p>In programme countries, national decision-makers consider and act on advocacy documents produced by programme partners</p> <p>In programme countries, governments implement laws/plans/strategies to increase the share of minority employees in public sector</p> <p>In Kosovo, government and international</p>	<p>The national decision-makers do hold consultations, and partner organisations participate in these events. The level of input varies from country to country.</p> <p>Only partially achieved in some countries (Croatia and Macedonia).</p> <p>Achieved in Macedonia.</p>	<p>This Output was significantly revised in 2009, and the segment of work with local authorities was cut. This evaluation refers to revised Output 2.</p>

	Achievement Rating	Log frame Indicators	Progress against the indicators	Comments (changes over the project, including unintended impacts)
		<p>community take measures to accommodate needs of minority communities in the decentralization process.</p> <p>In Macedonia, minority and gender issues are included in labor and social policies at local/national level; government allocates funds for Roma employment programmes</p> <p>In Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, Roma men and women are consulted in the design and effectively participate in the implementation of national strategies for Roma and the Decade for Roma Inclusion.</p> <p>In Serbia, government undertakes special measures to increase the employability and employment of particularly vulnerable minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, women victims of family violence)</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Partially achieved through legislation.</p> <p>Partially achieved.</p> <p>There are measures developed by the government, but these happen beyond and outside of the Project scope.</p>	
<b>Output 3.</b> Mechanisms for minority inclusion are introduced in the EU national development aid policy and practices including the mechanisms for the inclusion of vulnerable groups of minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, victims of family violence)	<b>3</b>	<p>At least 3 recommendations from project advocacy publications are referred to and/or introduced in EU policy in SEE</p> <p>In at least 2 of the 5 project countries, development projects are developed which pay specific attention to minority groups</p> <p>In Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and</p>	<p>There is low on non-existent awareness of the advocacy publications by majority of advocacy targets (exception: Croatia and to some extent Macedonia).</p> <p>Achieved.</p> <p>Partially achieved. The Project has</p>	No significant changes in this Output.

	Achievement Rating	Log frame Indicators	Progress against the indicators	Comments (changes over the project, including unintended impacts)
		<p>Serbia, work around Roma inclusion improves the conditions for increased enrolment of girls and boys in schools at all levels as well as increased employment opportunities for Roma men and women.</p> <p>In Kosovo, refugees and returnees from minority communities benefit from aid policies.</p>	<p>worked on raising awareness on Roma inclusion; however the measures for improvement of these conditions go beyond the scope of this Project</p> <p>N/A</p>	
<b>Output 4.</b> Strengthened capacities of national and regional networks of NGOs working on minority rights and minority women's rights enabling them to effectively advocate at the national, regional and international levels for the implementation of minority rights standards	<b>2</b>	<p>A network of project partners and other minority NGOs use minority rights mechanism to advocate for minority rights, and in particular minority women's rights, inclusion in policies at the EU and national levels.</p> <p>In project countries, partners and other minority NGOs are increasingly perceived as reliable counterparts to the government and international agencies</p> <p>Shadow reports prepared by project partners, jointly with a network of civil society and minority organizations, are used by relevant treaty bodies and the institutions monitoring the EU accession process</p>	<p>Largely achieved.</p> <p>Achieved to a great extent.</p> <p>Partially achieved</p>	No significant changes in this Output.
<b>Activities</b>		<p>The activities implemented in the project were relevant to the development context of the Western Balkans and to the project purpose. However, some products and activities, like shadow reports have not been utilised to the extent possible for more successful advocacy and achievement of set goals of the project.</p> <p>The need for building upon the existing work on advocacy with EU and national/local government is ongoing, especially in the light of the fact that minority inclusion remains problematic in the Western Balkans.</p>		

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Introduction to the Project

The Minority Rights Group International (MRGI) implemented a regional project on **'Advancing Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups in Southeast Europe: Minority Rights Advocacy in the EU Accession Process 2006-2010'** aiming at elimination of discrimination and ensuring minority protection by contributing to the inclusion and effective participation of SEE minorities in the economic and social development processes. In order to achieve its goal, the Project sought to utilize the opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe.

The project set out to accomplish its purpose by achieving the following **outputs**:

1. Minority communities, civil society organizations, EU and governments jointly identify opportunities for minority and civil society input into the EU policy in SEE through EU's reporting procedures.
2. Actions, policies and programmes of national and local authorities reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women.
3. Mechanisms for minority inclusion are introduced in the EU national development aid policy and practices including inclusion of vulnerable groups of minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, victims of family violence).
4. Strengthened capacities of national and regional networks of NGOs working on minority rights and minority women's rights enabling them to effectively advocate at the national, regional and international levels for the implementation of minority rights standards.

The central theme and efforts of the project have been the targeted **evidence-based** advocacy activities towards the EU. Namely, advocacy was based on the analysis of the minority issues in the EU pre-accession assistance and development aid flows and national budgets in SEE (presented in a range of reports); and meant engagement with local, national and EU decision-makers to discuss and raise issues of minority inclusion. Besides, these activities, strong emphasis was placed on building knowledge and capacities of partner organisations directly on topics such as the EU, its procedures and engagement in the Western Balkans; and the project envisaged further replication of this knowledge to local partners' respective networks and partners.

The advocacy targets included primarily the relevant EU institutions; political advisors and sector managers of the EU Delegations in the target countries; Members of the European Parliament working on minority issues; and the respective national government ministries dealing with development, EU integration and human rights issues.

The project has been implemented in Serbia, Bosnia, Croatia, Montenegro, Macedonia and Kosovo. The Project in Serbia was implemented in partnership with the local NGO **Bibija Roma Women's Centre**; in Bosnia and Herzegovina with local NGO **Independent**; in Croatia with **Center for Peace**; in Macedonia with **Roma NGO Sonce**; in Kosovo with **Roma and Ashkalia Documentation Center**; and with **NGO Ask** in Montenegro.

The MRGI commissioned Independent Evaluator, Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic to conduct the Final Evaluation of the Project. The Evaluation process included four of the six countries: Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Croatia. The Evaluation process began in October 2010 and was finalised in January 2011. The present Evaluation report has been prepared by the Evaluator.

## **1.2. The evaluation methodology**

The subject of the evaluation was the Project “**Advancing Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups in Southeast Europe: Minority Rights Advocacy in the EU Accession Process 2006-2010**” and its intended outputs, outcomes and impact. According to the Terms of Reference, the overall objective of the Final Evaluation was to assess how the Project results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in utilization of the opportunities provided by the EU accession process to combat poverty and exclusion of minority communities by mainstreaming their effective participation in political and development processes in Southeast Europe (SEE); as well as to achievement of change in identification and utilisation of opportunities for civil society input into the EU policy in SEE and creation of mechanisms for minority inclusion into the EU pre-accession assistance and development aid policy and practices. More specifically, the Evaluation focused on programme activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, and Serbia as well as Brussels. This Final Evaluation assessed the project achievements and progress at following levels:

### ***Output level:***

- a) Assess the success in completing all of the activities as planned to a reasonably high quality as per the Logical framework;
- b) Assess factors hindering successful completion of activities and their effects, as well as the approach to overcoming the obstacles;

### ***Outcome level***

- a) Assess the extent to which activities contributed to the planned results and provide evidence of best practices;
- b) Assess what factors intervened and their impact on achievement of results;
- c) Based on the points **a)** and **b)** above, provide case studies of (successful) approaches of organisations to overcome obstacles;

- d) Assess the context in which the project has been implemented and document any changes in the external environment that may have helped or hindered the project;
- e) Document any unplanned results (positive or negative).

### ***Assessing the Impact of the project***

The Project finished at end of October 2010, so it is rather early to assess the impacts of the project. Therefore, the evaluation assessed prospects of the impact of the results achieved. Also, the evaluation assessed the extent to which the purpose of the project will be achieved in the longer term from the perspective of the explanation of the project purpose in the project document.

Within its scope, the Evaluation Report covers issues of Project effectiveness (an assessment of the level of the Project contribution to achieving expected goals and capturing the Program impact on target groups), Project efficiency (assessing the structures, systems and procedures that supported and/or impeded implementation of the Project and drawing out lessons learned and specific recommendations), relevance (was the chosen approach/methodology appropriate to reach the goals and to have an impact on target groups) and sustainability (assessing the likelihood of benefits produced by the Project to continue to flow after external funding has ended).

