

# **Final Evaluation Report for the Project Supporting Minority Victims of Discrimination in Accessing their Human Rights**

**Implemented by  
Minority Rights Group  
In cooperation with  
Human Rights House Sarajevo  
and  
The Serbian Civic Council - Movement for Equality -  
Sarajevo Canton**

**Mirela Gruenther Đečević and Goran Bubalo  
January 2017**

This report is submitted to Minority Rights Group International (MRG)

This evaluation was conducted by a consultant team engaged by Minority Rights Group International for the project „*Supporting Minority Victims of Discrimination in Accessing their Human Rights*“, which is funded by EU.

This is an independent and external evaluation and does not necessarily represent the opinions of Minority Rights Group of the European Commission. The evaluators bear sole responsibility for the content of the evaluation, including both its conclusions and recommendations.

## Table of Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations .....	4
Acknowledgements .....	5
Executive Summary .....	6
1. Introduction .....	8
1.1. Basic introduction .....	8
1.2. Scope of evaluation.....	8
1.3. Objectives of the External Evaluation .....	10
1.4. Methodology.....	11
1.5. The Research Process.....	11
1.6. Beneficiary Orientation.....	12
1.7. Limitations of the evaluation.....	12
2. Description of the development intervention .....	12
2.1. Context.....	12
2.2. Goals and objectives.....	13
3. Main Findings.....	14
3.1. Problems and needs (Relevance).....	14
3.2. Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness).....	16
3.3. Sound management and value for money (Efficiency) .....	19
3.4. Financial control and accounting.....	20
3.5. Achievement of wider effects (Impact) .....	20
3.6. Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability).....	21
3.7. Project Management.....	22
3.8. Visibility and Media issues .....	23
3.9. Gender issues .....	24
3.10. Conflict sensitivity.....	25
3.11. Mutual reinforcement (coherence) .....	25
3.12. EC value added.....	25
4. Overall Assessment .....	26
5. Annexes: .....	29

## **Acronyms and abbreviations**

ADP	Anti-discrimination Points
ADL	Anti-discrimination law
BiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EUD	EU Delegation
FBiH	Federation Bosnia and Herzegovina (entity in Bosnia and Herzegovina)
HRHS	Human Rights House Sarajevo
MRG	Minority Rights Group International
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
RS	Republic of Srpska (entity in Bosnia and Herzegovina)
SCCS	The Serbian Civic Council - Movement for Equality - Sarajevo Canton

## **Acknowledgements**

The evaluation team wishes to thank the organisations and institutions whose individuals helped us during the conduct of this final evaluation review. The project leadership of MRG, especially Ms. Evelin Verhas, provided excellent support and guidance that made our work easy. Also, local project coordinators from the partner organisations, especially Jelena Visković and Živica Abadžić were gracious and supportive in supplying us with documents and information, answering our questions, helping arrange visits to the field and to all project sites, and finally explaining the background and various elements of their work. All personnel were interested and helpful with this review, and mindful how the information gathered and analysed might inform their future programming and investments for the new projects.

The project participants we visited in all places contributed valuable time and information. In some cases they travelled great distances to meet with us and allowed us to interrupt their busy days to tell us of their involvement in and commitment to human rights and community development.

Thanks to all of the people who readily made themselves available for interviews with the team. The leaders of partners' organisations and other NGOs willingly shared from their own work, their perspectives on the needs and issues of the target areas, and a perspective on MRG and partners for their future work in BiH.

## Executive Summary

The external evaluation mission of the project „*Supporting Minority Victims of Discrimination in Accessing their Human Rights*“ February 2013 to June 2016 implemented by Minority Rights Group (MRG), was undertaken in order to:

- i. Assess the set-up, activities and outcomes of the project since 2013 with regard to their relevance, effectiveness, impact efficiency and sustainability.
- ii. Give insight into the achievements or shortcomings of the chosen approaches and methods.
- iii. Assess the capacities and performance of the involved partner organisations / minority groups and individuals.

The overall assessment of the project's performance is made on the basis of desk review and information gathered in interviews with selected stakeholders. Generally, all interviewees were positive and openly discussed issues, which is a sign of the good working strategies applied in project and good relationships developed among project team and target groups.

The desk study and interview findings confirm that this project is relevant for the Bosnia and Herzegovina context and that it represents an important endeavour with respect to the protection of human rights of minority groups.

The evaluation was based on the following methodological elements: desk review of relevant documents, introductory briefing and face-to-face and phone interviews.

The most important achievements are:

- **Strengthened capacities and knowledge through experience sharing meetings, trainings and field work and monitoring** of minority groups representatives, domestic and international based CSOs and national authorities.
- **Provided legal aid and strategic litigation to minority groups and by setting up legal aid stations** in 25 locations and pro-bono lawyers giving legal advices and setting up a pro-bono network coalition.
- **Raised awareness and knowledge** about problems of minority groups and their discrimination through media work and work with journalists, initiating a video advocacy campaign and a local awareness rising campaigns documenting discrimination of minority groups, online briefing on the situation of minorities in BiH and national advocacy meetings and roundtables between partners, minority community representatives and national authorities.
- **A National Network Meeting (Anti-Discrimination Coalition meetings)** have been initiated in order to offer members regular opportunities to jointly engage and collaborate with each other and with other relevant human rights actors.

Appropriate recommendations have been formulated for future activities, having in mind that the second phase of this project is not planned *per se*. MRG made efforts to obtain additional funding from EU or alternative donors, but so far didn't have success. However, in some cases MRG will continue its advocacy work (such as Sejdić-Finci).

In spite of some operational and coordination issues, significant positive results have been achieved within the project, and much progress has been made towards the overall project objectives.

MRG's trainings were, at least in many instances, characterized by a higher level of methodological sophistication and technical quality, which could lead to more beneficial effects.

The key idea of the project responded very well to challenges on the ground in BiH. The idea of establishing ADPs matched the needs and perceptions held by the local people themselves. The project has, in other words, tested out in BiH a method used in other countries, and the method has been proven to work.

The majority of interviewed persons agree that the biggest changes have been introduced in understanding of the local communities what is and what is not discrimination. Through ADPs' activities, round tables, promotional materials and advocacy films many people were introduced to terms and being aware of them could more efficiently fight potential discrimination against them or other people.

The project as such has been developed in a coherent manner. All of the components have been developed to a degree which was possible to attain at a given phase of project development and in given circumstances. In all the project's components, the focus was shifting from short toward long-term objectives: from establishing ADPs, strengthening their capacities through education and training, giving them equipment necessary for their daily work, providing on the ground services, to certain level of capacity building preparing them to be more sustainable and active in approaching other donors, but also building up internal capacities to use in future work.

The impression of the evaluators is that the basic principles of the project have been operational through the whole period of implementation, resulting in similar, reliable quality outputs.

During the process of implementation, the project demonstrated a high degree of flexibility in terms of being adapted to the specific contexts of implementation and to the current socio-political changes within different local communities. The project aimed to keep up with the needs of local communities while being flexible with activities and support provided, adjusting the content of the education and courses, and working with government and ADPs to adjust scope and area of support to the specific social conditions within the milieu.

Institutional sustainability is one of the prime objectives of the project. Although the project didn't aim to focus on this, strengthening efficient management structures of local communities and organisations, many of them are still most active and local leaders, but the whole process is still far from being accomplished. All local communities, including project partners, need more support in capacity development and external support from MRG and other donors and implementing organisations, always working in cooperation with governmental institutions, to make it sustainable.

