MDG ACHIEVEMENT FUND

Serbia

Mid-Term Evaluation

Thematic window: Development and the Private Sector

Programme Title: Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development

Author: Jim Newkirk, 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

Millennium Development Goals – Achievement Fund
Mid-term Evaluation
Joint Programme on Development and the Private Sector
Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development – Republic of Serbia

Jim Newkirk
jimnewkirk53@gmail.com
+38160 747 8899

29 July 2011

Preface

This evaluation relates to the Joint Programme funded by the Millennium Development Goals Foundations being implemented by FAO, UNEP, UNDP (the administrative agent of the JP), UNWTO and UNICEF, in partnership with the Serbian Government's Ministry of the Economy and Regional Development (MERD) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Trade, Forestry and Water Management (MATFWM), together with the Tourism Organisation of Serbia (TOS).

The evaluation was undertaken by Jim Newkirk during June and July of 2011.

Table of contents

1 Executive summary i
1.1 The MDG-F i
1.2 The Joint Programme Under Review i
1.3 The Object Of Study Of This Evaluation i
1.4 Evaluation Approach And Methods ii
1.5 Principle Findings and Conclusions ii
1.5.1 The JP and UNDAF ii
1.5.2 The JP and Government Strategies ii
1.5.3 The JP and MDGs ii
1.5.4 Summary of Findings - Design Relevance iii
1.5.5 Summary of Findings - Efficiency iii
1.5.6 Summary of Findings - Effectiveness iv
1.5.7 Summary of Findings - Sustainability vi
1.6 Summary of Recommendations vi

2 Introduction 1
2.1 MDG-F 1
2.2 Joint Programme on Development and the Private Sector - Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development – Republic of Serbia 1
2.3 Mid-term Evaluation and Report 2

3 Description of the intervention 4
3.1 Intent of the Joint Programme 4
3.1.1 UNDAF 4
3.1.2 Government strategies 4
3.1.3 MDGs 4
3.2 Programme Outcomes 5
3.3 Strategic Approaches 5
3.4 Geographic Coverage 7
3.5 Beneficiaries 7
3.6 Implementation Status 7
3.7 The JP Team 8

4 Evaluation scope, objectives and methods 9
4.1 Evaluation scope 9
4.2 Evaluation Objectives And Criteria 9
4.2.1 Design Quality - Relevance 9
4.2.2 Efficiency Of JP Operations And Management. 9
4.2.3 Results - Programme Effectiveness 10
4.2.4 Results - Programme Sustainability 10
4.3 Evaluation approach and methods 11

5 Findings and conclusions 12
5.1 Relevance - Design 12
5.2 Process - Efficiency 17
5.3 Results - Effectiveness 18
5.3.1 JP Outcome 1: Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of the rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of MDGs. 19

5.3.2 JP Outcome 2: Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies. 20
5.4 Results – Sustainability 25
5.5 Advocacy and Communication 25
5.6 Conclusions 26
5.6.1 Strengths of the JP 26
5.6.2 Weaknesses of the JP 27
5.6.3 Design Relevance 27
5.6.4 Efficiency 28
5.6.5 Effectiveness 29
5.6.6 Sustainability 30
5.6.7 UNDAF 31
5.6.8 MDGs 31
5.7 Recommendations 32
6 Annex 1 - ToR for the evaluation i
7 Annex 2 – Listing Of Documentation Assessed During The Desk-top Study xii
8 Annex 3 – List Of Persons Interviewed During For The Evaluation xiii
8.1 National Partners xiii
8.2 PIU Staff xiii
8.3 UN Agency Representatives (Backstops etc) xiii
8.4 'Beneficiaries' (participants in the field) xiii
9 Annex 4 – Interview Guide xiv
9.1 Field Interviews – JP Manager xiv
9.1.1 Design level xiv
9.1.2 Ownership in the design: Effective exercise of leadership by national institutions and representatives xiv
9.1.3 Process level – Efficiency xiv
9.1.4 Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions xv
9.1.5 Results level – Effectiveness xv
9.1.6 Outcomes Anticipated xvi
9.1.7 Results level – Sustainability xvi
10 Annex 5 - Project or programme results map or results framework xviii

Acronyms And Abbreviations

JP	Joint Programme. MDG-F joint programmes are nationally owned programmes that promote pro-poor public policies, strengthen national and local capacities and involve and benefit local populations. Throughout this document JP refers to the specific joint programme being evaluated.
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDG-F	Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund
GoS	Government of Serbia
MERD	Ministry of the Economy and Regional Development (Serbia)
MATFWM	Ministry of Agriculture, Trade, Forestry and Water Management (Serbia)
TOS	Tourism Organisation of Serbia
UN Agencies	Where the document refers to 'UN Agencies', the reference is to the five Agencies delivering the JP: UNDP, FAO, UNWTO, UNEP and UNICEF, as a group.
UNICEF	The UN Agency responsible for protecting and promoting the rights of children.
UNWTO	UN World Tourism Organisation – the UN technical agency specialising in tourism policy and know-how.
FAO	The UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation – FAO's mandate is to raise levels of nutrition, improve agricultural productivity, better the lives of rural populations and contribute to the growth of the world economy.
UNEP	The UN's Environment Program's mission is to provide leadership and encourage partnership in caring for the environment by inspiring, informing, and enabling nations and peoples to improve their quality of life without compromising that of future generations.
UNDP	The United Nations Development Programme is the United Nations' global development network, an organization advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources.
RTMP	National Rural Tourism Master Plan
LAG	Local Action Group
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
PIU	Programme Implementation Unit
NSC	National Steering Committee
PMU	Programme Management Unit
LAG	Local Action Group – a fundamental component of the LEADER approach.
LEADER	A key rural development approach used within EU development assistance.

1 Executive summary

1.1 The MDG-F

The Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) is a partnership arrangement between the UNDP and the Government of Spain. The MDG-F works to assist countries in their progress to achieving their Millennium Development Goals through innovative and replicable programmes. The MDG-F operates in 49 countries, in Africa, Asia, the Americas, the Arab States and in Eastern Europe. The work funded by the MDG-F is undertaken through Joint Programmes of UN agencies, whereby the partner agencies work together on implementation as a way of strengthening programme delivery, as well as developing the capacity of UN agencies to work together.

1.2 The Joint Programme Under Review

The programme under review (*Joint Programme on Development and the Private Sector - Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development – Republic of Serbia*) comes within the Development and the Private Sector thematic window. It is being implemented by FAO, UNEP, UNDP, UNWTO and UNICEF, in partnership with the Serbian government's Ministry of the Economy and Regional Development and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management, together with the Tourism Organisation of Serbia.

The joint programme has two key outcomes:

- Outcome 1 (National Level): Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of Millennium Development Goals.
- Outcome 2 (Local Level): Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies.

The four regions in which the joint programme works are Lower Danube, South Banat on the Danube, Eastern Serbia and Central Serbia.

1.3 The Object Of Study Of This Evaluation

The object of study for this evaluation is the joint programme – the outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that are detailed in the joint programme document and any modifications to that document. This mid-term evaluation had the following specific objectives:

- To discover the programme's design quality and internal coherence (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), the National Development Strategies and the Millennium Development Goals, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
- To understand how the joint programme operates and assess the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the One UN framework.

- To identify the programme's degree of effectiveness among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the Economic Governance thematic window, and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

1.4 Evaluation Approach And Methods

The evaluation was qualitative in nature, and focused in three areas:

- Analysis of project documentation.
- Detailed interviews with representatives of all stakeholder groups, including national and local partners, Programme Implementation Unit members and analysis of the commentary and feedback of these stakeholders.
- Analysis of the feedback and input from the field work against the joint programme design and documentation and against the evaluation criteria.

The evaluation approach focused on:

- Ascertaining factual details about the joint programme in developing an understanding of intent and detailed plans and the status of implementation in relation to these plans.
- Extracting reflection and analysis from participants, staff and partners.
- Analysing the feedback based on the evaluation question(s).

1.5 Principle Findings and Conclusions

The following summarises the principle findings and conclusions of the evaluation.

- Detailed discussion of *findings* is found at section 5.6.
- Detailed discussion of *conclusions* is found at section 5.7.

1.5.1 The JP and UNDAF

The National Rural Tourism Master Plan (RTMP) and the rural development components around the LEADER approach and Local Action Groups (LAGs) directly contribute to change and development, responding to **UNDAF Outcome 3.1** – 'Sustainable development plans that effectively respond to the needs of people, communities and the private sector, and promote rural development and environmental protection.'

1.5.2 The JP and Government Strategies

Direct and indirect contributions are being made by the joint programme to the development and/ or implementation of each of the intended **Government strategies** – Strategy for Development of Tourism; Strategy for Regional Development; Poverty Reduction Strategy; National Sustainable Development Strategy.

1.5.3 The JP and MDGs

In its design, the joint programme is intended to respond to **eight MDG targets**:

MDG 1 – Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger

> No detailed assessment is possible based on joint programme data, but it is likely that the joint programme will contribute to the MDG 1.1 Reduce unemployment rate of young by at least one third, albeit in a limited way.
>
> The joint programme has a minimal focus on the involvement of people with disabilities in the programme, although overall, the policy change and other initiatives

of the JP are likely to have some limited effect on MDG 1.2 Reduce unemployment rate of persons with disabilities by at least 20%.

No detailed assessment is possible based on joint programme data, but it is likely that activities re the LEADER approach and LAG will have an impact on MDG 1.3 Reduce unemployment rate of women by over 45%.

MDG 7 – Ensure Environmental Sustainability

The RTMP includes specific provisions related to sustainable development principles – the joint programme has had a direct influence in the area of MDG 7.1 Integrate sustainable development principles in national documents, stop the loss of natural resources and encourage their revitalisation.

The RTMP includes specific provisions related to sustainable development principles – the joint programme has made a direct contribution in relation to MDG 7.2 Adopt and implement national programmes, strategies and laws governing sustainable development and environmental protection in Republic of Serbia by 2015.

While some inputs are expected from the joint programme in terms of MDG 7.5 Increase energy efficiency and usage of renewable energy, and some effects may occur, no work has yet been done.

1.5.4 Summary of Findings - Design Relevance

The key findings on design relevance are summarised here, the full discussion is found at 5.1.

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the objectives of the JP are consistent with the needs and interest of the people and institutions of Serbia and the MDGs and that national partners demonstrate ownership of the JP.

The overall design of the JP at outcome level has strong support across national and local partners.

The design of the JP fits neatly in GoS priorities.

The JP is providing a policy framework for sustainable rural tourism.

The JP also responds directly to GoS rural development program priorities, as defined in the National Rural Development Program for the years 2011-2013.

National partners express and demonstrate a high level of ownership of design and implementation.

Local partners consider the RTMP to be very significant.

Local partners feel the work of the JP is in line with the priorities of the regions.

1.5.5 Summary of Findings - Efficiency

The key findings on efficiency are summarised here, the full discussion is found at 5.2.

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the JP has been efficient in its use of resources and in converting resources into results.

There are issues with efficiency of project implementation and management that hamper implementation, but not to the extent that the JP is in danger of not delivering its outputs.

The PMC's effectiveness would be strengthened with a greater focus on the consistent participation of Agency and partner delegates.

The Inception Workshop did not address the intent of the workshop as described in the JP Implementation Guidelines, particularly in relation to roles and responsibilities of implementing parties. There is an expressed concern about the governance/ management structures of the JP, including roles and responsibilities, management and financial decision-making.

The fact that not all UN partner agencies are present in Serbia can generally be judged to be more positive than negative in its impact on project management and implementation.

1.5.6 Summary of Findings - Effectiveness

The key findings on effectiveness are summarised here, the full discussion is found at 5.3.

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the project has been effective to date in achieving its intended objectives.

Having gotten off to a particularly slow start, the JP is on track to complete it activities and outputs on time. While there are some areas of concern, most activities/ output areas are progressing well against the programmed time frame.

The JP is tracking well towards the successful completion of activities and achievement of intended outputs. Focus on outputs and outcomes must be maintained within the PIU.

Some areas of implementation have suffered from the push to bring implementation back on to the original timeline after the initial six month delay in getting activities underway.

The quality of outcome of the training inputs, and how they contribute effectively to capacity outcomes needs to be objectively monitored and assessed.

Output 1.3.4. – Investment Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy is part of the JP's M&E programme – management needs to ensure the responsible agency undertakes this activity as to ensure lessons learned from public tourism investments are understood.

The intent of Output 2.1.3 (ie Product Development with local tourism stakeholders) should not be lost in concerns about the use of the term TGO.

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.

1.5.6.1 Summary of outcomes and outputs.

- JP Outcome 1: Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of the rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of MDGs has not yet been completely achieved but it is 'on track'.
    - Outcome 1.1 – National Rural Tourism Master Plan (RTMP) for Serbia developed and submitted to the Government has been.
        - Output 1.1.1 – National RTMP: Developed and submitted to the Government for approval by the end of Year 1 has been achieved.
        - Output 1.1.2 – Principles and Framework for Children-Related Tourism. With the exception of the planned survey into backpack tourism this Output is achieved.
        - Output 1.1.3. – National Study on Sustainable Tourism has not been completed.
        - Output 1.1.4. – Assessment of the potential contribution of rural tourism to small farming sector and rural development in general has been achieved.

  - Outcome 1.2 – Rural Development Programme Planning is mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies; National Program for Rural Development for IPARD Axes 2 and 3 developed and submitted to Government has largely been achieved.
    - Output 1.2.1. – IPARD National Agriculture and Rural development Program (2010-2013): strategic guidelines for inclusion of rural tourism and related activities to Axes 2 and 3 developed has been delivered.
    - Output 1.2.2 – IPARD Life Conditions Study has been delivered.
  - Outcome 1.3 – Investment Mainstreaming – sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies has not been achieved.
    - Output 1.3.1. – Public Investments toward the RTMP has been partially achieved.
    - Output 1.3.2. – Public-Private Partnership Guidelines is partially complete.
    - Output 1.3.3. – SIFT Network is partly delivered.
    - Output 1.3.4. – Investment Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy has not been delivered and indicative activities are not being implemented.
- JP Outcome 2: Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies has not been achieved.
  - Outcome 2.1 – Capacity developed for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural development has not yet been achieved.
    - Output 2.1.1. Local Action Groups. Capacity of pubic, private and civil society sector stakeholders strengthened to enable the establishment of six Local Action Groups and develop local rural development strategies is partly achieved, and indicative activities are being undertaken.
    - Output 2.1.2 Rural Development Network capacity strengthened to lead development and facilitation of Local Action Groups, independently lobby for development initiatives and secure resources for regional development is not yet achieved.
    - Output 2.1.3. Local planning has not been delivered.
    - Output 2.1.4. Organisational Capacity Development is not completed. A significant amount of training, as envisaged in the programme document has been organised and delivered, and is ongoing.
    - Output 2.1.5. Marketing and Promotion is not completed and no activities have been initiated.
    - Output 2.1.6 Energy Efficiency and Alternative Energy and Output 2.1.9 Sustainable Resource Management is not yet completed.
    - Output 2.1.7 Rural Tourism-Oriented Networks has not yet been delivered.
    - Output 2.1.8 Product Development: Local tourism stakeholders actively participating in Product Development discussions through the TGOs and are trained to become active stakeholders in RTMP implementation has not been completed – no activities have been undertaken yet.
    - Output 2.1.9 (See 2.1.6).
    - Output 2.1.10. Agriculture Quality Standards training is complete.

- Outcome 2.2 – Tourism governance structures enhanced in target regions through dedicated organisations, pilot project and investment promotion has not yet been achieved.
  - Output 2.2.1. Tourism Governance Organisations has not been delivered and no work has yet been done on this component.
  - Output 2.2.2. Child-related Tourism Supply and Demand is not delivered, although some indicated activities are underway or completed.
  - Output 2.2.3. Investment Forum – the Investment Forum will take place in November.

1.5.7 Summary of Findings - Sustainability

Key findings on sustainability are summarised here, the full discussion is found at 5.5.

The evaluation tested whether or not there is likely to be a continuation of benefits from the JP after it has been completed.