### **1.3. Evaluation Methodologies and Techniques**

The Evaluation process and Evaluation report format have been developed as per the DfID Evaluation guidelines<sup>3</sup>. Besides the set questions as per the DfID guidelines, the standard evaluation methodology including qualitative indicators was applied in the evaluation process and assessment of achievement of envisaged Expected results. Synergy of **techniques** has been applied while conducting the evaluation, such as desk research, semi-structured interviews, and phone interviews.

Including all relevant **stakeholders** in evaluation processes was of crucial importance, so particular attention was put on involvement of MRGI Management, partner organizations, advocacy targets, especially representatives of government institutions, European Union and other boundary partners where possible. The role of local partner organisations has been crucial in providing the contacts of relevant interlocutors and the evaluation process and outcomes depend to great extent to the response of local partners in this regards.

---

<sup>3</sup> DfID evaluation guidelines may be found at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/funding/civilsocietycf-lesson-guidelinespdf>

## 1.4. Implemented activities

**Desk research:** As part of Preparation Phase, the Evaluator conducted desk research and analysis of key project documents listed in Annex 2 (the project application and relevant reports) in October and November 2010.

**Field research:** In November and December 2010, Evaluator conducted 32 meetings and/or phone interviews with representatives of MRGI management, partner organizations and other relevant stakeholders (Annex 1: List of interviewees). Partner organizations have been responsible for provision on lists of potential interviewees. The Evaluator was responsible for all logistical issues related to organizing the visits during the field phase. As per guidelines from MRGI, the Evaluator focused on Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia and Croatia, and advocacy targets at the European Commission in Brussels.

**Analysis and interpretation:** The draft Evaluation report has been submitted on January 4, 2011. The MRGI Office has analyzed the Report and provided their comments and suggestions on facts and judgments presented in it. The final report was submitted after receiving comments, on 27 January 2011.

## 1.5. Challenges in evaluation process

The Project comprehensiveness and thus, related evaluation demanded from the evaluator to respond to several specific challenges:

**Social context:** The Project was implemented in six countries (Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia and Croatia, Montenegro and Kosovo) out of which Project activities in four countries have been assessed<sup>4</sup> and each of them has its specific characteristics regardless of the trend to call all of them the Western Balkans. The diversity of the social context influenced the scope and the ways of implementation of program activities, so in the evaluation process it was necessary that the Evaluator get the knowledge of the current social state in each of the countries, with the special stress on the systematic care for the national minorities. The specific quality of each of the countries and the social developments in the period covered by the Project (2006-2010) partly determined the position of each of the organizations and without the insight into it the evaluation report would be incomplete. One of the ways of obtaining the insight into the overall situation in each of the countries was the desk review of developments in this area and interviews with different stakeholders and partner organisations. The readiness of the organizations to meet the needs of the Evaluator largely helped the Evaluator to respond adequately to this challenge.

**Influence of the Programme history:** The main Evaluator's task was to evaluate the period from 2006 to 2010. However, it is impossible to observe this stage completely separated from the period before 2006 due to the reason that this particular project funded mainly by DfID was extension of ongoing activities of the MRGI and partner

---

<sup>4</sup> Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia and Croatia

organisation, therefore the project has its roots in the past. The Evaluator needed certain knowledge about the activities and the modalities of work in the period before this particular project was implemented in order to obtain the insight into the whole context. However, due to limitations in the institutional memory due to significant turnover of staff mainly at MRGI, the input is pretty limited. Naturally when speaking of this challenge, it is important to stress clearly that the Evaluators did not enter any kind of evaluation of the activities and the achievements outside the period defined in the evaluation, but all the information obtained served as a supplement to the overall framework for the evaluation in the evaluation task.

While the evaluation process included interviews with majority of former and current staff of the Project, the Evaluator did not manage to have an interview with Ms Snjezana Bokulic. Nevertheless, the interviews with other former and current staff members provided a wealth of knowledge about the challenges and achievements of the project.

Finally, although the evaluation focused more on the qualitative analysis, it was necessary to obtain valid quantitative data (especially regarding the activities and the indicators) so that the evaluation of the overall achievements would be based on the actual state. The annual and other relevant reports and information were extremely important and thanks to the MRGI office they were made available for the Evaluator.

## ***2. Glance at the logical framework of the Project***

Designing comprehensive development projects aimed at covering larger geographic regions, particularly projects that address marginalised and excluded groups in complex political and socio-economic contexts, is a rather challenging task. In such circumstances, constructing log frames that fulfil the SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) criteria is especially demanding. During the design process of such projects that have a complex structure, one common mistake is to develop a very ambitious results framework that is not supported by SMART indicators.

A glance at the MRGI Project's results framework reveals a similar struggle. At the Output level, the vertical logic shows a clear focus on four core output areas: 1) Collaboration and participation of stakeholders; 2) Sensitivity and awareness of minority issues; 3) Mechanisms for inclusion and 4) Capacity building. However, although there is a clear logic to the selection of these outputs, the Project fails to define 'SMART' results statements in a way that can be directly linked to positive impact on beneficiaries. The broad nature of the Output statements is making for a very ambitious task that could stand as a project goal in itself. Good examples of such struggle to define a SMART output are the Output 2 and Output 3. The Output 2 sets out to achieve the change whereby *Actions, policies and programmes of national authorities reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women*. When analyzing the vertical logic further of the Output 2 for example, we find a significant discrepancy between the Output 2 and its corresponding activities. Same is true for the Output 3 (*Mechanisms for minority inclusion are introduced in the EU national development aid policy and practices including the mechanisms for the*

*inclusion of vulnerable groups of minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, victims of family violence)).*

Horizontal logic of the project highlights the challenge further. Indicators at all levels of Outputs are not SMART (see the presentation of the Results framework in the Annex 5 and the Table 1 below respectively) according to the rigid SMART criteria as it is summarised in the Table 1 below (please, see the Annex 6 for full analysis of indicators).

*Table 1: Analysis of the Project indicators according to SMART criteria*

	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant	Time-bound	Total
Output 1 (6 indicators)	1	0	6	6	0	13
Output 2 (7 indicators)	4	3	5	7	0	19
Output 3 (4 indicators)	1	1	3	4	0	9
Output 4 (3 indicators)	1	1	3	3	0	8
<b>TOTAL SMART indicators</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49</b>

As it can be seen from the table, while we find most indicators to be relevant and often achievable in hypothetical terms, they are most often not specific, measurable or time bound. It is difficult to measure indicators that do not define units to be measured in clear and specific terms. Problematic is the dimension of the specificity and measurability of the indicators – the indicators are very broad and general, and it may be said that they represent ***aspired changes*** rather than providing objectively verifiable indicators of success of this particular project. Also, none of the indicators are time bound. For example, the first indicator under Output 1 which reads “*In Serbia, partner input considered by policy makers and referred to in EU country reports*”, is supposed to measure whether the input is “*considered*”. The term “*considered*”, besides being non-committal, is also too ambiguous and if not specifically defined can be achieved fairly easy by the Project without contributing substantially to the achievement of the Output whose success it is designed to measure. The same is the case for majority of indicators listed in the results framework.

This log frame design challenge is important to highlight as the weak results framework directly influences the assessment and rating of the Project achievements. Namely, donors (especially the EC but also DfID) have developed assessment and rating frameworks that are based on the revision of the results framework. The weakness in clear linking the different items in the hierarchy (goal, purpose, outputs, activities – and related objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification) brings to difficulties and often lower rating of successful projects. The evaluation of this Project has also encountered this challenge. While many achievements have been made by the project, still – simple rating of its outputs may bring to a different conclusion due to weakly developed outputs.

### ***3. Evaluation Findings***

Analysis of achievements of the results drawn up by the MRGI and their local partners is presented in this section. The Section offers an analysis of the relevance, Equity, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability, Potential for replicability and finally Lessons learned from the Project as per the DFID guidelines for evaluations. Throughout the report, analysis of strengths, weaknesses and challenges in implementation of the Project is presented under the above mentioned subsections.

#### **3.1. Relevance**

Protection of minorities is an integral part of the EU political criteria for accession, which are considered to be essential for the start of the accession negotiations. In the Western Balkans, a region in the queue for EU accession, minority protection is an issue of increasing importance, because of its multiethnic character and the legacy of recent inter and intra-state conflicts. Scholars and practitioners have highlighted that the democratic consolidation of the region depends upon the management of minority issues. In these contextual conditions, the EU has been an actor that has significantly engaged in the promotion of improved minority protection in the framework of its political criteria for accession.