It is worthwhile noting here that the choice of content has a direct impact on several other elements of the training courses. MRG's trainings were, at least in many instances, characterized by a higher level of methodological sophistication and technical quality, which could lead to more beneficial effects.

Finally, great part of the success should also be ascribed to the systematic efforts by the MRG Project Manager in London to monitor the partner organisation who did a good job on the ground. Without this tight follow-up, the results and degree of goal attainment are likely to have been far poorer.

# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1. Basic introduction**

This report presents summary of findings and recommendations of an independent final evaluation of the project “Supporting Minority Victims of Discrimination in Accessing their Human Rights” implemented by Minority Rights Group International in cooperation with Human Rights House Sarajevo and The Serbian Civic Council - Movement for Equality - Sarajevo Canton in period February 2013 to June 2016.

The evaluation was carried out from September through November 2016, and underwent three phases: a preparatory phase, the fieldwork, and the final phase of writing and editing this report.

The evaluation was conducted by Mirela Gruenther Đečević and Goran Bubalo. The emphasis in the evaluation – as well as in the instructions communicated by the programme staff of MRG – was on a non-directive methodology that MRG utilizes in its approach with the project beneficiaries. The review has mainly been carried out as discussions/semi-structured interviews with partners and other people involved within this project. Organisations and individuals were interviewed during the field visit or were contacted by mail or phone during September through November 2016.

The major evaluation instruments used for the collection of primary data and information included interviews, focus group discussions, key informants' interview, meetings with concerned stakeholders, and reports obtained. The goal of these interviews was collecting all available information on their activities and the impact of the project.

## **1.2. Scope of evaluation**

This evaluation aims to explore and determine the strengths and weaknesses of the project approach, and to provide learnings and recommendations for the best future activities, a system or a combination of the best elements of different approaches for implementation of activities aimed at creating a better society.

The evaluation should focus on learning, efficiency, effectiveness and where possible impact. The external evaluation was undertaken in order to:

- i. Assess the set-up, activities and outcomes of the project since 2013 with regard to their relevance, effectiveness, impact efficiency and sustainability.
- ii. Give insight into the achievements or shortcomings of the chosen approaches and methods.
- iii. Assess the capacities and performance of the involved partner organisations / minority groups and individuals.

This project has been implemented in the period February 2013 – June 2016 by the Minority Rights Group together with partner, Human Rights House Sarajevo (HRHS), The Serbian Civic Council - Movement for Equality - Sarajevo Canton (SCC) with financial support of the EU and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway. Geographically, project activities have been implemented mainly in Sarajevo, but also in number of other cities throughout BiH.

The project's overall objective is to reduce discrimination faced by members of minority communities in BiH.

Specific objective:

- Strengthen the capacity of and networking between minority community leaders/representatives, CSOs, experts, private and public sector lawyers and other relevant human rights and socio-economic actors, (including trade unions, universities, private foundations, and international public interest organisations), so they can more effectively advocate for effective implementation of anti-discrimination laws guaranteeing minority rights.

The evaluation was looking for answers to the following groups of questions:

### **Key Questions**

The purpose and objectives of the evaluation will focus on four main questions:

1. Referring to the project documentation, did MRG complete all of the activities as planned to a reasonably high quality?
2. What problems were encountered at this level?
3. How did any problems affect the activities and to what extent were they overcome?
4. How did the project dovetail with and involve other MRG strategic litigation and legal empowerment work?

### **Relevance:**

- Is the chosen approach appropriate to have an impact in the specific and changing socio-political reality in the country in the perception of partners and allies? Are there any differences in the impact at the level of different minority communities and individuals; what are the reasons for such difference?
- Has the project changed the perception of partners and allies, and has it helped in developing as an integrated national programme overcoming existing borders in cooperation and communication between minority communities and their leaders/representatives?
- Has the MRG promoted participation and empowerment of the local partners and individuals?
- Has the population at the minority communities and at the country level directly been involved in activities promoted by the MRG?
- Has the MRG, through activities such as parliamentary debate, enhanced the responsibility of the governmental authorities? How?
- Has the MRG contributed to the challenges of gender stereotypes and to the change of social behaviour and to what extent?
- How has the MRG contributed to improve capacities at all levels (organisations, communities, country)?

### **Effectiveness:**

- Has the process of network building, enabling cooperation and communication between minority communities and their leaders/representatives in country had positive effects on their effective engagement in legal processes, thereby protecting and promoting their human rights?
- Has the provided support reached and strengthened the capacities of local minority communities?
- Has the MRG contributed to the motivation of the local partner organisations and individuals? How would you describe the level of commitment among them and what are the reasons for it?
- Has the MRG contributed to an increase of social capital of the target groups?

### **Impact:**

- Has the MRG contributed to the greater collaboration between minority representatives and various other groups?

- Has the MRG had an impact on the behaviour of citizens, communities and whole country?
- Assess the impact of the MRG on the crosscutting themes “gender” and “conflict sensitive working approach” (Do No Harm).
- Has the MRG had any unintended positive or negative consequences?

#### Efficiency:

- How was the management structure and the organisational MRG set-up? Were the roles and the responsibilities of MRG and partners / minority communities and individuals clearly defined and divided?
- Evaluate the competence and performance of partners and individuals and assess the quality of cooperation and the coordination of project activities, the different communities, as well as MRG project team.

#### Sustainability and the Future of the MRG:

- Whether the results achieved are likely, over the longer term to achieve or contribute to the achievement of the specific objective, and if possible the goal of the project?
- What can MRG further do to support minority communities and groups, but also other relevant actors from academic, cultural and socio-political contexts in BiH with the instruments of political education?
- Has the MRG contributed to a change of attitude / behaviour amongst people, minority communities and individuals?
- Have activities been appropriate in view of sustainable capacity building?
- How has the concept been received by other actors and government?
- Formulate ideas how to achieve more relevance on organisational and country level and towards more sustainability.
- Formulate lessons learnt and recommendations for the eventual future MRG's project.

### 1.3. Objectives of the External Evaluation

The external evaluation mission was undertaken with the following two objectives:

1. Assess the overall project's (i) relevance, (ii) quality performance, (iii) management and (iv) achievement of results/outcomes.

In order to adhere to the EC layout and structure of evaluation reports, the findings regarding these four aspects are integrated into seven evaluation criteria in the section 3. *Main Findings* in this report:

- the five evaluation criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact; and
- the two EC-specific evaluation criteria: EC added value and coherence.

Particular attention was paid to the impact of the Project actions against the overall and specific objectives. It is important to stress that this report does not contain the comprehensive record of evidence about the project impact, but rather an indicative list of the most significant signs of long-term, sustainable effects of the project felt by the project target groups and beneficiaries.

2. Give insight into the achievements or shortcomings of the chosen approaches and methods.

Have the following results been achieved:

- a. Strengthened capacities and knowledge amongst minority communities and their leaders/representatives to effectively engage in legal processes, thereby protecting and promoting their human rights.
  - b. Increased access to anti-discrimination legal protection for minority community leads to an increased number of anti-discrimination cases.
  - c. Increased knowledge and awareness at the national level of the human rights abuses against minority communities in BiH and the challenges they face in accessing their human rights.
  - d. Greater collaboration between minority representatives, CSOs, legal experts, private sector lawyers, and other relevant human rights actors leads to a greater commitment to address anti-discrimination and human rights issues of minority communities.
3. Assess the capacities and performance of the involved partner organisations / minority groups and individuals.

