FYR of Macedonia

Mid-Term Evaluation

Thematic window: Conflict Prevention and Peace Building

Programme Title: Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration in FYR of Macedonia

Author: Eva Otero, Consultant

Prologue

The current mid-term evaluation report is part of the efforts being implemented by the Millennium Development Goal Secretariat (MDG-F), as part of its monitoring and evaluation strategy, to promote learning and to improve the quality of the 128 joint programs in 8 development thematic windows according to the basic evaluation criteria inherent to evaluation; relevance, efficiency , effectiveness and sustainability.

The aforementioned mid-term evaluations have been carried out amidst the backdrop of an institutional context that is both rich and varied, and where several UN organizations, working hand in hand with governmental agencies and civil society, cooperate in an attempt to achieve priority development objectives at the local, regional, and national levels. Thus the mid-term evaluations have been conducted in line with the principles outlined in the Evaluation network of the Development Assistant Committee (DAC) - as well as those of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). In this respect, the evaluation process included a reference group comprising the main stakeholders involved in the joint programme, who were active participants in decisions making during all stages of the evaluation; design, implementation, dissemination and improvement phase.

The analysis contained in the mid-term evaluation focuses on the joint program at its mid-term point of implementation- approximately 18 months after it was launched. Bearing in mind the limited time period for implementation of the programs (3 years at most), the mid-term evaluations have been devised to serve as short-term evaluation exercises. This has limited the scope and depth of the evaluation in comparison to a more standard evaluation exercise that would take much longer time and resources to be conducted. Yet it is clearly focusing on the utility and use of the evaluation as a learning tool to improve the joint programs and widely disseminating lessons learnt.

This exercise is both a first opportunity to constitute an independent "snapshot" of progress made and the challenges posed by initiatives of this nature as regards the 3 objectives being pursued by the MDG-F; the change in living conditions for the various populations vis-à-vis the Millennium Development Goals, the improved quality in terms of assistance provided in line with the terms and conditions outlined by the Declaration of Paris as well as progress made regarding the reform of the United Nations system following the "Delivering as One" initiative.

As a direct result of such mid-term evaluation processes, plans aimed at improving each joint program have been drafted and as such, the recommendations contained in the report have now become specific initiatives, seeking to improve upon implementation of all joint programs evaluated, which are closely monitored by the MDG-F Secretariat.

Conscious of the individual and collective efforts deployed to successfully perform this mid-term evaluation, we would like to thank all partners involved and to dedicate this current document to all those who have contributed to the drafting of the same and who have helped it become a reality (members of the reference group, the teams comprising the governmental agencies, the joint program team, consultants, beneficiaries, local authorities, the team from the Secretariat as well as a wide range of institutions and individuals from the public and private sectors). Once again, our heartfelt thanks.

The analysis and recommendations of this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views of the MDG-F Secretariat.

MDG-F Secretariat

Mid-term evaluation of the UN Joint Programme "Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration" in the FYR of Macedonia

Eva Otero

May 2011

Mid-term evaluation of the UN Joint Programme "Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration"

External evaluation by: Eva Otero. Second Consultant: Maria Delgado
Collaborators: Blue Lisboa
Editing: Chris Whitehouse, miniAID.com

This report has been produced by independent evaluators, commissioned by the MDG-F Secretariat. As such, the views put forward in this report should not be considered as those of the MDG-F. The views expressed in this report reflect those of numerous informants, sources and research conducted by the evaluation team. Any comments regarding this report can be forwarded to the evaluation team by email or telephone at:
eva.otero@leitmotivsocial.com
+34 954 909690

The evaluation team is grateful to the many people who contributed to this report. We wish to acknowledge the time taken by all those who met with the team during the field mission, despite many competing and often urgent demands. We appreciate and celebrate the spirit of openness and constructive engagement encountered in all of our meetings. We also want to thank the interpreters and the national consultant for their professionalism and support. They made our work significantly easier.

Many thanks to:

Ahmet Jasharevski, DROM NGO
Aleksandra Dimoska, Kicevo municipality
Aneta Bozinovska, Psychologist, Sande Sterjovski school
Aneta Damjanovska, Capacity Development and Grant Officer
Ann-Marie Ali, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative
Arben Ristemi, young participant UNICEF, UNESCO
Damir Neziri, CDI, Tetovo
Deirdre Boyd, UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative
Elizabeta Cvetkovska, Mayor's office, Mun. of Kumanovo
Elizabeta Jovanovska, national consultant
Elizabeta Risteska, Centar za razvoj na Zaednicata
Emilija Jovanova Stoilkova, UNICEF Project Officer

Engelbert Ruoss, Director of the Venice-based UNESCO – BRESCE (Regional Bureau for Science and Culture in Europe)
Foroogh Foyouzat, UNICEF Deputy Representative
Gregory Connor, Chief Technical Specialist
Harald Schenker, OSCE High Commissioner for Minorities
Idriz Ibrahimi, Interpreter
Islam Jusufi, Delegation of the European Union
Ismail Xheladini, CICR Kumanovo
Katerina Vasileska, the Local Development Agency, Struga
Lauren Bohatka, Programme Officer for MDG-F JPs, UNESCO BRESCE
Lidija Topuzovska, Secretary General of Macedonian National Commission for UNESCO and Assistant Head of Sector for International Cooperation and UNESCO in the Ministry of Culture
Lindita Rexhepi, CID NGO (Multi Kulti)
Lirim Emini, Teacher in Sande Steroski
Ljupco Gjorgjinski, Coordination and Monitoring Officer
Mark McGinty, Coordination Officer
Mikerem Tairi, member, CICR, Kumanovo
Mitko Ceslarov, Bureau for Development of Education
Naser Selmani, Association of Macedonian Journalists
Nadica Petrovska, Vuk Karadzic School
Naim Memeti, SIOFA
Ognen Zografski, Interpreter
Rosica Toseska, IPA funds adviser, M.Edu'n &Sci
Safet Balazi, Centre for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution
Sheldon Yett, UNICEF Representative
Snezana Trpevska, School of Journalism and PR
Sonja Magdenovska, Teacher in Sande Steroski
Stojce Smileski, Municipal CICR - KICEVO & Forum ZFD NGO
Tatjana Kraljevska - Lazarova, Counsellor for Planning the Cooperation with UNESCO in the Ministry of Culture
Tatjana Krstevska, Sirma NGO
Violeta Petroska-Beshka, CHCRC
Vesna Dzuteska – Bisheva, Assistant Resident Representative (Programme)
Vesna Andonovska, Interpreter
Wally Merotto, Operations Coordination Officer, UNESCO BRESCE
Xhevahire Pruthi Zajazi, UNDP Project Manager
Zojka Naskova, UNESCO National Professional Officer

Abbreviations

CICR	Commission for Inter Community Relations
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EU	European Union
FYRoM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
HoA	Head(s) of Agencies
JP	Joint Programme
LSBE	Life Skills-Based Education
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDG-F	MDG-Fund
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MoES	Ministry of Education and Science
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non Government Organisation
OFA	Ohrid Framework Agreement
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PMC	Programme Management Committee
PMT	Programme Management Team
SIOFA	Secretariat for the Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WG	Working Group
ZELS	Association for Local Self-Government Units

Table of Contents

Executive summary 5
Introduction 9
Premises, Context, objectives and methodology 9
Objectives of the evaluation 9
Methodology applied 9
Level of analysis: Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions 11
Limitations of the evaluation 11
Description of the intervention 11
The need: 11
The purpose: 12
Logic Model of Change 13
FINDINGS, REMARKS AND LESSONS LEARNT 14
DESIGN 14
IMPLEMENTATION 18
EARLY IMPACTS 27
SUSTAINABILITY 28
M&E 30
MAIN CONCLUSIONS 31
RECOMMENDATIONS 32

ANNEXES

ANNEX I. Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators
ANNEX II. List of documents reviewed
ANNEX III. Evaluation matrix

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Premises, Context, objectives and methodology

This report presents the finding of the Mid-term review of the Joint Programme (JP) "Enhancing inter-ethnic dialogue and collaboration in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYRoM)". The evaluation process took place from February to April 2011. It included a field mission to FYRoM from April 8th-17th.

The final purpose of this evaluation process was to contribute to the implementation of the JP in its second phase of implementation from April 2011 to July 2012. The specific objectives of this mid-term evaluation were to:

- Assess the programme's design quality and coherence,
- Assess the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources and the programme's degree of effectiveness among its participants,
- Review the achievement of outputs through the current programme, and identify early signs of project results and sustainability of these results.

This Evaluation Report presents a qualitative analysis and discussion of the JP, following a thorough and detailed review of strategic programme documentation and numerous informant interviews and group discussions. Although many of the outputs are reviewed in some detail, the primary aim was to identify and address the key issues and major themes and their role in the achievement of the programme's three main outcomes. The report also attempts to identify areas for concern in the implementation of the programme and makes suggestions on how the programme can improve certain to better promote the achievement of its main outcomes.

The evaluation followed a six-step process: (1) engaging stakeholders and conducting a brief needs assessment; (2) describing the programme and validating the evaluation framework with the main users; (3) refining the evaluation framework and designing data collection tools; (4) gathering credible evidence; (5) consolidating data and writing the report; (6) sharing the draft report with the main users for feedback then finalization.

A number of data collection tools have been used:

- Desk review: including strategy documents, reports, and research publications that were examined together with additional relevant documentation gathered during the field mission. Stakeholder map: We compiled a stakeholder map built to identify and classify the JP´s partners and staff members involved with the programme. The map served two purposes: it provided a snapshot of the range of the programmes' partners, and it was used to select potential interviewees and workshop participants.
- In-depth informant interviews and participatory workshops: The evaluation team conducted semi-structured interviews and participatory workshops with 42 key informants selected based on the stakeholder map.

- Debriefing workshop: We organized a debriefing workshop with the Programme Management Committee at the end of the field mission to share preliminary conclusions and a remote session with the MDG-F secretariat.

Description of the intervention

The Joint Programme has been running since July 2009 with a total budget of US$ 4 million and is being implemented by United Nations agencies UNDP, UNESCO and UNICEF together with a number of national stakeholders led by the Secretariat for the Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (SIOFA).

The overall objective of the JP is to promote inter-ethnic understanding and tolerance as a prerequisite for sustainable human development. In particular this JP intends to enhance the capacity of central and local bodies to facilitate inclusive problem-solving processes and consensus-building around community priorities and to strengthen the commitment to an inclusive civic national identity with respect to diversity. The programme focuses on three main strategies: governance, education and communication.

Findings of the Evaluation

Design

- The programme is relevant and consistent with the main national priorities.
- In general, the overall logic of the programme makes sense to most stakeholders, who recognise the added value that joint programming brings in this case.
- The analysis of the design elements of the JP indicates some weaknesses in the design of Outcome 3, where the theory of change is not totally consistent, and the vertical logic is weak. Some minor flaws were also identified regarding operational issues and the definition of some of the activities under Outcome 2, which required further clarification and revision and that have partly hindered a smooth start up of the Programme.
- The Programme agrees that a proper inception phase would have helped ensure the fine-tuning of the programme design, and would have helped clarify some of the aspects that needed further elaboration.