Having in mind the multifaceted nature of EU conditionality and its impact on the Western Balkans political transformation, the question how external pressures have affected domestic institutional and policy changes remains to be answered, but it is evident from proliferation of policies and strategies to tackle the minority issues in the countries, that this pressure is significant and is bringing some, at least limited, results. Therefore, there is huge significance of the EU as an actor in the domestic minority politics in the candidate and potential candidate countries of the Western Balkans.

#### **Political conditionality and minority protection**

As candidate countries for EU membership, all Western Balkan countries are subject to conditionality in the area of minority protection primarily through the Copenhagen criteria for accession. The first Copenhagen criterion states that in order to join the EU, a new member state must ensure the stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities. In line with this requirement, the EU monitors the development in both countries through the mechanisms at its disposal, ranging from the reports on the implementation of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) to the EC Progress Reports and the European/Accession Partnerships. These documents contain the EC's assessment on the political criteria and the recommendations which the EU puts forward to the candidate countries and potential candidate countries, which concern the work of the parliament, government, judiciary, anti-corruption policy, protection of human rights and minorities; and regional cooperation.

Minority protection is an element of EU political conditionality, which emphasizes “respect for and the furtherance of democratic rules, procedures and values.” (Pridham, 2002, p.956). The EU political conditionality may be understood as per definition of Hughes et al (2005), according to which EU conditionality “includes not only the formal technical requirements on candidates but also the informal pressures arising from the behaviour and perceptions of actors engaged in the political process.” (p.2). Hughes et al (2005) distinguish “between formal conditionality, which embodies the publicly stated preconditions [...] of the ‘Copenhagen criteria’ and the [...] acquis, and informal conditionality, which includes the operational pressures and recommendations applied by actors within the Commission [...] during their interactions with their CEEC counterparts.” (p.26).

The EU uses standards on minority protection developed by the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (OSCE HCNM) and the Council of Europe (CoE) reports that are issued to assess compliance with various conventions within the CoE framework (such as the Framework Convention for the Protection of National minorities). The reports developed with regards to the OSCE and CoE are used commonly by the EC in the preparation of EC’s yearly progress reports. Besides these, the EC is increasingly involving a variety of civil society organisations in the EC Progress report development for each country, resulting in the fact that, as Sasse (2005) argues the EU conditionality in the area of minority protection is best understood as the cumulative effect of different international institutions. However, it is important to note that until recently, the EC has gathered only the opinions of large, international civil society organisations (such as the Amnesty International, Transparency, etc.) and not the local civil society organisations. The advocacy and awareness raising about the need to include those organisations that work directly with target groups has started giving results in more focus of the EC in organising consultations with the relevant civil society organisations from beneficiary countries.

### **Conclusion: Relevance**

In light of the above mentioned process and criteria of the EU, the Project has been extremely relevant and brought very significant contribution to the EU processes and procedures. By providing opportunities for local minority organisations-partners of the project to actively participate, provide input and contribute to development of the EU Progress reports for their respective countries, but also providing opportunities to develop and maintain links between local partner organisations and the EC – the project has brought significant contribution to raising awareness and strengthening the focus on minority rights, invested in relevant and important segment of the Copenhagen criteria, through putting stronger pressure on primarily the EC but indirectly (through the EU Progress reports) on the government on the importance on placing more focus on minority inclusion.

### **3.2. Equity**

In light of the fact that the Project’s overall goal was the elimination of discrimination and ensuring minority protection by contributing to the inclusion and effective participation of

SEE minorities in the economic and social development processes, through utilization of opportunities provided by the EU accession process; it is clear that the Project's activities towards mainstreaming effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe were set forth to bringing positive impact on the disadvantaged groups, in this case the minority communities in the Western Balkans. As per the Project document, the final beneficiaries of the project include but are not limited to groups such as Albanians, Roma, Slovenes, as well as Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs in areas in which they constitute a minority in BiH; Serbs, Roma, Bosniaks in Croatia; Roma, Ashkalia, Egyptians, Turks, Serbs in Kosovo; Albanians, Roma, Turks in Macedonia; Albanians, Bosniaks, Croats, Roma in Montenegro; Roma, Albanians, Hungarians in Serbia. Minority civil society were also to benefit from this project through its direct involvement in the EU advocacy effort.

The Project's interventions aimed at improving the status of minority communities in SEE and the local NGOs working on minority issues through its work on advocacy with the national governments and EU agencies and institutions. The project implementation saw the European Union as primary advocacy audience, while partner organisations have been involved in advocacy and also direct work with national government institutions (Croatia and Macedonia), while the Project also focused on building knowledge on the EU and advocacy capacities of the partner organisations and their networks. All Project partners also invested significant efforts in disseminating the project ideas and values amongst civil society in their own countries and local communities.

### **Conclusion: Equity**

The Project has had significant results in working with the EU and the local partners, but it is difficult to measure any specific effects on minority groups, as the project has not had any activities directly with those beneficiaries. At the same time, while the EU programming documents (such as MIPD and Progress reports) to which the Project partners brought contribution, do tackle questions of minorities, it is very difficult to measure the extent to which the Project itself brought any impact on improving the EU programming documents, except in terms of ever-stronger input on the state of minorities in the relevant EU documents.

### **3.3. Efficiency and effectiveness**

The MRGI Project 'Advancing Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups in Southeast Europe: Minority Rights Advocacy in the EU Accession Process 2006-2010' that is the subject of this Evaluation has been the extension of the wider MRGI efforts to support local partner organisations in advocacy towards active inclusion of minorities in decision making processes in the EU and target countries. As continuation of the efforts, this project was a result of a joint planning effort of the MRG and its partners which was based on the evaluation and lessons of two previous projects conducted in the Western Balkans. The main lessons from the previous joint work of MRGI and partners that presented the basis for this project were: 1) The importance of the EU accession process in providing the necessary leverage for the improvement of minority situations in the candidate and

potential candidate countries in the Western Balkans; and 2) MRG have learned that a rights-based approach to programming needs to be applied, meaning that programme design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation are participatory, transparent and mutually accountable. Also, the project was developed based on the fact that attention has been given to minority protection in SEE, to the fulfilment of the Copenhagen political criteria and the present accession process. However, civil society organizations were not proactively included in the EU minority protection discourse through a systematic and well-planned advocacy project. Therefore, the Project's main aim was to build capacities, provide opportunities and strengthen links between Western Balkans' civil society and the EU, in such a way that partners are empowered to conduct advocacy directly, instead of delegating it to an international NGO.

The project has made significant achievements in terms of empowering local partner organisations to conduct advocacy directly through building knowledge, links and skills of the partners. Also, valuable was the input that the partner organisations produced through the shadow and regional reports, participation and provision of inputs during in-country or EU level consultations on minority questions. However, the Project has faced significant challenges that hindered the project efficiency and effectiveness.

### **3.3.1. Challenges**

This section provides an overview of challenges the project faced, which will help understanding the extent to which the Project achievements were accomplished. Upon discussing the challenges, the following section, 3.3.2. provides an assessment of the extent to which the Project achieved its **outputs, purpose and overall aim**. The discussion on achievements and challenges will point towards the extent to which the project was efficient and effective.

#### **Financial challenges**

The Project structure was very robust, with the envisaged budget of 891,455 BGP and the proposal that DfID supports approximately 50% of the total budget, while MRGI and Partners should fundraise for the remaining budget from other donors. However, the main challenge that hindered the project was the fact that the MRGI experienced difficulties in raising the match funding required. This challenge may be accounted to the two relevant factors: firstly, the project started its implementation in 2006 when international donors started significantly shifting focus from the Western Balkans towards other regions, which made it more difficult for any organisation working in the Western Balkans to secure funds; and secondly, the global economic crisis has brought additional challenge to organisations due to the fact that donor countries decreased the levels of funding for developing countries, and instead became more focused on tackling the needs of their own economies. The MRGI and partners were particularly proactive in trying to secure the funding needed from the start of the project until the time negotiations with DFID were concluded. Within fundraising efforts, the Project partners applied to a wide range of donors including the EC, the Olof Palme Center Initiative, the Swiss MFA (etc), resulting in securing funding from the Charles Stuart Mott Foundation,

the King Baudouin Foundation, the Council of Europe. Also, all organizations used some of their own funds (core or other grants) to match DFID grant. Due to challenges to secure all funding envisaged in the original proposal, MRGI entered into negotiations with the DfID (whose funds were also affected by the currency fluctuations) to cut on the activities in order to make more significant impact on narrower number of areas. Therefore, the Project's envisaged output 2. *“Actions, policies and programmes of national and local authorities reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women”* was reformulated into the following *“Actions, policies and programmes of national authorities reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women”*, in order to put focus only on national authorities rather than local authorities. The Project came with the decision not to publish the in-country studies which would have been a powerful tool to engage with local authorities, meaning that work with local authorities would not be implemented.

