

## **FYR of Macedonia**

### **Improvement Plan**

**Thematic window: Conflict Prevention and Peace Building**

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

## Joint Programme Improvement Plan

After the interim evaluation is complete, the phase of incorporating its recommendations shall begin. This file is to be used as the basis for establishing an improvement plan for the joint programme, which will bring together all the recommendations, actions to be carried out by programme management.

| <p><b><u>Evaluation Recommendation No. 1</u></b></p> <p><b>Design:</b><br/> <b>Outcome 3 needs further clarification and articulation.</b><br/>           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 <b>communication and advocacy strategy</b> 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.</p> |  |  |           |        |             |        |
|--|--|--|-----------|--------|-------------|--------|
| <p><b><u>Response from the Joint Programme Management</u></b></p> <p><i>The JP deems the strategic orientation of Outcome 3 to be appropriate and therefore not requiring further clarification and articulation. The phasing of the Programme's delivery foresaw the implementation of Outcome 3 over the second half of the programme.</i><br/> <i>The Communication and advocacy strategy for the JP is currently being developed and operationalised.</i></p>  |  |  |           |        |             |        |
| Key actions  | Time frame                             | Person responsible   | Follow-up |        | Secretariat |        |
| 1.1 strategic review of Outcome 3 with a focus on the coordination of activities across agencies and a strong link to the outcomes under outcome 1 and 2.  | June 2011                              | Project managers of UNDP & UNESCO (with possible contribution from UNICEF) | Comments  | Status | Comments    | Status |
| 1.2 Communication and advocacy strategy of JP developed and operationalised  | June 2011, to the end of the programme | UN Communications Officer and PMT  |           |        |             |        |

## Evaluation Recommendation No. 2

### **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

### **Response from the Joint Programme Management**

*Many coordination initiatives have been put in place to ensure optimal coordination – however, the JP recognises that these processes can always be improved and considers that the recommendations provided by the evaluation may have validity.*

*The JP notes that there are programme focal points in the 3 focus municipalities.*

| Key actions   | Time frame                         | Person responsible               | Follow-up |        | Secretariat |        |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------|--------|
|   |                                    |                                  | Comments  | Status | Comments    | Status |
| 2.1<br><i>PMT + forum to be organised to comprise the PMT members and key implementation stakeholders (can be thematic and organised by implementing agencies on a rotational basis).</i> | <i>To the end of the programme</i> | <i>PMT</i>                       |           |        |             |        |
| 2.2 Grant scheme review   | <i>June-September</i>              | <i>PMT / national consultant</i> |           |        |             |        |
| 2.3. Organization   | <i>Bi-annual /</i>                 | <i>Programme</i>                 |           |        |             |        |