During the field mission, the key project achievements, strategies and approaches were discussed with the project manager and stakeholders and target groups in order to critically assess the strong and weak points of the project.

#### **1.4. Methodology**

The external evaluation was based on the following methodological elements:

**Clarification of the mandate and introductory briefing:** The Consultants discussed approaches and expectations of the evaluation with persons in charge at MRG at the Skype call on September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016 and were given background information about the project. The Consultants received abundant information about project activities and achievements from the MRG project manager.

**Elaboration of questionnaires:** The schedule of interviews for the field mission and the key questions for semi-structured interviews (interview guidelines) were developed in detail and shared with MRG.

**Desk review of relevant documents:** The evaluation draws on information gathered by the project evaluators. Background information was collected from a desktop review principally of project documents relating to the project and provided by MRG management, including the annual reports and multiple project reports from both the MRG, HRHS and SCCS, in particular project interim and progress reports, project work plans and training reports, except the final report that is yet to be prepared.

**Interviews:** The evaluation team administered semi-structured questionnaires to interview key staff from MRG and partner organisations HRHS and SCCS local project coordinators, thereby to collect quantitative and qualitative data on various issues and aspects of project activities. Other interviews included Anti-discrimination Points, CSOs and other relevant stakeholders. The selection of interviewees was assisted by all partner organisations. The questionnaires contained various questions considered necessary for evaluation of the performance and impact of project activities. The list of people interviewed is included in Annex 2.

#### **1.5. The Research Process**

Data and other types of evidence and arguments used in the evaluation stem from two sources. One of them is the field research that took place in the first phase of this evaluation. The other is written data from a variety of sources.

The process of the field research was organised in the following manner:

- In the first, “inception”, phase, a detailed technical proposal was prepared. The proposal envisaged that two evaluators would be involved. The proposal consisted of a detailed methodological proposal explaining the approach, its interpretation, the methods and concepts used and the terms of reference to be used. It also contained a description of expected outputs and a proposed evaluation schedule.
- The other source of information was a number of project files and documents, internal and project reports, reports from the field activities (prepared by MRG and partners), etc., reviewed by the authors of this evaluation.

## **1.6. Beneficiary Orientation**

The approach of this evaluation is explicitly based on a degree of “beneficiary orientation”. But this orientation is, by no means, intended to carry any kind of covert or otherwise illegitimate bias in favour of beneficiaries as opposed to donors. Instead, it aims at reflecting more the beneficiaries’ views, criteria of judging MRG’s project and interests in their process of implementation.

The specifics of the “beneficiary orientation” approach, as opposed to the “donor orientation” that is used for most evaluations, are reflected in several features: for one thing, the composition of the “evaluation agenda” and the types of questions being asked are somewhat changed by the beneficiary orientation. In this evaluation, the beneficiary areas individual circumstances, including institutional, legal, cultural, historic and other specifics, are examined in greater detail and are given more weight than usual

## **1.7. Limitations of the evaluation**

Due to the fact that only a small percentage of direct beneficiaries were interviewed, the evaluators cannot confidently draw specific conclusions pertaining to individual products. A longer time frame and more extensive survey would be required to analyse the respective limitations, issues or advantages of intervention in any specific type of product. While short to medium term impact and sustainability findings and observations are possible, it is not possible for this report to evaluate the projects longer-term sustainability or (longer-term) impact with any degree of certainty.

# **2. Description of the development intervention**

## **2.1. Context**

This primarily EU funded programme aimed to empower and support victims of discrimination to use available remedies to challenge instances and patterns of discrimination. It also aimed to encourage minority community representatives, CSOs, lawyers and other relevant human rights actors and stakeholders concerned about discrimination to form a network and work together. In addition the project was to support strategic litigation cases and to carry out advocacy linked to discrimination and minority rights both at the national and international levels.

## 2.2. Goals and objectives

The proposed project sought to contribute to reducing discrimination faced by members of minority communities in Bosnia Herzegovina, resulting in increased human rights implementation across the country, benefiting in the long term to all citizens.

The project aimed to work with all members of minority communities facing discrimination in the country including “others” (i.e. the non-Bosniak, Serb or Croat citizens of BiH, encompassing 17 national minorities) as well as the “constituent peoples” (Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs) who experience discrimination when they live in the “wrong” administrative entity. The specific objective of the planned work was to strengthen the capacity of and networking between minority community leaders/ representatives, CSOs, experts, private and public sector lawyers, and other relevant human rights and socio-economic actors, (including trade unions, universities, private foundations, and international public interest organisations), so they can more effectively advocate for effective implementation of anti-discrimination laws guaranteeing minority rights.

While some coordination already existed between civil society organisations working on discrimination and minority/human rights issues and/or providing legal aid to victims of discrimination, it is often limited to human rights organisations submitting joint alternative reports to international human rights monitoring bodies and jointly writing and signing letters of concern. Generally these stakeholders tend to work independently from each other and have limited capacity in a wide range of domains. For example, organisations with legal experience often lack specific expertise on minority issues and thus are unable to assist minority communities in tackling the issues they face. Similarly, organisations representing minority communities or working directly with these communities still remain largely unaware of the legal remedies available in cases of discrimination and other human rights violations and/or do not have the capacity to bring cases forth. Furthermore, human and minority rights CSOs, legal aid organisations, and minority community representatives do not engage with other socio-economic actors (i.e. universities, trade unions, private law firms) when such a networking/collaboration could be highly beneficial, creating a wider awareness of discrimination and other issues minority communities face and/or leading to joint working to challenge discriminatory practices and address problems affecting minorities if they were directly linked up with minority communities in need. These are the reasons MRG and partners have set themselves this specific objective.

Based on the agreed overall and specific objective for the initiative, MRG and partners expected to achieve the following results:

1. Strengthened capacities and knowledge amongst minority communities and their leaders/representatives to effectively engage in legal processes, thereby protecting and promoting their human rights
2. Increased access to anti-discrimination legal protection for minority communities leads to an increased number of anti-discrimination cases.
3. Increased knowledge and awareness at the national level of the human rights abuses against minority communities in BiH and the challenges they face in accessing their human rights.
4. Greater collaboration between minority representatives, CSOs, legal experts, private sector lawyers, and other relevant human rights actors leads to a greater commitment to address anti-discrimination and human rights issues of minority communities

## 3. Main Findings

### 3.1. Problems and needs (Relevance)

**Relevance to the country context and EU policies:** The relevance of the Project was well explained in the project proposal and the main points are still highly relevant to the BiH situation.

The project aimed at working with all members of minority communities facing discrimination in the country including “others” (i.e. the non-Bosniak, Serb or Croat citizens of BiH, encompassing 17 national minorities) as well as the “constituent peoples” (Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs) who experience discrimination when they live in the “wrong” administrative entity. Still, the majority of project efforts were focused on Roma population, with a second prong focussing on the Jewish community.

The discrimination faced by members of minority communities is still widespread and can affect all aspects of their lives including accessing services like health and education, employment opportunities as well as public participation.