### **Relations with donor**

Negotiations with DfID on terms and revision of the Project took very long time, due to a combination of various factors that impeded the speed of the process. The staff turnover in both the MRGI (discussed below) and the DfID were a challenge for the speed in the process. Another very important factor was that at the same period, the DFID handed over management of all DFID funded projects to the consultancy Tripleline, which additionally slowed down the process of revision of the project. The consequence of these factors, primarily transfer of communication and negotiations to the Tripleline, was that the project was halted for a significant period (June 2009-February 2010) during which MRGI had limited contact with the partner organisations.

### **Staff turnover**

Changes in MRG project staff and related to that, the inadequate hand-over have been significant obstacle to the Project implementation and institutional memory of the Organisation for this particular project.

### **Partnership within the Project**

This project was the extension of ongoing and wider efforts of the MRGI and partners and was created on the basis of lessons learnt from previous phases of the intervention. The reinforced expectations from the Project and MRGI leadership that were presented in the proposal were still high and thus, inevitably created certain frustrations during the difficult period of project implementation. The interviews with partners point towards the following groups of challenges in the relationship between partners and MRGI, which may be accounted to be effects of unanticipated objective circumstances in which the project was:

1. Only partial funding for the Project was secured. The fact that matching funding was not secured resulted in the fact that the *momentum* for project was *lost* pretty early in the project.

2. Significant changes in the project staff hampered institutional memory of MRGI, and also affected the communication with local partners, knowledge about the project itself, and about partners' involvement, work, needs and capacities. Also, this affected administration and management of the project as a whole.
3. Lack of consistent sharing of information with project partners on the part of MRGI in crucial moments of the Project, such as Logical framework and budget revision affected the relations with partners. On the positive note, the work of MRGI to re-build the relations upon recommencement of the project in 2010 brought re-instated will of partners to explore future partnerships with MRGI.

The period between June 2009 – February 2010 was very challenging for partnership between the MRGI and local NGOs, as the unclear and slow process of negotiations with the donor influenced the activities in the field. Discussions with partners revealed that some of the partners were not happy with the way in which the MRGI conducted the project revisions, as they felt that they were not included to sufficient extent in decision-making on revision of project and cutting activities. The fact that local advocacy was cut out of the Project was a significant matter of dissatisfaction, as most partners work with local governments. Still, all partners are aware that it was inevitable to cut some Project activities due to unsuccessful fundraising work.

Slow process of negotiations brought negative consequences to the Project as the activities were halted for a couple of months, affecting the motivation of local partners for the Project and losing the momentum that was achieved in the first year of the Project. Even though project was halted, partners report to have continued on their own with the advocacy work to some extent within their financial and organisational capacities, but all agree that the project visibility and presence was affected due to lack of funds.

Upon recommencement of the project activities in 2010, the MRGI lead important and positive initiative to restore the momentum of the project outside the ongoing project activities, such as: a) organising a number of gatherings and events that brought together - partners internally (The Partners meeting in Bosnia in June 2010-to discuss the Project, its opportunities and challenges in its finalisation, but also potential for continuing partnerships outside the project); - governments in the respective countries and partners to discuss EU programming process (local launches of the IPA report); b) establishment of a web resource for exchange and networking between partners; etc. These activities were crucial for restoring the partnerships and bringing the Project to a rather positive end.

The partnership for the Project was based on the Partnership Agreement as a governing document for the Project, and it was recognized as good practice by all parties involved especially as it helped mitigate the above challenges. All partners interviewed during the evaluation agree that, while there have been challenges during the project life, still partners see MRGI as important and positive partner. The final meeting of the Project was well organized and held in a very professional and good atmosphere. NGOs were actively involved in reflection on the Project achievements and challenges, and in

discussions regarding the potential future cooperation and networking, in line to their more specific interests and mission.

### 3.3.2. Achievement of Project objectives

This section provides an assessment of the extent to which the Project achieved its **outputs and purpose**. The selected approach to this assessment is “bottom up”; i.e. discussing first the project outputs and then going higher in the hierarchy of project purpose. It is important to note that activities have not been exclusively divided between the outputs, so there have been activities assigned to contribute to different outputs. The overall assessment of outputs is based on the change and/or improvements within the outputs, while the DfID defined rating has been applied in the conclusion with further elaboration in order to reconcile the factual achievements of the project and the need to rate against (sometimes) too-ambitious output as discussed in the Section 2 of this Report.

**Output 1: Minority communities, civil society organizations, EU and governments jointly identify opportunities for minority and civil society input into the EU policy in SEE through EU's reporting procedures.**

The wording of the Output 1 implies that the Project would work towards the point where the minority communities, civil society organizations, EU and, importantly, governments jointly identify opportunities for minority and civil society input into the EU policy in SEE. The wording further implies that this be done through the EU reporting procedures. Actually, the Project worked on international and regional advocacy, towards strengthening regular communication between partners and the DG Enlargement of the European Commission. The activities within this Output focused on continuation of dialogue through consultations with the EC over input into the Progress reports, both in-country (with EU Delegations) and in Brussels through meetings with relevant EC bodies. Besides this, trainings on minority rights and minority rights programming for DG Enlargement took place (the last one in June 2009).

The activities within this Output have contributed towards strengthening of the EU programming documents to include more in-depth analysis and focus on minority rights and current state of affairs in this area. Also, the activities contributed to a large extent to increased visibility of partner organisations and also MRGI as relevant actors in the area of minority rights on a general level; however with variance between the countries. Good example of these differences is the fact that, while the local NGO partners from Macedonia and Croatia were recognised as strong and important actors both by government, EC and EUDs; the organisations from Serbia and especially Bosnia and Herzegovina were not recognised to same extent in their respective contexts.

Also, the work within this output contributed to the fact the partner organisations are increasingly engaged by in-country delegations as part of their consultation processes.

The EU has increasingly recognised the importance of the consultations in drafting the progress reports and programming documents (such as the Multi-Indicative Programming Document - MIPD), and the procedures have been significantly improving during the last years of Project implementation (2008-2010). While the Project itself contributed to this change to some extent, through events that brought the EC and civil society organisations together, still it is fair to say that other external factors, such as general recognition by EC about the need to organise more comprehensive consulting process, also contributed to these improvements.

It may be concluded that the Output 1 was ***largely achieved*** despite a few shortcomings.

**Output 2: Actions, policies and programmes of national authorities reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women.**

The Output 2 was most strongly affected by the financial challenges that the Project faced. Original Output 2 “*Actions, policies and programmes of national and local authorities reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women*” was revised and the activities relating to work with local authorities have been cut in 2009. Nevertheless, partner organisations were involved in national level consultations and work on drafting the relevant legislation concerning minorities (such as the anti-discrimination law in Croatia, Montenegro, Serbia); implementation of laws (minority laws in Croatia, BiH); policy development (Roma strategies in Macedonia, and Serbia), etc. Interviews with relevant government advocacy targets reveal the fact that the work of partner organisations, especially in Serbia, Macedonia and Croatia has been very important and relevant, and that the organisations are increasingly recognised as relevant actor in the minority questions in these countries.

The interviews with advocacy targets in Bosnia and Herzegovina reveal low level of work of the partner NGO on the issues of minority inclusion and low visibility of the organisation as relevant in this sector. The reason for this may be the fact that the Bosnian organisation, *Independent*, worked mainly with (and through) the BiH NGO Council, through which input and advocacy was channelled. However, it is important to say that the decision of the BiH NGO to join the NGO Council is viewed as very positive as it shows the genuine recognition by the organisation that the serious changes in the policy-making process in BiH may only be achieved if partnerships of civil society organisations are made strong and if the civil society organisations act in common voice towards decision-makers.

