



FINAL EVALUATION

Republic of Serbia

Thematic window
Development and the Private Sector

Programme Title:
Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development

Prologue

This final evaluation report has been coordinated by the MDG Achievement Fund joint programme in an effort to assess results at the completion point of the programme. As stipulated in the monitoring and evaluation strategy of the Fund, all 130 programmes, in 8 thematic windows, are required to commission and finance an independent final evaluation, in addition to the programme's mid-term evaluation.

Each final evaluation has been commissioned by the UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) in the respective programme country. The MDG-F Secretariat has provided guidance and quality assurance to the country team in the evaluation process, including through the review of the TORs and the evaluation reports. All final evaluations are expected to be conducted in line with the OECD Development Assistant Committee (DAC) Evaluation Network "Quality Standards for Development Evaluation", and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) "Standards for Evaluation in the UN System".

Final evaluations are summative in nature and seek to measure to what extent the joint programme has fully implemented its activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes. They also generate substantive evidence-based knowledge on each of the MDG-F thematic windows by identifying best practices and lessons learned to be carried forward to other development interventions and policy-making at local, national, and global levels.

We thank the UN Resident Coordinator and their respective coordination office, as well as the joint programme team for their efforts in undertaking this final evaluation.

MDG-F Secretariat

The analysis and recommendations of this evaluation are those of the evaluator and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Joint Programme or MDG-F Secretariat.



Final 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
4 December 2012

Joint Programme Summary Table

Joint Programme number	<i>MDGF</i>
Joint Programme title	<i>Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development</i>
Thematic window	<i>Development and the Private Sector</i>
Joint Programme location	<i>Republic of Serbia</i>
Participating UN Agencies	<i>UNDP (administrating agency) UNWTO FAO UNEP UNICEF</i>
Joint Programme budget	<i>US\$ 4,000,000 US\$ 4,000,000 funded by the MGD-F In-kind office space component funded by the Government of Serbia</i>
Joint Programme timeline	<i>Start date: 4 December 2009 End date: 4 June 2012 Revised end date: 4 December 2012</i>
National implementing partners	<i>Ministry of Finance and the Economy (lead) Ministry of Agriculture, Trade, Forestry and Water Management The National Tourism Organisation of Serbia</i>

Preface

This report presents the findings of the final summative evaluation of the Serbian Joint Programme *Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development*. The evaluation process underpinning this report was undertaken in October and November of 2012.

The evaluator wishes to thank all the representatives of national institutions, agencies and organisations, as well as the Joint Programme team members that were interviewed during the evaluation exercise and contributed to the quality of the analysis through their insights, knowledge and support. Particular thanks goes Karlo Puškarica, the Joint Programme Manager, for providing extensive factual and analytical inputs as well as logistical oversight.

This final evaluation report draws heavily on their work, both for the review of activities implemented and outputs produced and the overall assessment of the Joint Programme. The analytical content of their reports provided a comprehensive understanding of the Joint Programme, which is summarized below and greatly contributed to shape the final evaluation.

James A Newkirk

Belgrade, 25 November 2012

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.
PSD	Development and the Private Sector Thematic Area of the MDG-F.
STRD	Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development (title of the Joint Programme).
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDG-F	Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund
GoS	Government of Serbia
MFE	Ministry of Finance and the Economy (Serbia)
MAFWM	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management (Serbia)
NTOS	National 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 United Nations Children's Fund – the UN Agency responsible for protecting and promoting the rights of children.
UNWTO	UN World Tourism Organisation – specialised agency of the UN mandated with the role to promote the development of responsible, sustainable and universally accessible tourism.
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.

Table Of Contents

1	Background And Rationale.....	1
2	Description Of The Private Sector And Development Joint Programme In Serbia	3
2.1	Intended JP Outcomes	3
2.1.1	Specific Programme Outcomes Within The JP Design.....	3
2.1.2	The JP And UNDAF.....	4
2.1.3	The JP And Government Strategies	4
2.1.4	The JP And Millennium Development Goals.....	4
2.2	The JP’s Strategic Approaches (At The Design Stage)	4
2.3	Geographic Coverage	6
2.4	Beneficiaries	6
2.4.1	Direct Beneficiaries.....	6
2.4.2	Indirect Beneficiaries	6
2.5	Implementation Status	7
2.6	JP Governance	7
2.6.1	NSC	7
2.6.2	PMC	7
2.7	The JP Team (The PIU).....	8
3	Purpose And Methodology Of The Final Evaluation.....	9
3.1	Methodology Of The Evaluation	9
3.2	Objectives Of The Evaluation	10
3.3	Limits To The Evaluation	11
4	Review Of Implementation	12
4.1	Effectiveness.....	12
4.2	JP Outcome 1: Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of the rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of MDGs.	12
4.2.1	Outcome 1.1 – National Rural Tourism Master Plan (RTMP) for Serbia developed and submitted to the Government.	13
4.2.2	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.	14
4.2.3	Outcome 1.3 – Investment Mainstreaming – sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia’s national policies.	15
4.3	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.	16
4.3.1	Outcome 2.1 – Capacity developed for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural development.	17
4.3.2	Outcome 2.2 – Tourism governance structures enhanced in target regions through dedicated organisations, pilot project and investment promotion.	20
4.3.3	JP Effectiveness and UNDAF Outcomes.....	23
4.3.4	JP Effectiveness and Government Strategies.....	23
4.3.5	JP Effectiveness And The MDGs	23
4.3.6	The JP And The MDG-F’s Cross-cutting Themes.....	24
4.4	Relevance.....	25
4.5	Efficiency Of JP Operations And Management.....	26
4.5.1	The JP’s Monitoring And Evaluation Framework	29
4.6	Sustainability	30

- 5 Conclusions, Including Recommendations And Lessons Learned.....32**
 - 5.1 Conclusions.....32**
 - 5.1.1 Strengths of the JP.....32
 - 5.1.2 Weaknesses of the JP33
 - 5.1.3 Results Summary33
 - 5.2 Lessons Learned35**
 - 5.3 Recommendations.....35**
- 6 Annexes37**
 - 6.1 Annex 1 – List Of Documentation Produced By The JP**
 - 6.2 Annex 2 – List Of Persons Interviewed During For The Evaluation**
 - 6.3 Annex 3 - c) File for the Joint Programme Improvement Plan (extract)**
 - 6.4 Annex 4 – Terms Of Reference**
 - 6.5 Annex 5 - Programme results framework**

Executive summary

The Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund

The Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund 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](#) 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.

The Joint Programme

The Joint Programme under review in this final, summative evaluation, was The *Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development* Joint Programme. It comes within the Development and the Private Sector (PSD) thematic window, had a total budget of \$4,000,000 and was implemented by:

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

The programme was implemented in partnership with:

- The Serbian government's Ministry of Finance and the Economy (MFE).
- The Ministry of Agriculture, Trade, Forestry and Water Management (MATFWM).
- The National Tourism Organisation of Serbia (NTOS).

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

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

- 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.

The Joint Programme was designed to respond 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 JP was designed to respond to the following 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.

The JP 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.
- 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%.

The Joint Programme worked 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 chosen because of their existing situation and their potential in terms of rural tourism.

The Joint Programme was designed to benefit a range of national and local institutions, both urban and rural. Intended beneficiaries included local tourism organisations (Municipal organisations), NGOs focused on economic and tourism development and local tourism providers (including families with a tourism product, farmers and processors in the tourism supply chain, schools and other providers). National ‘beneficiaries’ included the NTOS and MFE, as well as MAFTWE, in the sense that their partnership in the Joint Programme was

beneficial to their work on development of national strategies and plans, and their assistance to stakeholders at the local level in strategy, plan and product development.

The Joint Programme had two governance/ management bodies, the National Steering Committee and the Programme Management Committee. The National Steering Committee comprised the UN Resident Coordinator, the Ambassador of the Spanish Government and the Serbian Assistant Minister of Finance in charge of Programming, Management of EU Funds and Development Assistance. The third member of the National Steering Committee was in implementation a representative of the Serbian European Integration Office. The National Steering Committee was responsible for strategic directions, documented arrangements, synergy and communication plans.

The Programme Management Committee comprised participating UN Agencies, the Ministry of Finance and the Economy, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management and the National Tourism Organisation of Serbia. The responsibilities of the Programme Management Committee included operational coordination, management of resources, reporting, work planning and technical and substantive leadership.

The implementation team comprised:

- The Joint Programme 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).
- UNDP – Technical Advisor full-time.
- The project covered its administrative needs with an administration associate and contributed to Advocacy and Communication activities of the whole of the MDG-F program in Serbia through contributions to the Communication Analyst position in the UNDP office.

Each UN Agency has an appointed ‘backstop’ person for their implementation staff. Two of these ‘backstops’ are stationed in Belgrade while the rest are outside of Serbia.

The Final Evaluation

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

- Analysis of project documentation.
- Detailed interviews with representatives of stakeholder groups, including national and local partners, UN country team representatives, 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 JP design and documentation and against the evaluation criteria.

The Terms of Reference describes five specific objectives for the evaluation:

- To measure to what extent the Joint Programme contributed to resolving the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
- To measure the Joint Programme’s degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.

