Serbia

Mid-Term Evaluation

Thematic window: Development and the Private Sector

Programme Title: Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development

c) File for the 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.

Evaluation Recommendation No. 1 Beneficiaries. The PIU should prepare an assessment of intended JP beneficiaries, making use of existing material and a current assessment process and present a beneficiary analysis to the PMC for signing off.						
Response from the Joint Programme Management **Prepare a beneficiary report (analysis) for PMC.**						
Key actions	**Time frame**	**Person responsible**	**Follow-up**		**Secretariat**	
1.1 Methodology and scope of the assessment defined	End October 2011	Project officers & JPM	**Comments**	**Status** In progress	**Comments**	**Status**
1.2 Compilation and analysis of data	End November 2011	Project officers & JPM		Delayed		
1.3 Presentation to PMC	The first PMC meeting in 2012	JPM				
Evaluation Recommendation No. 2 PMC Composition and Meetings. Agencies and national partners indicate to the PMC who their formal representative is, as well as indicating that the representative has decision-making authority. These representatives, or their formal delegates, should be present at each PMC meeting.						
Response from the Joint Programme Management **PMC membership list updated and confirmed.**						
Key actions	**Time frame**	**Person responsible**	**Follow-up**		**Secretariat**	
2.1 Request for an update	07.10.2011	JPM	**Comments**	**Status**	**Comments**	**Status**
2.2 Formal answers received	14.10.2011	UN Back-stoppers & National partners' representatives		Done		
2.3 Presentation to PMC	21.10.2011	JPM		Done		
Evaluation Recommendation No. 3 Results Focus. With regards to all field activities, but particularly capacity building initiatives and the grant activities, *focus on outcomes* must be maintained within the PIU. • Capacity strengthening activities should focus on outcomes - not an input-						

focus where numbers of training sessions and participants is used to judge 'success'. • The Joint Fund must focus on the result (*enhancing tourism governance towards better linked and organised tourism and support industries where capacity is improved for delivering services*) not on the grants, which are simply an input – a tool.						
Response from the Joint Programme Management **Ensure that the PIU members maintain their focus throughout the project activities bearing in mind measurable, results - oriented reporting and actual change achieved.**						
Key actions	**Time frame**	**Person responsible**	**Follow-up**		**Secretariat**	
3.1 Regular PIU meetings on reporting	To the projects' end	JPM	**Comments**	**Status** Being done	**Comments**	**Status**
3.2 Institute follow-up mechanisms (survey, feedback...etc)referring to usefulness and application of the knowledge acquired through training	End March 2012	Project officers & JPM		In progress		
3.3 Collect data from grantees	May 2012	Independent local expert		In progress		
Evaluation Recommendation No. 4 **No-cost Extension**. It is recommended that a no-cost extension be given in order to: • More effectively deliver the Joint Fund. • Better understand to *effect*, i.e. result of Joint Fund activities. • Ensure the grant components intended in year two are *well conceived, have appropriate implementation time* in the field and are *able to be assessed against their intended outputs and outcomes*.						
Response from the Joint Programme Management **Proposal for no-cost extension submitted.**						
Key actions	**Time frame**	**Person responsible**	**Follow-up**		**Secretariat**	
1.1 Consultations with UN agencies, National partners and RCO	October 2011	JPM	**Comments**	**Status** Done	**Comments**	**Status**
1.2 Preparation of the proposal	Mid-November 2011	Project Officers, back-stoppers & JPM		Completed on 16.01.2012		
1.3 Approval by MDG-f Secretariat	?	?				
Evaluation Recommendation No. 5 **Grants Program**. The JP would benefit, logistically and in terms of outcomes, from running the Joint Fund's grants as a single initiative, in coordination with the financial initiatives of national partners. There are significant positives in delivering a process that represents a Joint Fund, with a single Call for Proposals, against a single set of requirements to be assessed by a single group of assessors.						