All partner organizations report to have continued the advocacy and contact building activities with their government institutions, despite the financial challenges that the Project faced. However, even though the organizations did invest efforts into advocacy still it is visible that the actions, policies and programmes of national authorities still do

not reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women to the extent that would be desired upon the finalization of the project. It is clear that such change goes beyond the project activities and depends on a range of external political, social, economic factors that the Project and its partners cannot influence. **Therefore, it may be concluded that this Output is partially achieved.**

**Output 3: Mechanisms for minority inclusion are introduced in the EU national development aid policy and practices including inclusion of vulnerable groups of minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, victims of family violence).**

The work of the partner organisations with support from MRGI mentioned within the Output 2 also contributed to the Output 3. Namely, the Project partners attended a number of relevant events organised by the EU (such as a conference organized by Directorate General Enlargement of the European Commission to launch a new financial facility to support civil society under IPA in April 2008), and government consultations in drafting the legislation (as mentioned on section on Output 2 above). Also, the Project partners drafted shadow reports, regional studies (first one on the Copenhagen Criteria, *Pushing for Change? South East Europe's Minorities in the EU Progress Reports* was launched in Brussels in July 2008; while the second one was drafted and presented in the electronic form.

The shadow reports and regional studies as documents generally hold strong message and may be used as important advocacy tools both at EU and national levels. However, the interviews with advocacy targets reveal that there is surprisingly low awareness of existence of both the shadow reports and regional studies. Striking is the fact that of all interviewed stakeholders, only the Croatian counterparts were aware and did use the relevant reports; while stakeholders in other countries denied awareness of existence of such documents. Discussion with partners raised this important finding: the partners report to have been sending all publications to all advocacy targets, but apparently they are not used. Having in mind the fact that the advocacy targets are institutions/focal points for wide range of issues within the country/sector, it may be assumed that these receive large number of different publications, reports, articles which sometimes may dilute the attention to the specific product of a specific organisation.

Still, it is a disappointing that the produced documents were not more intensively used as advocacy tools, especially having in mind the fact that this Project was an advocacy project and thus, such documents would have exceptional value also for promotion and raising credibility of all partners in the Project. This could have been done through organising meetings, short workshops and similar gatherings to present the reports and discuss the findings. Usually, such meetings do not require additional funds but do contribute to more visibility, further use of findings and conclusions, but most importantly increase the understanding of the topic and visibility of the organisations. In this specific case, if presented more intensively, such documents would represent valuable input also in the process of advocacy for and/or creation of mechanisms for minority inclusion in the EU national development aid policy and practices including inclusion of

vulnerable groups of minority women as it was stated in the Output 3. The lack of more aggressive promotion of the reports and studies may be considered as ***missed opportunity*** to contribute to mechanisms for minority inclusion in respective countries.

The produced reports, and importantly gathered knowledge and expertise in producing such comprehensive analytical work is a great asset for the organizations and the Project. The outreach has not been very successful and this presents a strong lesson learnt for the organizations. Taking all these factors into account, the general conclusion is that the **Output 3 has been partially achieved, but the benefits and shortcomings are finely balanced.**

***Output 4: Strengthened capacities of national and regional networks of NGOs working on minority rights and minority women's rights enabling them to effectively advocate at the national, regional and international levels for the implementation of minority rights standards.***

The work of the MRGI and its partners towards building capacities and networks of NGOs has been an ongoing process that was continued during the implementation of this project. The majority of NGO Partners were already partners of MRGI in previous projects; therefore the links were already relatively strong. Throughout this project, the capacities of partner NGOs and their networks in the region have been increasingly strengthened through regional trainings, followed by in-country trainings with local partner NGOs and their partners. Such activities were used as opportunity both for dissemination of knowledge among other minority organizations but also to create coalitions of minority organisations.

Besides these activities, the translation of the EU guide was valuable tool for the Project, and its dissemination provided local level minority organizations with a guide to the EU accession process and its relevance for minority rights advocacy.

All local partner organisations are recognised in the civil society contexts in their countries as relevant and credible actors in this area. At the same time, the partners invest efforts in networking with other CSOs. The opportunities and achievements of the Project within this Output may be assessed as ***positive and satisfactory***.

#### **Assessment of the accomplishment of the Project purpose**

##### ***Project Purpose***

***To utilize the opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe.***

Even though the project has faced significant setbacks and challenges, still it may be concluded that the Project purpose was largely achieved. The local partner organisations have been empowered to take more active part in EU programming

processes, while the Project provided opportunities for partners to develop their capacities and knowledge, participate and provide input in policy making at governmental and EU levels.

**Supporting and empowering local organisations to take active part in EU Programming was very good approach** in terms of **making contribution to real change in decision making and tackling the minority issues**. The “partner/facilitator/link” role of MRGI as a strong international organisation with access to EU bodies has been extremely beneficial for local organisation who otherwise would not have real access to these bodies. Easing access and facilitating the process of establishing links and channels with the EU bodies was extremely useful. The missed opportunity to use more aggressively the produced reports and studies may be assessed as a setback in full utilisation of opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women’s participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe.

### ***Conclusions: Efficiency and Effectiveness***

While the project approach was developed on the basis of intensive and positive partner relations, and conceptually, project approach was appropriate; the major obstacle to effectiveness and efficiency of the project was the financial construction of the project, whereby only 50% of the funding was secured at the start of the Project. The failure to ensure full finances for the project hindered both external (with donor) and internal relations (between partners). Also, halting of activities affected efficiency and especially effectiveness of the project, in terms of losing important momentum in advocacy activities and dissolving the project aims and outputs by delaying and cutting important activities. Therefore, it may be concluded that the project efficiency and effectiveness was not on a satisfactory level.

From the evaluation perspective, there have been opportunities to manage these obstacles if stronger efforts were invested by the MRGI to ensure adequate and strong hand-over and centralising operations from the main office, while at the same time maintaining consistent, proactive and time-bound relations with partners. Having in mind the staff turnover, the stronger involvement of the partners could have decreased or even diminished the negative consequences both internally and in relations with the donor.

### **3.4. Impact prospects**

It is difficult to measure the impact of the project at this point in time primarily due to the fact that the Project ended in time when this Evaluation took place (end of October 2010). However, as this project was the extension of previous interventions of MRGI and project partners, some impact prospects may already be visible today.

First of all, the long term investment of the MRGI in building capacities, links and networks of local partner organisations has surely made significant shift in organisational capacities of partners, their empowerment and recognition in society and with their

respective boundary partners. Partner organisations in each country that was target of this evaluation have their recognised role and place within the civil society context in their respective countries. Naturally, the success and recognition of individual partners is variable, and some organisations have very high profile (like Center for Peace in Croatia), some individuals are recognised as strong experts (case of Macedonia), while some organisations are leaders in their respective areas of work (case of Serbia).

Also, the Project has succeeded in creating links between the local partners and the EU, which, if maintained well, may contribute to significant level of input in the EU policy making towards each of the countries.

In this regards, while any impact on lives of primary beneficiaries as defined in the Project proposal may not be found as yet, still – the Project has brought about some positive changes in the way in which organisations operate, in their understanding and approach to EU policy making and especially programming. Finally, the Project implementation also saw the change in the way that the EU conducts consultations, although this change cannot be ascribed to the Project itself.

In terms of the broader economic, social, and political consequences of the project and its contribution to the overall objectives of the CSCF, this Project contributes to the following Millennium Development Goals:

- Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger*
- Achieve universal primary education*
- Promote gender equality and empower women*
- Reduce child mortality*
- Improve Maternal Health*
- Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases*
- Ensure environmental sustainability*
- Develop a global partnership for development*
- None of the above*

And also, the Project contributes to the following core CSCF areas:

- Building capacity of Southern civil society to engage in local decision-making processes*
- Building capacity of Southern civil society to engage in national decision making processes*
- Global advocacy*
- Raising awareness of entitlements and rights*
- Innovative service delivery*
- Service delivery in difficult environments*

### **3.5. Sustainability**

The participation of CSOs in consultation processes of the government and/or the EU generally is ensured through a range of procedures and mechanisms, and the fact that the Project partners have already been active and recognized actors in consultations

mean that there is a high prospect that they will continuously be engaged in these processes. However, in order to present and share important and relevant inputs to the consultations, organisations need to continue working with their primary beneficiaries and provide evidence based input. Therefore, the financial aspect of the work of organisations will be a relevant factor in maintaining positive results of the project.

The Project partners have established rather strong in-country and regional networks, and this is strong sustainability factor of the project extending beyond programme partners. Also important is the fact that the Project partners have ongoing good partnership, which resulted in joint strategy for further fundraising initiatives after the end of the Project, which, if successful will extend the good effects and achievements of the project and support sustainable regional network.