National partners have demonstrated the technical and leadership capacity necessary to move forward with initiatives that are part of the JP. MERD is driving the policy process related to the RTMP effectively and appropriately. While it is likely that initiatives evolving from the RTMP will receive budgetary assistance for the GoS, there is no guarantee that such assistance will be forthcoming.

National partners demonstrate the level of technical and management expertise necessary to take JP initiatives into the future, as part of GOS policy and procedural frameworks.

The JP needs to ensure there is an appropriate assessment of the outcomes and lessons learned from the grant schemes.

1.6 Summary of Recommendations

The following summarises the key recommendations for the JP in strengthening delivery through to completion of implementation. The detailed recommendation discussion is found at 5.8.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 3 – Results Focus. With regards all field activities, but particularly capacity building initiatives and 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.

Recommendation 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*, ie 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*.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 9 – Grant Scheme Outcomes and Lessons Learned. The JP should undertake an assessment of the outcomes and lessons learned from the grant schemes – and make recommendations that will assist in the future, particularly for donor organisations and the GoS, to ensure the priority areas of donation and the priority types of activities are most useful to anticipated outcomes.

Recommendation 10 – Leveraging JP Results As An Advocacy Strategy. The advocacy and communication strategy should give particular attention in the coming 12 months to using the JP to leveraging increased MDG results and citizen engagement, per the MDG-F strategy.

Recommendation 11 – Follow-up Programme. A follow-up programme should be considered to sustain the development. This is particularly relevant in relation to Outcome 2.

2 Introduction

2.1 MDG-F

The Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) is a partnership arrangement between the UNDP and the Government of Spain. Originally funded in 2006 with an amount of Euros 528 million by the Government of Spain (with a further contribution in 2008 of Euros 90 million), the MDG-F works to assist countries in their progress to achieving their Millennium Development Goals (MDG) through innovative and replicable programmes. The MDG-F operates in 49 countries, in Africa, Asia, the Americas, the Arab States and in Eastern Europe. The work funded by the MDG-F is undertaken through Joint Programmes (JP) of UN agencies, whereby the partner agencies work together on implementation as a way of strengthening programme delivery, as well as developing the capacity of UN agencies to work together.

The work of the MDG-F is undertaken in 8 thematic windows:

- Children, Food Security And Nutrition.
- Gender Equality And Women's Empowerment.
- Environment And Climate Change.
- Youth, Employment And Migration.
- Democratic Economic Governance.
- Development And The Private Sector.
- Conflict Prevention And Peace-Building.
- Culture And Development.
- Protecting And Enhancing Cultural Rights And Political Participation.

The programme under review in this mid-term evaluation (*Joint Programme on Development and the Private Sector - Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development – Republic of Serbia*) comes within the Development and the Private Sector thematic window, and is one of 12 JPs being funded within this thematic window. The Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the MDG-F require all JPs of longer than a two-year duration to undergo a mid-term evaluation. The MDG-F sees mid-term evaluations as 'highly formative in nature', with the stated intent of improving implementation, seeking to 'generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be transferred to other programmes'.

This evaluation was undertaken in this context. The evaluation is intended for the Programme Implementation Unit (PIU), the Programme Management Committee (PMC), the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Secretariat of the Fund. It is intended to assist these groups to understand the strengths and weaknesses in design, process and outcome and to address changes in these areas that can strengthen implementation and results.

2.2 Joint Programme on Development and the Private Sector - Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development – Republic of Serbia

The JP under review is being implemented by FAO, UNEP, UNDP (the administrative agent of the JP), UNWTO and UNICEF, in partnership with the Serbian government's Ministry of the Economy and Regional Development (MERD) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry

and Water Management (MATFWM), together with the Tourism Organisation of Serbia (TOS).

The JP has two key outcomes, intended to 'be achieved through a holistic approach to UN agency and partner cooperation'. The two are:

- Outcome 1 (National Level): Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of Millennium Development Goals.
- Outcome 2 (Local Level): Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies.

The four regions in which the JP works are Lower Danube, South Banat on the Danube, Eastern Serbia and Central Serbia.

2.3 Mid-term Evaluation and Report

The object of study for this evaluation is the JP – the outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that are detailed in the JP document and any modifications to that document. This mid-term evaluation has the following specific objectives:

- To discover the programme's design quality and internal coherence (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the Millennium Development Goals, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
- To understand how the joint programme operates and assess the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the One UN framework.
- To identify the programme's degree of effectiveness among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the Economic Governance thematic window, and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

This evaluation report is structured to allow the reader to understand the context of the intervention, the design logic of the intervention, the evaluation activities and approaches used in order to develop a picture of the strengths and weakness of project design, implementation and outcomes and then a detailed analysis of the intervention, based on evaluation activities and approaches.

2.3.1 The Intervention

Initially, the report will describe the intervention context and its design:

- Situational context – including national priorities, UNDAF priorities, MDGs and country-specific priorities.
- Intended beneficiaries – direct and indirect, national, regional and local.
- Partners – national (government and other), regional and local, and their roles.
- Intended outcomes – to which higher-level goals/ results is the programme intended to contribute.

- Intended outputs – what products or services are intended to be delivered by the programme.
- Planned activities – what specific activities are planned to deliver programme outputs and outcomes.

The report will also discuss the current stage of implementation and details of the size of the programme in terms of finances and staffing.

2.3.2 Evaluation scope, objectives and methods

The report defines the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions, including addressing design weaknesses or other implementation constraints. The report includes the timeframe of the evaluation, period of implementation, and the intent of the evaluation for the evaluation group (Programme Implementation Unit, the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund).

The report defines the evaluation criteria and performance standards, evaluation questions – at the design, process and outcome levels, in order to understand what information/ analysis the evaluation will produce, evaluation approaches and methods. Sources and reasoning for these sources, field instruments (interview questions, focus group conversation approaches, questionnaires), limitations of the methodology and procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions.

2.3.3 Evaluation findings and conclusions

The report then presents findings based on the analysis and conclusions of the evaluator. This analysis and conclusions are described in three, separate ways, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations.

3 Description of the intervention

The *Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development* project is an initiative of the Spanish MDG Achievement Fund, for Development and the Private Sector. The total budget of the programme is $4,000,000. The initiative is a Joint Programme of the UN, implemented by:

- FAO – the FAO contribution to the JP budget is US$1,160,238.
- UNEP – the UNEP contribution to the JP budget is US$333,709.
- UNDP (the administrative agent of the JP) – the UNDP contribution to the budget is US$1,048,824.
- UNWTO – the UNWTO contribution to the JP budget is US$1,026,211.
- UNICEF – the UNICEF contribution to the JP budget is US$431,018.

The programme is being implemented in partnership with:

- The Serbian government's Ministry of the Economy and Regional Development.
- The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management
- The Tourism Organisation of Serbia.

The Serbian's government's financial contribution to the budget is in-kind – the office space for the Programme Implementation Unit is provided at MERD.

3.1 Intent of the Joint Programme

According to the programme document, the JP is designed to *specifically contribute* to UNDAF outcomes, Government strategies and MDGs.

3.1.1 UNDAF Outcome 3

The JP responds to UNDAF Outcome 3. 'Sustainable development plans that effectively respond to the needs of people, communities and the private sector, and promote rural development and environmental protection' through 'planning initiatives at national and regional levels, and interventions in targeted rural regions that address supply and demand of rural tourism.

3.1.2 Government strategies

Strategy for Development of Tourism; Strategy for Regional Development; Poverty Reduction Strategy; National Sustainable Development Strategy; National Rural Development Program for the years 2011-2013.

3.1.3 MDGs

In its design, the JP is intends to respond to eight MDG targets:

MDG 1 – Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger

1.1 Reduce unemployment rate of young by at least one third.

1.2 Reduce unemployment rate of persons with disabilities by at least 20%.

1.3 Reduce unemployment rate of women by over 45%.

MDG 7 – Ensure Environmental Sustainability

7.1 Integrate sustainable development principles in national documents, stop the loss of natural resources and encourage their revitalisation.

7.2 Adopt and implement national programmes, strategies and laws governing sustainable development and environmental protection in Republic of Serbia by 2015.

7.5 Increase energy efficiency and usage of renewable energy.

MDG 8 – Develop a Global Partnership for Development

8.1 Dynamic and sustainable GDP growth based on assumptions established by the National Investment Plan, the Strategy for Promotion and Development of Foreign Investments and the Strategy for Economic development until 2012.

8.3 Increase investments in human resource development by 70%.

3.2 Programme Outcomes

According to the programme document, the JP has two key outcomes, intended to 'be achieved through a holistic approach to UN agency and partner cooperation. The two are:

- Outcome 1 (National Level): Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of Millennium Development Goals.

  This outcome is intended to be implemented at the national level by supporting the Government to:

  - Develop a National Rural Tourism Master Plan.
  - Develop a National Rural Development Program.
  - Provide guidance for public investments.
- Outcome 2 (Local Level): Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies.

  This outcome is intended to be implemented at the local and regional level, in four target regions, to provide support to local rural planning and destination development and management through:

  - Tourist destination development.
  - Diversification of the Rural Economy through Tourism.
  - Active Learning Tourism Investments.

3.3 Strategic Approaches

The JP was designed to use three strategic approaches in order to achieve these outcomes, particularly at the local and regional level of implementation, where the JP 'will support the participatory development of national and local rural tourism and development plans, which will enable municipalities and communities to develop projects under the Government's rural development and tourism support programmes and as a tool for a national IPARD plan':

- A LEADER Approach. Leader is a local level approach in rural communities that 'encourages rural communities to explore new ways to become or remain competitive by planning and implementing sustainable strategies'.
- Local Action Groups. A LAG is 'a local partnership that plans and implements a local rural development strategy'.
- Destination Management. Destination management is a strategic approach to the 'coordinated management of all the elements that make up a destination'.

As indicated above, the JP has a national focus – with Government, at a policy and legal level and at the local level, with the local tourism and support industries. Adding to this complexity is that the approach being taken incorporates activities directed at rural tourism as well as activities directed at rural development, with a tourism focus. This subtle distinction is critical as it incorporates the differences in priority and approach of both national partners and UN Agencies. MERD and the Tourism Organisation of Serbia (TOS) are focused on the tourism component per se, and the National Rural Tourism Master Plan, while the MATFWM's priorities are in terms of how rural tourism contributes to rural development, and the JP's strategies on LEADER and Local Action Groups.

As well, the JP has a local focus, with one component of this focus being the Joint UN Fund for Sustainable Rural Tourism, a critical part of JP design and implementation priorities, with its focus on grants at the local level. The Joint UN Fund is described in the programme document as follows:

Joint UN Fund For Sustainable Rural Tourism			
Manager	**Thematic Window**	**Investment Focus**	**Selection and Limits**
FAO	Diversification of the Rural Economy Through Tourism	Conservation and maintenance of traditional cultural and national heritage Production of food and non-food products and activities for local/ regional tourist market In cooperation with UNEP, support for environmentally sustainable tourism products	Local Action Groups Household $5,000 Organisations $20,000
UNWTO	Tourist Destination Development	Development of basic tourism services Development of attractors Development of specific attractive niche products Development of tourism clusters	Tourism Governance Organisations Average $10,000
UNICEF	Active Learning Tourism Investments	Child, family and school centred content Active learning education elements, including on environmental aspects of tourism Ministry of Education-approved active learning curricula	

Not included in the original project design, UNDP also provide grant funding from the Joint UN Fund:

UNDP	Diversification of Rural Economy through Tourism	Support for environmentally sustainable tourism projects Promotion of rural tourism Focus in 2010. was Support for environmentally sustainable tourism projects	Eligible applicants are Non Government Organization in partnerships with public and cicil sector. Limits: USD up to 20,000 per project First and second level of the evaluation process(Special criteria for the second level of evaluation)

3.4 Geographic Coverage

The JP works in four regions of Serbia, two along the Danube river (Lower Danube, South Banat on the Danube), Eastern Serbia and Central Serbia. The four target regions were selected following a detailed field survey, and were chosen because of their existing situation and their potential in terms of rural tourism.

3.5 Beneficiaries

There was a flaw in the design of the JP in relation to the definition of beneficiaries, both direct and indirect. While the individuals, institutions and agencies who might benefit from the JP are discussed through the program document, the document provides no specific details about, nor specific discussion on the intended beneficiaries, direct or indirect, in any coherent manner.

JP Monitoring Reports provide detailed enumeration of direct and indirect beneficiaries, at the institutional and individual level, as well as at the urban and rural level. These numbers were developed by the PIU in preparation for the first monitoring report, although it is no longer clear within the PIU exactly how these numbers were arrived at.

> Finding 1: JP implementation, as well as its analysis and reporting, would benefit from the PIU preparing an analysis of project beneficiaries, planned and actual, and develop a 1-2 page description of the types and numbers of intended beneficiaries. This document should then be signed off by the PMC, and used in future for analysis and reporting.

The JP Monitoring Reports describes direct impact or influence on 5 national institutions MERD, MATFWM and TOS, as well as the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry of Education, although these later two have not effectively been involved in the JP, 48 local institutions, and designated numbers of women, men, and members of ethnic groups in the target regions.

As well, the programme document indicates indirect beneficiaries including three national institutions, 124 local institutions and a large number of men, women and members of ethnic groups in the target regions.

3.6 Implementation Status

The JP was programmed to last 30 months, with an official starting date of 4 December 2009, ending on 4 June 2012. Significant delays were experienced at inception, with a full project staff complement not appointed until June of 2010. As a result, a number of activities and outputs have been delayed, and a request for a no-cost extension has been made. Of particular concern are the activities and grants which comprise the Joint UN Fund For Sustainable Rural Tourism. Two particular questions are of importance – whether or not the grant initiatives can be initiated (and completed) in any case within the current programme timeframe and whether or not, in any case, grant recipients and the grant initiatives more generally would benefit from a complete tourism season for implementation and assessment of results, which would require extension of the JP for a period up to the end of 2012.

This document comments below on the need for/ desirability of an extension.

3.7 The JP Team

The implementation team (the Project Implementation Unit – PIU) comprises the following members:

- Project Manager (Coordinator) – engaged by UNDP.
- FAO – Programme Officer and Assistant.
- UNICEF – Programme Officer.
- UNWTO – Programme Officer and assistant.
- UNEP – Programme Officer half-time (shared with UNDP).
- UNDP – Programme Officer half-time (shared with UNEP). The UNDP/ UNEP position has an two assistant position, a Technical Assistant and a Finance Assistant.
- The project also covers its administrative needs with a temporary administration assistant and contributes to Advocacy and Communication activities of the whole of the MDG-F program in Serbia through contributions to the Communication Analyst position at UNDP's office.

Each UN Agency has an appointed 'backstop' person for their PIU staff. Two of these 'backstops' (UNDP's and UNICEF's) are stationed in Belgrade while the rest are outside of Serbia (FAO's is in Budapest, UNEP's is in Geneva, UNWTO's is in Madrid. (It is noted here that the UNWTO does not describe their Madrid-stationed personnel as 'backstop' but as 'project manager', with the specific responsibility of 'managing UNWTO inputs to the JP.) A specific question of the evaluation, which is addressed below, is the impact on the JP of having 'backstop' persons outside the beneficiary country.

4 Evaluation scope, objectives and methods

The MDG-F sees mid-term evaluations as being 'highly formative in nature' and seeking 'to improve implementation of the joint programmes during their second phase of implementation'. This was the main focus of the evaluation: to make use of documentation, feedback and analysis to understand the intent of the JP, its current strengths and weaknesses and to propose recommendations that will assist the JP team to improve the responsiveness of the design of the JP as well as the implementation processes.

4.1 Evaluation scope

The evaluation was undertaken in June and July of 2011.

4.2 Evaluation Objectives And Criteria

Ultimately, the evaluation intends to help the PIU deliver stronger outcomes. Within this general framework, the evaluation looked at three areas of the JP, areas directly related to the evaluation criteria. While the evaluation criteria encompassed each of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability, the evaluation in the field focused on design, efficiency and effectiveness. The questions below are indicative only of those used during the evaluation.