- To measure to what extent the Joint Programme has attained development results with the targeted population, beneficiaries and participants, whether individuals, communities or institutions.
- To measure the Joint Programme contribution to the objectives set in the specific thematic window (public sector and development) and the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level. (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).
- To identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform with the aim of supporting the sustainability of the Joint Programme or some of its components.

Results Summary

- The Rural Tourism Master Plan was submitted to Government and has been approved. The Rural Tourism Master Plan includes
 - A Diagnostic.
 - A Strategy.
 - An Action Plan.
 - An Implementation Plan.
- The Rural Tourism Master Plan is being implemented, in line with the Implementation Plan.
- Principles and a Framework for child-related tourism were developed and are contained in the Rural Tourism Master Plan.
- A national study on sustainable tourism was undertaken – the contents of the study were used in the formulation of the Rural Tourism Master Plan.
- A study on the potential contribution of rural tourism to the small farming sector was undertaken – the contents of the study were used in the formulation of the Rural Tourism Master Plan.
- A Tourism Investment Conference was held which brought together a wide range of tourism stakeholders, including industry representatives with an investment interest in Serbia. There is a potential for significant international tourism investment as a result of the Conference, although this can not at this stage be assessed.
- An IPARD Axis 2 and 3 sectoral analysis was undertaken.
- Measures fiches were prepared for IPARD Axes 2 and 3.
- The IPARD life conditions study was completed.
- The National Rural Development Council was constituted.
- An analysis was undertaken of local and national budgets in relation to rural tourism, contributing to an understanding of the allocation of resources and inputs to the Rural Tourism Master Plan.
- Guidelines for Public-Private Partnerships in rural tourism in Serbia were prepared.
- Capacity has been enhanced in a number of precursor organisations for the establishment of Local Action Groups – capacity development includes planning, strategy development, group formation.
- Capacity has been enhanced with a group of rural development implementers, including individuals and groups – capacity development includes the ability to assist local stakeholders in preparation of local development strategies and in improving the skills of local groups in management of the project cycle.
- Local development strategies have been developed in all Municipalities in each of the 4 target regions.

- Capacity has been enhanced for local and national stakeholders involved in the development of child-focused educational tourism.
- Guidelines for child-focused tourism were developed.
- Networking of rural tourism oriented groups and individuals (providers, Local Tourism Offices, Municipalities, civil society) is occurring (and is mentioned by those involved as critical to their likely future success).
- Serbia's rural tourism product has been improved (without over-stating the extent of this improvement nor to make any reference to this improvement and the Rural Tourism Master Plan implementation, neither of which can be assessed through this study).
- The capacity and role of Local Tourism Offices in target regions has been enhanced. They are better prepared to assist local providers, and are performing an enabling role.
- The Joint Fund For Sustainable Rural Tourism provided assistance to a range of partners and beneficiaries, assistance which contributed to many of the results listed above. Tourism providers were direct beneficiaries of grants provided by the Joint Fund, as was the networking relationship inherent in the public private partnerships that were developed at the Municipal level.

Conclusions

There is a legal and policy framework for diversification of the rural economy through tourism, and a significant level of commitment by The Ministry of Finance and the Government of Serbia to the intent and detailed planning which is included in the Rural Tourism Master Plan. All three related outcomes have been achieved, and outputs designed to contribute to the legal and policy framework (nationally and locally) have been delivered:

- The Rural Tourism Master Plan was developed and submitted to Government and has been approved.
- Rural development programme planning has taken place, with the development of the national programme for IPARD Axes 2 and 3. Further Government of Serbia initiative is required to mainstream these in national policies, although indications are that this process will occur in the foreseeable future.
- The Rural Tourism Master Plan provides a framework and impetus for sustainable tourism investments, and there is evidence of growth in allocations from national budgets to sustainable tourism investments.

There is better linkage between and organisation of local rural tourism providers and support agencies (National Tourism Office of Serbia/ Local Tourism Offices/ Municipalities), and stakeholder capacity has been improved. This has been done within the framework of the Rural Tourism Master Plan, and the relationship between the national strategy and policies and local capacity and networking interlinks well in terms of future sustainability. Local product providers, Local Tourism Offices and Municipalities *all* specified networking outcomes as the most important achievement of the Joint Programme, and the organising and linking achieved through the Joint Programme will likely be of lasting significance. Both related outcomes have been delivered:

- Precursor organisations for the establishment of Local Action Groups have been established and are functioning; a group of trained individuals exist whose focus and interest is on rural development networks and their ability to assist rural development processes in conjunction with EU, Government and local initiatives. Local planning has been undertaken to better develop and implement development strategies, and

individuals and organisations have a wider range of knowledge in a number of areas of direct importance to and impact on rural tourism and rural development.

- Tourism governance in the target regions, through dedicated tourism organisations (Local Tourism Offices as well as local providers) and recipients of funding for pilots and investment promotion has been enhanced. The Ministry of Finance and the Government are providing strategic and policy support that will enhance local structures and products.

Lessons Learned

It is worth reiterating that one key to the success of the Joint Programme was the detailed and committed involvement of national partners. There are many examples in development assistance of project initiatives being implemented with ‘national partners’ that have little or no knowledge of or involvement in the project - the role played in the Joint Programme by Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management is not unusual. The Joint Programme has been successful to a certain large extent because national partners (The Ministry of Finance and the Economy and the National Tourism Office of Serbia particular) treated the Joint Programme as their own. In owning the programme, its activities and outputs, as well as its governance, they gave the Joint Programme the coherence, as well as the impetus, needed to be successful. The processes of involvement of national partners, from design through implementation and follow-up, can be complex and time-consuming. The lesson from this Joint Programme is that the effort expended at the ‘front-end’ can make all subsequent processes much more effective.

Recommendations

The current joint management and joint funding arrangements are neither the most effective nor most efficient approaches for implementation of the UN’s joint programmes. Inefficiencies include duplication of administrative arrangements, parallel processes and an inability of joint programme management to control financial processes. Notwithstanding the success of the Joint Programme, effectiveness was hampered through parallel management/ oversight arrangements, the inability of joint programme management to actually manage staff and other resources, and the cumbersome nature of planning/ thinking/ strategising processes which lead the implementation team away from innovative solutions and forward thinking.

It can be argued that this Joint Programme was not really of sufficient size and scope to be called a ‘programme’. While the variety of Agency representation can imply such a scope, the relatively small budget, relatively limited number and complexity of outcomes and relatively short timeframe, leave room for arguing that this was indeed a project, not a programme. This view then opens the potential for analysis of some of the management and governance ‘inefficiencies’ that have been discussed throughout the Joint Programme. It would be useful for implementing and funding agencies to consider the following scenario in development of further Joint Programmes:

- Design a *programme framework*, with a set of outcomes within the framework. This programme framework (and outcomes) would be developed with national stakeholders and would be undertaken within the UN goal and strategy structures.
- Invite Agencies to develop *projects*, whose activities, outputs and outcomes are designed with the *specific intent* of contributing to the outcomes of the *programme framework*.
- Funding for such an approach would be provided on an Agency-by-Agency basis (project basis) with additional direct support to the lead or administering agency for

the purposes of engaging a programme coordinator. Careful thought would need to be given to the role and function of a coordinator, although it is anticipated that such a role would be important in ensuring Agency focus remained on project implementation *within the framework of* programme objectives.

With further development, the simple approach could encourage furtherance of the more effective coordination and communication between Agencies without the burden of unrealistic goals for ‘joint delivery’ which impacted on this Joint Programme, within the implementation team as well as in the relationship national partners took to Agency governance and delivery mechanisms and decision-making.

1 Background And Rationale

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 Joint Programme (JP) under review in this final, summative 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 (PSD) thematic window. According to the MDG-F website, with regards the PSD thematic window:

‘Human development is the goal, economic growth a means.

Countries all around the world are striving for increased economic growth and productivity, yet for the most part when this comes it does not translate into benefits for the majority of the population. Programmes support the development of pro-poor growth policies that increase the participation and benefits of the poor in private sector development. Interventions seek to bolster economic sectors where the poor are strongly represented, open markets to improve.

We are supporting 12 joint programmes in this area with an allocation of US\$63 million. These efforts contribute to achieving the MDG goal of eradicating extreme poverty, halving between 1990 and 2015 the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1.00 a day.’

The JP under review is one of these 12 joint programmes.

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

- Analysis of project documentation.
- Detailed interviews with representatives of stakeholder groups, including national and local partners, UN country team representatives, 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 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 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).

2 Description Of The Private Sector And Development Joint Programme In Serbia

The *Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development* (STRD) JP had a total budget of \$4,000,000. The initiative was implemented by:

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

The programme was implemented in partnership with:

- The Serbian government's Ministry of Finance and the Economy (MFE).
- The Ministry of Agriculture, Trade, Forestry and Water Management (MATFWM).
- The National Tourism Organisation of Serbia (NTOS).

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

2.1 Intended JP Outcomes

2.1.1 Specific Programme Outcomes Within The JP Design

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

- 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.

2.1.2 The JP And UNDAF

The Joint Programme was designed to respond 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.’

2.1.3 The JP And Government Strategies

The JP was designed to respond to the following 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.

2.1.4 The JP And Millennium Development Goals

In its design, the JP 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.
- 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%.