### **3.6. Potential for replicability**

At the time of its design, the Project was very innovative and presented fresh approach to utilisation of opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes.

Such approach may be replicable in other context where local partner organisations, especially organisations representing marginalised and vulnerable groups from isolated communities, cannot access the decision-makers, especially those who can put pressure on the country governments (EU, UN, World Bank and other International Financial Institutions, and/or international organisations, etc.). Nevertheless, in order to be developed to achieve its fullest potential, lessons learnt from this project need to be taken seriously into account.

### **3.7. Lessons learned**

- The EU integration process is the major policy agenda of each of the Western Balkan country. Utilisation of opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe is ever relevant for civil society organisations in these countries. Therefore, the project has been very relevant. However, the actual utilisation of Project products (like shadow reports) and reach of advocacy measures in the Project have been limited. Effective assistance in this field needs to be carried out in a more comprehensive way, so that as many advocacy targets are met.
- Building and maintaining true equal partnership between partners is of utmost importance for the success of the Project, but also for building ethical norms of the civil society work. The Project was designed in the praise-worthy participatory manner. However, the equal partnership was challenged during the difficult times of the Project. The investment of the MRGI and partners to remodel relations upon recommencement of the Project in 2010, brought new energy and motivation to continue partnership in the future. The need to nurture relations and

maintain democratic nature of project implementation process has been recognised by all partners, in order to fulfil the joint vision of the Project to full extent.

- Financial aspects of any project (proposal) need to be carefully considered. The Project design must ensure that the Project is realistic and achievable. This is especially important in cases where project achievement depends on multiple donor funding as it was case in this project and thus is subject to external political, social and economic factors that are beyond control of implementing partners. This has been proven by the fact that this Project's fundraising efforts came in time marked by global economic crisis and general trend of shifting focus of donors to other regions. The Project was comprehensive, having activities and outputs not clearly clustered, the approach that is not attractive to multiple donors. The lack of possibility to offer specific clusters of activities/outputs to different donors creates confusing and unclear situation to the donors, resulting in donors refraining to fund projects that have unclear structures and thus unclear proposal of how funding will be distributed among donors. The multiple donor proposals, thus, should be based on clear logical framework with clear and understandable hierarchy of results and relevant activities; which may be clustered in such a manner to provide clear picture for funding for each result, but also provide SMART indicators for each one.
- The staff turnover within a Project, of course, is not controllable. However, strong management guidelines and procedures ensuring institutional memory through adequate and comprehensive hand-over and administration procedures must be ensured. The adequate institutional memory and handover also help new Project staff may pick up on the activities of the previous staff members and the Project itself, which in turn contributes to efficiency and effectiveness of the Project.
- Clear division of tasks with clear deadlines must be developed especially in situations where the Project has difficult donor or partner relations. It is important to maintain proactive work of the core Project staff, at the same time maintaining communication with all relevant Project partners in order to solve the bottlenecks as fast as possible.
- Partners' institutional memory and resources are also valuable for Project success, especially in difficult times. Proper and strong partnership based on equality and sharing of information surely ensure a more effective institutional memory of the Project that can only come handy at times of need. It is commendable that the new Project team used the partners' memory in restoring the momentum of the project upon its recommencement in 2010 (good examples are organisation of the partners meeting in Bosnia June 2010, the establishment of a web resource for exchange and networking between partners; etc.). This approach shows that the MRGI did learn from the difficult process and applied the lessons learnt during the project itself, which proved to be positive and motivating for all parties involved. This further resulted in the common agreement to explore other potentials for cooperation after the project end.

- Monitoring and Evaluation of organisations of a similar capacity by partners, offers a greater degree of reflection on organisational development and provide a more realistic source of best practice.

## ***4. Conclusion and recommendations***

The Project is a conceptually a very relevant vehicle for promoting and utilising the opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe, and also increasing the capacities of minority organisations in the Western Balkans to actively work on mainstreaming minority issues in decision making processes. It is also timely and appropriate to the current stage of development of the region. Its strengths are that it adopts a holistic approach to organisational strengthening, and addresses the issue of advocacy for minority policies from both the top down, and the bottom up. While the Project correctly identifies the EU as the most important advocacy target, a shortcoming to date is its failure to create mechanisms for systematic dissemination of the produced publications and studies that are relevant for increasing awareness of minority questions at the EU and country levels.

The Project has made progress towards achieving its ambitious set of objectives. At the EU level, it has succeeded in stimulating an inclusive process of consultations and provision of inputs by local partner organizations in the important policy documents of the European Union, thus succeeding to influence indirectly a range of both EU and governmental policies and interventions in the area of minority protection.

The project has also opened the way for productive civil society – EU dialogue in minority policy issues. This has been achieved by the innovative mechanism of MRGI acting as initiator and facilitator of dialogue and consultations with the EU. Some partner organisations also took proactive role in civil society - government relations during the drafting of relevant minority related legislation, which was very important both for ensuring that rights of minorities are tackled, but also that the credibility and role of the partner organisation are recognised.

The Project has correctly identified drafting shadow reports and regional studies on the minorities and EU policies as key advocacy tools, but the strategy of dissemination of these studies was not adequately developed, resulting on very low awareness of advocacy targets about the very existence of such important documents.

The project has had significant challenges, primarily of financial nature but also in terms of internal issues such as staff turnover that hindered the achievement of project objectives. Due to poor strategy of tackling these challenges, the Project faced the halting of activities for quite a significant period of time (June 2009-February 2010), and losing the important momentum of the Project.

Development projects involving many partners and covering multiple countries and targeting different groups are by their nature complex and difficult to present in the generally rigid results framework. Also, such projects struggle with explaining clearly the link between the concrete activities (with target groups) with general changes, especially connecting them with the objectively verifiable indicators. The revision of the Project's results framework indicates this struggle. The Project logframe shows rather poor

development of the Project intervention, with the fact that the outputs, activities and indicators are not clear, not SMART and not linked to each other, which provides certain difficulties in understanding properly the project logic.

### **Recommendations:**

- However difficult it is to fit the results framework within the SMART criteria, still efforts should be invested to develop more SMART logical framework. This will have multiple benefits: the intervention will be clearer to the donor, partners and other involved stakeholders; it will facilitate the implementation, so it will be easier to report and provide evidence for the achievements.
- In order to increase the chances of successful fundraising, but also to ensure efficient use of resources, greater care should be taken in identifying individual project elements. The strategic thinking within Project(s) should be strengthened.
- Coherent and systematic monitoring and evaluation system should be reinforced including:
  - ✓ Development of SMART indicators for each project component (outputs);
  - ✓ Establishment of baselines for the project;
  - ✓ Measurement of indicators at four levels: Activity, including process; results; objectives or outcomes; development goal or social impact.
  - ✓ Generation of clear and relevant indicators with the participation of partners. These indicators should be reviewed periodically over the life of the programme to test their relevance and ease of measurement, and adjusted accordingly.
  - ✓ Ongoing Monitoring and Evaluation of project elements.
- Considering the slow progress in developing measures and policies for minority protection in the South-East Europe, MRGI should consider continuation of its support to empowerment of the local partners for ongoing advocacy and input provision in consultation process both with the EU and country governments.

## ***Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation***

### **Advancing Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups in Southeast Europe: Minority Rights Advocacy in the EU Accession Process 2006 – 2010 Final Evaluation**

This project aimed to utilize the opportunities provided by the EU accession process to combat poverty and exclusion of minority communities by mainstreaming their effective participation in political and development processes in Southeast Europe (SEE). The project sought to strengthen the minority rights discourse in the EU accession process through the creation of structured channels of communication between minority communities, civil society, EU institutions and national governments. The also sought to identify and utilise opportunities for civil society input into the EU policy in SEE through the EU's regular reporting procedure and create mechanisms for minority inclusion into the EU pre-accession assistance and development aid policy and practices. The project activities have included training, supported research and advocacy projects, and national, regional and international advocacy. Programme activities have taken place in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia as well as Brussels and Budapest with support from staff based in London. The programme is due to end at the end of October 2010. There will be a partners' evaluation meeting in the final week of October 2010 and if at all possible the evaluator should be available to attend all or part of that meeting. The bulk of the evaluation work will take place in November and December 2010 with the first draft report due to reach MRG by 4th January 2011. MRG will have two weeks to supply comments, with the final report then due in no later than the end of January 2011. We would expect that the evaluator selected would have a good knowledge of minority communities in the programme countries, an excellent understanding of EC advocacy and accession processes. The evaluator will also need a good background in minority rights standards and government policies towards minorities in the programme countries, knowledge and experience of partnership programmes, of advocacy and capacity building programmes, a working knowledge of languages spoken in the programme countries and experience of fundraising for work in this region would also be useful.