4.2.1 Design Quality - Relevance

The intent of this component of the assessment was to evaluate the relevance of the project's design to the needs of stakeholders. As necessary, JP management may make use of the material in this component to address necessary design changes.

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the objectives of the JP are consistent with the needs and interest of the people and institutions of Serbia, as well as the MDGs. Specific emphasis was placed on the level of ownership of the JP by the leadership and representatives of national partners. Examples of the questions that were asked include:

- To what extent does the JP design respond to national and regional plans, to identified needs, and to the operational context of national politics?
- To what extent have the country's national and local authorities been:
    - taken into consideration in JP design.
    - participated or become involved in JP design.
- To what extent does the interaction of national partners affect JP implementation.

4.2.2 Efficiency Of JP Operations And Management.

The evaluation looked at the program management model, with the intention of understanding the quality and level of efficiency of the One UN framework, as applied to the JP. The intent of this assessment was to understand the strengths and weaknesses of JP operations and management and to propose recommendations for strengthening these areas. This was an area of significant comment from national partners, PIU and other UN Agency staff, and is commented on extensively in the report. It is worth noting at this point that most of the comments are related to overall structure and financing of the JP, and are therefore may be more relevant to the MDG-F Secretariat than the JP itself.

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the JP has been efficient in its use of resources and in converting resources into results. The evaluation analysed activities and outputs against inputs. Specific emphasis was placed on the JP's management model and its contribution to

outputs and outcomes, inter-agency coordination and the role and locations of UN Agency 'backstop' personnel. The evaluation also look at the level of ownership of the JP by the leadership and representatives of national partners. Examples of the questions that were asked include:

- To what extent does the JP's management model contribute to achieving anticipated outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other and with the government?
- Is the model of NSC, PMC, PIU appropriate to project management? Does the management structure improve the efficiency and effectiveness of delivery?
- What impact on project implementation has occurred as a result of the fact that not all UN partner agencies are present in Serbia?
- Are work methodologies, financial instruments and information shared among agencies?

4.2.3 Results - Programme Effectiveness

The intent of this component of the assessment was to ensure that the JP is as effective as possible in delivering the intended outcomes of the program, and to provide recommendations as appropriate to strengthening implementation and results.

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the project has been effective to date in achieving its intended objectives. This area of analysis will inform both recommendations in terms of implementation through project completion and thinking about the potential emphasis of a future initiative. Examples of the questions that were asked include:

- Is the JP making progress towards achieving anticipated results?
- Is the JP being implemented against the planned timeframe? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes?
- Do the outputs produced meet the required high quality?
- Does the JP have follow-up mechanisms to verify the quality of the products and timeliness of delivery?
- Does the JP have follow-up mechanisms to measure progress in the achievement of anticipated results?
- Does the JP's M and E plan and reporting system provide appropriate levels of analysis of activities, outputs and outcomes?
- Is the JP working with beneficiaries as planned?
- Has the JP generated innovative problem-solving approaches? What are they?
- What good or best practice, lessons learned or success stories have been identified? Have they been transferred to other JP or stakeholders?
- What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the JP in accordance with gender, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population? To what extent?

4.2.4 Results - Programme Sustainability

Finally, the evaluation tested whether or not there is likely to be a continuation of benefits from the JP after it has been completed. Examples of the questions that were asked include:

- Are national institutions demonstrating the technical capacity and leadership commitment to move forward with JP initiatives/ approaches?

- Has relevant capacity been created and/ or reinforced in national partners?
- Do partners have sufficient financial capacity to maintain the approaches of, and benefits produced by, the JP?
- Is the duration of the JP sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project sustainability of the JP? The evaluation will specifically address the need for a no-cost extension, and the likely impact to project outcomes of extending the implementation timeframe.

4.3 Evaluation approach and methods

The evaluation was qualitative in nature, and focused in three areas:

- Analysis of project documentation and analysis of the commentary and feedback of project stakeholders and participants. Documentation studied in the initial desk review included a range of material describing the MDG-F, its priorities and intents, material specific to the JP, including the programme document, interim reports, monthly reports, reports on PIU, NSC and PMC meetings and project outputs, including the National Rural Tourism Master Plan and subsidiary documents. A complete listing of analysed documentation can be found at Annex 3.
- Detailed interviews with representatives of all stakeholder groups, including national partners, PIU members from each UN Agency, UN representatives in Serbia and backstop personnel from each Agency. Focus group conversations with local partners (two separate field visits were undertaken, where focus group conversations were held with representatives of local and regional partners involved in JP activities in the target districts). A total of 30 persons were interviewed. Processes and focus varied depending on the role and function of the interviewee, with a variety of perspectives sought in interviews and focus group conversations. A number of interviews were held with the JP Manager to ensure completeness and correctness of detail, as well as to ascertain and understand the functioning of the JP. The previous JP Manager, who left his position in March, was also interviewed.
- Analysis of the feedback and input from the field work against the JP design and documentation and against the evaluation criteria.

The evaluation approach focused on:

- Ascertaining factual details about the JP in developing an understanding of the intent and detailed plans for the JP and the status of implementation in relation to these plans. The document review also provided a wider range of questions to be asked during field work.
- Extracting reflection and analysis from participants, staff and partners. Field instruments were developed that encompassed the key questions (and relevant sub-questions) for each area of enquiry, to ensure a full range of inputs from interviewees on the evaluation questions. The field instruments were varied according to the type of interviewee (staff, partner, 'beneficiary', Agency/ backstop).
- Analysing the feedback based on the evaluation question(s).

Interviews were held in confidence (this did not apply to the focus group discussions held with beneficiaries) and interviewees were advised that their responses were confidential and that any reporting of their feedback would not include references to its source.

5 Findings and conclusions

While the JP has struggled with a number of issues and difficulties, it is basically working in the right direction, achieving planned outputs and contributing to intended outcomes. Feedback from stakeholders was consistent in the view that, with some exceptions, work is progressing within appropriate timeframes and with requisite levels of quality. Although it is yet to be seen if the programme for the coming year will be achieved, given the extensive range of activities and the priority of the grants programmes, feedback from both programme coordinators and Agency 'backstops' is that activity delivery is on track. This is happening to a certain extent in spite of issues with design and management components. This is the main area of concern, as will be seen below, some aspects of programme design, particularly in relation to JP management, block efficient programme implementation. The PIU, national partners and UN Agencies have delivered outputs effectively to date, as a result of their professionalism and commitment to the task, but the system and structures of the JP do not add to their endeavours nor facilitate completion of tasks.

A further area of concern, as will be seen below, is in the focus of project activities going forward. There is a significant component of capacity building required in JP activities in the period to the end of the JP, including all aspects of the grant programme. The JP needs to *be careful not to lose sight of programme intent in the midst of organising and delivering training programmes and grant schemes*. The intent is not the delivery of the activities themselves, it is the strengthening of capacity in the field. Particular reference is made to the three components mentioned in the JP document:

- Tourist destination development.
- Diversification of the Rural Economy Through Tourism.
- Active Learning Tourism Investments.

This is a critical area for discussion within the PIU and PMC – ensuring the JP does not lose its focus in these areas as it works to ensure it completes programmed activities.

The discussion below details findings in the areas of design, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

5.1 Relevance - Design

The design of the JP at outcome level, particularly in relation to national partners, fits neatly in Government of Serbia (GoS) priorities. 'Rural tourism is not the highest priority of the Government, but it is a priority.' The country has great potential for rural tourism, and is seen as such, and the subject of rural tourism is firmly on the agenda now, in terms of economic diversification. The view of national partners is that while the JP will not address the whole of this issue, the policy framework is important, and that within that policy framework there will be 'valid, measurable results'.

This view is supported at the local level, where local partners considered the RTMP as 'very significant', as it will provide a 'critical component' of necessary policy in Serbia. Local partners also felt that the 'work of the JP is exactly in line with the priorities of the regions.' 'Rural development used to be chickens and cows – no one understood the value of paragliding and Guca.'

The JP also responds directly to GoS rural development program priorities, as defined in the National Rural Development Program for the years 2011-2013.

Having said that, there is not a strong consensus among national partners or UN Agencies as to the focus of the JP. There are conflicting views about whether the JP is about 'tourism' or 'rural development'. While none of these expressed views dismissed the JP's design and intent, it is significant that there is no consensus among partners as to the relative merits these two key aspects of the JP. The nature of the roles of the main national partners in all likelihood contributed to this, as, for example, the MERD did not understand the relevance of LAGs nor have any commitment to their development. The significance of the priorities and activities of UNEP, or a LEADER approach, or UNICEF's focus on child and school tourism is not readily apparent to national partners, focused on tourism policy. On the other hand, there is a view that MERD overemphasises 'rural tourism', as opposed to 'sustainable tourism for *rural development'*.

To a certain extent, it is because of this that the support of national partners, and the detail of their involvement in the JP is not consistent. MERD has taken a more direct leadership role while to date MATFWM has not demonstrated the strong, consistent leadership role at the PMC level, nor in more direct aspects of implementation, that might have been expected. GoS priorities, and indeed the current policy focus of the MATFWM, have also impacted. There are indications though that this situation is improving, with the appointment of a new representative of the Ministry to the PMC. The role of TOS is strongly on the tourism side of the project, and indeed does question the relative merits of 'rural development' within the project framework, but they work closely within the MERD framework and leadership.

Agencies, partners and the PMC work well together to ensure that implementation is not impeded in any way. The lack of a 'strong consensus' does not imply a lack of will, or direction, and it is likely that at the highest level of Government, priorities across a programme of this type will always bring difference of opinion. The PMC works well in providing the decision-making necessary for the PIU to move implementation forward.

On balance, national partners demonstrate a strong commitment to the project, and indeed acknowledge that where they may not agree with nor understand the focus outside their priority areas, they understand the responsibility and commitment of the JP in these areas. National partner commitment is recognised by and commented on by UN Agencies. One said 'the work of MERD on public relations for the JP is unbelievable. I do not think it could have been better, on any project, anywhere.'

> Finding 2: The overall design of the JP at outcome level has strong support across national and local partners, and national partners generally express and demonstrate a high level of ownership of design and implementation.

There were issues at project formulation stage that were commented on both in an 'historical' sense (that they happened and were of impact on implementation) and in the sense that some still impact on project implementation. These issues include the abovementioned lack of consensus about whether the JP is a tourism programme or a rural development program, and residual levels of distrust of the priorities and focus of agencies of 'the other persuasion'. These concerns exist both within national partners and within UN Agencies. The basic discussion indicates that both national partners and UN Agencies have 'moved past' the issues they had at the time of the formulation of the JP design, but having 'moved past', the issues still concern them and impair effective programme delivery to an extent.

> Finding 3: There were some residual concerns about the original formulation of the programme, particularly in terms of conflicting priorities of national partners and of Agencies within the JP's priority framework. These concerns are managed effectively by the PMC.

It is within this context that the role of the PMC was discussed. The PMC plays a strong role for national partners in their ownership of the JP, but a more effective PMC would address concerns of the programme team and work them through to the overall benefit of the JP. Per the Joint Implementation Guidelines, and the ToR for PMCs, the PMC was structured to include the key personnel of each national partner and UN Agency, so the necessary technical/ operational decisions can be made. With some notable exceptions, the PMC does not have consistent participation from these people, a fact noted in interviews as well as in the minutes of PMC meetings. In playing its management function, participants must be across the import and detail of issues being discussed and must be in a position to make decisions within the PMC on behalf of their organisation.

> Finding 4: The PMC's effectiveness in addressing management and implementation problems, and particularly in ensuring the technical and operational teams work together, in a coordinated way, on programme activities and in consultation with the JP Manager, would be strengthened with a greater focus on the consistent participation of the relevant Agency and partner delegates.

The role and responsibilities of partners was raised, in how they function in relation to UN Agencies – and how Agencies function, in terms of their responsibilities for and obligations to the JP. Concerns were expressed about the nature of the partner relationship. Some tension is expected in these relationships, it is in the nature of the relationship between Ministries of sovereign states and external agencies.

The JP Implementation Guidelines guide decisions about management models (but leave exact details to the JP itself). The Guidelines indicate that 'management of the programmes should reside within national entities' and describe the possible use of a Lead Ministry model where a number of national entities are involved in the programme. The JP document describes MERD and MAFTWM as 'Lead Ministries'.

Quite some detail is provided in the Guidelines as to potential forms for leadership and management of a JP, and of the variety of roles to be played by national entities and UN Agencies. The Guidelines leave it to the relevant organisations in each country to address the detail of these arrangements, although they specifically '*recommend that an inception workshop with wide participation of relevant counterparts is carried out as soon as possible* to determine the roles and responsibilities of the implementing parties' and states that the JP document 'should contain an explanation of how each UN agency will work with respective implementing partners (if not already done, do so during the Inception Workshop)'.

The draft Inception Workshop Agenda, from the JP Guidelines includes:

- Invite all relevant stakeholders to the inception workshop/preparatory meetings.
- Make any necessary revisions to the joint programme document.
- Revise and agree on the annual work plan.
- Complete the M&E Plan and identify responsible parties.

- Discuss and develop an advocacy and communications plan that is based on desired policy impacts of programme.
- Flesh out the role of the various lead ministry and lead UN Agency and detail the responsibilities of each partner, reconfirm the management model described in the joint programme and agree on administrative work flows.
- Review the joint programme implementation guidelines and adapt them as necessary to local conditions.

The agenda of the Inception Workshop, which took place during parts of two days in February of 2010 was:

- Provide recommendations about proposed joint programme outcomes.
- Prepare a list of joint actions for delivering as one.
- Promote a better understanding amongst programme counterparts on DAO programme outputs.
- Reach an agreement on annual work plan.
- Provide recommendations on the proposed monitoring and evaluation framework.

The Inception Workshop as undertaken by the JP did not address the intent of the workshop as described in the JP Implementation Guidelines, and, particularly in relation to discussions on the roles and responsibilities of implementing parties, the concept of partner, what is meant by 'lead', JP leadership, management processes, procedures and reporting.

As a result:

- No formal partnership agreements exist and the role of 'partners' is described only in the Guidelines (a guide only to be further developed) and the project document, wherein only technical discussions. The best illustration of this is the TOS, described as contributing to implementation and having 'signed off' on the JP document, but having no specific responsibilities as an implementing agency, an omission that could have been rectified at the Inception Workshop.
- The relationships between Lead Ministries, and between these Lead Ministries and UN Agencies was not well defined.
- The roles and responsibilities of the UN 'Lead Agency', and implementing Agencies were not well defined, nor agreed.
- The basic 'ethos' of the partnership was not described. As one national partner said, 'coordination is a way of doing things, partnership is a culture – we are not close to this culture'. In this context, one national partner felt they were treated like a 'beneficiary', not a 'partner'. It is not enough to describe an organisation as a partner, and expect a functional, responsible relationship. It might happen, because of good will, but it should not be expected.
- There was no formative process for developing the processes and systems for the way implementing agencies and national partners would implement the JP – with partners working through together what the intent of their relationship is, who will provide what and who is responsible for what. This process would enable the development of a real partnership (the 'culture' described above), and the detailed description of a partnership, in the form of a partnership agreement, would give form to what has been developed. The agreement is then an objective reflection of the relationship.

> Finding 5: From the perspective of this JP, the evaluator does not believe it would add significant value to partnership arrangements or relationships, nor indeed to the quality of implementation, to attempt at

this stage to rectify this omission. The PMC, Agencies and national partners are addressing the shortcomings relatively effectively. However, it is incumbent on project management to ensure that the understandings and the relationships are maintained and effective, and contribute to JP outcomes. It appears at this stage that following a difficult period the relationships are relatively balanced, but it is important for the JP Manager to give attention to the functioning of this aspect of JP management.

Finding 6: From the overall perspective of the MDG-F, the Inception Workshop recommended in the JP Implementation Guidelines, 'with wide participation of relevant counterparts is carried out as soon as possible to determine the roles and responsibilities of the implementing parties', should be a requirement of the inception phase, not a recommended activity. It is worth considering further development of the draft agenda, based on experience to date. It is also worth considering engaging an external facilitator for the workshop, to enable an objective perspective throughout the workshop processes.