The intent and priorities of individual Agencies can be maintained as sub-components of the Call. The process would be more transparent, more efficient and would generate less confusion in the field.							
Response from the Joint Programme Management **Joint Call for Proposals is issued jointly.**							
Key actions	**Time frame**	**Person responsible**	**Follow-up**		**Secretariat**		
			Comments	**Status**	**Comments**	**Status**	
2.1 Issuance of the call	25.08.2011	JPM					
2.2				Done			
2.3							
Evaluation Recommendation No. 6 **Output 2.1.3 Product Development**. The JP should re-focus activities on local tourism stakeholders actively participating in product development discussions and are active stakeholders in RTMP implementation.							
Response from the Joint Programme Management **Ensuring stakeholders' active participation through already established and newly created mechanisms.**							
Key actions	**Time frame**	**Person responsible**	**Follow-up**		**Secretariat**		
			Comments	**Status**	**Comments**	**Status**	
3.1 Create & implement appropriate mechanisms	To the projects' end	Project officers		In progress			
3.2							
3.3							
Evaluation Recommendation No. 7 **Output 1.3.4. – Investment Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy**. Programme management needs to ensure the responsible agency undertakes this activity as a way of ensuring that lessons learned from public tourism investments are understood and are able to be incorporated.							
Response from the Joint Programme Management **Prepare public tourism investment analysis**							
Key actions	**Time frame**	**Person responsible**	**Follow-up**		**Secretariat**		
			Comments	**Status**	**Comments**	**Status**	
1.1 Employing an expert	Mid-November 2011	UNDP Project Officer & JPM		Done			
1.2 Completing a study	Mid-March 2012	UNDP Project Officer & JPM		In progress			
1.3 Implementation of conclusions	Beginning of June 2012	MoERD Sector for Tourism					
Evaluation Recommendation No. 8 **Quality Assessment of Capacity Building Activities**. It is recommended that the JP engage in a qualitative assessment of the JP's capacity building program (across all areas of activity) with a view to ensuring the anticipated quality of outcomes are being achieved.							
Response from the Joint Programme Management **Assess the impact of capacity building activities.**							

Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
			Comments	**Status**	**Comments**	**Status**
2.1 Agree responsibilities, design methodology and perform assessment	End January 2012	Independent evaluator				
2.2 Presenting results	February 2012	Project Officers & JPM		In progress		
2.3 Final evaluation of the Assessment, analysis of the achievements and improvements, evaluation of the stakeholders' capacity level increase(production of case studies)	March 2012	MoERD Sector for Tourism				

Evaluation Recommendation No. 9	
Grant Scheme Outcomes and Lessons Learned. The JP needs to ensure there is an appropriate assessment of the outcomes and lessons learned from the grant schemes – recommendations that will assist in the future, particularly donor organisations and the GOS, to ensure the priority areas of donation and the priority types of activities are most useful to anticipated outcomes.	
Response from the Joint Programme Management **Perform reviews for Gran Schemes 2010 and 2011**	

Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
			Comments	**Status**	**Comments**	**Status**
3.1 Performing reviews at the end of grant cycle	The end of each cycle	Respective Project Officers & back-stoppers		2010 done		
3.2 Compilation and presentation of the results	Upon completing reviews	JPM		In progress		
3.3						

Evaluation Recommendation No. 10	
Leveraging JP Results As An Advocacy Strategy. It is recommended that the advocacy and communication strategy give particular attention in the coming 12 months to using the JP to leverage increased MDG results, and citizen engagement it its activities, per the MDG-F Advocacy strategy	
Response from the Joint Programme Management **Use evaluation and beneficiary analysis findings in future advocacy and communication campaigns.**	

Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
			Comments	**Status**	**Comments**	**Status**
1.1 Organize promotional & communication events	To the projects' end	JPM & RCO		Being done		
1.2 Disseminate results and recommendations	To the projects'	JPM & RCO		In progress		

	end						
1.3							

Evaluation Recommendation No. 11				
Follow-up Programme. A follow-up programme should be considered to sustain the development. This is particularly relevant in relation to Outcome 2.				
Response from the Joint Programme Management **A follow-up programme developed through consultations with all relevant stakeholders and submitted to potential donors.**				

Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
			Comments	**Status**	**Comments**	**Status**
1.1 Consultations with stakeholders	October & November 2011	JPM & RCO		In progress		
1.2 Concept paper prepared	December 2011	JPM & RCO		In progress –first draft completed		
1.3 Follow-up programme developed and approved		JPM, RCO & PMC				

Updated: 01.02.2012

By: Karlo Puskarica