2.2 The JP’s Strategic Approaches (At The Design Stage)

The JP was designed to use three strategic approaches in order to achieve its outcomes, particularly at the local and regional level of implementation, where the JP was designed to ‘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 IPARD¹ plan’:

¹ (see <http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/enlargement/assistance/ipard/>) IPARD – Instruments for Pre-Accession Assistance in Rural Development; funding instruments of the EU. The objective of IPARD is two-fold: to provide assistance for the implementation of the acquis concerning the Common Agricultural Policy and to contribute to the sustainable adaptation of the agricultural sector and rural areas in the candidate country.

- 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 (LAG). 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’.

In the actual implementation process, the impact of these strategic approaches on the JP were much less significant than was intended at the design stage. The lessening of impact/ emphasis was occasioned, largely, as a result of factors outside the control of the JP team. The LEADER approach (and LAGs) continued to ‘drive’ the conceptual approach of the JP, but LEADER and LAGs are specific, EU and legislated, concepts that are being implemented in Serbia within an EU IPA framework – Serbia’s IPARD access timeframe has extended beyond what was imagined at the design stage of the JP. The JP used LEADER-type approaches, and worked with local groups that were established in such a way that they can and will take advantage of LAG legislation when it is established in Serbia. But within the specific framework of the JP, these strategic approaches became less significant during implementation.

The JP had 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 implementation complexity was the fact that the JP incorporated activities directed at rural tourism *and* activities directed at rural development (with a tourism focus). This subtle distinction was critical as it incorporated the differences in priority and approach of both national partners and UN Agencies. MFE and the National Tourism Organisation of Serbia were focused on the tourism component per se, and the National Rural Tourism Master Plan, while the MATFWM’s priority was how *rural tourism contributed to rural development*.

As well, the JP had 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 a focus on grants at the local level.

These objectives are to be met by implementation of 9 different measures under 3 priority axes:

- Axis 1 - Improving Market Efficiency and Implementing Community Standards - Measures:
 1. Investments in agricultural holdings to restructure and upgrade to the EU standards
 2. Investments in processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products to restructure and upgrade to the EU standards
 3. Supporting the setting up of producer groups
- Axis 2 - Preparatory actions for implementation of the agri-environmental measures and Leader - Measures:
 4. Preparation for implementation of actions relating to environment and the countryside
 5. Preparation and implementation of local rural development strategies
- Axis 3 - Development of the Rural Economy - Measures:
 6. Improvement and development of rural infrastructure
 7. Development and diversification of rural economic activities
 8. Training
 9. Technical assistance

2.3 Geographic Coverage

The JP worked 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 chosen because of their existing situation and their potential in terms of rural tourism.

2.4 Beneficiaries

The Mid-term Evaluation report pointed to a design flaw in the JP in relation to the definition of beneficiaries, both direct and indirect, and recommended 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. Project documentation documents a range of national and local institutions, both urban and rural, intended to benefit from the JP. In terms of project activities and outputs, beneficiaries of the JP have included local tourism organisations (Municipal organisations), NGOs focused on economic and tourism development and local tourism providers (including families with a tourism product, farmers and processors in the tourism supply chain, schools and other providers). National 'beneficiaries' have included the NTOS and MFE, as well as MAFTWE, in the sense that their partnership in the JP was beneficial to their work on development of national strategies and plans, and their assistance to stakeholders at the local level in strategy, plan and product development.

The following tables are the latest information available on total beneficiary numbers from the JP.²

2.4.1 Direct Beneficiaries

Beneficiary Type	Expected Number Institutions	Institutions To Date	Expected Number Women	Women To Date	Expected Number Men	Men To Date
National	5	3	10	8	10	9
Local		51	50	45	30	67
Urban						
Rural	556	27	350	348	520	267
Total	561	81	410	401	560	343

2.4.2 Indirect Beneficiaries

Beneficiary Type	Expected Number Institutions	Institutions To Date	Expected Number Women	Women To Date	Expected Number Men	Men To Date
National	3	5	5	12	5	6
Local	124	41	408	57	25	23
Urban			40	15	4	1
Rural	1500	29	645	405	180	35
Total	1624	75	1098	489	214	65

² Joint Programme Monitoring Report. June 2012.

2.5 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 were delayed, and a request for a no-cost extension was made, and supported by the Mid-term Evaluation. As a result, the JP was officially extended to 4 December 2012 – at no additional cost to the MDG-F.

2.6 JP Governance

The JP had two governance/ management bodies, the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Programme Management Committee (PMC).

2.6.1 NSC

Per the Joint Programme Document, the NSC comprised the UN Resident Coordinator, the Ambassador of the Spanish Government and the Serbian Assistant Minister of Finance in charge of Programming, Management of EU Funds and Development Assistance. The third member of the NSC was in implementation a representative of the Serbian European Integration Office.

The NSC was responsible to:

- Approve strategic directions.
- Align MDG-F activities with the UN Strategic Framework.
- Approve documented arrangements for management and coordination.
- Establish programme baselines to enable monitoring and evaluation.
- Approve annual work plans and budgets.
- Review the consolidated JP report.
- Suggest corrective measures.
- Create synergies.
- Approve the communication and public information plans of the PMC.

2.6.2 PMC

Per the Joint Programme Document, the PMC comprised

- Participating UN Agencies, with the UN Resident Coordinator as Chair.
- Ministry of Finance and the Economy.
- Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management.
- National Tourism Organisation of Serbia.

Other, relevant organisations were able to participate as observers, subject to need.

The responsibilities of the PMC included:

- Ensuring operational coordination.
- Appointing a Joint Programme Manager or equivalent.
- Managing JP resources to achieve the outcomes and outputs defined in the JP document.
- Establishing adequate reporting mechanisms for the JP.
- Integrating work plans, budgets, reports and other JP documents.

- Providing technical and substantive leadership regarding activities envisaged in Annual Work Plans.
- Agreeing on re-allocations and budget revisions and making recommendations to the NSC as appropriate.
- Addressing management and implementation problems.
- Identifying emerging lessons learned.
- Establishing communication and public information plans.

2.7 The JP Team (The PIU)

The implementation team (the Project Implementation Unit – PIU) comprised 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).
- UNDP – Technical Advisor full-time.
- The project covered its administrative needs with an administration associate and contributed to Advocacy and Communication activities of the whole of the MDG-F program in Serbia through contributions to the Communication Analyst position in the UNDP 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’.)

3 Purpose And Methodology Of The Final Evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation rationale, detailed in the Joint Programme Document, envisaged that the UNDP be assigned responsibility to coordinate the monitoring and evaluation of the Joint Programme in line with its monitoring and evaluation framework. The Joint Programme incorporated a range of monitoring and evaluation processes to ensure the quality, relevance and effectiveness of the technical assistance provided to national partners. These processes included a mid-term evaluation that also appraised management arrangements, synergies and coordination among implementing agencies and this final summative evaluation. This final evaluation reviewed the progress made in relation to the activities of the Joint Programme and the SMART outputs produced, and assessed the overall performance of the Joint Programme, focusing particularly on its overall relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

3.1 Methodology Of The Evaluation

The evaluation was conducted in October and November 2012 and was informed by the findings of the field work. The evaluation was carried out under the guidance of the Evaluation Reference Group and in close coordination with the members of the STRD Joint Programme team. 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. The JP contributed a wide range of material to the understanding and development of rural tourism in Serbia, as a result of studies and consultancies undertaken throughout the programme. A complete listing of JP documentation (analysed as part of the evaluation) can be found at Annex 2.
- 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 (a field trip was undertaken where partners/ stakeholders were interviewed one-on-one or in focus groups in Donji Milanovac, Kladovo, Negotin, Knjazevac, Pirot, Ljig and Vršac. A total of 39 persons were interviewed – the full list can be found at Annex 3. 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.
- Analysis of the feedback and input from the field work against the JP design and documentation and against the evaluation criteria.

Per the Terms of Reference, the objective of the evaluation was to:

- Assess if and how programme outputs were achieved and the efficiency with which outputs were achieved and to provide recommendations for future engagement.

Further, again per the Terms of Reference, the evaluation was to:

- Focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the Joint Programme, based on the scope and criteria included in this Terms of Reference.

3.2 Objectives Of The Evaluation

Finally, the Terms of Reference describes five specific objectives for the evaluation:

1. To measure to what extent the Joint Programme contributed to resolving the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. To measure the Joint Programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
3. To measure to what extent the Joint Programme has attained development results with the targeted population, beneficiaries and participants, whether individuals, communities or institutions.
4. To measure the Joint Programme contribution to the objectives set in the specific thematic window (public sector and development) and the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level. (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).
5. To identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform with the aim of supporting the sustainability of the Joint Programme or some of its components.

Further to these five specific objectives, the Terms of Reference request that the evaluation provide considered inputs to the following issues:

- The status of the corresponding Country Programme outcome and estimate the degree of project's contribution to it.
- The degree to which the programme activities listed in the Project Document have been successfully implemented and desired outputs achieved.
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness.
- The efficiency of the programme approach in delivering outputs.
- Assessment of external factors affecting the programme, and the extent to which the programme has been able to adapt and/or mitigate the effects of such factors.
- The approach to project management, including the role of stakeholders and coordination with other development projects in the same area.
- The extent to which the target beneficiaries have benefited from the project activities.
- The level of beneficiaries' and partners satisfaction with programme implementation and results.
- The potential for continuation or up-scaling of the initiative.