Implementation:

- The implementation of the JP is facing some difficulties that are mostly attributed to weaknesses in management structure. The PMC is experiencing certain limitations and not functioning as the decision-making mechanism it should be.
- The decision-making process has become mostly an internal process with limited participation of stakeholders. There is insufficient strategic engagement of stakeholders in the implementation.
- A remarkable level of ownership by national and local stakeholders at the level of outputs and activities was found. For example, government officials intended to disseminate and replicate the action plans developed by the Commissions for Inter Community Relations (CICRs) in the three core municipalities; the methodology for the revision of school textbooks developed under the guidance of UNICEF was recently endorsed by the national government; the organisation of the Second World Conference on Inter-religious

and Inter-civilization Dialogue was extraordinarily owned by the Ministry of Culture who partially funded this event.

- Although at the local level it was easier to observe some interesting operational synergies the potentials of the design of the programme to leverage interaction between components have not been fully capitalised yet. For example, the UNDP-led participatory assessment of local and national capacities around inter-ethnic issues brought together many of the agency's constituencies (municipality, CSO, national institutions, etc.), but left out other JP counterparts in the key sectors of education or culture.
- Despite a late start and some operational handicaps the programme has been able to catch up its delivery rate, and has already achieved some positive results.

Early impacts

Most stakeholders perceive that some slight changes in behaviours are starting to be noticeable and that some processes were starting to be in place. A few examples of the contribution of the Programme:

- Slight changes of attitudes regarding inter-ethnic issues among those national and local stakeholders who had had some direct contact with the JP.
- Increased local awareness about the role and existence of the CICRs in the three core municipalities, and a stronger engagement and ownership among the appointed members of such commissions
- Capacities are being strengthened
- New platforms of institutional dialogue around inter-ethnic education created coordination.
- A textbook methodology developed for the revision of textbooks legally endorsed.

Sustainability

- The political climate of the country and the high polarization of the society represent a major threat to the long-term sustainability of the any programme tackling inter-ethnic issues in FYRoM and a limitation that the JP and its stakeholders are well aware of.
- However, a positive sign is the significant ownership by government officials and civil society organisations (both at local and national level) of a number of JP outputs which demonstrate a reasonable commitment and interest by the national institutions to continue, at least, some of the processes developed within the JP after its end. For example, the legal endorsement of the textbooks methodology, the dissemination of a extracurricular activities manual by the education authorities or the development of a code of ethics for journalists (still to be developed under outcome 3) were frequently mentioned as outputs that will outlive the JP. Other stakeholders from the national government reported that they were using the example of the CICRs action plans developed under the JP to encourage CICRs in other municipalities.
- Outcome 3 emerges as the key for sustainability and needs to be further clarified and articulated.

Recommendations

- We recommend further clarification and articulation of Outcome 3. Designing a communication and advocacy strategy can be the way forward.
- The programme needs to strengthen national and local stakeholders' information and involvement at the strategic level to fully leverage the JP design potential. This may entail the opening up regular spaces for information sharing and feedback among the JP and its stakeholders; appointing "focal points" in the three core municipalities or increasing the presence of the implementing team or the governing body at the local level at critical and regular points in time.
- A strategic review and coordination of the different grant schemes by the different agencies may be useful for, and indeed critical to, the escalation and sustainability of results
- The governing mechanisms of the programme need to be seriously strengthened. Increased ownership at the strategic level is key for the sustainability of the Programme. At this point of time the identified limitations in the PMC mean that the JP is working without a functional joint mechanism in charge of regularly taking strategic decisions and inspiring synergies and to which the management team feels accountable.
- We strongly recommend a reinforcement of the governing mechanisms of the programme by either restructuring the composition of the PMC or creating an alternative mechanism that, taking into account the local context, involves those key national/local stakeholders with a daily involvement and decision power.
- We recommend that the programme undertakes a thorough review of its monitoring and financial reporting mechanisms and criteria.
- We recommend that the programme devotes some further effort to strengthening the local-national link through the promotion of joint activities, inclusive workshops or other alternatives mechanism that can ensure contact and exchanges between the local and national levels of implementation and looks at creative ways to reach out to the private sector and mobilise private resources.

Introduction

This report presents the finding of the Mid-term review of the Joint Programme (JP) "Enhancing inter-ethnic dialogue and collaboration in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYRoM)". This Evaluation Report is a qualitative analysis and discussion of the JP, following a thorough and detailed review of strategic programme documentation and numerous informant interviews and group discussions. Although many of the outputs are reviewed in some detail, the primary aim is to identify and address the key issues and major themes and their role in the achievement of the programme's three main outcomes. The report also attempts to identify areas for concern in the implementation of the programme and makes suggestions on how the programme can improve certain to better promote the achievement of its main outcomes.

This evaluation process took place from February to April 2011. It included a field mission to FYRoM from April 8th-17th.

Premises, Context, objectives and methodology

Objectives of the evaluation

The final purpose of this evaluation process was to contribute to the implementation of the Joint Programme (JP) "Enhancing inter-ethnic dialogue and collaboration in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYRoM)" in its second phase of implementation from April 2011 to July 2012. As stated in the Terms of Reference (ToR), the specific objectives of this mid-term evaluation were to:

- Assess the programme's design quality and coherence,
- Assess the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources and the programme's degree of effectiveness among its participants,
- Review the achievement of outputs through the current programme, and identify early signs of project results and sustainability of these results.

Methodology applied

This evaluation has followed a six-step process: (1) engaging stakeholders and conducting a brief needs assessment; (2) describing the programme and validating the evaluation framework with the main users; (3) refining the evaluation framework and designing data collection tools; (4) gathering credible evidence; (5) consolidating data and writing the report; (6) sharing the draft report with the main users for feedback then finalization.

Critical to the evaluation process was to ensure that the final report would be relevant to the end users. It was therefore important to start with an accurate description of the programme's purpose and modus operandi and to shape and adjust the evaluation design and the research tools to the needs and interests of its main users. A review of key strategic documents and telephone consultations with two key staff helped us in this preliminary phase.

The following research tools and data sources were used:

Desk review

The coordination office provided a large preliminary body of documents. They included strategy documents and monitoring reports that were examined together with additional relevant documentation gathered during the field mission. We also reviewed a number of third party reports and official documents. For a full list of all documents reviewed please refer to Annex II.

Stakeholder map

We used a stakeholder map to identify and classify the partners and staff members involved with the Programme. The map provided a snapshot of the range of the programme's partners, and was used to select potential interviews.

Briefing workshop

The evaluation process included a briefing workshop with the management team. The aim of the workshop was to understand as much as possible about the programme's purpose and theory of change, the expected impact and outcomes, the strategies developed and the mechanisms and relationships planned and/or built to be implemented and monitored.

In-depth informant interviews

The evaluation team conducted semi-structured interviews with 17 key informants whose selection was based on the stakeholder map. Efforts were made to ensure that a range of voices were represented and that they were ethnically balanced. Although the interview sheets were highly structured, we freely followed up on any emerging issues that appeared relevant to the core questions.

Group Discussions

During the field mission five group discussions, involving 25 stakeholders, were organised with follow-up interviews conducted with some of them. The objectives of these meetings were to create a learning-oriented environment and to provide a space for the collective examination and assessment of the programme by stakeholders, helping to bring out the different perspectives and voices and, importantly, to give these stakeholders an active role in the evaluation process.

Debriefing

The evaluation team conducted a debriefing workshop with the Programme Management Committee and the Heads of Agencies to present the preliminary findings at the end of the field mission and a debriefing session with the Resident Coordinator and with the Secretariat of the MDG-F. These debriefings gave stakeholders the opportunity to complete and challenge the initial conclusions and to provide the evaluation team with extra documentation to conclude the data analysis.

In total the evaluation team gathered information from 38 key informants. The field mission included visits to two of the three core municipalities included in the Programme's design: Kicevo and Kumanovo.

Level of analysis: Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions

The object of analysis of this evaluation is the Joint Programme "Enhancing inter-ethnic dialogue and collaboration in the FYR Macedonia". The assessment was done against three frameworks: (a) the social and political context of FYRoM with particular regards to the country's efforts to meet the requirements for accession to the EU and the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (OFA); (b) the MDGs and the general aims of the thematic window for "conflict prevention and peace building" and (c) the undergoing reform within the UN System.

As a result of the documents reviewed and the brief needs assessment conducted at the beginning of the evaluation process, an evaluation framework was drafted. The evaluation framework had five levels of analysis: Design and alignment with national priorities, MDGs and EU accession process; Implementation, including coordination mechanism and pace of delivery; Results; Sustainability; and M&E mechanisms.

The original questions prompted in the ToR were prioritised and combined with key issues raised during the preliminary interviews carried out with the primary users of the evaluation. They were selected on the basis of any or some of the following criteria: usefulness to programme managers, data that can be leveraged to further the goals of the project, feasibility and cost of gathering the data and ability to fill current knowledge gaps. This report presents the main findings and answers to those questions on the basis of evidence.

Limitations of the evaluation

Common time and resource constraints for conducting rapid assessments evaluations limit the ability to capture all relevant information. This is particularly notable in the face of highly complex interventions that take place in extremely complex environments. Considering the short period of implementation and the limited time available, this evaluation does not pretend to go through the many activities that at national and local level have already been implemented and will mainly focus on the processes generated along the programme implementation, and on the identification of emerging or potential results.

Description of the intervention

The need:

Since its independence in 1991, FYR Macedonia has faced social, political and economic challenges related to transition including an inter-ethnic conflict in 2001. This conflict delayed human development and further politicised issues of ethnicity and cultural diversity. Despite considerable progress made, there are still important issues in interethnic relations and elements of ethnocentrism that need to be tackled. While the internationally mediated

Ohrid Framework Agreement (OFA) of 2001 brought the dispute to an end and laid a solid foundation for peace and stability, its continued observance and implementation is crucial both for sustainable development and sustainable conflict prevention. The country's desire for European Union (EU) accession has served as a catalyst for pursuing many important political and social processes that require consensus among different ethnic communities and political parties. However, efforts need to be deepened in addressing remaining challenges such as: weak institutions and systems capacities, educational issues, gender and an insufficient understanding and communications around inter-cultural issues.

The purpose:

The overall objective of the JP is to promote inter-ethnic understanding and tolerance as a prerequisite for sustainable human development. In particular this JP intends to enhance the capacity of central and local bodies to facilitate inclusive problem-solving processes and consensus-building around community priorities and to strengthen the commitment to an inclusive civic national identity with respect to diversity.

The Joint Programme is centred on UNDAF Outcome 2.3 (2010-2014), which promotes inter-ethnic dialogue and social cohesion. It is structured in three mutually-supportive outcomes:

Outcome 1: "*By 2012, key national and local institutions dealing with inter-ethnic relations more effectively build inter-ethnic consensus".* This outcome focuses on facilitating a systemic linkage between existing responsible mechanisms for inter-ethnic relations at national and local levels and on enhancing the capacities of central and local bodies to facilitate inclusive problem-solving and consensus-building.