In July 2009, Bosnia passed an anti-discrimination law (ADL) with the goal of providing equal rights for all people in Bosnia, including minorities. Its provisions are fairly strong, making it a valuable instrument to challenge discrimination. Yet, so far, minorities have brought very few cases under the law: this is not only because minorities and the organisations representing them lack knowledge of the law but also because there is a general lack of understanding among the judiciary and the public and minority communities about the law’s prohibitions on both direct and indirect discrimination. Hence, legal advice and legal aid was a very important aspect of the project.

The project especially aimed to further the human rights of BiH’s Roma population, and by doing so the project was clearly highly relevant from the point of view of beneficiary need. The Roma are both the largest and most vulnerable ethnic group in BiH who have experienced increasing marginalisation and a deterioration of their overall wellbeing since the end of the Bosnian war in 1995.

The project has been relevant, adaptable and timely. In every case the project approach has been designed to fit in with local circumstances.

The project addressed a number of important needs in the sphere of human rights and democratic participation, central to MRG’s mandate. Most fundamentally, it responded to the unmet need of Roma communities for recognition of their needs and for practical public initiatives dedicated to providing for them. By focusing on the theme of anti-discrimination laws it emphasized particular spheres where action was urgently required. The purpose of the litigation component of the project was to demonstrate to the Roma people the viability of taking legal action as a means through which the state, at national and/or local level, might be held accountable for its failure to uphold their rights.

The project organised concrete action to contribute to building the capacity of Roma and general civil society to address through the political and legal systems the social, economic and political exclusion of what has been described as Bosnian largest and most neglected minority. It focused on empowerment of Roma and Non-Roma activists by equipping them with practical skills and experience, thus enabling them – and, through them, their communities – to engage with and participate in the democratic process. Through the

focused campaigns, publications and litigation it supported, the project enabled Roma civil society to demonstrate that they could make a difference.

**Comments on logical framework:** The Project's intervention logic, presented in the project proposal (logical framework matrix), correctly addressed the core problems related to discrimination of minority groups in BiH. The links between activities, expected results, specific objectives and the overall objective are generally clear and consistent.

**Key stakeholders and target groups were appropriately identified.** The process of project design and identifying appropriate stakeholders was particularly appropriate, establishing the conditions for achieving project success: participation of Roma and other minorities in all activities, inclusion of all stakeholders with a valid interest and productive cooperation between minorities and all relevant institutions.

**The Project implementation strategy** combined several approaches - *capacity-building, awareness-raising, legal advice and strategic litigation and networking among CSOs* - in a very effective way. These strategies were built into activities and sequenced in such a way to ensure that activities feed into each other.

### **Project adaptations and exit strategy**

The project's purpose and means of achieving it have retained their validity, and relevant changes to the environment have taken place largely as a result of project activities.

A number of additional activities to those envisaged in the original plan were carried out through a no-cost extension of five months, utilising unspent financial resources from other areas. These activities included 1. Round table with ADPs and government institutions in order to establish better links and cooperation between them and 2. A number of promotional activities to garner support for the ADPs and pro-Roma policy, including completing and promoting video advocacy films.

In the original project application, it was implied that implementation would follow naturally from the planning process within an institutional structure emanating from the coordination offered by the project. This was clearly an erroneous assumption and although additional efforts were made through the no-cost extension it showed to be futile effort.

**The human resources engaged for project implementation:** The Project team recognizes that more human resources should have been needed for implementation of the planned scope of activities with high quality. Many activities required more preparations and work than initially planned (e.g. identification of potential organisations and individuals to run ADPs, communication with bureaucratic institutions, etc.). At the minimum, the lead applicant – MRG- Project Manager should have been engaged 80% of working time, on top of requesting more professional approach and engagement by the partners.

Additional problem was practically voluntary engagement of people at ADPs that is not the general case in BiH and something organisations and individuals don't welcome, and it is not positive practice for the future activities.

Due to problems with partners and EU's unwillingness to approve partner changes, MRG's Project Manager stemmed a bigger burden of activities than initially expected and, thus, flexibly reacted to various requirements in order to maintain high quality of activities and achievements.

### **Monitoring and evaluation:**

The collection and recording of data during the project concerning the delivery of activities and the production of outputs has been meticulous, thus facilitating the ongoing assessment of progress towards fulfilling the action plan.

MRG led in monitoring and evaluating the overall programme with local partners supporting MRG directly and leading on monitoring and evaluation of the activities they were in charge of implementing. Monitoring was aimed at ensuring that activities were implemented according to plan (i.e. in terms of quality and timing) against desired outcomes and impact. This involved tracking changes in the external environment and ensuring that MRG could respond to emerging opportunities and threats.

These were incorporated into quarterly and annual reports, shared with partners and relevant stakeholders. MRG provided narrative progress reports annually, and reports on expenditure to donors supporting this work. In addition to regular email communication, to ensure cooperation and regular communication between project partners, regular weekly skype and phone calls were set-up between MRG and partners during which partners and MRG discussed the progress on implementation, upcoming activities, any difficulties partners are facing when implementing activities, and any partner reporting issues if applicable. Additionally, there was direct link between MRG and ADPs who were able to provide information on their work and ask for support in litigation cases.

The MRG Legal Cases Officer also attended National Network Meetings as well as some additional activity per programme year to participate in and also to monitor the activity. In addition, the MRG Legal Cases Officer travelled to BiH once in each programme year for a partner and project monitoring/evaluation visit.

### **3.2. Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness)**

Effectiveness is a measure of the contribution made by the results of the project to its specific objective; that is, progress towards the achievement of the project purpose. This is essentially a qualitative measure of immediate and observable change in the target groups as a direct result of project activities and the delivery of outputs.

Assessment of Project's effectiveness was conducted by considering the following questions:

- To what extent target groups built capacities, acquired knowledge and raised awareness as a result of Project activities (esp. trainings and local ADP campaigns)?
- To what extent the Specific objectives and Expected results have been achieved (legal aid, legal cases)?
- Which factors considerably influenced the achievement of the specific objectives?

Reflections are based on the information collected during discussions with the project manager and during interviews with stakeholders. The list of successful achievements is presented along the specific objective and expected results defined in the project proposal (logical framework). The list is not exhaustive but rather contains the most important achievements which are identified by the Consultants. These achievements are thought to have the potential for replication and/or they are seen as lessons which should be considered for future projects. Some achievements can be attributed to several expected results. To avoid repetition they are not elaborated under each relevant result.

The project met the test of effectiveness by completing all activities, excluding the litigation process, within the set timeframe (extended by five months). While some questions may be asked about project strategy (as noted below), the ability of MRG and its staff to ensure that work was completed as planned is satisfactory, and the project was managed in a professional way.

**Specific objective of the project:** Strengthen the capacity of and networking between minority community leaders/representatives, CSOs, experts, private and public sector lawyers and other relevant human rights and socio-economic actors, (including trade unions, universities, private foundations, and international public interest organisations), so they can more effectively advocate for effective implementation of anti-discrimination laws guaranteeing minority rights.

**Expected result 1: Strengthened capacities and knowledge amongst minority communities and their leaders/representatives to effectively engage in legal processes, thereby protecting and promoting their human rights.**

After capacity-building events organised in the Project, many members of the minority community (final beneficiaries) applied their knowledge from trainings and round tables. (see also below more on this point).