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).

3.3 Limits To The Evaluation

The evaluation was somewhat constrained in the effectiveness of its analysis by the relatively limited depth and breadth of feedback available during the allocated evaluation time period – the evaluator depended heavily on the views of individuals within project contexts. The evaluator cross-checked findings as possible, but there were limits regarding opportunities to independently confirm or verify evidence from secondary sources or the information received from interviewees.

No analysis of the financial status of the JP was undertaken. While the details of JP finances for one Agency were provided, the balance of financial information has not been completed or supplied.

4 Review Of Implementation

This section on Review Of Implementation initially discusses effectiveness, ie ‘the extent to which the JP attained its objectives’. The specific intent of this section of the report is to ‘assess if and how programme outputs were achieved’ – to address the status of implementation, delivery of activities, production of outputs and attainment of outcomes (Terms of Reference). Specific comments can be found on each SMART Output, as well as more general commentary on the Outcome statements. Following the effectiveness discussion, further analysis is undertaken on relevance, sustainability and efficiency.

4.1 Effectiveness

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the project has been effective to date in achieving its intended objectives. Examples of the questions that were asked include:

- Did the JP achieve anticipated results?
- Was the JP implemented against the planned timeframe? What factors contributed to progress or delays in the achievement of the outputs and outcomes?
- Did the outputs produced meet the required high quality?
- Did the JP work with beneficiaries as planned?
- What good or best practice, lessons learned or success stories have been identified? Have they been transferred to other JPs or stakeholders?

The JP was successful in delivering its planned outputs, and in achieving its intended outcomes.

- Outcome 1 was almost fully delivered - There is a legal and policy framework for diversification of the rural economy through tourism. Possibly more significant is the demonstrable support provide by MFE and the Government of Serbia to the intent and detailed planning which is included in the RTMP. Rural development planning has not been mainstreamed in Serbian policy, but the groundwork has been laid and there are indications that this will eventuate in the short term. There are demonstrable improvements in rural tourism investment mainstreaming, linked to outputs in this area as well as to the RTMP
- Outcome 2 is fully delivered - There is better linkage between and organisation of local rural tourism providers and support agencies (NTOS/ LTOs/ Municipalities), and stakeholder capacity has been improved. This has been done within the framework of the RTMP, and the relationship between the national strategy and policies and local capacity and networking interlinks well in terms of future sustainability.

The discussion below looks at each outcome and output statement.

4.2 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 been achieved. All three related outcomes have been achieved, and outputs designed to contribute to the legal and policy framework (nationally and locally) have been delivered. The legal and policy framework as anticipated, in support of the diversification of the rural economy through tourism, has been developed and is in place. In terms of effectiveness, the JP has demonstrated completion of activities and delivery of outputs, and as

a result outcomes have been achieved that are contributing now, or have the potential to contribute in future, to sustainable outcomes, as well as the potential to contribute to impact level effects. The RTMP has already been approved by the Government of Serbia, and the detail contained in the action and implementation plans are being implemented. In this sense, the Government has already moved beyond the JP's outcome of a framework into actual support for diversification of the rural economy. There is still significant room for further involvement from MAFWM in implementation of the rural development aspects, the IPARD measures. It is understood that Government policy will see a move beyond Axis 1 to Axes 2 and 3 from the beginning of 2013. The JP completed its programmed activities and achieved its intended outputs in these areas, and the framework for Serbia's IPARD involvement is in place. This work (specifically the work on IPARD Axes 2 and 3) is not a current component of MAFWM activities and strategy.

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

This Outcome has been achieved. As anticipated, a number of studies and other activities were undertaken that contributed to the formulation and content of the RTMP, each of which is discussed at the output level below.

Further to the anticipated outcome, the RTMP has not only been submitted to the Government, it has been approved by Government and is being used by the MFE as a strategic and action planning framework, and is being implemented in line with the related Implementation Plan. The work of the JP was effective and there are indications of sustainability, as well as of impact level effects.

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

This Output has been fully delivered. The Master Plan For Sustainable Rural Tourism Development In Serbia³, comprising a Diagnostic⁴, a Strategy⁵, an Action Plan⁶ and an Implementation Plan⁷ has now been approved by the Government of Serbia. All phases of the formulation and approval of the RTMP were consultative, with workshops organised at both national and regional levels. Through the National Rural Tourism Unit, formed in the MFE with cooperation from the NTOS and UNWTO, the RTMP has now entered its implementation phase.

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

This Output has been fully delivered. The principles and framework were developed and used in the formulation of the RTMP, with appropriately qualified inputs to the RTMP gathered⁸. The RTMP in all its components contains the framework, which incorporates child, youth and

³ April 2011. *Master Plan For Sustainable Rural Tourism Development In Serbia*. UN Joint Programme Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development funded by the Spanish MDG Achievement Fund.

⁴ April 2011. *Volume 1 A Diagnostic Of Rural Tourism In Serbia*. UN Joint Programme Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development funded by the Spanish MDG Achievement Fund.

⁵ April 2011. *Volume 2 A Strategy For Rural Tourism In Serbia*. UN Joint Programme Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development funded by the Spanish MDG Achievement Fund.

⁶ April 2011. *Volume 3 An Action Plan For Rural Tourism In Serbia*. UN Joint Programme Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development funded by the Spanish MDG Achievement Fund.

⁷ April 2011. *Volume 4 Implementation Plan For Rural Tourism In Serbia*. UN Joint Programme Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development funded by the Spanish MDG Achievement Fund.

⁸ Education Forum UNICEF, Belgrade Office. *The Report on the Data Received for Mapping of the Potentials of Different Regions of Serbia for Sustainable Tourism in the Context of Rural Development*.

family tourism⁹. Further, child and youth-related tourism models were promoted and presented in two round of workshops through the 2011 grant scheme (see below).

SMART Output 1.1.3. – National Study on Sustainable Tourism.

This Output has been fully delivered. A study focused on the environment and sustainable tourism was prepared by UNEP in 2010¹⁰ and was used in the formulation of the RTMP.

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 fully delivered, through a study conducted per the planned activities. The assessment, done in 2010¹¹, was used in the formulation of the RTMP.

4.2.2 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 was partially achieved - in the sense that planned activities were completed and planned outputs delivered. However, it cannot be said that rural development programme planning has been mainstreamed in Serbia’s national policies. A planning process is complete, as an activity and output, but there is no demonstrable process of programme planning being mainstreamed. Further, within the specific framework of the JP, the activities and outputs of the JP have not, yet, been used by MAFWM or the Government. The work of the JP team was effective and outputs delivered, but delivery of the Outcome, and sustainability of the initiative and impact level effect is not visible.

It is noted that having completed the indicative activities, the JP continues to provide support to the MAFWM (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 fully delivered. Included in activities/ outputs in this output area was the development of the Axis 2 sectoral analysis and the measures fiches for IPARD for these two Axes - measures in synergy with an Avalon programme and STAR Component 3. As well, with regards Axis 3, was the development of a situation analysis and complete measures fiches for diversification and development of the rural economy (302), rural infrastructure development (301) and for upgrading of training (303). Three measures were developed for Axis 3, while for the fourth-technical assistance (501), brainstorming was provided together with advice for its use in rural development network operations (within the development of the Serbian rural development network. It is noted that with relation to Axis 3, tourism and handcrafts implementation is currently incorporated in the national rural development plan.

In the perspective of the longer term, these documents are not being used by the Government or MATFWM. As discussed with the Ministry¹², this is a conscious decision on the part of

⁹ Education Forum UNICEF, Belgrade Office. *Potentials For Child-Related Tourism - Serbia’s Potential For Educational Tourism For Children, Youth And Families*

¹⁰ July 2010. Stefanovic and Beronja. *National Study on Environment: Inputs to Sustainable Rural Tourism Master Plan.*

¹¹ 2010. Bogdanov, Miljkovic, Ristic. *Assessment Of The Potential Contribution Of Rural Tourism To Small Farming Sector And Rural Development In General.* MDG-F.

Government – to remain focused on Axis 1 until 2013 at the earliest, with some reference being given to Axes 2 and 3 after January 2013. All IPARD preparations have been completed in Serbia, with the next step being negotiations between the Government of Serbia and the EU in terms of the details of implementation, including completion of all requirements to get accreditation.

The JP assisted in the establishment of the National Rural Development Council with MAFWM, preparing a Terms of Reference for the Council and all required documentation for its establishment, and completed consultations with all appointed representatives of the Council when it was established at the end of 2010. The JP completed the agenda for the first meeting of the Council, a work protocol and all necessary documentation including provision of technical support for the session and to the chair, the Minister of Agriculture. The Council, intended as an inter-Ministerial group to oversee rural development (including rural tourism), still has not held its first meeting and it is not certain when this will happen.

SMART Output 1.2.2 – IPARD Life Conditions Study.