Outcome 2: *"By 2012, national education system better promotes ethnic and cultural diversity"* This outcome will work at both local and national level to address capacity gaps with regards to the policy framework, national curriculum, teachers' capacity and lack of opportunities for interaction among different cultural and ethnic groups in the school and the community.

Outcome 3: *"By 2012, media, local and religious leaders and civil society organisations promote and practice a greater level of cultural sensitivity and civic awareness".* This outcome pursues the creation of spaces for intercultural sensitivity and the strengthening of a stronger civic identity by engaging local leaders outside the political process and by assisting bodies and civil society organisations to facilitate mutual understanding and interethnic dialogue.

Logic Model of Change

STRATEGIES

- Reversing the dynamics of main contributors to polarization (education system, politicians and media) and using these channels as comprehensive drivers of change.
- National and local capacity building and inclusive support for institutionalization of dispute settlement mechanisms on both national and local levels.
- Promoting ethnic and cultural diversity through education.
- Raising awareness of intercultural sensitivities among media.
- Trust building among communities.

ASSUMPTIONS

- Maintaining and building positive inter-ethnic relations is central to the successful and rapid development of the country as a future European Union member.
- National development is most effectively advanced at local level. Achieving success in the 3 municipalities chosen for the JP will lead to a positive spillover effect.
- Social consensus on EU accession can serve as a basis for facilitating greater levels of intercultural dialogue.
- Education is key for the development and support of dialogue and communications.
- Improved integration in education will result in enhanced access to education for all.
- Creating stronger links between national and local governance levels essential for environment of interethnic collaboration and dialogue
- More dispute sensitive reporting will reduce media influence on ethnic misperceptions and intolerance.

INFLUENTIAL FACTORS

- Ohrid Framework Agreement provides a basic infrastructure for an inclusive country.
- EU accession perspectives and agenda serve as a catalyst for pursuing political and social processes.
- Ongoing decentralization process contributing to the improvement of public service delivery and citizen access to democratic institutions.

PROBLEM OR ISSUES

- Inadequate ethnic dialogue, ethnic polarization and increased permeation of ethnicity into most social relations eroding democratic transformation and stability.
- Weak institutional and systems capacity for enhancement of inter-ethnic dialogue and inclusive democracy.
- Linkages between enhanced inter-ethnic dialogue and expertise at national and local levels neglected.
- Schools fail to provide opportunities for students from different ethnic groups to communicate and learn together and to promote inter-ethnic dialogue and understanding.
- Ethnically divided and politically motivated media and journalists.

COMMUNITY ASSETS/ NEEDS

- Cultural leverage and religious diversity for unity and as a potential driver for economic development.
- Need to improve structures, linkages and capacities within relevant institutions to systematically operate in the area of conflict prevention and peace building.
- Local Commissions on Inter-community relations need support in becoming more institutionalized and sustainable.
- Dynamic Education reforms and openness to embrace new approaches
- Support higher education institutions in developing joint academic and student programs.
- Gender issues need to be addressed in terms of ethnic dialogue.
- The need to challenge media and journalists on the way they portray issues.
- Measures to build inter-communal trust and social capital at the local level.

DESIRED RESULTS

OVERALL: Enhancing Interethnic dialogue and collaboration in FYR Macedonia.

- By 2012, key national and local institutions dealing with inter-ethnic relations more effectively build inter-ethnic consensus.
- By 2012, national education system better promotes ethnic and cultural diversity.
- By 2012, media, local and religious leaders and civil society organization promote and practice a greater level of cultural sensitivity and civic awareness

FINDINGS, REMARKS AND LESSONS LEARNT

DESIGN

This section assesses the relevance of the project within its international and national context, as well as against its original design. Testing the implicit theory of change of the JP and its alignment to both local and national priorities has been at the core of this evaluation and has been the thread that has guided us throughout the complete evaluation process.

Overall finding: The programme is relevant and consistent with the main national priorities. In general, the overall logic of the programme makes sense to most interviewees, who recognise the added value that joint programming brings in this case. The analysis of the design elements of the JP indicates some weaknesses in the design of Outcome 3, where the theory of change is not totally consistent, and the vertical logic is weak. Some minor flaws were also identified regarding operational issues and the definition of some of the activities under Outcome 2, which required further clarification and revision and that have partly hindered a smooth start up of the Programme. As a lesson learnt, the Programme accepts that a proper inception phase would have helped ensure the fine-tuning of the programme design, and would have helped clarify some of the aspects that needed further elaboration.

Testing the Theory of change.

"Well founded theories of change are at the heart of effective work in all fields"[1].

According to the Programme document, the JP's main rationale is that, by facilitating linkages between conflict transforming capacity and expertise at national and local level and by enhancing skills to facilitate inclusive dialogue, confidence-building and problem-solving processes, inter-ethnic cohesion in FYRoM will improve.

Evidence collected during the course of this evaluation reveals that the majority of the stakeholders have grasped a good understanding of the overall goal of the programme. It was apparent, however, that many people involved in implementing one particular output or outcome were not aware of the other products, activities or components of the programme and that only a few people were fully familiar with the complete logic leading to the achievement of that main goal.

Interviews revealed that most stakeholders agree that the design of the programme addresses the main driving constituencies for peace and change (academia, government officials, schools, parents, journalists and civil society, among others) and properly tackles the most relevant drivers for reducing tension in the country (education, media, religion, governance...) with the exception of the economic factors, that were frequently mentioned as missing.

Many believed that the programme should make an effort to further engage the private sector in the implementation, a key social connector that was only marginally touched in the design. In the same line, and as pointed out by a significant number of stakeholders, political parties, which are key

[1] Guidance on evaluating conflict prevention and peace building activities. W*orking draft for application period.* DAC-OECD (2008)

actors in this type of process, and particularly relevant to the FYR Macedonian context, were absent in the logic of this programme.

An indirect approach to this constituency is actually taking place under outcome 1, and special attention to political representativeness in the activities is paid. However there are a number of reasons (legitimacy issues, mandate of UN...etc) that explain why the JP is not directly addressing these actors. Indeed, and as many interviewees recognised, depoliticising the inter-ethnic relations issue and widening the dialogue were significant added values of the programme's approach.

Vertical logic of the Programme

The assessment of the logic of the Programme is somewhat limited by the fact that only a few stakeholders outside the UN were found to hold a comprehensive understanding/knowledge of the JP as a whole. This suggests that the complete logic of the programme is still mostly held within the shell of the UN. However, amongst those interviewees that had the "bigger picture" in mind, there was a unanimous feeling that the programme's theory of change was clear and pointing in the right direction.

When analysing the contribution of each different component of the JP to the overall goal and the internal coherence of the Programme, the information gathered suggests that whereas the vertical logic is reasonably sound and clear for Outcomes 1 and 2, Outcome 3 is generally perceived as a more fragmented and unarticulated component.

> Whereas most stakeholders clearly identified the components of Outcomes 1 and 2 respectively as governance and education, when it came to Outcome 3 we got a variety of responses: "it is about media", "about religious dialogue", "working with civil society"...

Outcome 3 is the main "joint" component of the Programme (the one with "no owner", as one informant told us), fully co-implemented by two agencies: UNDP and UNESCO. It is also, according to the views of a significant number of informants, the one with the strongest potential to provide coherence and cohesion to the whole intervention.

However, the lack of a clear driving strategy in the design of this component has, so far, impacted negatively on the performance of the programme, and may affect its long-term impact; but it is a limitation that can still be corrected. The JP is in a good position to lead a strategic review of this outcome and leverage its potentials by strengthening the connections between outputs, outcomes or overall goal of the programme.

In general terms, many informants noted that although the intervention could not be considered particularly innovative, it brings an important added value. Potential links and interrelations among the components were favourably perceived, and there was high praise for the systemic dimension of the programme and the involvement of a number of key national and local institutions in its implementation, something that had been missing in previous similar initiatives in the country.

Operational issues

A number of minor issues were also put forward regarding the design process of the programme. For instance, various informants believed that some operational aspects, such as overhead costs or joint agency premises and resources, were not sufficiently taken into account during the formulation of the Programme. This was particularly true for UNESCO, which, as a non-resident agency, is disadvantaged in terms of the human resources and means available in the field. Also, the lack of clarity in the definition of some of the activities in Outcome 2 made the programme prone to duplications. This had created some misunderstandings between UNESCO and UNICEF that had to be dealt with during implementation, but that are now solved.

Although corrective measures have been taken, including the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the three agencies soon after the approval of the programme, it would have been better if these issues could have been identified and addressed in an inception phase, prior to full implementation. The main reason why this phase did not take place is that there had been major changes in the staff that had been involved in the formulation and in the Un Country Team (UNCT). Although this certainly added to the difficulties that are often faced in the launching of any Programme, the investment of extra time and effort in attending to such details early on would have been worthwhile, for the long-term effectiveness and smooth-running of the programme. A lesson that the JP has learnt.

Alignment with national and local priorities

In terms of relevance, the main conclusion of this evaluation is that the programme is fully in line with national priorities. No one disputed the fact that the programme responds to a need of the country and that fostering inter-ethnic cohesion is key for stability, peace and development. This also matches the analyses of third party sources reviewed in the course of this evaluation, that recurrently insist in the country's need of further efforts to "*strengthen inter-ethnic relations and preserve the concept of a multi-ethic, multicultural society*" [2].

It was a unanimous opinion amongst all those interviewed that the JP fits particularly well within the government's political agenda and international obligations. The JP is consistent with, and of relevance to, two key processes: the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (and its annex C) and the EU accession. Indeed, the programme demonstrates to the international community and the EU the country's strong commitment to having a sound control of its inter-ethnic issues and to meeting some of the challenges, institutional gaps and weaknesses as identified by the European Union.

> "If this programme did not exist we would probably have to invent it" (key informant)

At the national level some stakeholders stressed how the formulation of the Programme and some of its outputs had actually been instrumental in shaping some of the strategic priorities of the government, such as mapping the institutional gaps and capacities in inter-ethnic issues, developing curricula for introducing Life Skills-Based Education (LSBE) in secondary education, revising the

[2] 4th Monitoring Report on FYR Macedonia. ECRI (Council of Europe)

national framework for extracurricular activities and developing a new methodology for the review of textbooks.

At local level, we could only find limited evidence of alignment with local priorities and needs. This conclusion relies on the information gathered during group discussions in the two municipalities visited during the evaluation and on the revision of the local strategic documents available. Group discussions gave us a mixed picture: one municipality clearly identified inter-ethnic issues as a social priority; the other mainly referred to the socioeconomic aspects, such as unemployment or environmental issues as local priorities and only marginally mentioned conflict prevention as a top issue. None of the strategic documents clearly identify inter-ethnic tensions as a development priority.

However, the relevance of the Programme is not contested by the majority of those interviewed. A couple of recent examples of trends towards increasing tensions, especially at the local level, were put forward to the evaluation team to prove that the opportunity of the intervention continues to be valid and relevant.