At the beginning of this Project MRG staff was aware that initiative for promotion protection of human rights communities in BiH from London would not be strong enough. Therefore, they entered into partnership with HRHS and SCC for this Project.

**Expected result 2: Increased access to anti-discrimination legal protection for minority community leads to an increased number of anti-discrimination cases.**

There were number of discrimination cases reported during the length of the project, directed to MRG who followed on them.

During the course of the project 81 complaints were received by MRG from AD points or identified through field work. 13 complaints were dismissed as no element of discrimination was found, and further 15 were dismissed as MRG could not acquire enough information to establish a *prima facie* case of discrimination. In 6 instances some elements of discrimination were found but discrimination was not based on ethnicity but on other protected grounds, so victims were advised to contact relevant organisations. In 12 instances no action was taken as the deadline for litigation under the anti-discrimination law passed, and 13 cases were closed as victims did not want to take action, while two cases were dismissed as they were employment discrimination cases because MRG made a strategic decision not get involved in employment litigation. 6 cases were addressed and solved through a meeting with local authorities, and one case was addressed without MRG's intervention. In 13 cases, action was taken - either by referring the case to the Office of the Ombudsman (10 cases) informally through MRG or by submitting a formal complaint by the victim or the AD point.

In one instance MRG assisted in drafting court documents (Bugojno case), in one case MRG intervened as a third party at the European Court of Human Rights (Pilav case). In the Zavidovići case, MRG was waiting for the prosecution to close its investigation so action can be taken. Once the investigation was closed, MRG helped to draft the complaint to prosecution office, and handed over the case to the Lawyer's Chamber of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which appointed a lawyer in December 2016 to lead on the case.

Moreover, one AD point (Prnjavor) directly referred some cases to Vaša prava, without informing MRG, so they have no data available about these.

**Expected result 3: Increased knowledge and awareness at the national level of the human rights abuses against minority communities in BiH and the challenges they face in accessing their human rights.**

The project applied participatory approaches that recognize the importance of community involvement in all activities. Thus, local communities, through ADPs, were involved in the assessment of the local situation in terms of discrimination against minorities, with the aim of identifying gaps in knowledge, attitudes and practices. In this respect, the project focused

specifically on the involvement of marginalized and vulnerable groups in activities related to data collection, problem identification and priority setting. Community mobilization took place through ADPs activities such as calls for individuals to ask them for help, local round tables, and various media activities.

**Expected result 4: Greater collaboration between minority representatives, CSOs, legal experts, private sector lawyers, and other relevant human rights actors leads to a greater commitment to address anti-discrimination and human rights issues of minority communities.**

ADPs made efforts to mobilize key stakeholders through project activities and later on through small grants activities.

Unfortunately there was no greater involvement of other experts, such as local lawyers, but in many cases local offices of NGO Vasa prava was able to respond on requests for support on individual cases as requests by ADPs, while more difficult cases were directed to MRG to handle them.

**Multiplier effect of trainings and roundtables**

A particular impact can be seen from the topics of trainings, roundtables and the conference where practically all interviewed participants claimed that their attitudes have changed. The multiplier effect of the Project activities had the most direct influence on reducing the discrimination of minority groups.

Planned project trainings and roundtables were reflecting the beneficiaries' needs, based on prior research that helped prepare the proposal which was consequently approved by the donor. Needless to say, various training courses differ greatly from one another. Still, there are some general differences between organised trainings (such as these) on one hand and project trainings on the other. The most important of these differences are as follows:

- MRG's trainings focus both on the skills improvement and attitude change, but also on knowledge transfer.
- MRG's trainings are more practice oriented, as opposed to other training courses, which are more oriented toward theory. Many other courses are usually very similar to the lectures, regarding both their content and style.

It is worthwhile noting here that the choice of content has a direct impact on several other elements of the training courses. For example, skills improvement, some would argue, requires stronger reliance on an interactive training style, including the application of such methods as case studies, group work, etc. Skills-based content and interactive training styles are much more characteristic of MRG's than other courses. We therefore acknowledge that MRG's trainings were, at least in many instances, characterized by a higher level of methodological sophistication and technical quality, which could lead to more beneficial effects.

The trainings and roundtables were organised in logical sequence, adopting the non-formal, competency-based and hands-on approach to skills development, and were sub-divided into the specific units with clearly defined learning objectives, training methodology and performance measurement. Practically all ADPs were attending events, and by being connected with people from government and other institutions and organisations they were able to increase their knowledge on selected topics, but also to present their work to other stakeholders who could further support their work.

Lesson plans were presented in adequate details and provided sufficient exercises and illustrations, most of which reflect conditions that trainees are expected to meet during the training stage and, later, in actual working conditions (e.g. when preparing project proposals to be submitted to

project partners). Projects and/or exercises for trainees are included as an integral part of the courses, and there is sufficient coordination between theoretical and practical training.

In conclusion, these trainings and round tables were highly efficient and appreciated by the training participants coming from ADPs.

### **3.3. Sound management and value for money (Efficiency)**

Efficiency relates to the linkage from the project inputs in terms of any financial, material and human resources expended to the delivery of activities and the subsequent outputs. In other words efficiency examines what was done and whether it was carried out in a rational way with sufficient resources.

The evaluators find that the project has been managed well and organised and implemented in an efficient way.

All planned activities have been implemented according to the original plan and all expected outputs were achieved. Most important from the point of view of raising capacities is the project's participative process which has determined that all outputs are the result of actions or decisions, whether acting alone or in cooperation with members of the local community or government bodies.

The partner's own monitoring is detailed in the reports submitted to MRG. The reports are in general well written, although only after MRG requested clarifications. They normally provide an overview of the project, an account of the activities realized during the period in question, an estimation of the number and type of beneficiaries, and a discussion of results thus far and of achievements and difficulties within the project.

Operational work planning and implementation have been positively assessed by the Consultants.

In the sphere of strategic litigation, the timetable for the emergence of appropriate cases and for carrying them forward through the legal process was beyond the control of project management. Overall, MRG did a good job in managing the litigation component and keeping the cost to the project of a more expensive component (as a result of legal fees) within reasonable limits.

The financial planning was generally good. Budgetary considerations will be detailed in the external audit report. As it was, project management seems to have performed well in producing a long list of deliverables with the funds available.

Apart from the litigation, trainings and conferences, the small grants / projects through ADPs initiatives have made up the backbone of the project. They fulfilled threefold function: First, the small grants provided the ADPs with a platform for inter-ethnic interaction in a safe and supported environment. The citizens' initiatives thus contributed to translating personal attitude change to actual behaviour change by rehearsing positive interaction and strengthening trust, and to counter the negative conflict dynamic from a lack of interaction and lack of trust. Secondly, the citizens were activated and the civil society, as a whole, was empowered through the citizens' initiatives. The initiatives thus served the goal of overcoming the passivity and lethargy of the civil society on the local level. Thirdly, the citizens' initiatives strengthened vulnerable groups and fostered their inclusion by dedicating funds for activities directed at youth, women, and other vulnerable minority representatives facing discrimination.

Methodological approach of the project was to support projects that would be relatively small – in terms of budget, duration, and geographical coverage. The total budget per initiative was up to 600 BAM (300 Euro).

Small grants were made available to ADPs to work individually or collaboratively on the local level initiatives. These activities were taken with good care, with appropriate financial reporting on each of them.