Interviewees were asked to discuss the effectiveness or otherwise of the fact that three of the five implementing UN Agencies are not present in Serbia. A range of both positive and negative factors were raised.

- Negatives.
    - Slowness of decision-making – needing to seek approvals from a 'line manager'/ backstopper who is not resident, and who has other project and programme responsibilities is at times a slow-moving process.
    - There is no clear, and generally agreed description of the role and function of a 'backstopper'.
    - Slowness of completion of tasks - needing feedback, inputs, reports etc from a 'line manager'/ backstopper who is not resident, and who has other project and programme responsibilities is at times a slow-moving process
    - Slowness of financial processes, as each Agency follows it own procedures within its own system.
- Positives
    - Some Agencies, whose management and administrative structures are apparently of a greater capacity, are able to provide both technical and management inputs and guidance to in-country staff while maintaining leadership of other programme initiatives on behalf of their Agency. The fact they are not 'in country' allows them to be more effective in terms of other assignments.
    - Non-resident Agencies are grateful for the opportunity to work in Serbia, and look at potentials for more work, without the additional costs of establishing an infrastructure for this work during the 'testing' phase.
    - The additional costs of making country visits are offset by not having a need to establish an operation in-country. This gives Agencies some flexibility in their operations while they determine if there is sufficient need and financing for a more significant, longer term presence.

Finding 7: The fact that not all UN partner agencies are present in Serbia can generally be judged to be more positive than negative in its impact on project management and implementation.

5.2 Process - Efficiency

There are flaws in the JPs implementation of the MDG-F's joint programme approach. Some of these issues go back to JP inception, and the PMC formation which is discussed above. However, there is also a consistent and vocal concern across UN Agencies and national partners about the application of 'One UN' approaches as demonstrated in the JP.

On the basis of comments received, as well as upon overall analysis, it can be said that there is a general lack of belief in, and commitment to, the 'joint' nature of approaches that extends across Agencies and national partners. One partner said 'They do not deliver as one. They do not act as one. It is not and should not be Agency programmes. The 'un-shared' vision impacts on management.' Another said 'UN Agencies, and the JP, do not give the JP Manager the power to execute the JP.' Another national partner said 'the five Agencies each follow their own course'.

This view extends to the Agencies themselves. There is a view that coordination happens only in general terms, about overall directions - 'We hide from each other.' '"Our" training refers to training by 'my' Agency.' 'There is still quite a danger that this is not a JP, but a parallel program. This danger has not been resolved with this management model.' 'The JP works as a clearing house. No power. You consult them, you ask them questions. Nothing more. There is a bit of redundancy in this sense. What is UNDP's role? Let them coordinate.'

The evaluator asked all Agency interviewees for comments on the contribution of the JP's management model to achieving anticipated outputs and outcomes. In response, the high level of nominal coordination and lack of an actual management structure or leadership was lamented. One interviewee stated that the JP Manager 'functions as a glorified secretariat' - a structural comment, not a statement about the JP Manager himself. Another said 'We need a professional manager, or the coordinator needs to have a stronger mandate.' Another - 'Is the Manager a manager or a coordinator? These are very different functions.' Another expressed the view that there are 'too many chiefs and not enough Indians'. One commented: 'The difficulty I find is that it is very difficult to work on a structure where there is no *one* responsible person.'

Secondly, the absence of a clearly defined management structure within the JP creates complexity in the effective management relationships with, access to and coordination of both national and local partners. Anyone, virtually, can approach partners at any time, creating issues with the partner, an overlap in communication and, as a rule, leaving the partner feeling as though the JP is poorly managed.

Thirdly, it is not clear within the PIU which agency is the lead agency, UNWTO, FAO or indeed UNDP, and what role, if any, a 'lead agency' has. The view of the evaluator is that JP leadership defined nor understood within the PIU, and this is of some concern. Staff and partners make a strong indication that this lack of a clearly defined leadership contributes to some inefficiencies in programme delivery. As discussed above, this situation would have been clarified had the Inception Workshop been better structured. It

There is a related concern that UNWTO and FAO do not agree about the fundamentals of the JP, and never have, and that these differences mirror to some extent the differing views of MERD and MATFWM in terms of rural tourism and rural development. However, there is

general agreement within these two Agencies (and from UNEP), that each Agency was able, ultimately, to have their priority components included in the RTMP, and that it does reflect all Agency's priorities. The JP could have assisted Agencies in more efficient management of their divergent views, and approaches, with a more structured inception phase.

Not surprisingly, given the relative size of the components and the non-presence of some Agencies, the JP is at a different level of priority for different Agencies. UNWTO has its project manager in Madrid – 'We are responsible for program funding. We manage all program activities.' while other Agencies clearly subscribe to the 'backstop' model, and assign significant roles to programme coordinators.

Finally, there was extensive commentary on finances. 'The separated financial model does not work. We need *a* financial system.' 'Why don't we have a single financial instrument?' 'We have a structure for harmonised budget categories, why not just have a budget that uses the same categories?' Programme officers may not even see detailed expenditure statements against their programme responsibilities, making it extremely difficult for them to actually manage their work.

> Finding 8: There is a concern across all stakeholders about the governance/ management structures of the JP, including the fundamentals of a 'joint programme', the role and functions of the 'JP Manager', line management, reporting, financial decision-making and financial reporting. The management model is not seen to add value to programme efficiency.

5.3 Results - Effectiveness

The discussion below will make use of the project document to provide a framework for the discussion. Detailed commentary will be made on each SMART Output statement, the three Finding statements below address JP effectiveness generally.

> Finding 9: The JP is tracking well towards the successful completion of activities and achievement of intended outputs. Focus on outcomes must be maintained though within the PIU – there is a danger at this juncture, and with the existing time constraints, that focus will shift to completing activities (particularly the grant schemes) without sufficient focus on what *results* these activities intend to *achieve*.

> Finding 10: Some areas of implementation have suffered from the push to bring implementation back on to the original timeline after the initial six month delay in getting activities underway.

> Finding 11: The JP – specifically the grant program – will benefit from a no-cost extension in order to more effectively deliver this component and also to better understand to effect of the grant activities. The no-cost extension is appropriate for the joint programme to 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.

5.3.1 JP Outcome 1: Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of the rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of MDGs.

This Outcome has not yet been completely achieved, although it is 'on track', subject to successful completion of work currently underway.

5.3.1.1 Outcome 1.1 – National Rural Tourism Master Plan (RTMP) for Serbia developed and submitted to the Government.

This Outcome has been achieved.

SMART Output 1.1.1 – National RTMP: Developed and submitted to the Government for approval by the end of Year 1.

For all intents and purposes this Output has been achieved. Each of the indicative activities related to this Output is complete, and the RTMP is now with the MERD, being prepared for submission to Government for approval. From this point, the processes are outside the control (and largely outside the influence) of the JP.

SMART Output 1.1.2 – Principles and Framework for Children-Related Tourism.

With the exception of the planned survey into backpack tourism, which will not be done, the indicative activities for this Output are complete. The studies were used in the formulation of the RTMP.

SMART Output 1.1.3. – National Study on Sustainable Tourism.

The activities to complete this output are not complete. The environmental study was done, and contributed to the RTMP. UNEP is now working on a study that will highlight items identified under RTMP which require preventative measure to minimise environmental impacts and recommend possible options for solutions.

SMART Output 1.1.4. – Assessment of the potential contribution of rural tourism to small farming sector and rural development in general.

This Output has been delivered, through a study conducted per the planned activities. The assessment was used in the formulation of the RTMP.

5.3.1.2 Outcome 1.2 – Rural Development Programme Planning is mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies; National Program for Rural Development for IPARD Axes 2 and 3 developed and submitted to Government.

This Outcome is largely achieved to date, and ongoing activities continue to address the intended outcome. It is noted that having completed the indicative activities, the JP continues to provide support to the MATFWM (The Rural Development Planning Group) in the development of rural development policy and GOS capacity in this area.

SMART Output 1.2.1. – IPARD National Agriculture and Rural development Program (2010-2013): strategic guidelines for inclusion of rural tourism and related activities to Axes 2 and 3 developed.

This Output has been delivered, although further aspects are being undertaken to strengthen the outputs.

SMART Output 1.2.2 – IPARD Life Conditions Study.

This Output has been delivered.

5.3.1.3 Outcome 1.3 – Investment Mainstreaming – sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies.

This Outcome has not been achieved – while some activities have been done, and some aspects of outputs delivered, generally speaking activities under this component are yet to be completed, but are programmed for year two.

SMART Output 1.3.1. – Public Investments toward the RTMP.

Some of the indicative activities for this output have been completed, but not all. A significant aspect of planned activities intended to contribute to achieving this output and outcome is the Investment Forum planned for November 2011.

SMART Output 1.3.2. – Public-Private Partnership Guidelines.

Some activities have been completed. This output includes the grant component of UNDP's area of responsibility, and some grants were provided during the initial stage of the JP. The grants emphasised partnerships in the development of a tourism product.

> Finding 12: The JP needs to ensure that the focus of this SMART Output is not grants, and specifically not grants that provide material, equipment or supplies. The emphasis of this component of the JP is 'sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies', with the focus of this SMART Output being Public-Private Partnerships (guidelines and activities). It would be unfortunate if the JP lost touch with this intended focus.

SMART Output 1.3.3. – SIFT Network.

This Output is partly delivered, and indicative activities to finalise are underway.

SMART Output 1.3.4. – Investment Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy.

This Output has not been delivered and indicative activities are not being implemented.

> Finding 13: This output is intended to feed the lessons learned from Outcome 2 (Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies) into public tourism investments. The output is part of the JP's M&E 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.

5.3.2 JP Outcome 2: Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies.

This is a very ambitious Outcome, and its focus on tourist destination development, diversification of the rural economy through tourism and active learning tourism investments cannot be forgotten. But it has strong support with both local and national partners. This

outcome has not yet been achieved. Focus on outcomes must be maintained though within the PIU – there is a danger at this juncture, and with the existing time constraints, that focus will shift to completing activities (particularly the grant schemes) without sufficient focus on what *results* these activities intend to *achieve*.

5.3.2.1 Outcome 2.1 – Capacity developed for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural development.

This outcome has not yet been achieved– while some activities have been done, and some aspects of outputs delivered, activities under this component are yet to be completed.

SMART Output 2.1.1. Local Action Groups. Capacity of pubic, private and civil society sector stakeholders strengthened to enable the establishment of six Local Action Groups and develop local rural development strategies.

This output is partly achieved, and indicative activities are being undertaken. This output links to Output 1.3.2., in relation to the grant scheme. The process is constrained somewhat by the fact that no legislative framework yet exists for Local Action Groups.

SMART Output 2.1.2 Rural Development Network capacity strengthened to lead development and facilitation of Local Action Groups, independently lobby for development initiatives and secure resources for regional development

> Finding 14: The JP should not lose sight of the fact that these outputs and outcome are about 'strengthening capacity'. They are not about the LAGs themselves, nor about 'training', unless that training is clearly strengthening the capacity of 'public, private and civil society stakeholders' and clearly strengthening the capacity of the RDN to 'lead development'. Nor are they about 'grants', except insofar as those grants *strengthen capacity*.

SMART Output 2.1.3. Local planning.

This output has not yet been delivered, and activities with regards this output are ongoing. These activities include the drafting of four local rural development strategic plans. LAGs will use these strategic plans to develop specific LAG strategies for their respective territories.

SMART Output 2.1.4. Organisational Capacity Development. A significant amount of training, as envisaged in the programme document has been organised and delivered.

This training is ongoing. Feedback from the field, from participants in the training, was to a great extent positive. However, there is an expressed feeling that there was simply too much training done in too short a period, and that quality and the focus of participation suffered as a result. The evaluator is of the view that this occurred as the JP attempted to bring implementation back onto track against the programmed time frame after the six month delay in initiating programme activities.

It is critical, over the coming 12 months of implementation, that the JP focus on developing the capacity in the field, particularly in relation the tourist destination development, diversification of the rural economy and active learning tourism investments.

> Finding 15: The JP would have benefitted greatly from knowing, soon after actual implementation began, that a no-cost extension would be agreed. The JP has brought the programme back into line with the

original implementation timeframe, but the quality of some components has suffered as a result.

SMART Output 2.1.5. Marketing and Promotion.

No activities related to this output have been initiated yet.

SMART Output 2.1.6 Energy Efficiency and Alternative Energy and SMART Output 2.1.9 Sustainable Resource Management.

The regional assessments and environmental studies anticipated under these outputs have been programmed, but have not yet been undertaken. A training program has been designed to address the planned training programme – a two-day session that incorporates energy efficiency on day one and sustainable resource management on day 2. The program will be implemented from September 2011 through April 2012.

Finding 16: As with comments above, the evaluator encourages the JP to look closely at the *intent* of this output and the outcome and to focus not on the number of trainees and number of sessions but on ensuring the programme 'develops capacity for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural development.'

SMART Output 2.1.7 Rural Tourism-Oriented Networks.

This output is not yet delivered. Some of the indicative activities have been completed, and further work is ongoing.

SMART Output 2.1.8 Product Development: Local tourism stakeholders actively participating in Product Development discussions through the TGOs and are trained to become active stakeholders in RTMP implementation.

Tourism Governance Office is a term with a specific meaning, and there are issues with its use in Serbia. Partly as a result of this, no work has yet been undertaken in relation to this output. However, the critical component of this output is not TGOs, but rather product development discussions.

Finding 17: While there are issues with the term TGO and its application in Serbia, the *intent* of this output should not be lost – without an appropriate focus from the JP, it will be difficult for the programme to ensure that local tourism stakeholders are actively participating in product development discussions and are active stakeholders in RTMP implementation. A greater focus will be required here for this output to be delivered.

SMART Output 2.1.9 (See 2.1.6).

SMART Output 2.1.10. Agriculture Quality Standards training.

The training is completed.

> Finding 18: It would be useful for the JP to assess the quality of outcome of the training over the next period of implementation, with a view to ensuring the anticipated quality of outcomes are being achieved.

5.3.2.2 Outcome 2.2 – Tourism governance structures enhanced in target regions through dedicated organisations, pilot project and investment promotion.

This outcome has not yet been achieved.

SMART Output 2.2.1. Tourism Governance Organisations

No work has yet been done on the component of the JP, with UNWTO focused to date on the RTMP. There appears to be some issue with the use of the name Tourism Governance Organisation, and the formal nature of the concept.

> Finding 19: The evaluator is of the view that the essence of the JP, as stated in Outcome statement 2.2, is about 'tourism governance structures', ie not TGOs per se, and the focus of this outcome is on 'enhancing' these structures. This output and its activities then become a very interesting, useful process in support of the development of rural tourism.

SMART Output 2.2.2. Child-related Tourism Supply and Demand

Some indicative activities of this output are completed and some are ongoing, and the output is not yet fully delivered.

SMART Output 2.2.3. Investment Forum

The Investment Forum, a critical component of the JP strategy in relation to investment promotion, is being jointly organised with MERD and will take place in November.

5.3.2.3 The Grant Programmes

SMART Outputs 2.2.4., 2.2.5., 2.2.6 relate to the Joint UN Fund For Sustainable Rural Tourism (The Grant Programmes).

These SMART Outputs relate to each UN Agency's component of the grant schemes. The grants are of interest to all Agencies and all national partners, each having a view as to the most effective approach to making use of the available funds. The grants are also at the forefront of the thinking of the PIU and JP Manager, as the timing of design of the grant schemes, issuing a call for proposals, assessing applications, making payments of grants and monitoring/ overseeing the implementation of the grant schemes is a long process.