Alignment with the MDGs and UNDAF

It was generally acknowledged among the main users of the evaluation that the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) framework was not likely to be the main reference in a country that is preparing for EU accession, and it was accordingly not included among the evaluation questions. It did nevertheless emerge on several occasions where stakeholders spontaneously linked some of the strategies under outcome 2 to the achievement of MDG 2.

In terms of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), analysis of the 2005-2009 and the 2010-2015 strategic documents, along with findings from interviews during the field mission, lead to the conclusion that the JP is fully aligned with both frameworks.

Ownership

During the design phase of the programme, a number of national and, to a lower extent, local stakeholders were consulted, and they are listed in the project document. Participation seems to have been highly sector-specific, with little strategic involvement of key national or local stakeholders in the overall design.

A consequence of the process being reasonably inclusive is that most key stakeholders interviewed, particularly at the national level, confirmed that they had a say in the design of the intervention, something unanimously celebrated and positively remarked upon in all cases. There are concrete examples of outputs that had been directly introduced during the concept note negotiations (the LSBE curricula, the textbook's methodology, the World Conference on inter-religious and inter-civilizations dialogue); others mentioned their active role in the identification of stakeholders for the programme. These examples allow us to conclude that ownership of the design of the Programme is, in general terms, satisfactorily high.

IMPLEMENTATION

Within this section the Programme will be assessed against (a) joint action and coordination among implementing agencies and with stakeholders, (b) ownership and participation in its implementation of target population and participants, (c) interrelation among the Programme's components, and (d) pace of implementation.

Overall finding: The implementation of the JP is facing some difficulties that are mostly attributed to weaknesses in management structure. Particularly worrying is the lack of a clear leadership and governance of the programme and the insufficient strategic engagement of stakeholders in the implementation so far. Although the team has shown sufficient flexibility in adapting to changes in circumstances when necessary, this situation is substantively hampering efficient implementation of project activities, and weakens the potentials for synergies among components and actors. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that despite these handicaps the programme has been able to catch up its delivery rate, and has already achieved some positive results.

Coordination

The Joint Programme "Enhancing Inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FYRoM" involves three implementing agencies, UNDP, UNICEF and UNESCO and a significant number of national and local stakeholders.

At the UN level, the evaluation team was able to verify that the technical coordination and information sharing among the implementing team is good and is constantly being improved. The programme management team (PMT) is sharing common working premises, and this has facilitated the development of a number of coordination tools, such as newsletters and mailing lists, and the fostering of regular coordination meetings. It was pleasing to see that every member of the team was reasonably familiar with everybody else's respective activities and work plans something largely attributable to the personal efforts of the project implementation team. It was however noted that this has meant extra time devoted to internal coordination that sometimes resulted in minor delays of activities.

Although after the official launch in February 2010 there was an initial effort to disseminate the JP among main stakeholders[3], an analysis of the different mailing lists that were operational during the evaluation, revealed that 89% of designated recipients belong to the UN system. This suggests that, at this stage, the information is kept largely within the UN, and may also explain, partly but not only, why external stakeholders interviewed were found to have only a partial understanding of programme aims and activities, much of it limited to their own sector.

There is a clear need to create new channels for more substantive coordination; it is clear that a real sense of "jointness" is not yet fully embedded in the implementation of the programme. The lack of

[3] After the official launch, UNDP, with the involvement of UNESCO and UNICEF convened a number of inception workshops, aiming to engage principle programme stakeholders, increasing stakeholder understanding and ownership of the programme. Joint communications materials were also developed and disseminated to partners: programme brochure, factsheet, and a webpage.

one clear reporting line to a JP governing body, which will be elaborated below, combined with institutional inertia, has impaired joint implementation and raises a challenge for joint delivery.

Governance

Although the Programme Management Committee (PMC), the statutory body in charge of the technical and operational oversight and coordination of the JP at a management level, is formally constituted and meets twice a year, this mechanism is experiencing certain limitations that most informants attribute to:

a) the particularly complex political situation in the country (with several election processes meaning frequent stakeholders turnovers),
b) the serious power unbalance in the appointment of members of the PMC by the national government (for instance, in the same body a Deputy Prime Minister is sitting with a very junior assistant of one Ministerial department) and
c) the lack of a clear mandate as reflected in the PMC's ToR, or a weak understanding by the government.

As a consequence, the PMC is not functioning as the decision-making mechanism it should be, and the decision-making process has become mostly an internal process with limited participation of stakeholders.

As an alternative, the JP has set up a new overarching operational mechanism that is partly dealing with decision-making, partly acting as a "buffer" zone: the Heads of Agencies meeting (HoA).

However, many agreed that the HoA meeting works more as a "solution finding body" rather than as a governing body that takes charge of making strategic decisions and promoting synergies. The minutes of these meetings were useful to understand the internal dynamics of the Programme and to confirm that this body has taken charge in dealing with differences or disagreements in the interpretation and definition of respective responsibilities, and has successfully covered the need to fine-tune the programme design and to find solutions for some of the identified flaws of the JP. However, a governing body, fully responsible of the strategic direction of the JP, is still missing.

This situation is creating some bottlenecks and presents a structural gap that should be seriously addressed. However it was encouraging to confirm a true will to work towards a stronger sense of joint delivery from all three agencies, which provides cause for optimism that improvements will take place during the next phase.

Relationships with stakeholders

The JP also involves a high number of partners including, but not limited to, state level ministries and departments, primary and secondary schools, three municipalities, civil society organisations and the University. The Secretariat for the Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (SIOFA) acts as the main partner of the JP and co-chairs the PMC. Thus, the implementation relies on a set of connections and interactions amongst all those given actors in a complex setting that deploys both at national and local level.

At the national level, relationships between the UN agencies and those stakeholders are mostly kept bilateral and the quality of those partnerships, depending on the history of each agency in FYRoM, is uneven. In this regard, whereas UNICEF and UNDP show a long programmatic-based relationship with the education authorities and a long standing experience in the country, it was clear that UNESCO faces distinctive challenges that must be acknowledged. Although UNESCO has been present in the country for many years through the UNESCO National Commission, the agency proceeded to set up an individual antenna office that would take charge of the implementation of this JP. This new setting has obviously required an extra effort to ensure and nurture a differentiated working relationship with the National Commission while developing new relationships with other stakeholders (Universities, schools, CSOs, etc.), something that has not been always easy but that seems to be normalised at this stage.

> The situation at local level mirrors the national scenario. During the group discussions held in Kicevo and Kumanovo, some stakeholders expressed the need for these spaces where meetings could proceed in order to create synergies and avoid duplications. When asked about why these meetings were not taking place, the answer was that they were unsure of who should be in charge of calling them.

It was therefore clear that, as it is working right now, each agency operates mostly with its own "natural" partners, and they do not frequently communicate or work with other agencies' counterparts. Although some examples of cross-cutting relationships were provided (for example between UNESCO and the Ministry of Education) they seemed to be anecdotal and limited in scope. In general terms the stakeholder's relation with the JP was mostly limited to their own sector, and no evidence was found of substantive contacts among the national or local stakeholders[4]. Although most informants considered their relationships with respective implementing agencies efficient and satisfactory many also felt that facilitating some key spaces for dialogue and information-sharing would be useful to enhance ownership and sustainability.

In most MDG-F Joint Programmes, the PMC would be the natural place for this to happen and the key space for this strategic involvement. However, as already discussed, this decision-making body is not fully functional and therefore alternative spaces or solutions need to be provided.

Particular attention needs to be paid, according to many interviewees, to ensuring the vertical coordination and feedback channels of the Programme between local and national level activities, outputs and stakeholders. Again, the governing body (either the PMC or some similar body) could provide the space to ensure this.

Ownership

Although, during the design stage of the JP, the promoters of the intervention instituted a good consultation process with a broad range of stakeholders, the engagement and strategic participation of stakeholders in the implementation, as we have already discussed, has not been properly fostered by the JP, and this is to the detriment of national/local ownership.

[4] Although the minutes of meetings around the process of implementation of the Integrated Education in the FYR of Macedonia (a project mostly promoted by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, OSCE) reveal some cross-cutting contact and collaboration between SIOFA and the MoES, it is not clear to what extent those can be directly attributed to the JP, although some contribution can indeed be assumed.

Nonetheless the in-depth interviews and workshops conducted during the evaluation revealed a remarkable level of ownership by national and local stakeholders at the level of outputs and activities.

This can be illustrated with various examples: the action plans developed by the Commissions for Inter Community Relations (CICRs) in the three core municipalities were considered by government officials as best practices and as very practical tools that they intended to disseminate and replicate elsewhere. Secondly, the methodology for the revision of school textbooks developed under the guidance of UNICEF was recently endorsed by the national government through a partial amendment of the law on textbooks for primary and secondary education. Finally, the organisation of the Second World Conference on Inter-religious and Inter-civilization Dialogue was extraordinarily owned by the Ministry of Culture who partially funded this event.

Interrelation among components

The JP is articulated around three different components that are expected to leverage one another: governance, education and society.

In the case of governance, the component led by UNDP, all stakeholders understand that the main goal of the activities under this component is to build institutional capacities and systems for conflict transformation at both local and national level.

The second component, led by UNICEF (and to a minor extent UNESCO) envisages a number of activities and outputs designed to strengthen the education sector and to enhance interethnic dialogue and democratic participation in schools. It also intends to build linkages between schools and other institutions such as municipalities or the civil society.

Finally, the third component is designed to work towards achieving a social constituency of support around inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration, although as already discussed it is still not clear how this outcome is to build on and to leverage the other two.

In practice, the potentials of this design have not been fully capitalised yet. For example, the UNDP-led participatory assessment of local and national capacities around inter-ethnic issues brought together many of the agency's constituencies (municipality, CSO, national institutions, etc.), but left out other JP counterparts in the key sectors of education or culture. This case illustrates the present implementation dynamics of the JP, where the three components seem to work in parallel with little strategic interrelation.

At the local level it was easier to observe some interesting operational synergies, particularly between UNDP and UNICEF. In Kumanovo, a working group on education, youth and sports, involving teachers, the members of the city council, civil society organisations and members of the CICR was created through one of the grants funded by UNDP. Also, in both municipalities visited, the youth centres supported by UNICEF were serving as premises for the projects funded by UNDP.

Despite these examples, strategic synergies between the components are still rare, and this is an area with a strong potential to grow both at national and local level.

After just one year of implementation (in practice less than a year due to the late start of the JP) the above situation may be considered quite normal. However, evidence gathered at this stage already suggests that the JP needs to find alternative ways to proactively build real synergies at national and local level.

> For example, during one of the meetings held during the evaluation, one participant from the Civil Society sector explained how, had they of known that media was also part of the programme, they would have used that resource to escalate the impact of their own project.

Pace of delivery and progress

This section discusses the programme's record of success in completing planned activities. The JP implementation experienced a slow start due to some difficulties in assembling the team and, to a minor extent, the replacement of some key players during that first period. In practice that has meant approximately a six-month delay in the start up. However at the time of this evaluation, all the activities were reported by the PMT as being "on track" (see table below) and the programme had managed to pick up the delivery rate to an acceptable 74%.