### **3.4. Financial control and accounting**

Grant management was implemented by partners and it faces numerous obstacles throughout the implementation phase. ADPs were to receive money to cover their internet/phone expenses, but partners were unable to maintain adequate financial control and record keeping mechanisms to ensure the integrity of its financial management system that significantly imperilled functioning of ADPs and even the trust. During the process MRG introduced changes to partner reporting system, to align it to the general reporting to donors, always keeping in mind budget figures and reporting requirements. Finally, with delays and after resolving problematic issues all ADPs' needs and requests were met.

### **3.5. Achievement of wider effects (Impact)**

Impact measures the success of the project in realising the overall objective of the project; that is, the overall long-term and sustainable changes brought by the project. In short, the lasting difference to the original situation. Although it is increasingly common to ask for assessments of impact in final evaluations, logically one would not expect impact to become apparent until considerably later, at which time it might be measured with an ex-post evaluation.

The impact is assessed against achievement of the **Overall objective: Reducing discrimination faced by members of minority communities in BiH.**

This objective is analysed in a broad sense, not only by focusing on advocacy actions, but having in mind various strategies applied in the project and looking at the several fields of observation where impact of this Project can be identified.

After reviewing the project performance against the logframe, the evidence collected within the evaluation suggests that project activities are indeed successful in contributing towards the overall desired project goals. Specifically, project was successful in certain areas and it could lead to increased social justice and equality, and provide an environment where minority population will be able to realize their rights free from discrimination.

#### **i. Capacity building of minority community representatives**

When assessing the impact, understood as the totality and long-term effects brought about through the project, the evaluators find that it has contributed to improving both the knowledge and skills of participants as well as to a more limited extent the capacity within the organisations they come from. For instance, the assignment included in the project combined with the exercises improved many participants' ability and professionalism to develop new projects and to apply to other donors. Both the knowledge acquired and the funds for the local initiatives supported within the project has been important for the participants and local communities and institutions.

However, in regard to more long-term or broader local and institutional capacity development there is limited impact. In this respect the evaluators would like to maintain realistic expectations. Although highly desirable, the potential impact of capacity development both

on an individual and institutional level can only be relatively limited unless part of a more long-term initiative.

#### **ii. Legal and Judicial Advocacy and strategic litigation process**

In accordance with the advocacy plan, the project team initiated several advocacy processes to introduce changes in the legal and policy framework at various levels in BiH. Many interviewees are in favour of this kind of actions and would be willing to support or even openly join the activists in their future activities. All agree that it is important to be persistent and keep on trying to introduce positive changes in legal documents and strategies and cases.

The main problem is that people are still afraid to report cases of discrimination for fear of harassment and violence because of lack of trust in the police and judicial system or fear of further victimization.

#### **iii. Awareness raising and advocacy work**

Majority of interviewed persons agree that the biggest changes have been introduced in understanding of the local communities what is and what is not discrimination. Through ADPs' activities, round tables, promotional materials and advocacy films many people were introduced to terms and being aware of them could more efficiently fight potential discrimination against them or other people.

#### **iv. Networking and coalition building**

It is also evidence for the project's impact. All people who changed their attitudes as a result of the project represent a good ground for dissemination of messages and advocacy efforts in future.

Networking, when based upon a process of careful negotiation of joint interests and ambitions, can be an effective means of conflict resolution opening the way to forging a new-found unity. Networks are galvanised by the establishment of an agreed purpose, backed up with a programme of work whose design all members have contributed to and participated in.

Although no network was established as result of this project, project activities supported integration of individual Roma communities into the wider community and generally higher levels of information exchange. Through 25 ADPs are opened doors for increased cooperation and mutual support, both at organisational and individual levels, and it is up to them to build upon initial results.

### **3.6. Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability)**

Sustainability relates to whether and how the outcomes at the project objective level will continue over time after the end of project support. It also refers to whether project's longer-term impact on the situation will be maintained in the wider community.

The key factor for *institutional sustainability* of this project is the continued work of all target groups – ADPs/CSOs, journalists, minority community representatives, national authority representatives, etc. All interviewees expressed readiness to participate in all future actions, invite more people to events, disseminate information and contribute to design of future capacity-building efforts, but pending on available donor funding required for these kinds of activities.

The three organisations which implemented the project will partially continue work on similar actions. MRG will continue to deal with human rights issues within their broader human rights

agenda, as it has good experiences and will build on these results. However, due to limited capacities HSRS and SCC are unlikely to continue with similar activities although this project profiled them as potentially serious partner towards institutions, but also other implementing agencies and donors.

It is difficult to gauge advances in NGO capacity, especially without access to capacity assessments undertaken before and after the action. The organisations/ADPs included in the project are of varying sizes and have differing capacity levels. The majority are part-time, voluntary, sometime informal community-based organisations with few human resources and with possibly weak links to their own community constituency. During the evaluation it was suggested on a number of occasions that the very act of meeting, or *doing something*, might be considered a sign of capacity.

However, discussing future of better established local NGOs who served as ADPs, some NGOs partners have also undoubtedly been strengthened as a result of the project and have bright future with potential for significant progress.

The evaluators find that there is still a question of how much the results obtained through the project will be sustainable beyond the benefits to the individual participants ADPs, and the certain impact on their respective organisations and institutions. Follow up implementation activities rests with the future support, and eventually government, with need to additionally strengthen the institute of ADPs with appropriate funds to support their work. The second element of sustainability is the capacity of people and CSOs educated and supported through project activities, if they will have knowledge and skills to reach out to potential donors which could provide support to pursue with current and new activities.

Still, the concluding impression by the evaluators is that there are good chances that both of these things will be further promoted and strengthened as there are both people and CSOs willing to go further and beyond the current project.

As to broader sustainability of the results obtained through the project, much depends on the availability of funds to MRG and others to continue the work of building the capacity of Roma civil society and of Roma activists more broadly, since it will be critical to ensure that Roma voices are heard within other civil society groups, and not merely in Roma-only groups. From a sustainability perspective, such efforts in the future will require the establishment of on-going national-level support to support the building of Roma capacities to play a role in the public realm.

Future work will be well advised to focus on a broader group of civil society activists, with most support delivered at national level, and where the focus is on Roma NGOs as much as on individuals, so that there is more prospect of retention of skills and knowledge acquired. Given the dispersal of its funds across several components and the limited time span of the project, it was not possible to build a more direct linkage between litigation and advocacy (except at support provided to Sejdić-Finci and Pilav cases where MRG made significant international advocacy).

As MRG has shown in its long-term engagement with issues for litigation to be a catalyst for social change, it will be necessary to link court judgments with a sustained campaign, directed both at high-level decision-makers at the national level, and at opinion-leaders, the mass media, public officials at national and local level, and the public at large. This is the route to sustaining the benefits of strategic court judgments. Such a linkage cannot easily be established and activated within a two-year project, but a beginning could be made.

### **3.7. Project Management**

The project was managed from Minority Rights Group in cooperation with the Human Rights House Sarajevo and The Serbian Civic Council-Movement for Equality - Sarajevo Canton as the local partners organising field work, all of them directly complementing project activities. HRHS and SCCS clearly used to be some of CSO leaders in BiH, and in theory they were supposed to be able fully implement planned project activities, but unfortunately that didn't happen, mainly due to lack of partners' capacities. Looking into partnership between MRG and project partners from this perspective, the overall partnership was found to be at a rather unsatisfactory level.