This Output has been fully delivered. The Life Conditions Study (*Access For Women And Children To Services In The Rural Areas Of Serbia And Proposed Measures To Improve Their Situation*) was completed and promoted, not just with MATFWM, but also to other agencies involved directly or indirectly in rural tourism. It is also relevant here to mention the current Government policy in relation to IPARD Axes 2 and 3, as it impacts directly on implementation of this work. In this context, the JP's outputs on IPARD Life Conditions will not likely be piloted for some time, with the possible exception of specific components related to tourism.

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

This Outcome was largely achieved. Most activities were completed, and virtually all outputs have been delivered. Further, there is demonstrable evidence of a growth in financial allocations from national budgets to tourism initiatives. The RTMP provides a framework (and impetus) for mainstreaming sustainable tourism investments – the international conferences/ fairs and the work on child-related tourism is specifically relevant, as is the work on the IPARD axes/ measures – the positioning is completed.

SMART Output 1.3.1. – Public Investments toward the RTMP.

This Output has been delivered. The JP analysed local and national budgets in relation to tourism and rural tourism, providing data on activities related to promotion of investment. All of these activities were related to understanding and putting emphasis on the allocation of resources and inputs to the RTMP. During the period of the JP the national tourism budget has grown significantly, growth which was to some extent contributed to by the JP:

National Tourism budget:

- 2009 - 2,240,000,000 RSD.
- 2010 - 4,550,000,000 RSD.
- 2011 – 5,180,000,000 RSD.

This represents a total budget for national tourism in this period of approximately \$US 133,326,000.

¹² Field discussion with the representative of the MATFWM.

SMART Output 1.3.2. – Public-Private Partnership Guidelines.

This Output has been delivered. The JP produced strategy guidelines for Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) in Rural Tourism, and organised training programmes for decision-makers in the finance sector at both the national and local levels. Participants included officials from the National Tourism Development Corporation. The JP supported eight PPP initiatives through the grant scheme, across both grant scheme activities. This support went to Municipalities, local tourism offices (LTO) and to rural tourism providers, and partnerships between public, civil and private sectors in four regional stakeholder groups were fostered through all projects granted within the grant scheme.

SMART Output 1.3.3. – SIFT Network.

The National Corporation for Investment in Tourism became the SIFT focal point in 2010, and a Serbian sustainable tourism investment group was established and provided with training. A review of tourism investment policies was also undertaken and a website on tourism investment in Serbia (www.tourinvest.rs) develop. However, the National Corporation for Investment in Tourism was disbanded by Government in October of 2012. While there are on-going discussions as to which entity will now take up the role of SIFT focal point, no decision has been made.

SMART Output 1.3.4. – Investment Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy.

This Output has been largely delivered. An M and E strategy was implemented in each of the JP's PPPs. Specifically, the JP defined five indicators, and used a minimum of three, for each project granted financial assistance. The five are:

- Extent of increased visibility of the pilot areas in the tourism market.
- Increase in visit numbers compared to the baseline.
- Increase in financial effects in pilot areas.
- Strengthened capacity of tourist providers.
- Diversification of economic activities.

It is unclear what on-going usage will be made of these in future, and therefore their potential for impact is unclear.

This output formed part of the M and E system of the JP, and was intended to feed the lessons learned from Outcome 2, particularly. In this context it is worth noting that the JP also created a publication *Local Capacity Building for Rural Development Aimed at Promoting Tourism*, that addresses some of these lessons learned, reports on them, describes them and uses them.

4.3 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 outcome has been achieved. It was noted at the time of the mid-term evaluation that it is a very ambitious outcome, focusing as it does on destination development, diversification of the rural economy and active learning tourism investments. But, with the strong support provided by local and national partners, and the structural, strategic framework of the RTMP and Government (MFE) and NTOS encouragement, LTOs, Municipalities and local providers are better linked and organised, and local stakeholder capacity has indeed been improved. It is worth noting here, as part of this discussion, that local product providers, LTOs and Municipalities *all* specified networking outcomes as the most important achievement of the JP. The organising and linking achieved through the JP will likely be of lasting significance.

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

This outcome has been achieved. As well as training being delivered, capacity has been enhanced in the designated areas. Precursor organisations for the establishment of LAGs have been established and are functioning, a group of trained individuals exist whose focus and interest is on rural development networks and their ability to assist rural development processes in conjunction with EU, Government and local initiatives. Local planning has been undertaken to better develop and implement development strategies, and individuals and organisations have a wider range of knowledge in a number of areas of direct importance to and impact on rural tourism and rural development.

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

This output has been fully delivered. As is discussed throughout this report, the necessary supportive legislation that will allow establishment of LAGs, within the EU's LEADER framework does not exist yet in Serbia. Further, it is not intended by MAFWM to focus in this area until at least early 2013. This was not the understanding during the JP's design period. On the other hand, it is possible for a group to be formed, within current legislative frameworks, that can move smoothly to become a LAG when legislation comes into existence and force. As a result, some modifications were made to intent and activities in order to incorporate this change into project designs, and eight 'LAGs' (directly correlated to the 8 PPPs discussed at 1.3.2 above) were formed. As well as the groups themselves, four (draft) local development strategies have been prepared, one in each of the JP's four regions.¹³

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.

This output has been fully delivered, although its further development and impact are constrained by external factors. The RDN was trained, with local implementers, to help local stakeholders in preparing local development strategies. They were also trained as trainers in project cycle management for the first grant scheme. All activities with the RDN were completed, they still work with the JP, and the RDN exists as a legal entity, but there has been a collapse in its structure, partly as a result of it no longer performing specific tasks and roles for MAFWM. The RDN itself is struggling with a lack of funding and members of the network work with other sources of funding, and other related and unrelated activities. Indications are that the developed capacity has strengthened RDN organisations and individuals, inside and outside of the network itself. One particular indicator of this is the existing preparedness of the RDN to use IPARD technical assistance. MAFWM will need to re-establish financial support to the RDN (there are indications that this may happen in 2013), and in the meantime the RDM member organisations will continue work on LAG development, as well as concentrating on the capacity of the rural population to absorb IPARD funds, when they become available.

¹³ The four strategy documents are the *Rural Development Strategy For The Banat Oasis Group*, the *Rural Development Strategy For The BIS 5 Group*, the *Rural Development Strategy For The Spirit Of The Danube Group* and the *Rural Development Strategy For The Garden Serbia Group*.

It is understood from field work discussions¹⁴ that there are possibilities for the RDN to assist MAFWM in IPARD programme development, which may give them a future focus with the Ministry, but this is not guaranteed.

SMART Output 2.1.3. Local planning.

This output has been fully delivered. The JP was very active in the area of local planning, where it facilitated the drafting of local development strategies in all Municipalities in each of the 4 target regions. The JP provided local partners with a range of recommendations for improved management of resources at the local level.

SMART Output 2.1.4. Organisational Capacity Development.

This output has been fully delivered. A significant amount of training, as envisaged in the programme document has been organised and delivered. The mid-term evaluation recommended that the PIU concentrate on *capacity development* (output focus), as opposed to *training* (input focus) – this recommendation appears to have been followed.

Over 1,000 rural tourism stakeholders were trained through workshops, practical training programmes and coaching, in programmes concentrating on:

- Energy efficiency and sustainable use of resources.
- Support to local NGOs and other groups in proposal development. Participants can now support potential beneficiaries in preparing projects, and they have produced projects which have received grants.
- Mobilizing local and other resources.

The capacity of local and national stakeholders for the development of child and youth educational tourism was improved through constant awareness-raising activities, promoted by activities undertaken within grant projects.

SMART Output 2.1.5. Marketing and Promotion.

This output has been largely delivered. One aspect of the development of the RTMP has been the importance it has brought to marketing and promotion, particularly in the significance placed on training in these areas by local stakeholders. The promotional work being done by the Rural Tourism Task Force (see Output 2.2.1 below) has also seen an expression of the importance of the marketing and promotional aspects of the Master Plan. As a result, the Rural Tourism Task Force is working on creation of a guidebook, a manual for rural tourism providers on e-marketing and other aspects including clustering, partnerships, resource agencies/ resources.

A further point is the on-going and effective development of the partnership between the NTOS, MFE and the UNWTO, coupled with the instigation and development of the Rural Tourism Task Force. One key strategy of the JP, once the RTMP had been approved, was the linking of ‘all’ activities to the Master Plan. The Rural Tourism Task Force is the focal point for this strategy, and this Task Force will continue to give focus and direction to the marketing and promotion of rural tourism in Serbia.

FAO-organised training initiatives contribute to outputs in this area as well, particularly those initiatives which focused on the marketing of food products for tourism, the direct marketing of agricultural and handcraft products, and gastronomy as a complement to the tourism offer. Further, training and mentoring was provided in product and regional branding. Finally, a number of services and events were assisted that supported the integrated promotion of local

¹⁴ Interview with representative of MAFWM.

products, at the national and regional levels – notable in this is the internet portal Srpska magaza (<http://www.srpskamagaza.com>), and participation in the International Tourism Fair (2010-2012) and Ethno-food fair in Belgrade (2011).

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

These outputs have been largely delivered. The regional assessments and environmental studies anticipated under these outputs were completed and have been published.¹⁵ A training program was designed and delivered, addressing energy efficiency on day one and sustainable resource management on day 2. The program included 24 workshops, with a total of some 300 participants, each of whom has a better sense of how to better manage their rural tourism business.