Progress of outputs

The evaluation conducted a rapid analysis of the progress rate of the outputs based on the number of activities that were either completed or on track at the time of the evaluation[5]. Since tracing back the means of verification of each activity and a comprehensive examination of each of them was well beyond the scope of this mid-term assessment, we asked the PMT to inform us of the present status of activities and to report progress under the new M&E framework. We triangulated that information with the financial and M&E reports available.

Table 1 (below) presents a comparative of the reported status of activities versus progress towards impact, according to the JP progress indicators, at the output level. Some caution needs to be taken at this point because with the information available it is not possible to make an accurate assessment of rate in terms of "progress in implementation" for each activity.

[5] Activities that have been launched AND were progressing at a satisfactory rate according to the implementation team. This also includes those activities that are due to start at a later point of the implementation period.

Table 1: Status of activities and progress

OUTPUTS	Activities on track	Average % progress (over indicators)
OUTPUT 1.1: Key national and local institutions in 3 micro-regions dealing with inter-ethnic relations have a system to address issues that may weaken inter-ethnic cohesion (*UNDP)*	100%	50.4%
OUTPUT 1.2.: Key national and local institutions dealing with inter-ethnic relations have access to a pool of facilitation experts and resources *(UNDP)*	100%	0%
OUTPUT 1.3.: Local governments and community organisations have better opportunities to collaborate in 3 micro-regions *(UNDP)*	100%	66%
OUTPUT 2.1.: Understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity incorporated in the national education policies *(UNICEF)*	100%	17.5%
OUTPUT 2.2: Mechanisms for democratic participation, good governance and conflict resolution in the education sector strengthened in 3 micro-regions *(UNICEF)*	100%	37.5%
OUTPUT 2.3.: Children and youth have opportunities for interaction and dialogue in school and the community *(UNICEF/UNESCO)*	100%	32.6%
OUTPUT 3.1.: Local and religious leaders and civil society are better able to participate in dispute resolution processes (UNDP/UNESCO)	100%	77%
OUTPUT 3.2.: Journalists supported to practice culturally and conflict sensitive reporting *(UNDP/UNESCO)*	100%	5%
OUTPUT 3.3.: Media support mechanism (expertise, monitoring, tools) established for reducing social tensions *(UNDP/UNESCO)*	100%	6.6%

The central column shows the activities that, according to the implementation team, are on track or due to start according to schedule. Although some minor deviations from the first year work plan were reported, at the time of the evaluation they had already been corrected and no major delays were foreseen.

On the other hand, the column on the right assesses progress against the new impact indicators that guide the JP's M&E framework[6]. This analysis shows uneven results with some of the outputs presenting an alarmingly low progress rate. Although slow progress in outputs 1.2 and 3.3 can be explained by the minor start up delays mentioned above, a careful analysis of these results by the implementing team is highly encouraged. As will be elaborated later in this report, this also shows that the new M&E framework provides an excellent tool to guide this kind of reflections.

The following analysis provides a brief overview of the pace of progress in the different outputs but also makes some comments on the expected impacts. It does not pretend to be a detailed narrative of achievements and only major results or activities are singled out. We acknowledge that many of the implemented activities will intentionally not be reflected.

[6] Annex I further elaborates on this analysis.

OUTPUT 1.1: Key national and local institutions in 3 micro-regions dealing with inter-ethnic relations have a system to address issues that may weaken inter-ethnic cohesion (UNDP)

The pace of progress of the activities is reasonably satisfactory. The flagship product under this output, the participatory Assessment of National and Local Capacities for Strengthening Interethnic Dialogue and Collaboration, was conducted and a report with recommendations launched. The whole process is strongly owned by UNDP national counterparts, but has not engaged with other sectors such as culture or education, which could have reinforced the systemic approach and the synergies among the JP components. Workshops and training were reported as on track. No major issues were identified during the field mission regarding the activities. However it might be useful to regularly reflect on how the different activities contribute to the creation of the system that this output is targeting.

OUTPUT 1.2.: Key national and local institutions dealing with inter-ethnic relations have access to a pool of facilitation experts and resources *(UNDP)*

No progress has been reported or verified under this output. Planned activities have experienced major delays due to problems fitting this pool of experts within the structure of ZELS[7] as planned in the programme document. This has forced the JP to accommodate this mechanism within another national institution, and thus has taken more time than expected. At the time of the evaluation the situation was being sorted out.

OUTPUT 1.3.: Local governments and community organisations have better opportunities to collaborate in 3 micro-regions *(UNDP)*

Progress reported indicates that all activities are on track. According to the new M&E framework the Programme has achieved 66% of the targeted indicators.

A grant scheme for CSOs in the three core municipalities was launched and a number of initiatives developed. The grant scheme has fostered new interactions and links between these NGOs and other local bodies such as the CICRs, the schools or the municipality. Examples of this: NGOs have implemented different projects which aim to increase the capacities of CICR members and raise local awareness of these inter-ethnic mechanisms. The Working Group (WG) on education in Kumanovo, a project launched by an NGO but involving the municipality and the schools, is another example of collaboration that was frequently mentioned.

Aspects requiring further attention:

Some informants suggested that the grant scheme at the local level needed to be further focused. They were concerned about the fact that many small NGOs were getting funds for projects that were mostly targeting the same groups of beneficiaries (particularly CICRs). This, they believed, was overloading this target group with activities that they may not be able to absorb. A more strategic design of future schemes could avoid this risk.

A strategic review and coordination of the different grant schemes by the different agencies may be useful for, and indeed critical to, the escalation and sustainability of results.

[7] ZELS: Association for Local Self-Government Units

OUTPUT 2.1.: Understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity incorporated in the national education policies *(UNICEF)*

Despite the moderate achievement of indicators reported, at 17.5%, important progress was verified. Half of the indicators selected, gearing towards long-term impact, can introduce some distortion in the measurement of short-term results that needs to be taken into account.

Examples of progress include:

- The methodology for the revision of textbooks has been adopted and recently endorsed by the government. It is therefore expected that this legal endorsement will ensure a systematic revision of textbooks in the near future.
- A Working Group for strengthening the capacities of the Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) for policy and programme development for communication and advancement of interethnic relations in education has been created and was recurrently mentioned as one of the main contributions of the JP regarding the strengthening of national capacities.
- The first draft concept for the new curricula for secondary education aimed at developing similar LSBE for secondary education was developed. However no progress on indicator 3 has been reported yet.

OUTPUT 2.2: Mechanisms for democratic participation, good governance and conflict resolution in the education sector strengthened in 3 micro-regions *(UNICEF)*

The JP has organised some workshops aiming at raising the awareness of parents, students and the school community as a whole, on inter-ethnic issues. The objective of this output is to reinforce democratic participation mechanisms in schools. In terms of progress, a number of decisions taken as a result of the JP activities have been reported but could not be checked during the field visit. However, several informants shared a common perception that the JP has made a contribution to an increased interest from parents in participating in the school decision-making. This area of work was not frequently mentioned by stakeholders during the evaluation process.

OUTPUT 2.3.: Children and youth have opportunities for interaction and dialogue in school and the community (UNICEF/UNESCO)

Again here, progress reported under the new M&E framework does not give justice to the full extent of achievements under this output. For instance, the youth centres, established and supported by UNICEF, frequently emerged as best practices. The evaluation team visited two of those centres and could verify that they are providing the spaces for the implementation of activities of other agencies (mostly UNDP but also, to a minor extent, UNESCO) and offer the environment for youngsters to socialise or to enjoy extra-curricular activities and other trainings. It is also interesting to note that the premises for those centres have been allocated free of charge by the three municipalities.

Even if they are not singled out, other activities and outputs have been produced and contributed to this result. Although the pace of progress is not alarmingly low and all activities seem to be implementing without major delays, the JP should carefully evaluate the reported progress against

indicators, particularly on the UNESCO activities, and try to identify the real causes behind the low percentage of achievement of expected results.

OUTPUT 3.1.: Local and religious leaders and civil society are better able to participate in dispute resolution processes *(UNDP/UNESCO)*

According to the indicators, the progress of this output is fairly high. The main event under this output was the celebration of the Second World conference on inter-religious and inter-civilizations dialogue along with a number of events organised by both UNESCO and UNDP.

OUTPUT 3.2.: Journalists supported to practice culturally and conflict sensitive reporting *(UNDP/UNESCO)*

Progress on this output, as reflected in the M&E framework analysis, is low. This can be partly explained by the fact that most activities under Outcome 3 were planned for years 2 and 3. At this point attention needs to be paid to this, and to the development of creative ways of fostering results under this output and of linking them to other strategies of the JP. Results that could be verified during the evaluation include a UNESCO Chair formally established - but not consolidated yet - within the School of Journalism and Public Relations, and a publication that has been produced and disseminated through a roundtable.

OUTPUT 3.3.: Media support mechanism (expertise, monitoring, and tools) established for reducing social tensions *(UNDP/UNESCO)*

This output, related to output 1.2, has experienced major delays and is still in a very preliminary phase of implementation.

Table 2: Delivery rate December 2010

	Total Approved JP Budget	Total Amount of Transferred to date	Total Budget Committed to date	Delivery Rate
UNDP	$1.834.941	$1.453.756	$922.554	63%
UNICEF	$1.239.060	$895.400	$838.003	94%
UNESCO*	$925.999	$603.500	$432.394	72%
TOTAL	**$4.000.000**	**$2.952.656**	**$2.192.951**	74%

*UNESCO figures as of March 18th 2011

Finally, Table 2 presents the delivery rates reported as of December 2010. Due to some inconsistent reporting on the financial aspects of the programme, this table includes more recent data provided by UNESCO and some corrections in the figures of UNDP. The new figures show reasonable progress and delivery by all three agencies.

These inconsistencies and the lack of consensus among the implementing team were raised and discussed during the evaluation process, and flag the need to revise the financial monitoring criteria used by the PMT and to pay careful attention to financial issues.

Emerging issues: gender

The design of the JP pays particular attention to gender issues, an issue that was barely addressed in the country in terms of inter-ethnic dialogue. Gender was, accordingly, one of the core cross-cutting themes in the strategic approach of the JP, and an effort was made to mainstream gender into the design of activities and outputs, including disaggregation of data, gender balance among participants and the preparation of baseline study on gender and inter-ethnic relations in the country, and this was already finalised at the time of the evaluation.

Despite this explicit consideration of gender in the programme's design, gender issues rarely emerged during in-depth interviews or group discussions, and when they did, they mainly referred to the existence of disaggregated data and not to a systematic approach towards these issues. However, we learnt that the JP is now in conversation with UN Women, and it is hoped that the involvement of this specialised body may contribute to a more effective mainstreaming of gender into JP implementation during the next period.

EARLY IMPACTS

Overall finding: Despite the difficulties of identifying impacts in a mid-term evaluation, most stakeholders agreed that some slight changes in behaviours were starting to be noticed and that some processes were starting to be in place.