#### **PURPOSE:**

To utilize the opportunities provided by the EU accession process in order to mainstream effective minority and minority women's participation in political and developmental processes in Southeast Europe

#### **OUTPUTS:**

1. Minority communities, civil society organizations, European Union and governments jointly identify opportunities for minority and civil society input into the EU policy in SEE through the EU's reporting procedures.
2. Actions, policies and programmes of national and local authorities reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women

3. Mechanisms for minority inclusion are introduced in the EU national development aid policy and practices and so are the mechanisms for the inclusion of vulnerable groups of minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, victims of family violence)
4. Strengthened capacities of national and regional networks of NGOs working on minority rights and minority women's rights enabling them to effectively advocate at the national, regional and international levels for the implementation of minority rights standards.

For more detail and specific indicators for each country, please see attached logframe. The project has been primarily funded by DfID and the evaluation will need to satisfy DfID's evaluation requirements. The evaluation will be used by all partners to report to other donors as well as to beneficiaries.

The final evaluation will need to address:

#### Output level

Referring to the logical framework, (attached for information) did we complete all of the **activities** as planned to a reasonably high quality? What problems were encountered at this level? How did they affect the activities and to what extent were they overcome?

#### Outcome level

Where completed as planned, did the activities contribute to the planned **results**? Where this was so, refer to evidence. Where not so, what factors intervened and explain how they impacted. Suggest ways that the organisations tried to overcome any problems and how successful this was (or not). Document any changes in the external environment that may have helped or hindered the project. If there were any unplanned results (positive or negative) explain what these were and how they came about.

#### Impact level

If at all possible, make an assessment as to whether the results achieved are likely, over the longer term to achieve or contribute to the achievement of the **purpose** of the project:

If it is unlikely that all or part of the purpose will be achieved, why is this and is this something that could have been foreseen or overcome?

This programme was not fully funded and it was agreed with DfID to reduce the activities. It would be useful if the evaluator could also comment on the efforts made to raise the full budget, comment on the changes in the funding climate during the programme and the degree to which the original plans were realistic. It would also be useful if the evaluation could comment on the selection of the activities to be continued and to be cut and the process of negotiating this across the partnership.

### **Specific tasks of the evaluator**

- Read all project materials, participant evaluations from events, partners' reports on projects implemented, publications, selected visit reports and notes of advocacy meetings, review dissemination lists, advocacy letters etc.

- Speak to MRG project staff based in Budapest, Hungary: primarily Neil Clarke. Speak to MRG staff based in London: Claire Thomas, Shobha Das, and Madrid; Cecile Clerc.
- If possible speak to former MRG staff who worked on this programme, particularly Snjezana Bokulic and Jan Fiala by telephone.
- Visit at least four out of the six programme countries to meet with staff in partner organisations, advocacy targets and potential beneficiaries. Countries to be mutually agreed.
- Speak to at least one key staff member (and if possible more than one) in all 6 partner organisations whether during visits or by phone.
- Speak with at least 12 advocacy targets (local, national and international) from a list of 24 nominated by MRG and partners as well as at least 6 relevant decision makers identified independently by the consultant to assess their knowledge of and views of the project and any impacts it has had on them. (I.e. if at all possible three advocacy targets contacted per country).
- Consider and report on how well minority women, minority community members with disabilities and other forms of intersectional discrimination were addressed and included by the programme.
- Consider and provide responses to specific queries that DfID have raised in response to annual reporting.
- Independently review policy and practical changes to assess any impact of the programme
- Report with an assessment of the effectiveness and impact of the programme and on lessons that MRG and others can learn for the future in similar initiatives.

There is no preset format for this evaluation although MRG is particularly interested to learn from it, lessons that we can apply in working with partners and in running similar advocacy projects in the future.

**The evaluation will need to comply with DFID guidelines for evaluations of their projects**

## ***Annex 2: List of interviewed persons***

**Table 1: Partner organisations and MRGI staff**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Country</b>
Gordana Cicak, Executive Director	Independent Zenica	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Ankica Mikic, President	Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance, Vukovar	Croatia
Alexandra Bojadzieva, Programme Coordinator	Roma Democratic Association SONCE, Tetovo	FYR of Macedonia
Djurdjica Zoric, Vice President and Jasna Ilic, Assistant	Bibija Roma Women's Center, Belgrade	Serbia
Elisabeth Gross	MRGI	Hungary
Neil Clarke	MRGI	Hungary
Cecile Clerc	MRGI	Headquarters
Jan Fiala	former MRGI staff member	Hungary

**Table 2: Interviewed persons in Macedonia**

No.	Name	Institution
1.	Mabera Kamberi	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy of Macedonia
2.	Irena Ivanova	Delegation of the European Union in Macedonia (contact for NGOs),
3.	Plamena HALACHEVA	Delegation of the European Union to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Political and JHA issues, Information and Communication

**Table 3. Interviewed persons in Croatia**

No.	Name	Institution
1.	Dejan Palić, Deputy Ombudsman	Ombudsman of Republic of Croatia
2.	Predrag Šipka, Deputy Head of the government's Office for Human Rights in the Republic of Croatia	Office for Human Rights in the Republic of Croatia
3.	Aleksandar Tolnauer, President	Council of National Minorities in the Republic of Croatia

**Table 4. Interviewed persons in Serbia**

No.	Name	Institution
1.	Ivana Cirkovic, Deputy Team Manager	Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Unit
2.	Ana Milenic, EIDHR Project manager	EIDHR Projects – Operations
3.	Jelena Tadžić, Team Leader ai/Programme Officer; Inclusive Development	UNDP Serbia
4.	Ljuan Koko, Head of Office	Ministry of Human and Minority Rights of the Republic of Serbia
5.	Ana-Marija Cukovic, Associate	Ministry of Human and Minority Rights of the Republic of Serbia
6.	Jelena Avramovic, Resident Program Assistant	NDI- National Democratic Institute
7.	Aleksandra Calosevic, Program manager	The Social Innovation Fund
8.	Marija Mitić, Project Manager	Ministry of Labour and Social Politics/ UNDP Capacity Development forAccountable Governance Cluster

**Table 5. Interviewed persons in Brussels**

no.	Name	Institution
1.	Manuel Munteanu	Policy Officer, DG Enlargement Serbia Desk
2.	Dita Kudelova	Policy Office, DG Enlargement Bosnia Desk
3.	Veronique Dussaussois	Policy Officer (for Human Rights), DG Enlargement Montenegro Desk
4.	Martin Schieder	EC international relation officer at Croatian desk
5.	Allan Jones	EC international relation officer at Croatian desk
6.	Martin Dawson	DG Enlargement (Unit B2 on FYROM)

**Table 6. Interviewed persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina**

no.	Name	Institution
1.	Gordana Suvalija, Task Manager	Delegation of the European Union
2.	Selma Kasumagic	Directorate of European Integration
3.	Nermina Saracevic	Directorate of European Integration
4.	Vesna Vukmanic	ICVA

### ***Annex 3: Evaluation schedule***

**1. Desk Review:** October – November, 2010

**2. Field Phase:** November – December, 2010

Dates	Country visited
12 November, 19 November, 2010	Serbia
17-19 November, 2010	Macedonia
30 November -2 December, 2010	Brussels, Belgium
2-3 December, 2010	Croatia
6-10 December, 2010	Bosnia and Herzegovina

**3. Final report drafting phase:** December 2010 - January, 2011.

#### ***Annex 4: Documents consulted***

<b>1.</b>	Programme document MRGI 2006-2010
<b>2.</b>	LFA
<b>3.</b>	Annual Plans of the Project
<b>4.</b>	Reports of the project
<b>5.</b>	Minutes taken at relevant meetings
<b>6.</b>	advocacy material produced
<b>7.</b>	Reports made by the partner organizations and relevant publications produced by partners and project
<b>8.</b>	Relevant legal documents
<b>9.</b>	Relevant reports, publications, studies, and other material on Minority rights and inclusion in the SEE and EU
<b>10.</b>	Available statistical data