| <i>of mini/local PMCs in the target municipalities with key local stakeholders and key relevant national counterparts.</i>   | <i>q'ly to the end of the programme</i> | <i>Coordinator / PMT</i>        |                  |               |                    |               |
|--|---|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|
| <p><b>Evaluation Recommendation No. 3</b></p> <p><b>Governance</b><br/> 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.<br/> We strongly recommend either a <b>restructuring of the composition of the PMC</b> or an alternative mechanism that, taking into account the local context, involves those key national/local stakeholders with a daily involvement and decision power.</p> |   |                                 |                  |               |                    |               |
| <p><b>Response from the Joint Programme Management</b></p> <p><i>The JP recognises the deficiencies of the current PMC modus operandi. It must however be recognised that the Programme is being implemented at all stages in cooperation with and in support of national institutions and actors – which was duly praised by the evaluation. The programme team is using various mechanisms at different levels to ensure the highest level of national ownership and programme sustainability. The possibility of the UN being in a position to change the PMC's structure and modus operandi is limited, however the JP will explore this possibility.</i></p>  |   |                                 |                  |               |                    |               |
| <b>Key actions</b>   | <b>Time frame</b>                       | <b>Person responsible</b>       | <b>Follow-up</b> |               | <b>Secretariat</b> |               |
| <i>3.1 Increased high-level engagement from an overall programme perspective</i>   | <i>To the end of the programme</i>      | <i>RC and Heads of Agencies</i> | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Status</b> | <b>Comments</b>    | <b>Status</b> |
| <i>3.2 PMT + meetings (see 2.1.)</i>   | <i>To the end of the programme</i>      | <i>PMT</i>                      |                  |               |                    |               |
| <i>3.3 Enhanced engagement of PMC members by the Coordinator and</i>   | <i>To the end of the programme</i>      | <i>PMT</i>                      |                  |               |                    |               |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| direct UN Agency counterpart in preparation for substantive PMC meetings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |                        |                             |                  |               |                    |               |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|
| <b>Evaluation Recommendation No. 4</b>   |                        |                             |                  |               |                    |               |
| <p><b>Pace</b></p> <p>We recommend that the programme undertakes a thorough <b>review of its monitoring and financial reporting</b> 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.</p> <p>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 <b>reevaluates the need for a non-cost extension</b> of its implementation period.</p> |                        |                             |                  |               |                    |               |
| <p><b>Response from the Joint Programme Management</b></p> <p><i>The JP points to the focused work of the programme to strengthen the M&amp;E framework and to put in place a strong M&amp;E system for the programme.</i></p> <p><i>The process for developing the AWP Y3 will determine the need for a non-cost extension.</i></p>   |                        |                             |                  |               |                    |               |
| <b>Key actions</b>   | <b>Time frame</b>      | <b>Person responsible</b>   | <b>Follow-up</b> |               | <b>Secretariat</b> |               |
| 4.1 Continue to operationalise a functional M&E system   | To end of Programme    | PMT / Programme Coordinator | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Status</b> | <b>Comments</b>    | <b>Status</b> |
| 4.2 Determine need to no cost extension  | AWP Y3 planning cycle. | PMT / HoAs                  |                  |               |                    |               |
|  |                        |                             |                  |               |                    |               |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Evaluation Recommendation No. 5</b>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Sustainability:</b></p> <p>Recommend that the programme looks at <b>creative ways to reach out to the private sector</b> and mobilise private resources.</p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| <p>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 <b>strengthening the local-national link</b> 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.</p>  |  |                                     |                                |           |        |             |        |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------|--------|
| <p><b>Response from the Joint Programme Management</b></p> <p><i>The JP notes that many of the outcomes at local level (3 micro-regions) are intended for scaling up / replication by national authorities in the focus municipality and in other municipalities. The JP has already begun a discussion with government counterparts on “scaling-up” activities. With early parliamentary elections now over, the JP and the government will develop a sustainability plan.</i></p> <p><i>Concerning work with the private sector, the JP follows a two-pronged approach: private sector engagement and private sector development. To date, effort has largely been on engaging the private sector (consultation, planning, and implementation). For example, the programme has engaged business leaders in many of its activities. It will soon conduct a second annual business forum focussed on the role of the private sector in enhancing inter-ethnic relations. In Year 3, the JP will focus more on private sector development through the media, including the development of inclusive media products by the for-profit media sector.</i></p> |  |                                     |                                |           |        |             |        |
| Key actions   |  | Time frame                          | Person responsible             | Follow-up |        | Secretariat |        |
|   |  |                                     |                                | Comments  | Status | Comments    | Status |
| <p>5.1 Sustainability plan embedded across the programme (eg. UNDP’s “scaling-up plan” and UNICEF’s support to the three local municipalities to develop a strategy with action plan for sustainability and scaling up of activities within schools.)</p>   |  | <p>Continue to end of Programme</p> | <p>PMT</p>                     |           |        |             |        |
| <p>5.2. Organization of mini/local (see</p>   |  | <p>Bi-annual / q’ly to the</p>      | <p>Programme Coordinator /</p> |           |        |             |        |

|       |                                 |            |  |  |  |  |
|-------|---------------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| 2.3.) | <i>end of the<br/>programme</i> | <i>PMT</i> |  |  |  |  |
|-------|---------------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|