Nourishing partner relationships is a process that requires an extensive investment of time and energy, and cannot be a side issue in an otherwise full portfolio of responsibilities, especially in light of this rather full project with requirement of significant field work and presence at the field organising and supporting numerous local activities. Several dimensions can be identified, and consideration can be given to delegating some of those aspects, as is appropriate to a given situation. One is project management, with related reporting and accountability. Another is presence, which entails purposeful and sufficiently frequent personal contacts to build and maintain a relationship.

Although partners were introduced and consulted during the project preparation (although later on partners claimed it was limited involvement, due to the lack of experience and not understanding financial components), and even with their somewhat limited capacities they have helped as much as they could within the preparations phase, first problems arose quickly into the project.

MRG reacted where two persons from SCCS were removed from the project, and tried to act on HRHS staff changes and organisational difficulties, but none of issues were possible to be resolved in full that was rather damaging to the project activities.

Still, reflecting into the project results, overall the operational management, leadership of the project and the Project Manager and her team was good.

MRG's planning and management systems were thorough, while execution and monitoring of the plans were rigorous. Reports document project performance according to the logical framework. Indicators used to measure that performance were carefully defined in each of project's procedures. MRG's London-based Project Manager organised and distributed the reports, but also summarized and maintained minutes of the partner meetings and activities reports. These minutes indicated that the reports are rigorously employed as planning and management tools.

The main concern is that people working at the project (especially MRG) were stretched too thin with a number of other obligations. They have done their best and beneficiaries / partners did not suffer, but it took a lot of over-time working hours to cover it, so this is something to be considered for the future of this project.

### **3.8. Visibility and Media issues**

The Project team developed a visibility strategy and set clear rules for promotion of the EU contribution to the project at every event. In interviews, the people were aware of the link between the Project and EU support to promotion of human rights of minority groups in BiH. The Consultants had the impression that the EU visibility facilitated higher attention of public officials and opening of public institutions towards the theme.

All visibility actions in the Project were implemented upon the approval of the Task Manager at EUD. Based on the interviewees' statements and the desk review, the Consultant

concludes that the EU visibility was appropriately ensured, in accordance with the Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions.

To achieve the planned project objectives, the project needed excellent relations with media. Although clearly the topic raised through the project is not of high media interest, there were much potential for improvements.

In interviews with the project management and the local coordinators of the project, we came to several conclusions:

- The project was generally present in the media if there were certain events (mainly round tables), but without a clear strategic plan that would provide answers to questions such as who could speak to the media, who is making selection of media, speakers, presenters, etc.
- Most of the media outreach has so been "business" of management, not the activity of certain person(s) trained and paid to do the job.
- In dealing with the media, the project relied primarily on the interest of the media, without a strategic approach to building relationships with the media, including joint campaigns and strategies.
- Organisational and financial problems were an additional burden because it was very difficult to have a strategic plan and staff resources that would be in charge of media and communication strategy.
- Delays in preparing short movies and approval by EUD caused significant stress and organisations were unable to promote stories properly.
- There was a strategic approach and good relations in communicating to other types of local public (beneficiaries, influential persons, representatives of government, citizens, etc.).
- The topics raised by the project are generally neglected by the media, uninteresting, where additionally media is not attracted by positive stories from smaller communities, much less by the positive stories on decimation of Roma population.

It is an indisputable fact that the project has had significant results, but it is the opinion of the evaluators that they were not used in the most efficient manner in terms of visibility. Although all criteria required by project were technically met (number of press conferences, articles, video advocacy films), they were insufficient to attract greater media attention, and some came very later in the project (video advocacy films), too late to get greater visibility and not published at the mainstream media (films were distributed only on YouTube). Also, it is evident that the attitude to the field of communication with the public should have been improved in order to increase the overall professionalism of the two partner organisations, and in order to reach greater success in the implementation of the project.

### **3.9. Gender issues**

The project took into account that men and women have gender-specific needs and interests that need to be considered throughout all project activities and also in project decision-making, based on MRG's and partners gender policies.

The interviews consisted of a good mixture of male and female interviewees that reflects the situation on the field. Although in BiH society men are the most vocal and keep pushing themselves to the fore, regardless of the value of what they have to say, it's different in the support provided by this project, where a significant percentage of women were engaged in planned project activities, especially at ADPs and through trainings and small projects implemented at the local communities.

It is very different in various targeted communities, but in general terms participation of women was above 50% and much higher than it might be expected in BiH and specifically in the case of Roma patriarchal society.

Based on the interviews with women, it was found that participation in activities not only provided the women with some basic leadership qualities, but also acted as a catalyst for communities to gradually open up to the idea of women being leaders.

### **3.10. Conflict sensitivity**

The conflict analyses, risk assessments, and mitigation plans are essential prerequisites to avoid doing harm, and MRG implemented these prior to the project and in all project phases. Selected communities are no more than a reflection of the whole BiH society with all of its (dis)advantages. Project partners avoided working in ethnically homogenous communities, respecting the needs and priorities of each nation not allowing fragmentation and therefore grounds for possible conflict.

Community development is vital to long-term stability, reintegration, economic growth and sustainable peace in post-conflict situations. The project undertook a conflict assessment prior to the commencement of activities. With regards to actual implementation, the project was undertaken with a very high measure of conflict sensitivity. It was affirmed by the project management, and beneficiaries themselves that focusing the training and activities on concrete issues to help them professionally and privately, and the methodology of cross-religious and cross community training would help reduce the potential for conflict. This orientation focused the beneficiaries on common problems where they were working together in most cases across community and religious lines.

### **3.11. Mutual reinforcement (coherence)**

It is clear that respect for human rights of minorities is in line with EU policies as well as with BiH and international legal framework for human rights and anti-discrimination. Advocacy and legal actions of this project contribute to the BiH alignment with the EU human rights acquis.

The EU Delegation to BiH supports other projects on similar topics, and additionally EC Brussels is very active either through direct funds in BiH or from Brussels.

Most notable donors are USAID and Open Society Fund supporting project Equality for All – Civil Society Coalition against Discrimination. Their overall goal is to prevent and combat discrimination in BiH by promoting active involvement of CSOs in implementing antidiscrimination legislation in BiH. The specific objective of the project is to improve cooperation and build strategic partnership between CSOs and key government institutions and courts, in order to improve the legal framework pertaining to the protection from discrimination and to ensure its effective implementation.

Unfortunately during the length of this project there was no closer relations established between two actors.

### **3.12. EC value added**

By supporting MRG in the project, EU was providing resources to a relatively under-funded area and supporting the effort to facilitate the democratic inclusion of a highly-marginalized minority group. The project was a very close fit with EU priorities concerning minorities. This was one of the EU's larger projects, and there was a strong justification for the scale of investment in this initiative.

Projects of this kind deserve the attention of EU, since they tend not to fit with the priorities of most other donor organisations. Given the weakness of minority-run civil society and the difficulty most (though not all) Roma and other minority NGOs experience in obtaining funds, EU would be well-advised to consider making exceptions to its policy of not renewing funding for grantees (working based on individual project requests). This work requires long-term commitment and financial support far beyond individual projects.

To a certain extent, this Project exerted influence on projects and development cooperation policies of EU countries. For example, this Project is a part of activities of the MRG's international network.