The grants pose a fundamental issue for JP management and implementation. The comment was made to the Evaluator that 'This is not a Joint Fund. Each Agency has its own criteria, and there is no coordination. And there is no relationship between the JP's grants and grant initiatives of national partners.' From a logistical perspective alone, it makes complete sense for this process to indeed represent 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. It is the understanding of the evaluator that this will not happen, that there will be a range of criteria for success, varying degrees of transparency in selection, varying levels and

criteria for payments of first and subsequent tranches. In a joint programme, drawing on the same groups of beneficiaries, in the same geography, with the same source of funds, this approach is neither efficient or effective. As well as creating logistical issues for Agencies, it leaves the JP looking poorly coordinated and managed in front of national and local partners and the public.

> Finding 20: The JP would benefit, logistically and in terms of outcomes, from running the Joint Fund's grant initiatives as a single initiative, and where possible in coordination with the financial initiatives of national partners.

There are concerns about the ability of the JP to complete the grant schemes within the time frame of the JP. There are related concerns about the effectiveness of the grant schemes if the money is not available for grantees to be used across a complete tourist season. Finally, there are concerns about how to measure the effectiveness of the schemes if the JP is not extended, with the extension allowing some evaluation to take place by the PIU.

> Finding 21: A no-cost extension is appropriate for the JP solely to ensure the grant components intended in year two are well conceived, have appropriate implementation time in the field – across a complete tourist season as appropriate - and are able to be assessed against their intended outputs and outcomes.

> Finding 22: 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.

There are two comments to make on the effectiveness of implementation that are cross-cutting to Agencies, activities and SMART Outputs. As discussed in detail at Output 2.1.4 above, the evaluator is of the view that the first reflects the pressure experienced by the PIU to bring the JP back onto schedule, and is therefore unlikely to present a problem in the coming period. However, they are noted here as beneficiaries of JP initiatives expressed views on the quantity and quality of the training program that should be noted by the PIU in delivery of activities in the field, and that should be addressed in order to ensure participants experience JP activities as adding value to their work.

- Local and national partners are very supportive of the training program, particularly its intent to 'contribute to better servicing in the field', but made the point that the training was *dense* (there was lots of it) and overlapping. Doubts were expressed as to whether or not it was actually building capacity, particularly as it was not approached in a 'staged manner', 'staged' referring to the structure and efficiency of the timing of training programs.
- It was also noted that Agency coordination was poor - local partners would get requests for information that had already been provided to other Agencies in the JP.

5.4 Results – Sustainability

Assessments of the likely sustainability of the initiatives of the JP centred on the nature of involvement of national partners, the likely policy impact of JP initiatives and the potential for financial support/ investments in activities related to the JP's activities. All project stakeholders are aware of and commented on issues related to ownership and governance of the JP, discussed above, and recognised the strengths and weaknesses of the involvement of national partners. MERD (with support from TOS) has provided strong commitment to and involvement in the project's design and implementation processes, providing as well the leadership necessary to ensure the key policy component of the JP, the RTMP, is completed and submitted to Government for approval. The involvement of the MAWFM has not been as proactive, as Ministry policy shifted away from a focus on rural development (and therefore from a commitment to the role of rural tourism development in a rural development context). Ministry representatives to the PMC, and those with whom the JP work regularly, remain interested and committed to the JP, but the Ministry's policy and priority focus does not currently include the JP.

Of particular relevance is Serbia's preparations for accession, and the role and impact access to IPARD funding can have on the country, and particularly in relation to rural development. The reality is that at this moment MATFWM priorities have shifted away from focusing in these areas, to the detriment of national planning and preparation processes well beyond the JP.

Notwithstanding the comments above regarding national agriculture policy and the MATFWM, national partners have demonstrated the technical and leadership capacity necessary to move forward with initiatives that are part of the JP. MERD is driving the policy process related to the RTMP effectively and appropriately. The national partners have benefited from their association with the JP, particularly in terms of the technical assistance provided by UN Agencies in developing and preparing JP initiatives with Ministry representatives. While it is likely that initiatives evolving from the RTMP will receive budgetary assistance for the GOS, there is no guarantee that such assistance will be forthcoming.

> Finding 23: National partners have demonstrated, and continue to demonstrate the level of technical and management expertise necessary to take JP initiatives into the future, as part of GOS policy and procedural frameworks.

> Finding 24: Local partners feel that the key to the JP is that it is developing a large number of people, across 4 regions and 19 Municipalities, who communicate well.

5.5 Advocacy and Communication

The MDG-F Secretariat, in consultation with the various participating UN Agencies, has elaborated an Advocacy and Partnerships strategy 'to help the MDG-F advance its main goal of accelerating progress on the MDGs and related goals while advancing collaborative UN efforts. It responds to the demonstrated need to strengthen citizen's participation in development efforts and have clear advocacy interventions that push for more inclusive and responsive public policy and practice.'

The strategy provides a guiding framework within which to articulate national advocacy plans, and three key outcomes are anticipated:

- Increased awareness and support for the MDGs and the Fund both at policy and general public level.
- Programmes are leveraged for increased MDG results and citizen engagement in MDG-F and MDG processes is strengthened.
- Improved accountability and transparency towards all partners.

The MDG-F provides funding, through the three JPs in Serbia, for a position within UNDP that focuses on advocacy and communication. A range of initiatives have been undertaken as a result of this position being established, and these initiatives are responding well to the three above key outcomes of the MDG-F. The work being done is particularly strong in its approaches for increasing awareness of and support for the MDGs, and the MDG-F, at both a policy and public level. The work is also strong in terms of improving accountability and transparency to partners. While there is work being done to leverage the JPs in Serbia for increased MDG results and citizen engagement in MDG processes, this is an area where a specific, more direct focus, could deliver better outcomes.

> Finding 25: The JP, and the advocacy and communication strategies of the MDG-F, would benefit by adding a focus on leveraging for increased MDG results and citizen engagement in it activities.

5.6 Conclusions

The section below summarises the strengths and weaknesses of the JP and then provides conclusions against the evaluation questions. These conclusions draw specifically on the findings which are detailed on a section by section basis above.

Note: In providing the Finding statements here, in a single location, there is obvious repetition which, it is hoped, actually adds value to the report in that the findings are able to be seen in a single narrative.

5.6.1 Strengths of the JP

While the JP has struggled with a number of issues and difficulties, it is basically working in the right direction, achieving planned outputs and contributing to intended outcomes. Feedback from stakeholders was consistent in the view that, with some exceptions, work is progressing within appropriate timeframes and with requisite levels of quality.

From an assessment of activities and Outputs, and their contribution to JP Outcomes, it can be assessed that the JP is tracking well towards the successful completion of the programme. Focus on outcomes must be maintained though within the PIU – there is a danger at this juncture, and with the existing time constraints, that focus will shift to completing activities (particularly the grant schemes) without sufficient focus on what *results* these activities intend to *achieve*.

The overall design of the JP at outcome level has strong support across national and local partners, and national partners generally express and demonstrate a high level of ownership of design and implementation. National partners have demonstrated, and continue to demonstrate the level of technical and management expertise necessary to take JP initiatives into the future, as part of GOS policy and procedural frameworks.

Local partners demonstrate a commitment to improvements to servicing and a belief in the developing of tourism networks that are the focus of the JP. Coupled with this is the view of local partners that the most important aspect of the JP is that it is developing a large number of people, across 4 regions and 19 Municipalities, who communicate well with each other, in the field or rural tourism.

The fact that not all UN partner agencies are present in Serbia can generally be judged to be more positive than negative in its impact on project management and implementation.

5.6.2 Weaknesses

There was criticism of, and some residual concerns about, the governance framework for the JP, including questions about the basic formulation of the programme and the role and functioning of the partner relationships.

The management model as implemented by the JP is not seen generally to add value to programme effectiveness. It is felt that the PMC component is a strong positive in terms of ownership on the part of national partners, but did not function strongly enough as a management body.

No clear definition exists for the partnership relationship between national partners and implementing UN Agencies. This lack of a clear definition allows for confusion to develop, blocks transparency and does not contribute to appropriate levels of responsibility from all partners in the relationship.

There is a strong concern across all stakeholders about the governance/ management structures of the JP, including the fundamentals of a 'joint programme' as implemented by UN Agencies, the role and functions of the 'JP Manager', line management, reporting, financial decision-making and financial reporting.

The JP would have benefitted greatly from knowing, soon after actual implementation began, that a no-cost extension would be agreed. The JP has brought the programme back into line with the original implementation timeframe, but the quality of some components has suffered as a result of the push to bring implementation back on to the original timeline after the initial six month delay in getting activities underway.

5.6.3 Design Relevance

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the objectives of the JP are consistent with the needs and interest of the people and institutions of Serbia, as well as the MDGs. Specific emphasis was placed on the level of ownership of the JP by the leadership and representatives of national partners.

The design of the JP fits neatly in GoS priorities. Rural tourism is a priority. The JP will not address the whole of the Serbian Government's approach to sustainable rural tourism but the policy framework is important. Local partners consider the RTMP as 'very significant', as it will provide a 'critical component' of necessary policy in Serbia. Local partners also felt that the 'work of the JP is exactly in line with the priorities of the regions.' The JP also responds directly to GoS rural development program priorities, as defined in the National Rural Development Program for the years 2011-2013.

Finding 1: JP implementation, as well as its analysis and reporting, would benefit from the PIU preparing an analysis of project beneficiaries, planned and actual, and developing a 1-2 page description of the types and numbers of intended beneficiaries. This document should then be signed off by the PMC, and used in future for analysis and reporting.

Finding 2: The overall design of the JP at outcome level has strong support across national and local partners, and national partners generally express and demonstrate a high level of ownership of design and implementation.

Finding 3: There were some residual concerns about the original formulation of the programme, particularly in terms of conflicting priorities of national partners and of Agencies within the JP's priority framework. These concerns are managed effectively by the PMC.

5.6.4 Efficiency

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the JP has been efficient in its use of resources and in converting resources into results. The evaluation analysed activities and outputs against inputs.

There are a range of issues with efficiency of project implementation and management that hamper the deliver of project activities and outputs, but not to the extent that the JP is in danger of not delivering its programmed activities or outputs. It can be argued that the JP is succeeding because implementing Agencies are driven by their professionalism to ensure they complete with their responsibilities. It cannot however be said that the efficiency, nor the quality of outputs are of an added value because they are delivered within the framework of a joint programme.

Finding 4: The PMC's effectiveness in addressing management and implementation problems, and particularly in ensuring the technical and operational teams work together, in a coordinated way, on the programme activities and in consultation with the JP Manager, would be strengthened with a greater focus on the consistent participation of the relevant Agency and partner delegates.

The Inception Workshop as undertaken by the JP did not address the intent of the workshop as described in the JP Implementation Guidelines, and, particularly in relation to discussions on the roles and responsibilities of implementing parties, the concept of partner, JP leadership, management processes, procedures and reporting did not take place.

Finding 5: From the perspective of this JP, the evaluator does not believe it would add significant value to partnership arrangements or relationships, nor indeed to the quality of implementation, to attempt at this stage to rectify this omission. The PMC, Agencies and national partners are addressing the shortcomings relatively effectively. However, it is incumbent on project management to ensure that the understandings and the relationships are maintained and effective, and contribute to JP outcomes. It appears at this stage that following a difficult period the relationships are relatively balanced, but it is important for the JP Manager to give attention to the functioning of this aspect of JP management.

Finding 6: From the overall perspective of the MDG-F, the Inception Workshop recommended in the JP Implementation Guidelines, 'with wide participation of relevant counterparts is carried out as soon as possible to determine the roles and responsibilities of the implementing parties', should be a requirement of the inception phase, not a recommended activity. It is worth considering further development of the draft agenda, based on experience to date. It is also worth considering engaging an external facilitator for the workshop, to enable an objective perspective throughout the workshop processes.

Finding 7: The fact that not all UN partner agencies are present in Serbia can generally be judged to be more positive than negative in its impact on project management and implementation.

Finding 8: There is a concern across all stakeholders about the governance/ management structures of the JP, including the fundamentals of a 'joint programme', the role and functions of the 'JP Manager', line management, reporting, financial decision-making and financial reporting. The management model is not seen to add value to programme efficiency.

5.6.5 Effectiveness

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the project has been effective to date in achieving its intended objectives.

Having gotten off to a particularly slow start, the JP is on track to complete it activities and outputs on time. While there are some areas of concern, most activities/ output areas are progressing well against the programmed time frame.

Finding 9: The JP is tracking well towards the successful completion of activities and achievement of intended outputs. Focus on outcomes must be maintained though within the PIU – there is a danger at this juncture, and with the existing time constraints, that focus will shift to completing activities (particularly the grant schemes) without sufficient focus on what results these activities intend to achieve.

Finding 10: Some areas of implementation have suffered from the push to bring implementation back on to the original timeline after the initial six month delay in getting activities underway.

Finding 11: The JP – specifically the grant program – will benefit from a no-cost extension in order to more effectively deliver this component and also to better understand to effect of the grant activities. The no-cost extension is appropriate for the joint programme to 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.

Finding 12: The JP needs to ensure that the focus of Output 1.3.2 is not grants, and specifically not grants that provide material, equipment or supplies. The emphasis of this component of the JP is 'sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies', with the focus of this SMART Output being Public-Private Partnerships (guidelines and activities). It would be unfortunate if the JP lost touch with this intended focus.

Finding 13: Output 1.3.4. – Investment Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy is intended to feed the lessons learned from Outcome 2 (Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies) into public tourism investments. The output is part of the JP's M&E 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.

Finding 14: In relation to Output 2.1.1. Local Action Groups and Output 2.1.2 Rural Development Network capacity strengthened, the JP should not lose sight of the fact that these outputs and outcome are about 'strengthening capacity'. They are not about the LAGs themselves, nor about 'training', unless that training is clearly strengthening the capacity of 'public, private and civil society stakeholders' and clearly strengthening the capacity of the RDN to 'lead development'. Nor are they about 'grants', except insofar as those grants strengthen capacity.

Finding 15: The JP would have benefitted greatly from knowing, soon after actual implementation began, that a no-cost extension would be agreed. The JP has brought the

programme back into line with the original implementation timeframe, but the quality of some components has suffered as a result.

Finding 16: In relation to Output 2.1.6 Energy Efficiency and Alternative Energy and SMART Output 2.1.9 Sustainable Resource Management, the evaluator encourages the JP to look closely at the intent of this output and the outcome and to focus not on the number of trainees and number of sessions but on ensuring the programme 'develops capacity for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural development.'

Finding 17: While there are issues with the term TGO and its application in Serbia, the intent of this output - 2.1.8 Product Development - should not be lost. Without an appropriate focus from the JP, it will be difficult for the programme to ensure that local tourism stakeholders are actively participating in product development discussions and are active stakeholders in RTMP implementation. A greater focus will be required here for this output to be delivered.

Finding 18: It would be useful for the JP to assess the quality of outcome of the training over the next period of implementation, with a view to ensuring the anticipated quality of outcomes are being achieved.

Finding 19: The evaluator is of the view that the essence of the JP, as stated in Outcome statement 2.2, is about 'tourism governance structures', ie not TGOs per se, and the focus of this outcome is on 'enhancing' these structures. This output and its activities then become a very interesting, useful process in support of the development of rural tourism.

Finding 20: The JP would benefit, logistically and in terms of outcomes, from running the Joint Fund's grant initiatives as a single initiative, and where possible in coordination with the financial initiatives of national partners.

Finding 21: A no-cost extension is appropriate for the JP to ensure the grant components intended in year two are well conceived, have appropriate implementation time in the field – across a complete tourist season as appropriate - and are able to be assessed against their intended outputs and outcomes.

Finding 25: The JP, and the advocacy and communication strategies of the MDG-F, would benefit by adding a focus on leveraging for increased MDG results and citizen engagement in it activities.

5.6.6 Sustainability

The evaluation tested whether or not there is likely to be a continuation of benefits from the JP after it has been completed.

National partners have demonstrated the technical and leadership capacity necessary to move forward with initiatives that are part of the JP. MERD is driving the policy process related to the RTMP effectively and appropriately. While it is likely that initiatives evolving from the RTMP will receive budgetary assistance for the GoS, there is no guarantee that such assistance will be forthcoming.

Finding 22: 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.