One of the objectives of this mid-term evaluation was to look at early signs of potential impact. If in any mid-term assessment finding evidences of impact would be an arduous task, this is particularly challenging in a programme such as this which is explicitly geared towards long-term and intangible outcomes such as building capacities and fostering processes of transformation and social change. Therefore, it would be too early to expect population-level impact in terms of significant behaviour change at this stage of implementation of the JP.

It was also noted by many that the complexity of the task of improving a country's capacity to deal with inter-ethnic issues and potential tensions is not something that a Programme alone can successfully achieve. It requires the inputs of many different actors working in the same lines and towards similar goals. However, the vast majority of the informants interviewed agreed that, nevertheless, some **noticeable processes of transformation were starting to emerge**.

Based on informants' perceptions, we have tried to identify those common trends that hint at early signs of impact of the JP.

Many informants stated that the JP had **directly contributed to slight changes of attitudes** observed among those national and local stakeholders who had had some direct contact with the JP and who were now more comfortable and able to speak openly about **inter-ethnic issues**. This suggests that the JP is opening up new spaces for dialogue that are serving the purpose of steadily creating a critical mass, breaking taboos and fostering some shift in the public perception of these issues.

For example, there was a widespread perception amongst stakeholders at national and local level that the implementation of the JP is already contributing to both **increasing local awareness** about the role and existence of the **CICRs** in the three core municipalities, and to promoting a **stronger**

engagement and ownership among the appointed members of such commissions. These Commissions were legally established by the OFA and developed under the 2002 *Law on Local Self-Government* but little progress had been achieved and most commissions were not functional, had very little credibility and there was little or no information on their work[8].

Other emerging trends that could be identified were:

Outcome 1 - Governance

- Local and national stakeholders, such as CICRs' members or civil servants at national level, believe that their **capacities are being strengthened**.
- The CICRs are not only building their capacities but **starting to be operational**. In all three core municipalities, **action plans** have been approved for the first time and in some cases presented for funding to the municipalities.
- Projects such as the working group on education created in Kumanovo and funded through one UNDP grant seem to be launching **new platforms of institutional dialogue around inter-ethnic education** and indirectly, strengthening coordination.

Outcome 2- Education

- The government has **legally endorsed the textbook methodology** developed under the JP framework for the revision of textbooks.
- Experiences collected in the schools implementing extracurricular activities under the JP have been used by the **Bureau of Education to elaborate a manual** that is being disseminated in other parts of the country.
- **Spaces of coordination and dialogue within the education sector** have been reinforced through working groups, both at national and international level (WGs on education at national and local level; Donors WG).
- **Youth centres** were recurrently flagged out as best practices.
- Some informants report a moderate increase in the **interactions among students** (like socializing after schools) and an **increased interest of parents** to be involved in school issues.

Regarding Outcome 3 the JP is at an early stage of implementation of most activities and therefore, emerging impacts are still difficult to identify.

SUSTAINABILITY

Overall finding: Whereas the involvement of stakeholders in the design has positively contributed to a high level of sustainability of many outputs, the political climate of the country and the high polarization of the society put long-term sustainability of the impacts at risk. In this regard Outcome 3 emerges as the key for sustainability and needs to be further clarified and articulated.

[8] Selimi, N. "Commissions for Interethnic Relations in Municipalities of Macedonia (FYROM), CSSProject for integrative mediation. February 2008

> "This programme has given us the chance to review after many years some of our policies such as the textbooks methodology or the extracurricular activities and to expand others, such as LSBE, to further education cycles"

Sustainability of outputs is good

In-depth interviews carried out during the evaluation process confirmed **significant ownership by government officials and civil society organisations** (both at local and national level) of a number of JP outputs, which is a positive sign for a high prospect of sustainability.

It is likely that this finding has a direct link with the **high level of participation of national stakeholders in the formulation phase**. As one stakeholder told us "sustainability means that national stakeholders need to be involved in the design. We were there to make sure that the content of the project was relevant to the local context".

For example, the **legal endorsement** of the textbooks methodology, the **dissemination** of the extracurricular activities manual by the education authorities or the **development of a code of ethics** for journalists (still to be developed under outcome 3) were frequently mentioned as outputs that will outlive the JP. Other stakeholders from the national government reported that they were using the example of the CICRs action plans developed under the JP to encourage CICRs in other municipalities. These examples demonstrate a reasonable commitment and interest by the national institutions to continue, at least, some of the processes developed within the JP after its end.

Prospects of sustainability of outcomes

The long-term sustainability of the JP is very much based on the inspiration of strategic processes and systems, on the engagement of key actors and institutions and on the creation of a social constituency of support for inter-ethnic issues. This strategy is based on a series of target assumptions and risks, among which two are particularly critical to ensure the long-term sustainability of some project achievements: **political will** and **local capacity**.

Polarisation in the country is a major challenge

The unanimous opinion expressed during the in-depth interviews and group discussions was that the social and political polarization represents a major threat to the sustainability of any project tackling inter-ethnic issues in FYRoM. There was a widely shared perception that, in general, the political will towards these issues was more a result of the need to keep up appearances in front of the international community than a real political priority. Although this may also have to do with a certain generally embedded culture of mistrust and discredit of the political system, it raises some concern about the long-term sustainability of project achievements.

The JP has always taken into account this risk which was already made explicit in the project document. This being so, the JP design intentionally chose to take the focus away from the traditional political sphere to build social and institutional capacities and to widen the dialogue among more neutral actors (children, youth, education or institutions). Thus, it is implicitly expected that this will progressively set the basis for a stronger constituency of social support around inter-ethnic issues in the country and therefore create a social demand with the potential to gain some influence upon future political actions.

Strengthening capacities

The JP is also promoting a number of training activities at national and local levels aiming to strengthen local capacities on **inter-ethnic dialogue**, **consensus-building** and **dispute resolution**. Most informants interviewed agreed that those capacities will be the main legacy of the programme over the long term.

However, some stakeholders warned that enhancing capacities alone are not sufficient and that sustainability also requires an enabling political and institutional environment. For example they suggested that, although the Programme had supported the improvement of CICRs' capacity and functionality, if no action was taken to help them gain some political influence, their chances to survive after finalization of the programme would be jeopardized.

Two main conclusions:

First, during the first phase of implementation the programme has successfully put into operation some important "pieces" or units of the national system for conflict transformation. In order to better advance the outcome, in the next phase the JP needs to devote some attention to ensure that **linkages** between the different parts of the system are also put in place. This could be achieved by increasing its level of material support to the CICRs, designing an advocacy strategy or strategically bringing together the necessary key institutional actors at local and national level.

Secondly, the future sustainability of the JP depends on the strategic implementation of Outcome 3. If this outcome is to work as the "glue" that holds together the two other components, it needs to be **further articulated and clarified**. There is a widespread perception among stakeholders that at this point in time the programme needs to reach wider audiences and to gain social support; outcome 3 has an extraordinary potential to serve this goal.

As many respondents noted, a **communication and advocacy strategy** can help move things forward. So far, the programme has steadily started to build a critical mass around inter-ethnic issues, although this is happening rather organically, mainly based on spontaneous personal relationships (among students, teachers... etc) and would benefit from some strategic thinking. A careful identification of the target audiences and a creative use of the resources (and even some early results or best practices) of the JP to reach them, is therefore highly encouraged.

M&E

In the last months of 2010, the JP decided to revise its whole monitoring and evaluation framework in an unusual exercise that has provided the implementing team with a comprehensive framework of quality indicators to measure activities, processes and impacts[9] Choosing what to monitor and evaluate, and how to do it, can be a daunting task but is something that needs to be celebrated.

[9] When comparing output indicators we could see that the combination of impact versus activity and of quantitative versus qualitative indicators was quite uneven in the different outcomes. This requires particular attention and analysis when reporting so as to avoid comparative grievances/unbalances.

So far, reporting on the progress of the JP has followed a traditional accountability, activity-based focus with little analytical perspective. At present, this is not providing adequate information to show the real progress of the project in meeting its objectives.

The new M&E tool offers an extraordinary opportunity for the PMT to bring added value to their monitoring and reporting systems, and to evolve from a classic M&E framework to a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) paradigm. While M&E frameworks are generally used as a tool to measure results and provide accountability, a learning-oriented use of M&E can help to improve performance by feeding learning into the management and the decision-making cycles, to meet reporting requirements or to inform the programme's communication strategy.

However, the team must bear in mind that in order to be useful, and to capture the full impact of the Programme and stories of change, a MEL approach requires the enabling of the right environment and spaces for debates and joint reflection. It therefore needs both time and resources. Particular attention needs to be paid to monitoring the quality of outputs such as trainings, which in this programme are to a large extent delivered by the civil society organisations funded through the different grant schemes. Most importantly, rather than solely focusing on pieces of information (single indicators), further questions need to be systematically introduced into the monitoring system: why did it happen like this? What does it mean for us? What will be our next steps? So what?

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

The JP is relevant and aligned with main national priorities and the design of the programme brings an added value to the country. The internal logic of the design is in general terms good but Outcome 3 needs to be better clarified in order to serve its purpose of serving as the "glue" that brings the programme together.

Overall, the programme's pace of implementation and delivery is on track and delays have to a great extent been corrected. The implementation of the JP is facing some difficulties that are mostly attributed to weaknesses in management structure. The PMC is experiencing certain limitations and not functioning as the decision-making mechanism it should be and the strategic involvement of partners in the implementation is weak. One result of this is that the programme's potential to foster synergies among the different components and stakeholders has not been fully capitalised yet.

Despite the fact that it is difficult to identify early signs of potential impact in a programme which is explicitly geared towards long-term and intangible outcomes, most stakeholders perceive that some slight changes in behaviours are starting to be noticeable and that some processes were starting to be in place.

The political climate of the country and the high polarization of the society represent a major threat to the long-term sustainability of the any programme tackling inter-ethnic issues in FYRoM and a limitation that the JP and its stakeholders are well aware of. However, the significant ownership shown by government officials and civil society organisations (both at local and national level) of a number of JP outputs demonstrate a reasonable commitment and interest by the national

institutions and a positive sign for the sustainability of the main outputs of the programme. Outcome 3 emerges as the key for sustainability and needs to be further clarified and articulated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Design

To achieve its goal of reaching wider social audiences **Outcome 3 needs further clarification and articulation**. That will enable those broader processes that aim to create spaces for intercultural sensitivity and a stronger civic identity. The unanimous view of stakeholders is that a **communication and advocacy strategy** can be the way forward. We therefore recommend that this strategy is used to revisit some of the strategies under Outcome 3 and to articulate those in a way that leverage outcomes 1 and 2, increasing the overall vertical logic of the Programme.