SMART Output 2.1.7 Rural Tourism-Oriented Networks.

This output has been largely delivered. Eleven of the 12 planned rural-tourism-oriented networks of producers, processors and rural tourism service providers were established, one as a national integrated marketing platform, 6 as regional gastronomy and product brands and thematic routes and 4 public private partnerships around capacity building for strategic planning, intended to contribute to the formation of 4 regional tourism LAGs. Through the grant scheme the JP supported three partnership projects, with individuals networking within these partnerships (processing and production units for food, rural accommodation, handicrafts, promotional material and trainings and direct marketing). The other 4 networks (development of regional brands) were supported through trainings, coaching and mentoring in the development of rules for their networks and registration documentation. Four PPPs were supported with training on strategic planning, fundraising, project cycle management and project writing.¹⁶ Srpska Magaza, in Ljig, is an example of the JP's outputs in this area – it functions as a brand, a shop and an internet portal, working both locally and regionally in promoting rural tourism.

As well as FAO, UNICEF's work also contributed in this area, through the establishment of a network of rural tourism destinations. This conscious network has been supported through the JP, developing and marketing a specific tourism product (see the network's website at: www.obrazovniturzam.rs) and have begun the establishment of an Educational Tourism Cluster.

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.

Notwithstanding comments below on 2.2.1 (Tourism Governance Organisations), this output has been largely delivered. Work on this output area was directly and closely linked with the grant schemes, where significant focus was placed on product development through the creation of tourism product clusters and where there are clear examples of how this work has

¹⁵ September 2012. *Regional Environmental Studies Serbia Study Report*. UN Joint Programme Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development Funded by the Spanish MDG Achievement Fund.

¹⁶ For its component of the second grant scheme, FAO chose to make use of MAFWM's Payment Agency. While there were strategic reasons for making this decision, ultimately the size and slowness of the process impacted on the ability of the JP to deliver this part of the grant programme effectively. At the time of writing the 12 individual IPARD grants are incomplete, although they are close to completion, and may be completed by the end of the JP. There are indications that FAO will complete them after formal completion of the JP, but this cannot be guaranteed.

both improved the local tourism offer in target regions and has prepared relevant and appropriate examples for other local tourist operators to emulate. In addition, capacity building was provided to local rural tourism stakeholders and LTOs on how to access EU funds and prepare project proposals for improved rural tourism infrastructure, facilities and services so as to improve product development. Also, at the request of MFE and NTOS, a scheme for the voluntary upgrading of rural tourism facilities and services is being formulated for implementation through a pilot programme in 2013 by MFE. This manual will be a novel approach towards encouraging rural tourism stakeholders to form part of a labeling system which offers guarantees of quality to rural tourism products.

While local tourism stakeholders received *training to become active stakeholders in RTMP implementation*, it cannot be assessed that they *are* more active stakeholders, beyond their participation in training that makes them more effective locally, and that improves their offer.

SMART Output 2.1.9 (See 2.1.6).

SMART Output 2.1.10. Agriculture Quality Standards training.

This output has been fully delivered. Over 600 producers, farmers and processors were trained in GlobalGap, HACCP, etc in 25 workshops on agricultural quality production and standards. The training was planned and delivered in cooperation with the Quality Group in MAFWM. The selection of training content and participants followed from undertaken needs assessments, and were developed in a ‘demand-driven’ manner.

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

This outcome has been achieved. There are some issues with completion of the FAO grant programme, but notwithstanding these issues, it can be assessed that tourism governance in the target regions, dedicated tourism organisations (LTOs as well as local providers) and recipients of funding for pilots and investment promotion have been enhanced. As was stated in the field interviews, ‘there is a rural tourism product – not just marketing’. Further, with the strategic and policy support being demonstrated by MFE and the Government, local structures and products are likely to be further supported and enhanced.

SMART Output 2.2.1. Tourism Governance Organisations

This output has been largely delivered, although the formal concept of a Tourism Governance Organisation was not accepted by MFE,¹⁷ specifically as the Government of Serbia did not want any new tourism organisations. The Government had concerns about (a lack) of funding for these organisations and their inability to be sustainable, and wanted to focus on sustainable solutions. The determined approach was the development of the Rural Tourism Task Force, not as a ‘governance’ mechanism but as the lead player in rural tourism, under the auspices of the MFE.

The Task Force is undertaking all dissemination and promotion of the RTMP nationally (it is an on-going process) – they prepare and deliver the workshops and explain the Master Plan to interested stakeholders, and they are developing the RTMP website and hotline. The Task Force also organised promotional workshops, drafts and disseminates questionnaires and address feedback. The promotional process has demonstrated two priorities, marketing and

¹⁷ 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.

promotion (see Output 2.1.5 above) and some key training needs related to improvements in knowledge and skills in accessing funding (particularly EU funds). This process is not complete, with the training programme not anticipated to be completed until after the formal finishing date of the JP – scheduled for completion in mid-December 2012.

SMART Output 2.2.2. Child-related Tourism Supply and Demand

This output has been fully delivered. A range of material, including guidelines on child-related tourism, have been prepared. While the project document referenced ‘standards/guidelines’, it was determined to address only guidelines at this point, given the complexity and difficulties associated with implementing a specific set of ‘standards’. These guidelines, *Smernice za razvoj i realizaciju usluga u ruralnom turizmu namenjenih deci i mladima* can also be found online¹⁸. Looking in the longer term, it is noted that the guidelines have not as yet been incorporated into processes, nor while they have been provided to the Ministry for endorsement, this endorsement has not happened.

As the JP nears completion, a manual is being produced that will describe and detail the processes for establishing an Educational Tourism Centre. The manual will provide detail on the full range of potential models and structures for a Centre, as well as the regulatory framework.

SMART Output 2.2.3. Investment Forum

This output has been fully delivered. The Tourism Investment Conference, held in November of 2011 under the auspices of MFE and with the direct support of the JP, brought together a wide range of tourism stakeholders, including industry representatives with an investment interest in Serbia. The MFE view is that the Conference was of great quality and importance, and that, significantly, as a ‘direct result’¹⁹ of their participation in the Conference, three international hotel chains have developed or furthered their plans to build hotels in Serbia. Another conference on rural tourism and sustainable development was held within the Tourism Fair in February of 2012, involving panel discussions with tourism stakeholders from the region. One focus of the conference was the dissemination of the work and outcomes of the JP, as an initiative and as a component of the work of the MFE.

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 outputs have been largely delivered. These outputs relate to each UN Agency’s component of the grant schemes. The grants were 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 were also at the forefront of the thinking of the PIU and Joint Programme Manager. The mid-term evaluation made the point that the emphasis of the JP’s Joint Fund was *enhancing tourism governance towards better linked and organised tourism and support industries where capacity is improved for delivering services* – ie a focus on results, not on the grants, which were simply an input – a tool for achieving the output/ outcome. On the basis of the evaluation’s field work, it can be assessed that the JP worked hard in maintaining this results focus, and to good effect.

2.2.4 FAO Diversification of the Rural Economy Through Tourism

A total of three partnership groups with 11 sub-projects were supported in the first grant scheme and 12 individuals with 12 small projects in the second grant scheme. Support was

¹⁸ See: http://obrazovniturizam.rs/wp-content/themes/obrazovni_turizam/ebook/book2/.

¹⁹ Field work interview with MFE representatives.

directed at leading legal entities, representing partnership for groups interested in tourism and agriculture production – ie as an exercise in LEADER-type support to local projects, selected by the PPPs and in line with their draft strategies. In the second round support was directed to 12 individual rural households dealing with rural tourism and small scale processing or food production. As a result of the mid-term evaluation, a dissemination aspect was added - a booklet and other resources on rural tourism - that will be provided to farmers and rural tourism operators, together with a DVD of all studies and outputs of the project, as a way of disseminating all JP outputs.²⁰

2.2.5 UNWTO Tourist Destination Development

UNWTO, as a non-resident agency, decided to enter into an agreement with NTOS for NTOS to implement and monitor the grant scheme.

NTOS handled agreements with grantees, and went into the field. Ownership, and strengthening the relationship between NTOS and local providers were important aspects of this approach. All but one grant was successfully completed, from UNWTO's single round of grants. The application process, which was designed specifically to facilitate grant applications from geographical clusters, gathered 105 applicant proposals, of which 42 were approved in principle. 37 were ultimately funded, for a total of \$US 202,007. Grants, and projects, focused on basic tourism services, attractors, niche products and cluster development.

2.2.6 UNICEF Active Learning Tourism Investments

Following a recommendation to the PMC, and their acceptance of the recommendation, the JP provided 6 grants of \$20,000, rather than the originally programmed 20 grants of \$2,000-\$5,000. The change improved outputs as well as administrative processes. Six destinations (each with a strong focus on educational programmes) were funded, through the 6 grants, with rural schools leading the applicant partners in three cases. In the other three the lead was the Red Cross, a museum and an NGO, although each had a rural school as a partner. The grants piloted the use of the space now available in schools' 'extended operations', in villages. The grants had a strong focus on sustainability, through preparing and delivering a tourism project from the work done on the JP. The grants, and the established destinations, benefited as learning exercises both the guest (hosted children and others) and the hosts, establishing a specific tourism product that is designed to impact on the knowledge, skills and capacities of guests. The grant process included consideration of replication, and of promotion.