Finding 23: National partners have demonstrated, and continue to demonstrate the level of technical and management expertise necessary to take JP initiatives into the future, as part of GOS policy and procedural frameworks.

Finding 24: Local partners feel that the key to the JP is that it is developing a large number of people, across 4 regions and 19 Municipalities, who communicate well.

5.6.7 UNDAF

The JP is responding to **UNDAF Outcome 3.1** – 'Sustainable development plans that effectively respond to the needs of people, communities and the private sector, and promote rural development and environmental protection.'

- The RTMP and the rural development components around the LEADER approach and LAGS directly contribute to change and development in this area.

The JP is responding to the intended **Government strategies** – Strategy for Development of Tourism; Strategy for Regional Development; Poverty Reduction Strategy; National Sustainable Development Strategy, National Rural Development Program for the years 2011-2013.

- Direct and/ or indirect contributions are being made by the JP to the development and/ or implementation of each of these strategies.

5.6.8 MDGs

In its design, the JP is intended to respond to eight MDG targets:

MDG 1 – Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger

1.1 Reduce unemployment rate of young by at least one third.

- No detailed assessment is possible based on JP data, but it is likely that the JP itself will contribute to the MDG, albeit in a limited way.

1.2 Reduce unemployment rate of persons with disabilities by at least 20%.

- The JP has a minimal focus on the involvement of people with disabilities in the programme, although overall, the policy change and other initiatives of the JP are likely to have some limited effect.

1.3 Reduce unemployment rate of women by over 45%.

- No detailed assessment is possible based on JP data, but it is likely that activities re the LEADER approach and LAG will have an impact in these areas.

MDG 7 – Ensure Environmental Sustainability

7.1 Integrate sustainable development principles in national documents, stop the loss of natural resources and encourage their revitalisation.

- The RTMP includes specific provisions related to sustainable development principles – the JP has had a direct impact in this area.

7.2 Adopt and implement national programmes, strategies and laws governing sustainable development and environmental protection in Republic of Serbia by 2015.

- The RTMP includes specific provisions related to sustainable development principles – the JP has made a direct contribution in this area.

7.5 Increase energy efficiency and usage of renewable energy.

- While some inputs are expected from the JP in this area, and some effects may occur, not work has yet been done.

MDG 8 – Develop a Global Partnership for Development

8.1 Dynamic and sustainable GDP growth based on assumptions established by the National Investment Plan, the Strategy for Promotion and Development of Foreign Investments and the Strategy for Economic development until 2012.

- The evaluator is not able to comment on this MDG component.

8.3 Increase investments in human resource development by 70%.

- The evaluator is not able to comment on this MDG component.

5.7 Recommendations

The following provides some recommendations for the JP in terms of its delivery of the JP through to completion of implementation. Some recommendations are general and some respond directly to findings of the evaluation. In the later case, the recommendation notes which finding is being discussed.

Recommendation 1 – Beneficiaries. With regards to Finding 1 it is recommended that the PIU 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.

Recommendation 2 – PMC Composition and Meetings. With regards to Finding 4, it is recommended that Agencies and national partners indicate to the PMC who their formal representative is, as well as indicating that the representative has decision-making authority. Subsequently, it is recommended that these representatives are present at PMC meetings, or that they formally delegate someone on their behalf, including their decision-making responsibilities.

Recommendation 3 – Results Focus. With regards all field activities, but particularly capacity building initiatives and the grant activities, *focus on outcomes* must be maintained within the PIU.

- One specific concern is that activities associated with 'strengthening capacity' can lose their focus in a cluttered and time-pressured environment. The JP needs to ensure it keeps its *result focus* in relation capacity-building activities (not an input-focus where numbers of training sessions and participants is used to judge 'success').
- The emphasis of the JP's Joint Fund is *enhancing tourism governance towards better linked and organised tourism and support industries where capacity is improved for delivering services*. The focus must be on results, not on the grants, which are simply an input – a tool for achieving the output/ outcome. With the existing time constraints, there is a danger that the focus will shift to completing activities (particularly the grant schemes) without sufficient focus on *the results these activities intend to achieve*. It is recommended that the PMC works closely with the PIU to ensure that the results focus is not lost in order to complete activities.

Specific reference is made to the following output areas:

- Output 1.3.2 Public-Private Partnership Guidelines includes a grant component. The emphasis of this output area is 'sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies', with the focus of this Output being Public-Private Partnerships (guidelines and activities). Activities and outputs should be assessed against this focus.
- Output 2.1.1. Local Action Groups and Output 2.1.2 Rural Development Network focus on 'strengthening capacity'. They are not about the LAGs themselves, nor

'training', nor 'grants'. Activities, and their subsequent assessment, need to be against an output of strengthening capacity, *not* an input of training or grants.

- Output 2.1.6 Energy Efficiency and Alternative Energy and Output 2.1.9 Sustainable Resource Management focus on developing 'capacity for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural development.' Activities, and their subsequent assessment, need to be against an output of strengthening capacity, *not* an input of training.
- It would be beneficial for the JP to assess the *quality of outcomes* (against anticipated JP Outcomes) of the training over the next period of implementation, with a view to ensuring the anticipated quality of outcomes are being achieved.

Recommendation 4 – No-cost Extension. With regards to the grant program, it is recommended that a no-cost extension be given in order to more effectively deliver this component and also to better understand to effect of the grant activities. The no-cost extension is appropriate for the joint programme to 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*.

Recommendation 5 – Grants Program. Recommendation The JP would benefit, logistically and in terms of outcomes, from running the Joint Fund's grant initiatives as a single initiative, and where possible 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.

Recommendation 6 – Output 2.1.3 Product Development. With regards the product development discussions at output 2.1.8, it is recommended the JP re-focus activities on the intent of this output, which is that local tourism stakeholders are actively participating in product development discussions and are active stakeholders in RTMP implementation.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 11 – Follow-up Programme. A follow-up programme should be considered to sustain the development. This is particularly relevant in relation to Outcome 2,

where a further single year of activities with local tourism suppliers and tourism organisations/ LAGS/ local self government will not be sufficient to ensure development of the kind of structural strength needed. A further initiative that links rural tourism and a LEADER approach can make significant inroads into addressing local needs.

Annexes

6 Annex 1 - ToR for the evaluation

EVALUATION OF JOINT PROGRAMMES ON DEVELOPMENT AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

General Context: the MDG-F Development and the Private Sector Window

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG-F supports countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication.

The MDG-F operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 49 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs.

The 12 joint programmes in this window support, either directly or indirectly, national productive forces (e.g. farms , small and medium enterprises and other economic agents). These joint programmes In particular seek to contribute to: increasing the competitiveness of micro- and small enterprises and/or farms, adopting or improving policies in favor of small enterprises and/or farms, and increasing the capacity of existing enterprises and/or farms through technical training.

The beneficiaries of the Joint Programmes are fairly concentrated. Many joint programmes involve the government, as a major actor of the support to enterprises. Entrepreneurs and/or farmers are naturally another key stakeholder, identified as such in all Joint Programmes. Beneficiaries are sometimes part of specific sectors (such as crafts, tourism, textile, agriculture), and sometimes all entrepreneurs without restriction.

The following points should be provided by the joint programme team

- Describe the joint programme, programme name and goals; include when it started, what outputs and outcomes are sought, its contribution to the MDGs at the local and national levels, its duration and current stage of implementation.
- Summarize the joint programme's scale of complexity, including its components, targeted participants (direct and indirect), geographical scope (regions) and the socio-economic context in which it operates.
- It is also useful to describe the human and financial resources that the joint programme has at its disposal, the number of programme implementation partners (UN, national and local governments and other stakeholders in programme implementation).
- Changes noted in the programme since implementation began, and how the programme fits in with the priorities of the UNDAF and the National Development Strategies.

2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDG-F. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that all joint programmes lasting longer than two years will be subject to a mid-term evaluation.

Mid-term evaluations are highly formative in nature and seek to **improve implementation of the joint programmes during their second phase of implementation**. **They also seek and generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned** that could be transferred to other programmes. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC GOALS

The mid-term evaluation will use an expedited process to carry out a systematic, fast-paced analysis of the design, process and results or results trends of the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period of approximately three months.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this interim evaluation is the joint programme, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This mid-term evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. To discover the programme's **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the **Millennium Development Goals**, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
2. To understand how the joint programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the **One UN** framework.
3. To identify the programme's **degree of effectiveness** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the **Economic Governance thematic window,** and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS AND CRITERIA

The main users of the evaluation represented in the evaluation reference group (Section 8 of the TOR), and specifically the coordination and implementation unit of the joint programme, are responsible for contributing to this section. Evaluation questions and criteria may be added or modified up to a reasonable limit, bearing in mind the viability and the limitations (resources, time, etc.) of a quick mid-term evaluation exercise.

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

Design level:

- **Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.**

a) Is the identification of the problems, with their respective causes, clear in the joint programme?
b) Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women and men in the areas of intervention?
c) To what extent has the intervention strategy been adapted to the areas of intervention in which it is being implemented? What actions does the programme envisage, to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural background?
d) Are the follow-up indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme?
e) To what extent has the MDG-F Secretariat contributed to raising the quality of the design of the joint programmes?

- **Ownership in the design: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions**

a) To what extent do the intervention objectives and strategies of the Joint Programme respond to national and regional plans and programmes, to identified needs, and to the operational context of national politics?
b) 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?

Process level

- **Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results**

a) To what extent does the joint programme's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) contribute to obtaining the predicted products and results?
b) To what extent 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?
c) Are there efficient coordination mechanisms to avoid overloading the counterparts, participating population/actors?
d) Is the pace of implementing the products of the programme ensuring the completeness of the results of the joint programme? How do the different components of the joint programme interrelate?
e) Are work methodologies, financial instruments, etc. shared among agencies, institutions and Joint Programmes?
f) Have more efficient (sensitive) and appropriate measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural problems identified?

- Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions

g) To what extent have the target population and participants made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation have taken place?

h) To what extent have public/private national resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme's objective and produce results and impacts?

Results level

- Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance.

a) Is the programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results?
    a. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
    b. To what extent is the programme contributing to the goals set by the thematic window, and in what ways?
b) Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes?
c) Do the outputs produced meet the required high quality?
d) Does the programme have follow-up mechanisms (to verify the quality of the products, punctuality of delivery, etc.) to measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results?
e) Does the programme have follow-up mechanisms (to verify the quality of the products, punctuality of delivery, etc.) to measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results?
f) Is the programme providing coverage to beneficiaries as planned?
g) In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving?
h) Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified?
i) In what ways has the joint programme contributed to the issue of fair youth employment?
j) In what ways has the joint programme contributed to the issue of internal and/or external migration?
k) 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?

Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.

a) Are the necessary premises occurring to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme?

    At local and national level:

    i. Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions?
    ii. Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme and to repeat it?
    iii. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
    iv. Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
    v. Is the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of the interventions?
b) To what extent are the visions and actions of the partners consistent or divergent with regard to the joint programme?

c) In what ways can the governance of the joint programme be improved so that it has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability?

5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The mid-term evaluations will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form opinions. Consultants are also expected to use interviews as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the desk study report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the Secretariat of the MDG-F:

- **Inception Report** (to be submitted within fifteen days of the submission of all programme documentation to the consultant)

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the joint programme this report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers. The report will follow this outline:

0. Introduction

1. Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach

2. Identification of main units and dimensions for analysis and possible areas for research

3. Main substantive and financial achievements of the joint programme

4. Methodology for the compilation and analysis of the information

5. Criteria to define the mission agenda, including "field visits"

- **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 15 days of completion of the field visit)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be shared with evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions. This report will contain the same sections as the final report, described below.

- **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within ten days of receipt of the draft final report with comments)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the following sections at a minimum:

1. Cover Page
2. Introduction
   - Background, goal and methodological approach
   - Purpose of the evaluation
   - Methodology used in the evaluation
   - Constraints and limitations on the study conducted
3. Description of interventions carried out
   - - Initial concept
   - - Detailed description of its development: description of the hypothesis of change in the programme.
4. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions
5. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)
6. Recommendations
7. Annexes

7. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The mid-term evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

• **Anonymity and confidentiality**. The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.

• **Responsibility**. The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.

• **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.

• **Independence**. The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.

• **Incidents**. If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDG-F. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDG-F in these terms of reference.

• **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.

• **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.

• **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

8. ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION

The main actors in the mid-term evaluation process are the MDG-F Secretariat, the management team of the joint programme and the Programme Management Committee that could be expanded to accommodate additional relevant stakeholders. This group of institutions and individuals will serve as the evaluation reference group. The role of the evaluation reference group will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
- Providing input on the evaluation planning documents,(Work Plan and Communication, Dissemination and Improvement Plan).
- Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference.
- Facilitating the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
- Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

The MDG-F Secretariat shall promote and manage Joint Programme mid-term evaluation in its role as commissioner of the evaluation, fulfilling the mandate to conduct and finance the joint programme evaluation. As manager of the evaluation, the Secretariat will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation process is conducted as stipulated, promoting and leading the evaluation design; coordinating and monitoring progress and development in the evaluation study and the quality of the process.

9. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

A. Preparation of the evaluation (approximately 45-60 days before the date the programme reaches a year and a half of implementation). These preparatory activities are not part of the evaluation as they precede the evaluation exercise.

1. An official e-mail from the Secretariat is sent to the RC, coordination officers in the country and joint programme coordinator. This mail will include the official starting date of the evaluation, instructive on mid-term evaluation and generic TOR for the evaluation.
2. During this period the evaluation reference group is established, the TOR are adapted to the context and interest of stakeholders in the country and all relevant documents on the joint programme are sent to the evaluator.

This activity requires a dialogue between the Secretariat and the reference group of the evaluation (the body that comments on and reviews but does not interfere with the independent evaluation process). This dialogue should be aimed at rounding out and modifying some of the

questions and dimensions of the study that the generic TOR do not cover, or which are inadequate or irrelevant to the joint programme.

3. The Secretariat's portfolios manager will discuss with the country an initial date for having the field visit.
4. From this point on, the evaluation specialists and the portfolio manager are responsible for managing the execution of the evaluation, with three main functions: to facilitate the work of the consultant, to serve as interlocutor between the parties (consultant, joint programme team in the country, etc.), and to review the deliverables that are produced.

B. Execution phase of the evaluation study (87-92 days total)

Desk study (23 days total)

1. Briefing with the consultant **(1 day).** A checklist of activities and documents to review will be submitted, and the evaluation process will be explained. Discussion will take place over what the evaluation should entail.
2. Review of documents according to the standard list (see TOR annexes; programme document, financial, monitoring reports etc.).
3. Submission of the inception report including the findings from the document review specifying how the evaluation will be conducted. The inception report is sent and shared with the evaluation reference group for comments and suggestions (within **fifteen days of delivery of all programme documentation to the consultant**).
4. The focal person for the evaluation (joint programme coordinator, resident coordinator office, etc) and the consultant prepare and agenda to conduct the field visit of the evaluation. (Interview with programme participants, stakeholders, focus groups, etc) (Within **seven days of delivery of the desk study report**).

Field visit (10-15 days)

1. The consultant will travel to the country to observe and contrast the preliminary conclusions reached through the study of the document revision. The planned agenda will be carried out. To accomplish this, the Secretariat's programme officer may need to facilitate the consultant's visit by means of phone calls and emails, making sure there is a focal person in the country who is his/her natural interlocutor by default.
2. The consultant will be responsible for conducting a debriefing with the key actors he or she has interacted with.

Final Report (54 days total)

1. The consultant will deliver a draft final report, which the Secretariat's programme officer shall be responsible for sharing with the evaluation reference group **(within fifteen days of the completion of the field visit).**

2. The Secretariat will assess the quality of the evaluation reports presented using the criteria stipulated by UNEG and DAC Evaluation Network **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report).**

3. The evaluation reference group may ask that data or facts that it believes are incorrect be changed, as long as it provides data or evidence that supports its request. The evaluator will have the final say over whether to accept or reject such changes. For the sake of evaluation quality, the Secretariat can and should intervene so that erroneous

data, and opinions based on erroneous data or not based on evidence, are changed **(within fifteen days of delivery of the draft final report).**

The evaluation reference group may also comment on the value judgements contained in the evaluation, but these may not affect the evaluator's freedom to express the conclusions and recommendations he or she deems appropriate, based on the evidence and criteria established.