## ***Annex 5: Excerpt from the Revised LFA: Outputs, activities, OVI***

<b>Output</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<p>Minority communities, civil society organizations, European Union and governments jointly identify and use opportunities for minority and civil society input into the EU policy in SEE through the EU's reporting procedures.</p>	<p><b>Advocacy activities</b> (Results 1, 2, 3, 4)</p> <p><u>Regional:</u> 1.1 3 strategic advocacy planning meetings (1 planning, 2 review of strategy) to develop Programme Advocacy Plan with specific aims and deliverables for each programme country</p> <p><u>National:</u> 1.2 Programme partners participate at 2 relevant international fora annually (HDIM, Strasbourg, Geneva, etc.)</p> <p>1.3 1 shadow report on relevant international treaties and conventions per partner (7 total)</p> <p>1.4. Support for partner advocacy activities</p>	<p>In Serbia, partner input considered by policy makers and referred to in EU country reports</p> <p>In Croatia, partner organization in cooperation with civil society and minority organizations successfully advocate for implementation of the Constitutional Law for Protection of Minority Rights provisions and fulfillment of relevant international treaties commitments; this effort is reflected in EU country reports</p> <p>In Kosovo, partner is consulted by local and international officials on status talks; recommendations are taken forward by authorities</p> <p>In BiH, partner organization and grass roots organizations are consulted by governmental and EU officials</p> <p>In Montenegro, partner organizations hold consultative meetings with EU officials; government officials take up policy recommendations put forward by partners</p> <p>In Macedonia, reports/documents on Roma, employment of minorities in judiciary and participation of women in minority communities produced by programme partners are referred to in EU country reports</p>
<p><b>2.</b> Actions, policies and programmes of national authorities reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women</p>	<p>Activity 2: <b>Policy analysis/research</b> (Results 1, 2, 3, 4)</p> <p>2.1. The study (approx. 10,000 words in length) <i>Pushing for Change? South East Europe's Minorities in the EU Progress Reports</i></p>	<p>In programme countries, national decision-makers hold consultations at least 6 times with partner and minority NGOs</p> <p>In programme countries, national decision-makers consider and act on advocacy documents produced by programme partners</p> <p>In programme countries, governments implement laws/plans/strategies to</p>

	<p>2.2. Study focusing on the analysis of EU Pre-Accession funds and development aid flows into the region and national budgets to establish how minorities' needs have been considered in the process of allocating funds, designing the programs and how these communities have ultimately benefited will be prepared and published. Length, languages and launch as the publication above.</p>	<p>increase the share of minority employees in public sector  In Kosovo, government and international community take measures to accommodate needs of minority communities in the decentralization process.  In Macedonia, minority and gender issues are included in labor and social policies at local/national level; government allocates funds for Roma employment programmes  In Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, Roma men and women are consulted in the design and effectively participate in the implementation of national strategies for Roma and the Decade for Roma Inclusion.  In Serbia, government undertakes special measures to increase the employability and employment of particularly vulnerable minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, women victims of family violence)</p>
<p><b>3.</b> Mechanisms for minority inclusion are introduced in the EU national development aid policy and practices including the mechanisms for the inclusion of vulnerable groups of minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, victims of family violence)</p>	<p><b>Activity 3  Partner Development</b>  (Results 1, 4)</p> <p>3.1 1 regional seminar on EU and minorities, gender mainstreaming and the rights-based approach held for core partner group</p> <p>3.2 In country replication of seminar, in local language; one seminar per partner</p> <p>3.3 Support for in-country network development</p> <p>3.4. Phase II EU guide translated into languages in use in programme</p>	<p>At least 3 recommendations from programme advocacy publications are referred to and/or introduced in EU policy in SEE  In at least 2 of the 5 programme countries, development projects are developed which pay specific attention to minority groups  In Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, work around Roma inclusion improves the conditions for increased enrolment of girls and boys in schools at all levels as well as increased employment opportunities for Roma men and women.  In Kosovo, refugees and returnees from minority communities benefit from aid policies.</p>

<p><b>4.</b> Strengthened capacities of national and regional networks of NGOs working on minority rights and minority women's rights enabling them to effectively advocate at the national, regional and international levels for the implementation of minority rights standards</p>	<p>countries (5 translations)</p> <p><b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b> (Results 1, 2, 3, 4)</p> <p>4.1 Monitoring of programme implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- six semiannual reports on the implementation of National Advocacy Plans prepared by partners</li> </ul> <p>4.2 Evaluation of programme impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- internal evaluation: 3 annual meetings by partners</li> <li>- internal: 2 visits per country by MRG and partners</li> <li>- external: end of programme impact and process evaluation</li> </ul>	<p>A network of programme partners and other minority NGOs use minority rights mechanism to advocate for minority rights, and in particular minority women's rights, inclusion in policies at the EU and national levels. In programme countries, partners and other minority NGOs are increasingly perceived as reliable counterparts to the government and international agencies</p> <p>Shadow reports prepared by programme partners, jointly with a network of civil society and minority organizations, are used by relevant treaty bodies and the institutions monitoring the EU accession process</p>
--	--	---

## ***Annex 6: Analysis of the Output Indicators according to the SMART criteria***

	<b>Log frame Indicators</b>	<b>Specific</b>	<b>Measurable</b>	<b>Achievable</b>	<b>Relevant</b>	<b>Time-bound</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Output 1:</b> Minority communities, civil society organizations, European Union and governments jointly identify and use opportunities for minority and civil society input into the EU policy in SEE through the EU's reporting procedures.	In Serbia, partner input considered by policy makers and referred to in EU country reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
	In Croatia, partner organization in cooperation with civil society and minority organizations successfully advocate for implementation of the Constitutional Law for Protection of Minority Rights provisions and fulfilment of relevant international treaties commitments; this effort is reflected in EU country reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
	In Kosovo, partner is consulted by local and international officials on status talks; recommendations are taken forward by authorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2*
	In BiH, partner organization and grass roots organizations are consulted by governmental and EU officials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
	In Montenegro, partner organizations hold consultative meetings with EU officials; government officials take up policy recommendations put forward by partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
	In Macedonia, reports/documents on Roma, employment of minorities in judiciary and participation of women in minority communities produced by project partners are referred to in EU country reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
<b>Output 2.</b> "Actions, policies and programmes of national authorities	In programme countries, national decision-makers hold consultations at least 6 times with partner and minority NGOs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4

	Log frame Indicators	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant	Time-bound	Total
reflect sensitivity to and awareness of minority issues and problems faced by minority women”.	In programme countries, national decision-makers consider and act on advocacy documents produced by programme partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
	In programme countries, governments implement laws/plans/strategies to increase the share of minority employees in public sector	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
	In Kosovo, government and international community take measures to accommodate needs of minority communities in the decentralization process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
	In Macedonia, minority and gender issues are included in labor and social policies at local/national level; government allocates funds for Roma employment programmes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
	In Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, Roma men and women are consulted in the design and effectively participate in the implementation of national strategies for Roma and the Decade for Roma Inclusion.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
	In Serbia, government undertakes special measures to increase the employability and employment of particularly vulnerable minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, women victims of family violence)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
<b>Output 3.</b> Mechanisms for minority inclusion are introduced in the EU national development aid policy and	At least 3 recommendations from project advocacy publications are referred to and/or introduced in EU policy in SEE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
	In at least 2 of the 5 project countries, development projects are developed which pay specific attention to minority groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2

	Log frame Indicators	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant	Time-bound	Total
practices including the mechanisms for the inclusion of vulnerable groups of minority women (women with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, returnees, victims of family violence)	In Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, work around Roma inclusion improves the conditions for increased enrolment of girls and boys in schools at all levels as well as increased employment opportunities for Roma men and women.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
	In Kosovo, refugees and returnees from minority communities benefit from aid policies.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
<b>Output 4.</b> Strengthened capacities of national and regional networks of NGOs working on minority rights and minority women's rights enabling them to effectively advocate at the national, regional and international levels for the implementation of minority rights standards	A network of project partners and other minority NGOs use minority rights mechanism to advocate for minority rights, and in particular minority women's rights, inclusion in policies at the EU and national levels.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
	In project countries, partners and other minority NGOs are increasingly perceived as reliable counterparts to the government and international agencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
	Shadow reports prepared by project partners, jointly with a network of civil society and minority organizations, are used by relevant treaty bodies and the institutions monitoring the EU accession process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
<b>TOTAL SMART indicators</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49</b>