Coordination

The programme needs to strengthen national and local stakeholders' information and involvement at the strategic level to fully leverage the JP design potential. This may entail the following actions:

- Opening up **regular spaces for information sharing and feedback among the JP** and its stakeholders. At national level one way to achieve this could be through the constitution of inclusive working groups or advisory boards on particular issues or implementation strategies.
- At local level we recommend that the JP considers the possibility of **appointing "focal points" in the three core municipalities**. This figure would be in charge of bringing a "joint vision" to the local scenario, promoting regular exchanges of information among the local stakeholders and devolving feedback to the implementation team.
- An **increased presence of the implementing team or the governing body** at the local level at critical and regular points in time is also suggested.
- A **strategic review and coordination** of the different grant schemes by the different agencies may be useful for, and indeed critical to, the escalation and sustainability of results

Governance

The governing mechanisms of the programme need to be seriously strengthened. Increased ownership at the strategic level is key for the sustainability of the Programme. At this point of time the identified limitations in the PMC mean that the JP is working without a functional joint mechanism in charge of regularly taking strategic decisions and inspiring synergies and to which the management team feels accountable.

We strongly recommend either a **restructuring of the composition of the PMC** or an alternative mechanism that, taking into account the local context, involves those key national/local stakeholders with a daily involvement and decision power.

Pace

We recommend that the programme undertakes a thorough **review of its monitoring and financial reporting** mechanisms and criteria. Clearing identified inconsistencies and reaching a consensus on the common criteria for the tracing of funds is highly recommended and necessary at this stage in

order to improve transparency and to comply with financial accountability requirements in the future.

Although most activities and outputs were reported on track it is suggested that taking into consideration the pace at which the programme is being delivered, and the prospects for completing all activities, particularly those under outcome 3 that have experienced some delay, the JP **re-evaluates the need for a non-cost extension** of its implementation period.

Sustainability

We recommend that the programme looks at **creative ways to reach out to the private sector** and mobilise private resources. The communication and advocacy strategy could be a good opportunity to do this.

In order to increase the prospects of sustainability of certain outputs the JP needs to pay further attention to ensuring that the linkages and interactions among the different elements of the system (people, structures, processes) are established. In particular, we recommend that the programme devotes some further effort to **strengthening the local-national link** through the promotion of joint activities, inclusive workshops or other alternatives mechanism that can ensure contact and exchanges between the local and national levels of implementation.

JP “Enhancing inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FRYoM”
Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators

	Sub-outputs	**Status**	
OUTPUT 1.1: Key national and local institutions in 3 micro-regions dealing with inter-ethnic relations have a system to address issues that may weaken inter-ethnic cohesion. (*UNDP)*	Mapping of existing capacities and capacity gaps of central and local level institutions for confidence and inter-ethnic cohesion building.	Done	
	Initiating consensus-building dialogue at local and national level for establishing comprehensive systems of confidence and inter-ethnic cohesion building. (UNDP)	On track	
	Establishing systemic coordination of facilitation expertise to support confidence and inter-ethnic cohesion building system institutions and procedures.	On track	
	Supporting the establishment of M&E functions within national system for confidence and inter-ethnic cohesion building.	On track	
	Development of training to strengthen capacity and enhance functions for dialogue consensus building and dispute resolution of existing bodies-	On track	
	Indicators	**Progress reported**	
	Assessment of National and Local Capacities for strengthening inter-ethnic dialogue and collaboration completed	yes	100%
	% of 45 recommendations of the Assessment of national and local capacities addressed through at least one activity of the Joint Programme	6% (target 30%)	20%
	No. of national and local institutions that endorse coordination and communication protocol dealing with inter-ethnic relations	0	0%
	Development of training to strengthen capacity and enhance functions for dialogue, consensus building and dispute resolution (training curricula developed: 1 point, 6 training sessions delivered for 60 participants: 1 point, How-To Guide produced: 1 point)	2 (target 3)	66%
	Progress towards establishing an M&E system for inter-ethnic relations (methodology for monitoring and evaluating drafted: 1 point, M&E officers trained in methodology: 1 point, M&E officers produce first monitoring report: 1 point)	2 (target 3)	66%

Activities on track: 100%
Average progress (over indicators): 50,4%

JP “Enhancing inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FRYoM”
Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators

OUTPUT 1.2.: Key national and local institutions dealing with inter-ethnic relations have access to a pool of facilitation experts and resources *(UNDP)*	**Sub-outputs**	**Status**	
	Strengthening capacity of ZELS/XXXX to coordinate facilitation expertise.	On Track	
	Identification of experts and conducting advanced training.	On track	
	Indicators	**Progress reported**	
	Establishment of a pool of facilitation experts (institution that manages pool contracted: 1 point, experts in pool trained: 1 point, awareness campaign completed: 1 point)	0 (target 3)	0%
	No. of times key national and local institutions call upon pool of facilitation expertise	0 (target 20)	0%

Activities on track: 100%
Average progress (over indicators): 0%

JP "Enhancing inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FRYoM"
Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators

	Sub-outputs	**Status**	
OUTPUT 1.3.: Local governments and community organizations have better opportunities to collaborate in 3 micro-regions *(UNDP)*	Facilitating dialogue on conflict-sensitive development at local and micro-regional levels, involving relevant stakeholders.	On track	
	Facilitate development of Inter-Municipal Cooperation agreements among municipalities in micro-regions on conflict-sensitive and inclusive economic development plans.	On track	
	Creating links among local bodies for inter-ethnic relations, including inter-community relation committees, school boards, religious leadership and student organizations.	On track	
	Organizing a Grant Scheme with incentives for Improvement of inter-ethnic relations	On track	
	Enhancing capacity of municipalities to take up decentralized responsabilities on managing local culture and cultural diversity.	On track	
	Indicators	**Progress reported**	
	No. of fora on conflict-sensitive development, study tours and training of municipality stakeholders conducted (2008: 0, 2010: 2, 2012: 10)	3 (target 10)	30%
	No. of Inter-Municipal Cooperation Agreements that facilitate interethnic collaboration among ethnically diverse municipalities signed within 3 micro-regions	3 (target 3)	100%
	No of cases of successful collaboration between civil society organizations and local self-government units that work to improve interethnic collaboration and dialogue that are result of Grant Scheme project activities	8 (target 12)	67%

Activities on track: 100%
Average progress (over indicators):66%

JP "Enhancing inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FRYoM"
Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators

	Sub-outputs	**Status**	
OUTPUT 2.1.: Understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity incorporated in the national education policies *(UNICEF)*	Strengthen capacity of the MoES and its related institutions for incorporating contents related understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity in the secondary education curricula.	On track	
	Create capacity within the existing in-service teacher training system for enforcement of understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity in both primary and secondary education schools	On track	
	Support the Pedagogical Service in the BED (MoES) for introducing and applying criteria related to multiculturalism, understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity in textbooks development and accreditation	On track	
	Support the Department for Advancement of the Education of Minorities in building their capacity to develop policies and programmes for communication and dispute resolution	On track	
	Indicators	**Progress reported**	
	Life Skills Based Education curriculum for secondary education developed (2008: no, 2010: no, 2012: yes)	no (target yes)	0%
	No. of primary education teachers trained by 20 Bureau for Development of Education advisors in Life Skills Based Education (2008: 750, 2010: 1,070)	750 (target 1070)	70%
	No. of secondary education teachers trained by 20 Bureau for Development of Education advisors in Life-Skills Based Education (2008: 0, 2012: 300)	0 (target 300)	0%
	No. of revised text books per grade following the new criteria to promote multiculturalism and inter-ethnic relations	0 (target 13)	0%

Activities on track: 100%
Average progress (over indicators): 17,5%

JP “Enhancing inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FRYoM”
Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators

OUTPUT 2.2: Mechanisms for democratic participation, good governance and conflict resolution in the education sector strengthened in 3 micro-regions *(UNICEF)*	**Sub-outputs**	**Status**	
	Strengthen capacity (mandate, statute, working protocols, election criteria) of existing governance bodies and structures at schools level (school boards, parents’ councils, students’ organization)	On track	
	Support establishment of communication and coordination mechanism between school boards and municipal bodies (councils and inter-ethnic committees) and national structures (MoES, BED) for increased democratic participation and dispute resolution	On track	
	Indicators	**Progress reported**	
	Training of students, teachers and parents to strengthen the existing school capacities and structures for democratic participation, governance and dispute resolution (training curricula developed: 1 point, 1000 participants trained: 1 point)	2 (target 2)	100%
	No. of municipality council and inter-ethnic commission meeting attended by school representatives in 3 selected municipalities, 2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 10)	0 (target 10)	0%
	No. of schools in 3 selected municipalities that adopt statute, mandate and working protocols for schools (school boards, school communities, parents' councils, student organizations) bodies in a democratic and participatory manner	0 (target 12)	0%
	No. of decisions taken by school boards in 3 selected municipalities that pilot taking decisions of the school board upon initiatives from students and parent bodies (2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 10)	5 (target 10)	50%

Activities on track: 100%
Average progress (over indicators): 37,5%

JP "Enhancing inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FRYoM"
Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators

	Sub-outputs	**Status**	
OUTPUT 2.3.: Children and youth have opportunities for interaction and dialogue in school and the community *(UNICEF/UNESCO)*	Joint curricular activities in mixed schools (e.g. on subjects such as IT, physical education, civic education, foreign languages) and extracurricular activities (e.g. sport activities, school events, school camps) organized	On track	
	Support the functioning of community-based youth centers	On track	
	Promote intercultural dialogue and multiple partnerships through higher education structures (e.g. student clubs, university chairs)	On track	
	Indicators	**Progress reported**	
	No. of joint curricular and extracurricular activities for ethnically mixed groups (2008: 0, 2010: 125, 2012: 400)	135 UNICEF, 15 UNESCO (target 400)	37%
	No. of children and youth that complete a course in 3 inter-ethnic community based centres	669 (target 2500)	26%
	A university set up a centre of excellence in intercultural and peace studies (established: 1 point; needs assessment report with recommendations published: 1 point, at least 5 studies published: 1 point, recommendations published from conference on the role of higher education and the strategy for integrated education: 1 point, curriculum developed for inter-cultural communication and conflict resolution developed: 1 point)	1 (target 5)	20%
	No. of youth clubs that implement activities that promote inter-ethnic dialogue among university students	4 (target 5)	80%
	World Heritage in Young Hands programme piloted in Associated Schools Project Network schools as elective course or extra-curricular activity	No (target yes)	0%

Activities on track: 100%
Average progress (over indicators): 32,6%

JP "Enhancing inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FRYoM"
Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators

	Sub-outputs	**Status**	
OUTPUT 3.1.: Local and religious leaders and civil society are better able to participate in dispute resolution processes *(UNDP/UNESCO)*	Identification of local leaders and facilitation of local civic dialogue on topical issues.	Done	
	Leadership and communication skills training of local leaders (youth, religious, political, social, etc...)	Done	
	Support for the establishment of public dialogue opportunities on topics relevant to intercultural and ineterreligious dialogue .	On track	
	Indicators	**Progress reported**	
	Nr. of participants (local and religious leaders and civil society representatives) at leadership, communication skills, mediation, gender training in three municipalities (2008: 0, 2010: 90, 2012: 200)	90 (target 200)	45%
	% of participants at leadership, communication skills, mediation, gender training that are women (2008: n/a, 2010:?, 2012: 35%)	30% (target 35%)	86%
	% of participants at leadership, communication skills, mediation, gender training who are from local non-majority groups (2008: n/a, 2010: ?%, 2012: 35 %)	35% (target 35%)	100%
	Nr. of events which raise awareness on inter-cultural and inter-religious sensitivity (conferences, forums, round tables, community events, knowledge cafes)	12 UNDP, 15 UNESCO (target 35)	77%