As a result of this programme, UNICEF is now rolling out a larger educational tourism process, involving 12 newly selected schools. These 12 will benefit from what has been learned in the JP and will be supported processes related to educational tourism and project design/ implementation.

UNDP

As well as these three components, UNDP supported the development of eight PPP initiatives (3 in the first grant scheme, 5 in the second). The focus extended to Municipalities, LTOs and rural tourism providers, with maximum available in the first scheme \$50,000 and in the second scheme \$80,000, and maximum grants per project \$20,000.

²⁰ 2012. Suzana Djordjevic-Milosevic and Jelena Milovanovic. *Održivi turizam u funkciji ruralnog razvoja - Srpsko malo farmerstvo i ruralni turizam*. Belgrade and Budapest.

4.3.3 JP Effectiveness and UNDAF Outcomes

The JP responded 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 specifically responded to this outcome, as did the work of the JP (through UNEP’s component) on environmental protection and sustainability. Further, notwithstanding the lack yet of a formal national framework, the rural development components around the LEADER approach and LAGs directly contribute to change and development in this area.

4.3.4 JP Effectiveness and Government Strategies

The JP responded effectively to specific **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, and necessarily, contributed to Government of Serbia strategy in its work on the RTMP and component documents.

4.3.5 JP Effectiveness And The MDGs

The JP was intended to respond to eight MDG targets, described in the project document. The work and outputs of the JP, in relation to the eight targets, are discussed below.

MDG 1 – Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger

1.1 Reduce unemployment rate of young by at least one third. No detailed assessment was possible based on JP data, but it is likely that the JP contributed to this MDG in a limited way – the development of better conceived, local tourism product may provide some employment opportunities for young people in the future, through participation in family tourism offers.

1.2 Reduce unemployment rate of persons with disabilities by at least 20%. The JP had only a minimal focus on the involvement of people with disabilities. Policy changes and other initiatives of the JP are likely to have a minimal 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 were directed by the JP to this area, and there may be some longer term effects, they will be minimal.

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.

4.3.6 The JP And The MDG-F's Cross-cutting Themes

4.3.6.1 Gender

In order to promote equitable gender balance and representation, local professionals working for the UN in Serbia, in community and economic development initiatives, developed the following 'best practices'.

- Ensure project staffing takes into consideration gender balance desired in project outputs.
- Use community leaders both women and men to serve as examples of success.
- Specifically target both women and men engaged in business and farming activities.
- Incorporate gender responsive programming that seeks inclusion of both women and men in project activities.

Further, the JP was designed and managed to incorporate the following practices in addition to the above-expressed general approaches. These specific practices included:

- Ensure baseline and other analyses are disaggregated according to gender where applicable.
- Ensure that rural women are informed and take an equal part in all JP training, forums and other events.
- Direct a portion of the pilot project funds to initiatives in which rural women are the primary beneficiaries.
- Ensure that women and men benefit equally from this initiative.

The JP has considered gender equality in its implementation, including some specific activities and strategies to address gender priorities in rural tourism. Of particular interest was a study on the inclusion of gender equality in local development strategies in the JP's partner Municipalities. The study included an analysis, including statistics on gender inclusion, and a set of recommendations to ensure gender equality in the development and implementation of local strategies.²¹

4.3.6.2 Persons With Disability

The JP was also designed with specific measures for addressing the needs of persons with disabilities:

- All pilot projects supported with JP funds with public access will be made accessible to persons with disabilities.
- All training, network forums and other initiatives supported by the JP will address disability issues and will be accessible to persons with disabilities.

²¹ 2011. Aleksandra Vladislavljevic. *Gender Equality Inclusion In Local Development Strategies Of 19 Municipalities In Serbia.*

- All websites and other information developed through the JP will be accessible to persons with disabilities by ensuring that all disabled persons' organisations are included in distribution.

Addressing the needs of persons with disabilities was not a focus of the JP during implementation. While the specific measures described above were considered, and generally implemented, they were not the key aspects taken into consideration by the JP when designing initiatives, issuing grant calls or organising events.

Having looked above at the detail of the JP in terms of effectiveness, the following section of the report looks at relevance, efficiency and sustainability.

4.4 Relevance

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the objectives of the JP were 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 did the JP design respond to national and regional plans, to identified needs, and to the operational context of national politics?
- To what extent were the country's national and local authorities:
 - taken into consideration in JP design.
 - participated or become involved in JP design.
- To what extent did the interaction of national partners affect JP implementation.

The design of the JP at outcome level, particularly in relation to national partners, fits neatly in Government of Serbia priorities, and in particular responded directly to Government rural development program priorities, as defined in the National Rural Development Program for the years 2011-2013. 'Rural tourism is not the highest priority of the Government, but it is a priority.' This view is supported at the local level, where local partners considered the RTMP as 'very significant', providing a 'critical component' of policy in Serbia. Local partners also felt that the 'work of the JP is exactly in line with the priorities of the regions.'

Looking forward, it can be argued that the JP design missed some components that would have assisted its own effectiveness while furthering the development of Government of Serbia processes. The programme did not focus on systems for gathering, storing and querying data on numbers of visits, for example. The JP itself could not have impact on the number of 'bed-nights', but it could have assisted the development of the systems that would allow Government to have evidence on/ data about these numbers. It would have been worthwhile to look in detail at the efforts of Selo²², which has been supported by and developed through the JP, in terms of bookings in rural households, and the potential for development of a business, nationally, that would benefit providers, as well as assisting in gathering data on providers and purchasers of this product. While this development could not in all likelihood have been foreseen at design stage, it may have been able to have been encouraged during implementation. A third example relates to the relationship between NTOS and LTOs. The development of this relationship, at both strategic and programme levels, can be of value to Serbian tourism generally and to the development of the local products that form the overall offer. Each of these examples are also examples of the type of initiatives that could now be pursued in a follow-up programme.

²² www.selo.rs

Generally, national and local partners demonstrate a strong commitment to the project, and it is not surprising that the general view of national (and local) partners/ stakeholders is that the JP was relevant in both its design and in its implementation. The fact the JP was delivered with the strong commitment of the MFE, and particularly its specialised area on tourism, and with the strong support of NTOS, particularly in the detail of the RTMP, added to relevance. There was an immediate realisation of the importance of shifting away from traditional/ classical ideas of rural tourism and looking forward with a more integrated, inter-sectoral approach. The country has great potential for rural tourism, and is seen as such ('outside of Belgrade there is *only* rural tourism'), and the subject of rural tourism is firmly on the agenda now, in terms of economic diversification. While this was a significant shift, national and local partners 'bought in' early, understanding the significance. Indeed, one key component of the JP's relevance was the development of local/ national cooperation and communication.

Secondly, the fact that 'product' benefited, and was developed, was relevant in implementation. The programme went beyond marketing (although marketing benefited as well) to ensuring there were improvements in what is actually being offered by suppliers. The quality of product at the local level has improved.

Finally, the JP demonstrated a real partnership between national partners and implementing agencies. The JP's concept – rural tourism and rural development – fit particularly well within Serbia's need framework and strategic priorities for tourism development. In ensuring an environmental/ sustainable development focus within this framework it provided a wider perspective to rural development. Further, the child-based tourism component took advantage of a strategic possibility and a felt need. In this sense, the joint programme was an important aspect of its relevance – it brought a wider range of priorities and thinking to design and delivery. Of particular note was the value added to the knowledge available to MFE in the development of the RTMP, as well as for MAFWM in relation to IPARD measures, and the specific support provided from Agencies, and Agency-provided specialists, in these areas. This is true also for the inputs on child-focused tourism and sustainable aspects of rural tourism, but strategic aspects are more immediately apparent with regards the RTMP, and the technical support provided MAFWM on IPARD.

In looking to the future, both aspects of the JP's design objectives (national policy frameworks and local capacity) can play important/ significant roles in the development of rural tourism and rural development. The strategic and policy framework exists, and there is a strong resource group in the four pilot regions. It will be important to strengthen (and broaden, geographically) the local component, and the involvement of MAFWM and IPARD measures will be of particular importance in ensuring longer term outcomes.

4.5 Efficiency Of JP Operations And Management

The evaluation tested the hypothesis that the JP was efficient in its use of resources and in converting resources into results. The evaluation analysed activities and outputs against inputs. Some emphasis was placed on the JP's management model and its contribution to outputs and outcomes and inter-agency coordination and communication. The evaluation also looked 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 did the JP's management model contribute to achieving anticipated outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent did participating agencies coordinate with each other and with 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 occurred as a result of the fact that not all UN partner agencies are present in Serbia?

As is discussed throughout this report, and with the exception of MAFWM whose participation varied from year to year as its management changed, ownership of the JP by national partners was of a high order. This ownership was demonstrated in a commitment to the intent, outputs and activities of the JP (both national, strategic priorities and local development priorities) as well as practical, regular involvement in the oversight of the JP through the PMC and the NSC. National partners, PIU members, JP management and UN representatives were in complete agreement about the positive nature of the type and quality of inputs from national partners, and the positive impact this had on the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the JP. This involvement went well beyond participation in PMC and NSC meetings, to an actual involvement in the work of the JP – an important aspect of the effectiveness of this engagement in the JP.