All comments will be compiled in a matrix that the Secretariat will provide to the evaluation focal points.

4. On the completion of input from the reference group, the evaluator shall decide which input to incorporate and which to omit (**ten days**) and submit to the MDG-F Secretariat a final evaluation report.
5. The Secretariat will review the final copy of the report, and this phase will conclude with the delivery of this report to the evaluation reference group in the country **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report with comments).**

C. Phase of incorporating recommendations and improvement plan (within fifteen days of delivery of the final report):

1. The Secretariat's programme officer, as representative of the Secretariat, shall engage in a dialogue with the joint programme managers to establish an improvement plan that includes recommendations from the evaluation.
2. The Secretariat will publish the evaluation in its website.

10. ANNEXES

a) Document Review

This section must be completed and specified by the other users of the evaluation but mainly by the management team of the joint programme and by the Programme Management Committee. A minimum of documents that must be reviewed before the field trip shall be established; in general terms the Secretariat estimates that these shall include, as a minimum:

MDG-F Context

- MDG-F Framework Document
- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

Specific Joint Programme Documents

- Joint Programme Document: results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
- Mission reports from the Secretariat
- Quarterly reports
- Mini-monitoring reports
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Annual reports
- Annual work plan
- Financial information (MDTF)

Other in-country documents or information

- Evaluations, assessments or internal reports conducted by the joint programme

- Relevant documents or reports on the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country
- Relevant documents or reports on One UN, Delivering as One

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				
Response from the Joint Programme Management				
Key actions	**Time frame**	**Person responsible**	**Follow-up**	
1.1			**Comments**	**Status**
1.2				
1.3				
Evaluation Recommendation No. 2				
Response from the Joint Programme Management				
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	**Follow-up**	
2.1			Comments	Status
2.2				
2.3				
Evaluation Recommendation No. 3				
Response from the Joint Programme Management				
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	**Follow-up**	
3.1			Comments	Status
3.2				
3.3				

7 Annex 2 – Listing Of Documentation Assessed During The Desk-top Study

Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development – Joint Programme Document

2010 UN Success Stories

Final 2010 UN Annual Report

MDG Report 2010

Media Mapping

Millennium Goals National MDG Report for Serbia

Semi-annual Report STRD July-Dec 2010

Semi-annual Report STRD Jan-Jun 2010

Local Strategies and Tourism

Gender Aspects of Local Development Strategies Report

Family, Children and Youth Tourism Demand Assessment

Mapping of Potential Destinations

Potentials for Child-related Tourism

National Rural Development Program for the years 2011-2013

Diversification and Development of Rural Economic Activities – Sector Services – IPARD Axis 3

1. Action Plan	3. Implementation Plan	5. Strategy
2. Diagnostic	4. Master Plan	6. Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development

NSC Presentations

PIU Meeting Minutes

PMC Meeting Minutes

MDG-F Advocacy and Communication Strategy

Feedback on Monitoring Reports – MDG to Serbia

Joint Implementation Guidelines

MDG Feedback on JP Reports

MDG-F Mission Report Balkans

MDG-F Mission Report Eastern Europe

Private Sector and Development Thematic Indicators

Serbia Monitoring Report January 2011

8 Annex 3 – List Of Persons Interviewed During For The Evaluation

8.1 National Partners

Name	Agency
Aleksandar Bogunovic	Project Support Senior Advisor, MATFWM
Goran Petkovic	State Secretary, MERD
Vera Jankovic	Senior Advisor, MERD
Bane Miletic	MERD
Kristina Kujundzic	Advisor, TOS

8.2 PIU Staff

Name	Agency/ Position
Karlo Puskarica	UNDP, JP Manager
Vera Jovanovic	UNICEP, Programme Officer
Suzana Djordjevic Milosevic	FAO, Programme Officer
Dragan Stefanovic	UNDP and UNEP, Programme Officer
Ljubica Milojevic	UNWTO, Programme Officer
Milos Zivkovic	UNDP, Technical advisor (provided specific inputs on the grant scheme).
Pedja Markovic	Former UNDP Staff, former JP Manager

8.3 UN Agency Representatives (Backstops etc)

Name	Agency
Richard Eberlin	FAO Budapest
Milena Isakovic	UNDP Belgrade
Vedrana Trisic	UNDP, Advocacy and Communication Analyst
William Infante	UNDP, Resident Coordinator
Rie Tsutsumi	UNEP, Geneva
Vanesa Satur	UNWTO, Madrid
Borka Jeremic	UNDP Belgrade, Coordination Office

8.4 'Beneficiaries' (participants in the field)

Name	Agency
Gordana Blagojevic	Tourism Organisation Ljig
Vladimir Ivanovic	Tourism Organisation Ljig
Mile Gosnic	MOBA, Ljig
Dragan Cajic	MOBA, Ljig
Katarina Lazic	MOBA, Ljig
Zorica Velimirovic	Regional Centre for Rural Development, South Banat
Snezana Kremic	Coordinator, Rural Development Regional Centre, South Banat
Jelena Nakic	Regional Development Agency, Eastern Serbia, Zajecar; Regional Rural Centre, Eastern Serbia
Predrag Petric	Regional Rural Centre for Development, Kladovo; Association for Development of Kladovo
Zeljana Lukic Radojcic	Eko Skola Banja Vruijci; Kreativa, Banja Vruijci
Katarina Carapic	Kreativa, Banja Vruijci

9 Annex 4 – Interview Guide

This interview guide is provided as an example only of the approach taken by the evaluator. Different guides were prepared for each interviewee, and for the focus group conversations with local partners.

9.1 Field Interviews – JP Manager

9.1.1 Design level

The first hypothesis to be tested is related to relevance: that the objectives of the JP are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.

Is the identification of the problems, with their respective causes, clear in the project document?	
Does the project document take into account the specific interests of women and men?	
To what extent is policy level impact anticipated in the design of the JP? Is the timeframe of the JP sufficient for policy change?	
Are indicators relevant and able to measure the outputs and outcomes of the JP?	
To what extent has the MDG-F Secretariat contributed to raising the quality of the design of the JP?	

9.1.2 Ownership in the design: Effective exercise of leadership by national institutions and representatives

To what extent does the JP design respond to national and regional plans, to identified needs, and to the operational context of national politics?	
To what extent have the country's national and local authorities been: ▪ taken into consideration in JP design. ▪ participated or become involved in JP design.	
To what extent does the interaction of national partners affect JP implementation. How? Positive/ negative. Detail.	

9.1.3 Process level – Efficiency

The second hypothesis is that the project team has been efficient in its use of economic resources and inputs, and in converting these resources into results. The evaluation team will look into the budget and expenditure of the project, from an activity/ output/ outcome perspective. The team will not audit expenditure, but will analyse expenses against planned and actual activities and actual project outputs and outcomes.

To what extent does the JP's management model contribute to achieving anticipated outputs and outcomes?	
To what extent are the participating	And particularly the role of MoA and MERD in Management and

agencies coordinating with each other and with the government?	Coordination.
Is the model of NSC, PMC, PIU appropriate to project management? Does the management structure improve the efficiency and effectiveness of delivery?	
What impact on project implementation has occurred as a result of the fact that not all UN partner agencies are present in Serbia?	
Is there a methodology for the work and internal communications that contributes to effective joint implementation?	
Are there efficient coordination mechanisms to avoid overloading national partners?	
Does the pace of implementing the JP ensure completeness of JP results?	
Are work methodologies, financial instruments and information shared among agencies?	

9.1.4 Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions

To what extent has the government and the target population made the JP their own, taking an active role in it?	
What modes of participation have taken place that have contributed to this ownership?	
To what extent have public/ private national resources been mobilized to contribute to the JP's results?	

9.1.5 Results level – Effectiveness

The third hypothesis to be tested is related to the effectiveness of the Project implementation – specifically, that the project was effective in achieving its intended objectives. This is the focus area of the evaluation, and emphasis will be placed here in stakeholder interviews and interviews with external agencies. This area of analysis will inform both recommendations in terms of implementation through project completion and thinking about the potential emphasis of a future initiative.

Is the JP making progress towards achieving anticipated results? ▪ To what extent and in what ways is the JP contributing to MDGs at the local and national level? ▪ To what extent is the JP contributing to the goals set by the thematic window (Promote and support national and local policies and programmes in favour of enterprise development; Provision of technical assistance and capacity development activities; Creating or strengthening organizations and partnerships to contribute to enterprise development and	

competitiveness)? How?	
Is the JP being implemented against the planned timeframe? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes?	
Do the outputs produced meet the required high quality?	
Does the JP have follow-up mechanisms to verify the quality of the products and timeliness of delivery?	
Does the JP have follow-up mechanisms to measure progress in the achievement of anticipated results?	

Does the JP's M and E plan and reporting system provide appropriate levels of analysis of activities, outputs and outcomes?	
Is the JP working with beneficiaries as planned?	
Has the JP generated innovative problem-solving approaches? What are they?	
What good or best practice, lessons learned or success stories have been identified? Have they been transferred to other JP or stakeholders?	
What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the JP in accordance with gender, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population? To what extent?	

9.1.6 Outcomes Anticipated

Outcome 1 (National Level): Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of Millennium Development Goals (National Rural Tourism Master Plan	1.1 – NRTMP 1.2 – Nat Prog for Rural Development 1.3 – Investment Mainstreaming
Outcome 2 (Local Level): Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies (Capacity Development	2.1 – Capacity Development. 2.2 – Destination Development and Management

9.1.7 Results level – Sustainability

Finally, the evaluation will test whether or not there is, or is likely to be, a continuation of benefits from the JP after it has been completed.

Are national, regional and local institutions demonstrating the technical capacity and	

leadership commitment to move forward with JP initiatives/ approaches?	
Has relevant capacity been created and/ or reinforced in national partners?	
Do partners have sufficient financial capacity to maintain the approaches of, and benefits produced by, the JP?	
Is the duration of the JP sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project sustainability of the JP? The evaluation will specifically address the need for a no-cost extension, and the likely impact to project outcomes of extending the implementation timeframe.	
To what extent are the visions and actions of the partners consistent or divergent with regard to the JP?	
In what ways can governance of the JP be improved so that it has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability?	

10 Annex 5 - Project or programme results map or results framework

JP Outcome 1: Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to the achievement of Millennium Development Goals.

JP output: 1.1 Please highlight the rate of delivery for each joint programme's output:
a. Less than 30% b. between 31%-50% c. between 51-60 d. between 61%-70% e. between 71%-80 f. More than 80%

Outputs	Activity	YEAR 1		UN Agency	Responsible Party	Source of Funding	Budget description	Implementation Progress			
		Q2	Q4					Total Amount Planned	Total Amount Committed	Total Amount Disbursed	% Delivery rate of budget
1.1. National Rural Tourism Master Plan for Serbia developed and submitted to the Government.	1.1.1.a. In cooperation with FAO and lead ministries, establish an inter-ministerial working group, with a sub-group for development of National Rural Tourism Master Plan.			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Rural Tourism Development	5,000		5,878	
							Administrative Assistant	3,000	3,261		
							Supplies/Communications/Operations	3,641	1,865		
							Misc.	1,000	150		
							Agency Management Support (7%)	885	369	411	
							Sub-total	**13,525**	**5,645**	**6,289**	**88%**
	1.1.1.b. Conduct permanent information and decision making activities with all stakeholders and ensure incorporation of studies by other participating UN agencies (1.1.2-4 and 1.2.1).			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	National Rural Tourism Master Plan	30,000	30,000		
							NPO Rural Tourism Development	13,000	13,000		
							Administrative Assistant	7,000	7,000		
							Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance	3,210			
							Supplies/Communications/Operations	4,000	2,000		
							Misc.	1,000			
							Domestic travel	3,000	8,278		
							International travel	1,500		1,220	
							ICT/Equipment/Furniture	5,000			
							Agency Management Support (7%)	4,740	4,219	85	
							Sub-total	**72,450**	**64,497**	**1,305**	**91%**
	1.1.1.c. Develop specific programs within the National Rural Tourism Master Plan in the following fields: analyzing, sustaining, knowing, excelling, innovating, promoting and governancing.			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	National Rural Tourism Master Plan	230,000	230,000	13,401	
							NPO Rural Tourism Development	6,000	6,000		
							Administrative Assistant	3,000	3,000		
							Vehicle, Fuel Maintenance	3,000			
							Misc.	1,000			
							Domestic travel	3,000			
							Agency Management Support (7%)	17,220	16,857	938	
							Sub-total	**263,220**	**255,857**	**14,339**	**103%**

	1.1.1.d. Make formal official presentation of National Rural Tourism Master Plan.			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	National Rural Tourism Master Plan NPO Rural Tourism Development Administrative Assistant Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Misc. Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	24,000 5,000 2,375 1,169 1,105 2,355 **36,004**	24,000 5,000 2,375 2,196 **33,571**		**93%**
	1.1.2.a. Conduct surveys to identify demand: i) by citizens for family tourism, ii) by youth for youth-related (esp. backpack) tourism, especially back-pack tourism, iii) by schools for school tourism.			UNICEF	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Children in Rural Development Programme Assistant Child friendly tourism policy Supplies/Communications/Operations Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,000 5,000 20,000 1,000 2,170 **33,170**	5,000 2,898 14,000 1,532 **23,430**	 152 **152**	**71%**
	1.1.2.b. Identify best practices from other countries.			UNICEF	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Children in Rural Development Programme Assistant Local consultants Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,000 3,000 3,000 770 **11,770**	4,452 400 340 **5,192**	 2,600 182 **2,782**	**68%**
	1.1.2.c. Establish cross-sector working group that shall, based on surveys & good practices and with assistance of tourism specialists provided by contractor, provide input into principles, frameworks & measures.			UNICEF	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Children in Rural Development Programme Assistant Supplies/Communications/Operations ICT/Equipment/Furniture Misc. Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	3,000 2,000 1,000 500 1,500 560 **8,560**	2,148 150 **2,298**	852 2,000 0 499 235 **3,586**	**69%**
	1.1.3 a. Conduct a National Environmental Study to assess capacity by collecting and using locally available environmental information/data.			UNEP	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Investment & PPP (50%) National Environmental Study ICT/Equipment/Furniture Supplies/Communications/Operations Domestic travel Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,000 15,000 550 2,000 1,750 1,701 **26,001**	5,000 0 550 2,000 0 1701 **9,251**	1,500 0 550 0 0 850 **2,900**	**47%**
	1.1.3 b. Identify potential impact of National Rural Tourism Master Plan by examining: i) potential impacts on ecosystems from proposed options; ii) energy			UNEP	MERD	MDG-F	Internal Expert Review of the Rural Tourism Master plan ICT/Equipment/Furniture Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,000 700 399 **6,099**	0 0 700 399 **1,099**	0 0 700 200 **900**	**33%**

	consumption & efficiency; iii) buffer zone management; iv) other environmental impacts.										
	1.1.4.a. Conduct an assessment of the potential contribution of rural tourism to small farming sector, including potential benefits in terms of income diversification, branding, certification and standards.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Potential contribution of rural tourism to small farming ICT/Equipment/Furniture Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	4,000 4,000 20,000 4,000 2,240 **34,240**	1,588 529 25,000 - 1,898 **29,015**	467 187 0 - 46 **700**	**87%**
							Total	**505,039**	**429,855**	**32,953**	**92%**

JP output: 1.2 Please highlight the rate of delivery for each joint programme's output:
a. Less than 30% b. between 31%-50% c. between 51-60 d. between 61%-70% e. between 71%-80 f. More than 80%