The project successfully engaged in higher level advocacy (Sejdić-Finci and Pilav cases), successfully challenging at international bodies discriminatory provisions within Bosnia's Constitution and electoral laws.

## 4. Overall Assessment

The overall assessment of the project's performance is made on the basis of desk review and information gathered in interviews with selected stakeholders. Generally, all interviewees were positive and openly discussed issues, which is a sign of the good working strategies applied in project and good relationships developed among project team and target groups. Despite the closed attitudes of some institutions and difficulties in finding good partners among public institutions, the project team applied effective strategies and flexible approaches in order to fulfil the project objectives.

The desk study and interview findings confirm that this project is relevant for the Bosnia and Herzegovina context and that it represents an important work in the human rights field in BiH. Generally, the Consultants assess that the project objectives have been fulfilled and the project impact is satisfactory although some delays occurred within the planned timeframe.

Here is the summary of the most important achievements:

- **Raised awareness and knowledge** of all trainings and roundtables participants about problems and concerns with respect to discrimination of minority groups. All of them explained that they disseminated information to colleagues and would support future activities, so the overall impact in this field is much higher than expected.
- **CSOs' networking** has been intensified through coalition building and networking activities. The number of supportive CSOs is higher today than (before this project) in all targeted municipalities.
- **Visibility of minority rights:** The opening up of minority rights issues in media and in public forums (roundtables, conferences) created a slightly better environment for public statements of minority groups and for establishment of interest-based informal groups and formal organisations.

There are many lessons that the project team and their colleagues from MRG, HRHS and SCCS can learn from this project and use in future activities. This section presents the most successful achievements described in project documents and the key messages stressed by interviewees. Appropriate recommendations have been formulated for future activities,

having in mind that the second phase of this project is not planned *per se*. However, in some cases MRG will continue its advocacy work (such as Sejdić-Finci).

Formulation of recommendations was guided by the following questions:

- Which processes and approaches were successful and should be continued, reinforced and built on?
- Which approaches should be changed and improved in future projects?
- Which strategies are most effective when working with minority groups?

The most successful processes, that should be continued, reinforced and built on, are as follows:

- **Identify driving forces**, i.e. open-minded and aware people and/or organisations, who are ready to upgrade, replicate and disseminate knowledge and skills. Many training and roundtable participants in this project have become driving forces and they can be great resources for future activities – maintain relationships with them, consult with them about design of new training modules and promotional messages, engage them in advocacy activities, etc.
- **Organisation of trainings and roundtables should continue**. Many participants of roundtables would like to deepen the knowledge and many participants of the trainings would like to continue education. Hence, plan more capacity-building events for other groups and sectors (people who have not attended similar events before) and in other locations in the country.
- **Continual media campaign** should be maintained in order to improve visibility of the minority community, raise public awareness and create a more conducive environment for expression of minority rights. Maintain good relationships with journalists – they should be allies in such actions.
- **CSOs networks** have a substantial function for advisory support to minority community, visibility and advocacy actions.
- **Promote good practices** achieved in terms of institutional changes, successful legal cases, etc. These are precious processes that should be documented, disseminated and potentially replicated in other parts of the country.
- **Advocacy actions** were well planned and persistent. Such efforts should continue. Many interviewees recognize the need to improve legislation in order to better define minority rights and they would be ready to support the advocacy efforts. So, take advantage of the good will of new ‘advocates’, build advocacy skills of supporting organisations and test new advocacy strategies.

Weak points in the project strategies. If there would be things to improve in future work, they would refer to the following:

- Project coordination and partnership issues.
- **Involve beneficiaries and target groups in all phases of the project**, from planning to realization of activities.
- If there are problems with partners, as it was case in this project, EU should be more open to allow necessary changes.

In spite of some operational and coordination issues, significant positive results have been achieved within the project, and much progress has been made towards the overall project objectives.

MRG is an international organisation with visibility and credibility, and one whose mission dedicates it to enhancing minority rights. The involvement of MRG as a partner in the strategic litigation cases was crucial, since few national organisations have the necessary combination of litigation expertise and understanding of critical rights issues facing Roma and other minority communities, families and individuals.

The key idea of the project responded very well to challenges on the ground in BiH. The idea of establishing ADPs matched the needs and perceptions held by the local people themselves. The project has, in other words, tested out in BiH a method used in other countries, and the method has been proven to work.

Finally, great part of the success should also be ascribed to the systematic efforts by the MRG Project Manager in London to monitor the partner organisation who did a good job on the ground. Without this tight follow-up, the results and degree of goal attainment are likely to have been far poorer.

In conclusion, the project and its main components are analysed within the framework of six dimensions: *coherence, reliability, flexibility, relevance, effectiveness and sustainability*.

The project as such has been developed in a coherent manner. All of the components have been developed to a degree which was possible to attain at a given phase of project development and in given circumstances. In all the project's components, focus was shifting from short toward long-term objectives: from establishing ADPs, strengthening their capacities through education and training, giving them equipment necessary for their daily work, providing on the ground services, to certain level of capacity building preparing them to be more sustainable and active in approaching other donors, but also building up internal capacities to use in future work.

The impression is that the basic principles of the project have been operational through the whole period of implementation, resulting in similar, reliable quality outputs.

During the process of implementation, the project demonstrated a high degree of flexibility in terms of being adapted to the specific contexts of implementation and to the current socio-political changes within different local communities. The project aimed to keep up with the needs of local communities while being flexible with activities and support provided, adjusting the content of the education and courses, and working with government and ADPs to adjust scope and area of support to the specific social conditions within the milieu.

The project is very relevant not only because of the evident need for the community building and anti-discrimination work that is the same as when the project started, but also because of the need for professional community work and development. The relevance is reflected in the quality of individual and social community gains, which did not change much throughout the length of implementation. Being flexible to a desirable degree, the project was slowly becoming more and more relevant for the changing contexts of implementation. Being oriented toward community development, the project has evident social relevance. During implementation it was slowly gaining communities' trust and the respect of people requiring support, and in some cases authorities.

The project was effective in various degrees in terms of: (a) number of people in all local communities taking part in all ADPs planned activities, (b) engagement of government and getting their support, (c) working on changing local circumstances, and (d) societal legitimization. The impacts are observable at both individual and social level.

The impact of education (trainings and round tables) on individual participants is clear. All interviewees stressed the importance of the project for their professional / daily work and for the way they relate to their social environment. Project participants reported that they conveyed experiences and values acquired during trainings and practical work in local communities to the others they work with, inducing thus the changes at the societal level.

Small grants, trainings and anti-discrimination activities supported various kinds of activities with noticeable success. The impacts of the funds, trainings and actions could be observed

on an individual level of participating members of the ADPs – through their involvement in community affairs, acquired new skills and overall personal impacts, at a group or local ADP level, which is at the core of the project, providing the vehicle for consensus building, decision-making and ultimately democratization, building democratic society and human rights at the wider community level.

Institutional sustainability is one of the prime objectives of the project. Although project didn't aim to focus on this, strengthening efficient management structures of local communities and organisations, many of them are still most active and local leaders, but the whole process is still far from being accomplished. All local communities, including project partners, need more support in capacity development and external support from MRG and other donors and implementing organisations, always working in cooperation with governmental institutions, to make it sustainable.

## **5. Annexes:**

1. List of stakeholders consulted
2. Terms of References
3. Evaluation Offer