Activities on track: 100%
Average progress (over indicators): 77%

JP “Enhancing inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FRYoM”
Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators

OUTPUT 3.2.: Journalists supported to practice culturally and conflict sensitive reporting *(UNDP/UNESCO)*	**Sub-outputs**	**Status**	
	Formal and informal education of reporters, editors and media owners on the aspects of the conflict-sensitive reporting	On track	
	Facilitating a “Community of Interests” among opinion-makers nation-wide on providing conflict-mitigating perspectives.	On track (not started)	
	Indicators	**Progress reported**	
	Nr. of participants (practicing journalist, students of journalism, related staff) at culturally and conflict sensitive media education events (2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 300)	30 (target 300)	10%
	Progress towards a higher education programme on conflict sensitive reporting in School of Journalism (curriculum developed: 1, all planned resources developed: 1 point, programme accredited: 1 point)	0 (target 3)	0%

Activities on track: 100%
Average progress (over indicators): 5%

JP “Enhancing inter-ethnic community dialogue and collaboration in FRYoM”
Progress of activities versus achievement of indicators

	Sub-outputs	**Status**	
OUTPUT 3.3.: Media support mechanism (expertise, monitoring, tools) established for reducing social tensions *(UNDP/UNESCO)*	Setting up of an online resource, connected to the Pool of Facilitation Expertise housed in ZELS, with the aim of making a positive contribution to debates on sensitive multicultural and multireligious issues	On track	
	Support to local media in developing and broadcasting social content programmes and public service announcements that promote harmony and peaceful settlements of disputes.	On track	
	Indicators	**Progress reported**	
	Nr. of TV/radio/news programmes hours produced to reduce social tension (2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 20)	0 (target 20)	0%
	Progress towards setting up a Media Rapid Response Mechanism (contract signed with School of Journalism: 1 point, structure of MRRM designed: 1 point, quarterly media monitoring reports started: 1 point, panel of experts established: 1 point, website online: 1 point)	1 (target 5)	20%
	Hits per month on Media Rapid Response Mechanism website (proxy for level of usage & quality) (2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 10,000)	0 (target 10.000)	0%

Activities on track: 100%
Average progress (over indicators): 6,6%

EVALUATION OF THE JP "ENHANCING INTER-ETHNIC COMMUNITY DIALOGUE AND COLLABORATION IN FYRoM"

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- **"Age-Contact-Perceptions: How Schools Shape Relations between Ethnicities".** OSCE. January 2010
- **Analytical Report,** for the Opinion on the application from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for EU membership (2005)
- **Annual work plan 2010 Y1Q4**. Work Plan for: Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration. Period: Year 1 Quarter 4,
- **Annual work plan 2010 - Y1Q3.** Work Plan for: Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration Period: Year 1 Quarter 3,
- **Budget allocation at concept note stage.** 19 May 2008
- Concept Note: Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration in FYR Macedonia19 May 2008
- **Conclusions on the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** (extract from the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament "Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2009-2010", COM(2009)533 final)
- **Color coded AWP year I** (Reporting on 01 January to 31 March)
- **UNICEF and OSCE Consolidated list of the representatives of the donor organisations** (internal document)
- **Minutes of the coordination meeting with donor organizations in the area of multiculturalism and inter-ethnic cooperation in schools.** 16 April 2010
- **Draft Law for Amendment of Law on Textbooks for Primary and Secondary Education**. (Extract). 22.02.2011
- **Draft Minutes, Meeting of Programme Management Committee**, 25 November 09
- **Draft Resume - Priorities pointed out on the coordination meeting of the Ministry of Education and Science with the Donor Community.** 15 February 2011**.**
- **Draft Terms of Reference for the Programme Management Committee**
- **JP Annual Workplan Year II.** Quarterly update to AWP
- **Signed Joint Programme "Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration**". 29 June 2009
- **Final M&E framework**
- **JP Mailing Lists and Individual Contact Info**
- **JP Monitoring Report Conflict Prevention and Peace Building Window, Reporting Period**: August 2009-December 2009
- **JP Monitoring Report Conflict Prevention and Peace Building Window, Reporting Period**: January-June 2010
- **JP Monitoring Report Conflict Prevention and Peace Building Window, Reporting Period**: July-December 2010
- **JP Annual Work Plan (Year II)**
- **Interoffice Memorandum.** 14 May 2009
- **Local Sustainable Development Strategy and Action Plan for the Municipality of Kumanovo.** September 2006

- **MDG-F Advocacy & Communications Strategy**
- **MDG-F Mission Report and Agenda, February 1-18, 2010**
- **Minutes of the meeting of the Commission for Inter-Community Relations (CICR) under the Council of the municipality of Kumanovo**. 28 December 2010 and 5 January 2011
- **Minutes of meeting of Donor community and Goverment of FYRoM on Curricula and textbooks**. 14 October 2010
- **Minutes of the donors meeting.** 22 November 2010
- **Minutes, Meeting of Heads of Implementing Agencies.** 1 April 2010
- **Minutes, Meeting of Heads of Implementing Agencies,** 24 May 2010
- **Minutes Meeting of Heads of Implementing Agencies & PMT,** 16 July 2010
- **Minutes of Meeting IE Strategy with MoES**
- **Minutes of the meeting with the Macedonian institutions for organizing of the donor conference for the Strategy for Integrated Education**, Skopje, 05.01.2011
- **Minutes Meeting of Programme Management Committee**
- **Minutes of meeting Teacher's Qualifications**, Skopje, 20 December 2010
- **Minutes, Meeting of UN Heads of Implementing Agencies**
- **Minutes of meeting Thematic Strand**, Skopje 24 January 2011
- **Monitoring Indicators Tracksheet**
- **Monitoring Indicators Tracksheet (amended)**
- **Multicultural Workshops, Evaluation of the Impacts of the Programme**
- **Multi-donor Evaluation of Support to Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activity in Southern Sudan since 2005,** World Food Programme Evaluation Reports
- **People-Centered Analysis Report, Quality of Social Services.** UNDP and SEEU. April 2010
- **Planning for Year 2,** PMC Presentation 22 July 2010
- **Policy Promoting Peace and Security through Development Cooperation**
- **Programme results,** PMC Presentation 22 July, 2010
- **Programme Overview**, PMC Presentation 22 July, 2010
- **Report on the FYR Macedonia**, European commission against racism and intolerance. 4th monitoring cycle. 28 April 2010
- **Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Asma Jahangir,** Mission to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Human Rights Council, A/HRC/13/40/Add.2. 28 December 2009
- **Report on the Progress towards the Millenium Development Goals.** Government of the Republic of Macedonia, June 2009
- **Results Report to Programme Management Committee,** December 2009 – June 2010
- **Results Report to National Steering Committee**. December 2009 – June 2010
- **Revised Standard Joint Programme Document**
- **Selimi, N. "Commissions for Interethnic Relations in Municipalities of Macedonia (FYROM),** CSSProject for integrative mediation. February 2008
- **Strategic Plan for Local Economic Development of the Municipality of Kicevo- Mar-05**
- **Submitted concept note,** UNDP Spain MDG Achievement Fund. (image)
- **The FYR Macedonia 2009 progress report**, communication from the Commission

to the European Parliament and the Council enlargement strategy and main challenges 2009-2010 {com(2009) 533}

- **Table 1: UNDAF Result Based Matrix FYR Macedonia (2005-2009)**
- **Table 2: UNDAF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for FYR Macedonia (2005-2009)**
- **Table 4: Monitoring and evaluation Calendar for the UNDAF of the Macedonia**
- **Table of activates of the donor organizations in the area of inter-ethnic education**
- **Thematic indicators for the conflict prevention and peace building window,** indicators template
- **Working group Education, Youth and Sport**
- **UNICEF and OSCE Consolidated list of the representatives of the donor organisations**
- **UNDAF for FYR Macedonia** 2010-2014
- **UNDP/Spain Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund**
- **UN Joint Programme, "Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration"**

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Levels of Analysis	Evaluation questions	Data sources	Methodology
Design	Is the logic of the intervention sound and clear? Does it address relevant causes of conflicts, key dynamics and driving factors, or key driving constituencies of the problem?	JP team; Key stakeholders; JP Documents; Bird's eyes viewers	Desk review; in-depth interviews; briefing workshop
	To what extent do the intervention objectives and strategies of the Joint Programme respond to national and regional plans and priorities?	JP Documents; JP team; Partners; Bird's eyes viewers	Desk review; in-depth interviews; focus groups
	To what extent have the country’s national and local authorities and social agents been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the development intervention?	JP Documents; JP team; Partners; Bird's eyes viewers	Desk review; in-depth interviews; focus groups
	Are contextual conditions (both opportunities and barriers) accounted for and actions envisaged, to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural background? Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women and men in the areas of intervention?	Management; Key stakeholders; JP Documents	Desk review; in-depth interviews; briefing/debriefing workshops
Implementation Process	To what extent and in what ways have the target population and participants made the Programme their own, taking an active role in it? To what extent have public/private national resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the Programme’s objective and produce results and impact?	Partners; JP Team	In-depth interviews; focus group interviews; direct observation
	To what extent and how efficiently are the participating agencies coordinating with each other, with the government and with civil society? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation and the achievement of results?	JP Team; Key stakeholders	Briefing/debriefing workshops; in-depth interviews
	How do the different components of the Joint Programme interrelate?	JP Documents; M&E Reports; JP Team; Partners	Desk review; in-depth interviews

	Is the pace of implementation ensuring the completeness of the results of the JP? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes?	JP Team; M&E reports	Desk review; in-depth interviews
Results trends	Is the Programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results?	JP Team; M&E reports; partners	Desk review; in-depth interviews
	Is the Programme providing coverage to beneficiaries as planned?	JP Team; partners/beneficiaries	In-depth interviews
	To what extent and in what way has the Programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving and readjustments?	JP Team; key stakeholders	In-depth interviews; direct observation
	What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?	JP Team; partners; beneficiaries	In-depth interviews
Sustainability	Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions? Do those institutions show technical and financial capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme beyond its existence?	Partners; JP Team; Bird's Eyes Viewers; policy documents	Desk review; briefing/debriefing workshops; in-depth interviews
	To what extent are the visions and actions of the partners consistent or divergent with regard to the joint programme?	Partners; JP Team	In depth interviews
	In what ways can the governance of the joint programme be improved so that it has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability?	JP Team; Key stakeholders	In-depth interviews
M&E	Are the follow-up indicators and mechanisms to measure progress in the achievement of envisaged results and quality of the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme?	JP Team; Key stakeholders	Briefing/debriefing workshops; in-depth interviews
	What changes have been observed as a result of the intervention? Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified?	JP team; partners; M&E reports	Desk review; in-depth interviews; focus group interviews