Outputs	Activity	YEAR 1		UN Agency	Responsible Party	Source of Funding	Budget description	Implementation Progress			
		Q2	Q4					Total Amount Planned	Total amount Committed	Total Amount Disbursed	% Delivery rate of budget
1.2. Rural Development Program planning is mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies; National Program for Rural Development for IPARD Axes 2 & 3 developed & [illegible] for implementation	1.2.1.a. In cooperation with UNWTO and MERD, establish an inter-ministerial working group, with a sub-group for elaboration of National Rural Development Programme.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	8,000 5,000 910 **13,910**	645 215 60 **920**	190 76 19 **285**	**9%**
	1.2.1.b. Identify & engage expert group of outside & supporting resources to complete program development, including studies undertaken as part of Output 1.1.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Rural Development Programme Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	4,000 4,000 20,000 1,960 **29,960**	1,935 645 0 181 **2,761**	569 228 0 56 **853**	**12%**
	1.2.1.c. Conduct assessment & prepare plan in accordance with requirements, including detailed description of Axis 2 and 3 (measures related to rural economy diversification with emphasize on rural			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Rural Development Programme FAO & International Rural Dev't Expertise Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	4,000 1,000 20,000 14,000 2,730 **41,730**	1,935 645 40,000 - 2,981 **45,561**	569 228 0 - 56 **853**	**111%**

	tourism and measures related to preparation of measures to support sustainable management of the natural resources and environmental protection in rural areas.										
	1.2.2.a. Conduct study on present access to services in rural areas, barriers to access, and potential solutions. Data will be obtained through official statistics, surveys, focus groups representing children, women, health practitioners, in social protection practitioners, and other actors and community groups.			UNICEF	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Children in Rural Development Programme Assistant IPARD Life Conditions Study Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Supplies/Communications/Operations ICT/Equipment /Furniture Misc. Domestic travel Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,000 2,000 10,000 2,000 1,000 2,000 224 2,007 1,696 **25,927**	1,852 10,000 576 **12,428**	1,648 2,000 17,292 424 1,652 **23,016**	 **137%**
								Total	**111,527**	**61,670**	**25,007**	**78%**

JP output: 1.3 Please highlight the rate of delivery for each joint programme's output:
a. Less than 30% b. between 31%-50% c. between 51-60 d. between 61%-70% e. between 71%-80 f. More than 80%

Outputs	Activity	YEAR 1		UN Agency	Responsible Party	Source of Funding	Budget description	Implementation Progress			
		Q2	Q4					Total amount Planned	Total amount Committed	Total Amount Disbursed	% Delivery rate of budget
1.3. Sustainable tourism Investment Mainstreaming: mainstreamed in national policies.	1.3.1.a. Identify public, private and external resources that can leverage one another in rural tourism initiatives.			UNDP	MERD	MDG-F	Supplies/Communications/Operations International travel Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,249 1,500 262 **4,011**	 **0,00**	2,249 2,095 262 **4,606**	 **115%**
	1.3.1.b. Engage with all relevant line ministries to promote public investments that are in line with Rural Tourism Master Plan and environmentally sustainable.			UNDP	MERD	MDG-F	International consultants Supplies/Communications/Operations Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,000 500 175 **2,675**	 **0,00**	 500 175 **675**	 **25%**
	1.3.2.a. Produce strategy guidelines for securing and leveraging public-private partnerships.			UNDP	MERD	MDG-F	PPP Guidelines Supplies/Communications/Operations Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	23,025 475 1,645 **25,145**	 **0,00**	 475 1,645 **2,120**	 **8%**
	1.3.2.b. Provide strategic investment training for target			UNDP	MERD	MDG-F	Support for PPP initiatives Local consultants	2,500 3,250			

	group of public decision-makers and private investors.						Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	403 **6,153**	**0,00**	403 **403**	**7%**
	1.3.2.c. Support and monitor at least six PPP initiatives in rural tourism.			UNDP	MERD	MDG-F	Support for PPP initiatives Local consultants Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,500 3,250 403 **6,153**	**0,00**	403 **403**	**7%**
	1.3.3.a. Identify organizations and/or individuals to serve as SIFT focal point and/or working group members.			UNEP	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Investment & PPP (50%) Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,500 175 **2,675**	2,500 175 **2,675**	500 0 **500**	**119%**
	1.3.3.b. Provide training to focal point or working group on benefits and expectations as member of SIFT network.			UNEP	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Investment & PPP (50%) International consultants International travel Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,500 4,000 1,000 525 **8,025**	2,500 0 0 525 **3,025**	0 0 0 0 0	**38%**
	1.3.4.a. As part of M&E of the JP, adopt at least three indicators for evaluation of pilot projects.			UNDP	MOA	MDG-F	Local consultants Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	10,000 700 **10,700**	10,000 **10,000**	1,019 700 **1,719**	**110%**
							Total	**65,537**	**15,700**	**10,426**	**40%**

JP Outcome 2: Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies

JP output: 2.1 Please highlight the rate of delivery for each joint programme's output:
a. Less than 30% b. between 31%-50% c. between 51-60 d. between 61%-70% e. between 71%-80 f. More than 80%

Outputs	Activity	YEAR		UN Agency	Responsible Party	Source of Funding	Budget description	Implementation Progress			
		Q2	Q4					Total Amount Planned	Total Amount Committed	Total Amount Disbursed	% Delivery rate of budget
2.1. Capacity developed for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural	2.1.1.a. Identify resources and existing initiatives to serve as possible foundation for LAGs.			UNDP	MOA	MDG-F	Local Action Groups (support & capacity development) Supplies/Operations/Communications Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	7,000 2,000 630 **9,630**	5,000 **5,000**	 439 630 **1,069**	**63%**
	2.1.1.b. Using the EU's Leader approach, mobilize public, private & civil society actors to engage in Local Action			UNDP	MOA	MDG-F	Local Action Groups (support & capacity development) Supplies/Operations/Communications Domestic travel	15,000 2,000 500	15,000 	 1,500 	

	Groups and support them in increasing benefits for rural population from available financing & donation instruments.						Misc. Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	1,000 1,295 **19,795**	**15,000**	1,000 1,295 **3,795**	**95%**
	2.1.1.c. Build capacity & cohesiveness of Local Action Groups through trainings suited to target region and expert support, including to strengthen the role of women in LAGs.			UNDP	MOA	MDG-F	Local Action Groups (support & capacity development) Supplies/Operations/Communications Domestic travel Misc. Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	28,000 2,611 500 1,389 2,275 **34,775**		 1,958 191 771 2,275 **5,195**	**15%**
	2.1.2.a. Provide capacity building and Training-of-Trainers for RDN to serve as outreach & implementation tool to i) promote Ministry programs & IPARD; ii) support and mentor local NGOs and other groups in local initiatives and proposal development; iii) facilitate and promote local partnerships; iv) motivate and mobilize local partners for LAG development; v) provide inputs for policy changes at the national level.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant ICT/Equipment/Furniture Misc. Domestic travel Rural Dev't Network trainings Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	1,000 1,000 1,000 1,000 1,000 5,000 700 **10,700**	496 165 - - - 7,000 536 **8,197**	146 58 - - - 0 14 **218**	**79%**
	2.1.3.a. Follow-up with target municipalities on the implementation of gender-responsive local development strategies and provide expert support for inclusion of sustainable rural tourism initiatives where appropriate			UNDP	MOA	MDG-F	Mentoring on local dev't planning Supplies/Operations/Communications Misc. International consultants Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	15,000 2,751 1,806 2,000 1,509 **23,066**	 **0,00**	 1,509 **1,509**	**7%**
	2.1.4.a. In cooperation with UNWTO (activity 2.1.5.a), survey RDN, LAGs, DMOs, and agriculture & non-agriculture producer groups on organizational capacity and			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Misc. Domestic travel Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,000 1,000 2,000 3,000 770 **11,770**	546 182 6,000 - 471 **7,199**	161 64 0 - 16 **241**	**63%**

	needs.										
	2.1.4.b. Provide targeted training, technical assistance and mentoring on topics of organizational management; project management; fundraising; proposal development and advocacy; product creation & management; competitiveness, marketing & commercialization.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Misc. Organizational Capacity Building Supplies/Communications/Operations Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,600 1,000 1,641 3,000 282 3,477 1,050 **16,050**	744 248 - 21,000 - - 1,539 **23,531**	219 88 - 0 - - 21 **328**	**149%**
	2.1.6.a. Assess regional initiatives in energy efficiency and alternative energy, including potential for improvements in this field, both locally and through funding opportunities, and provide technical input for FAO activity 2.1.7.			UNEP	MERD	MDG-F	Energy Efficiency & Alternative Energy trainings Local consultants Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	3,000 2,000 350 **5,350**	0 0 350 **350**		**7%**
	2.1.7.a. Develop database of agriculture and non-agriculture products important for tourism development in targeted geographic regions.			FAO	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Database support Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	1,000 1,000 25,000 1,890 **28,890**	1,340 447 17,000 1,315 **20,102**	394 158 0 39 **591**	**72%**
	2.1.7.b. Conduct market analysis of traditional and regional products and craft markets in targeted regions.			FAO	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Market analysis Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	1,000 1,000 10,000 840 **12,840**	595 198 13,000 966 **14,759**	175 70 0 17 **262**	**117%**
	2.1.7.d. Organize networking events of tourism and agriculture stakeholders (women & men) in pilot project areas to improve linkages and strengthen local and regional brands and present themselves together with regional tourism offer on the national and international tourism markets.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Rural Tourism Networks (product & service chains) International travel Supplies/Communications/Operations Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,000 2,000 5,000 1,000 4,000 1,805 1,106 **16,911**	784 261 20,000 - - - 1,473 **22,518**	231 92 0 - - - 23 **346**	**135%**

	2.1.8.a. Facilitate active participation of local stakeholders in fine-tuning of National Rural Tourism Master Plan through established TGOs, especially with regards to product development.			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Rural Tourism Development Administrative Assistant Local consultants Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,000 1,000 900 483 **7,383**	5,000 1,000 900 482 **7,383**		**100%**
	2.1.8.b. Provide training through workshops and seminars, engaging when necessary UNWTO experts and delegates of the inter-ministerial working group			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Rural Tourism Development Administrative Assistant Product development Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	3,000 500 25,000 1,995 **30,495**	 25,000 1,750 **26,750**		**88%**
	2.1.8.c. In coordination with all agencies, include strategies and management techniques for environmental and cultural issues within the National Rural Tourism Master Plan.			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Rural Tourism Development Administrative Assistant Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,600 2,000 322 **4,922**	2,600 2,000 322 **4,922**		**100%**
	2.1.9.a. Identify tourism stakeholders, including destination managers, tourism offices, park & nature reserve managers, RDN, DMOs, LAGs, private companies, and local officials who are impacted by improved (or lack of) sustainable resource management principles.			UNEP	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Investment & PPP (50%) Domestic travel Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,000 250 368 **5,618**	5,000 0 368 **5,368**	1,500 0 184 **1,684**	**126%**
	2.1.9.b. Adapt UNEP Sustainable Management Training for delivery in targeted Serbian regions; provide training to identified stakeholders.			UNEP	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Investment & PPP (50%) Local consultants Misc. Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,000 8,000 80 706 **10,786**	2,000 0 0 706 **2,706**	0 0 0 353 **353**	**28%**
	2.1.9.c. Conduct environmental studies of the target regions examining that aspect of rural tourism sustainability, and present at trainings.			UNEP	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Investment & PPP (50%) Regional environmental studies Domestic travel Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	3,000 30,000 1,000 670 2,427 **37,097**	3,000 0 1,000 0 2,427 **6,427**	0 0 1,000 0 1,214 **2,214**	**23%**

	2.1.10.b. Provide 4 Training-of-Trainers (one in each target region) and coordination for National Agriculture Extension Services, Cooperative Union of Serbia and Rural Development Network in Global GAP and introduction to quality standards and certification (change made in training program, organic and other left for 2011).			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Local consultants Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	4,000 1,000 5,000 700 **10,700**	496 165 8,000 606 **9,267**	146 58 0 14 **218**	**89%**
							Total	**296,778**	**179,478**	**18,023**	**67%**

JP output: 2.2 Please highlight the rate of delivery for each joint programme's output:
a. Less than 30% b. between 31%-50% c. between 51-60 d. between 61%-70% e. between 71%-80 f. More than 80%

Outputs	Activity	YEAR 1		UN Agency	Responsible Party	Source of Funding	Budget description	Implementation Progress			
		Q2	Q4					Total Amount Planned	Total Amount Committed	Total Amount Disbursed	% Delivery rate of budget
2.2. Tourism governance structures enhanced in target regions through dedicated organizations, pilot projects, investment promotion	2.2.1.a. Assess the needs of the Tourism Governance Organizations in the target regions, including possible models and existing capacities (namely the Local Action Groups and local tourism organizations)			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Rural Tourism Development Administrative Assistant Local consultants Destination management (assessment, manual, trainings) Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	1,000 1,000 3,100 5,000 707 **10,807**	1,000 1,000 3,100 357 **5,457**		**50%**
	2.2.1.b. Establish Tourism Governance Organizations according to results of Assessment in the target regions.			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Rural Tourism Development Administrative Assistant International consultants Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	1,000 1,000 5,000 831 548 **8,379**	1,000 204 5,000 434 **6,638**		**79%**
	2.2.2.a. Provide input, through presentations and facilitation, into workshops, seminars & planning processes organized with LAGs, RDN and DMOs on child-related tourism			UNICEF	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Children in Rural Development Programme Assistant Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	5,000 489 384 **5,873**	2,500 0 175 **2,675**	2,500 489 209 **3,198**	**100%**

	issues.										
	2.2.2.b. Produce guidelines for rural tourism service providers and schools on catering to children and pupils.			UNICEF	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Children in Rural Development Guidelines for schools & service providers / child-friendly capacity building Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	1,000 8,750 683 **10,433**	 4,750 333 **5,083**	952 **952**	 **58%**
	2.2.3.a. Identify existing initiatives which can collaborate in the Investment Forum organization (Tourism Fair, NALED, Standing Conference of Towns & Municipalities, Municipal Investment Forum).			UNEP	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Investment & PPP (50%) International travel Supplies/Communications/Operations Vehicle/Fuel/Maintenance Misc. Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,800 1,000 2,005 2,000 1,255 634 **9,694**	2,800 1,000 0 0 0 634 **4,434**	0 1,002 0 0 0 317 **1,319**	 **59%**
	2.2.4.a. In cooperation with participating UN agencies, support Local Action Groups in defining priority interventions and designing the ToR for this Thematic Window, to be approved by PMC.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant FAO & International Rural Dev't Expertise Local consultants Domestic travel International travel Supplies/Communications/Operations Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	2,000 4,000 16,000 7,000 500 3,000 1,000 1,000 2,415 **36,915**	1,712 571 - 0 - - - 160 **2,443**	504 202 - 0 - - - 49 **755**	 **9%**
	2.2.4.b. LAG subcommittees collect & evaluate proposals in (i) Integrated rural tourism and agriculture development on the rural community level; (ii) Conservation & maintenance of traditional rural cultural & natural heritage for integrated rural and rural tourism development; (iii) Diversification and upgrade of the production of food and non-food products and activities for local/regional rural tourist markets.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Development Programme Assistant Joint UN Fund/Diversification of Rural Economy Local fund management Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Domestic travel Supplies/Communications/Operations Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	4,000 4,000 84,000 16,000 3,000 500 4,000 8,085 **123,585**	5,730 1,910 0 0 - - - 353 **7,993**	1,686 675 0 0 - - - 165 **2,526**	 **9%**

	2.2.5.a. Support the development of basic tourism services such as accommodation, food and beverage, reservation systems and tourism offices.			UNWTO	MOA	MDG-F	NPO Rural Tourism Development Administrative Assistant Supplies/Communications/Operations Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	4,000 431 569 350 **5,350**			**0%**
	2.2.6.a. Establish criteria for school-centered rural tourism activities to be Ministry of Education-approved course curricula.			UNICEF	MERD	MDG-F	NPO Children in Rural Development Programme Assistant Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Supplies/Communications/Operations Domestic travel Agency Management Support (7%) **Sub-total**	21,600 5,511 1,448 448 993 2,100 **32,100**	21,600 993 1,662 **24,255**	 5,511 751 0 438 **6,700**	**96%**
							Total	**243,136**	**58,978**	**15,450**	**31%**