National partners found coordination and communication across UN Agencies useful, described by one as how they ‘stepped into’ the UN system, as they wanted to have their people learn how the process works. The experience allowed these agencies to develop organisational capacity, and the knowledge and skills of their staff, and the ability of their staff to communicate effectively with representatives of external agencies and institutions.²³

The JP has demonstrated a only a relatively high level of efficiency in its management and operations. There were issues in the early stages of the JP, internally and with national partners, related to JP overall management, which resulted in a change in JP Manager. This change had a number of positive effects. National partners welcomed the change which they viewed as the installation of a person with sufficient background in project management and tourism, and sufficient stature as a manager, to oversee the complex communication and coordination procedures of the JP. The new JP Manager insisted on higher levels of coordination within the JP, and facilitated the communication and coordination between the PIU and national partners. The change was noted extensively by national partners, and was also commented by Agency representatives.

Further, the JP was not on time in delivery of activities and outputs at the time of the mid-term evaluation, but with exceptions noted above, all activities have been completed and outputs largely delivered by completion. In this sense, efficiency has improved since the mid-term evaluation.

There are inherent inefficiencies with JP operational, financial and management processes and procedures.

- 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, although there was no apparent correlation between Agency ‘resident’ or ‘non-resident’ status in terms of apparent priority or effectiveness, as can be seen in the role played by UNWTO, who were generally recognised as effective, significant players, notwithstanding their non-resident status.
- Financial arrangements of the JP are not conducive to effective financial management, and the efficient use of resources. The Programme Manager is not in a position to manage specific financial inputs, nor to make the decisions required of project

²³ From an interview with the representative of a national partner.

management in project circumstances. As a result, control processes, in residing ‘out there somewhere’ do not actually exist at the JP level, but only at an Agency level. Financial resources are not able to be used as efficiently and effectively, as the whole picture is not held anywhere. Completion of the grants programme is an example of where the efficiency of financial management suffered as decisions were taken outside the control of the JP Manager. A further example is the lack of financial data/ records for completion of this report. While it is understood that expenditure is generally in line with the planned programme, with one exception the evaluator was not provided financial statements from Agencies in order to compare expenditure to budget.

- Management arrangements as well are not conducive to effective delivery of activities and outputs. As the JP Manager is not in a position to manage specific human resource inputs, nor to make the required management decisions for efficient and effective operations, control is lost, to a certain extent. There is discussion about the JP Manager position being, in reality, a ‘JP Coordinator’. The evaluator is of the view that this would change little, as the issue is with effective control and management procedures, not coordination. Further, potential design and implementation initiatives, such as with the examples discussed at Relevance above, are not considered or acted on.

There is a wide expression of views on the efficiencies of the joint programme approach, from all ‘stakeholders’ except local actors. National partners, UN representatives, PIU members and Agency representatives hold a variety of perspectives, and express these perspectives openly and frankly. Notwithstanding the variety of these views, when looking at JP efficiency they fall into two main categories:

- ‘Joint’ processes are in name only, and there are inherent inefficiencies and management difficulties in this approach – that many of the ‘joint processes’ generate more bureaucracy, not less. Further, the ‘joint’ nature of the initiatives is more about information sharing, not implementation, as implementation is still Agency-driven. As was the case at the time of the mid-term evaluation, the role of the Joint Programme Manager was raised as a case in point, that this role is not really a management role, but one of coordination, and it is understood in fact that the title of the role has been changed in some JPs.
- The UN is working hard to achieve a more unified approach, and one that opens the door for the involvement, particularly, of non-resident agencies, and while the process has some difficulties, it is evolving towards something that is more functional. The view was expressed that ‘the Spanish model did improve overall coordination and communication within the UN. Agencies really did learn how to work better together, and are much better prepared for dealing in “the open market”’.²⁴

Those on both sides of the argument see improvements, that the process of delivering a joint programme has brought Agencies together, and that has created real, and effective opportunities for non-resident Agencies to engage in initiatives in Serbia. The joint programme approach has clearly increased overall coordination and communication within the UN, and Agencies are learning how to work better together. It is still too dependent on individuals, rather than structures, but this is not certain. In terms of this JP, what is certain is that the role played at PMC level by the MFE’s representative was invaluable, as it was this role that insisted on cohesion to the JP’s approaches.

²⁴ Further discussion can be found in the Recommendations section.

The JP articulated a communication and advocacy strategy, and during a specific period of the JP was supported by a specific communication's resource through the Resident Coordinator's Office. The strategy outlined four key objectives:

- Guide JP Communications internally among partner agencies to support JP implementation.
- Provide guidance and quality assurance for JP external communication in order to ensure consistent and appropriate visibility for JP activities, and to support the creation and maintenance of positive and successful relationships with STRD stakeholders.
- Outline JP communication activities' framework to support the achievement of programme outputs and outcomes.
- Provide the basis for co-ordinate advocacy action among all JP partners and team members, utilizing advocacy opportunities and resources to help achieve the positive change identified, contributing to advocacy around the achievement of JP goals and MDGs.

Some aspects of enhanced communication included:

- A clear and effective visual identity of the JP.
- Targeted promotional activities at the local, national and international levels.
- Media presence in the local and national media.
- Partnership building with relevant organizations.

The JP's communication and advocacy strategy was more effective when the communication specialist was working. During this period the strategy was developed and delivered, and provided the JP with an effective communication and advocacy approach. The mid-term evaluation recommended that the advocacy and communication strategy give particular attention to using the JP to leverage increased MDG results, and citizen engagement in its activities, per the MDG-F Advocacy strategy. While some work was done to respond to this recommendation, it was not fully implemented.²⁵

4.5.1 The JP's Monitoring And Evaluation Framework

The JP developed a monitoring and evaluation framework, which was the basis of semi-annual reporting to the MDG-F Secretariat. The framework includes a logical framework, a logical framework with financial data, a disaggregation of beneficiary numbers, and a narrative discussion on progress, incorporating a range of areas of JP management and implementation. The framework is used as a reporting tool for the PIU - it is not the critical tool used by the JP for monitoring and evaluation of progress. The framework provides the structure against which programme management assesses activities and outputs – it is not the fundamental way in which management of the JP is guided, neither within the PIU nor within the PMC and the Resident Coordinator's Office. The framework provides the sole discussion on beneficiary numbers, planned and reached.

²⁵ See Annex 4.

4.5.1.1 The Mid-term Evaluation And The Improvement Plan

The mid-term evaluation proposed 11 measures for improving the effectiveness of the JP. These 11 recommendations were built into the JP's Improvement Plan (see Annex 4). As can be seen in the Improvement Plan, an approach for addressing each recommendation was developed, and in most (but not all) cases implemented.

Some recommendations had outcomes that impacted on the quality of project outputs/outcomes:

- The recommendation on seeing training as a tool, and capacity as the outcome appears to have been taken up well by the PIU, given the indicated quality of training outcomes.
- This is also true of the recommendation to maintain focus on results, not activities. There was a clear output focus in the later part of the JP, and there are some examples of where additional work was undertaken to improve outputs and outcomes, indicating this focus on results, as opposed to activities.

Other recommendations do not appear to have had a great deal impact:

- The recommendation on beneficiaries was implemented, and signed off by the PMC, but it is not apparent in the monitoring and evaluation framework that it was used extensively in understanding the JP's intended beneficiaries.
- The logistics of the grant schemes were managed as a single activity, but the actual grant programmes themselves remained with Agencies. This lessened efficiency (note the incompleteness of one Agency's grant programme) and effectiveness.
- There is no evidence of an analysis of the approach and outputs of the grant schemes as a way of adding value to MDG-F approaches.
- A recommendation was made to leverage the communication and advocacy strategy to the benefit of MDG-F goals. As discussed in more detail above, the communication and advocacy strategy took on less importance within the UN after the mid-term evaluation.
- A follow-up programme was recommended. As is also discussed below, while a follow-up was designed, no efforts were made to find a donor.

4.6 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?

To a certain extent, the question of 'ownership' on the part of national partners is discussed above, in both the Relevance and Efficiency sections. Further to this though, it is noted that national partners 'promote the programme as one of *our* most important initiatives'²⁶, ie they see it as theirs, and describe it as such in its promotion. Here, the developing relationship between NTOs and LTOs is likely to continue to grow, to evolve – a strengthening of the national/ local relationship is important in future directions.

²⁶ From an interview with the representative of a national partner.

MFE is trying now to expand the JP approach beyond the four pilot areas. They have, with UNWTO, prepared trainers who will do the workshops to begin this work, on the basis of the national strategies the JP established for the 're-packaging' of the local product. National partners commented particularly on the potential, regionally as well as nationally, that can evolve from UNICEF's work on child and family tourism, and there is a strong network of individuals involved at the local level that contributes to the strength of activities/ outputs in this area - a network that is thinking about and developing a cluster approach. National partners have begun negotiations with Montenegro on a similar initiative, and anticipate good outcomes from this initiative. Having said this, the view was expressed that UN Agencies simply must get better at sharing outcomes and outputs effectively. 'If they were better at this, simply better, they would get better transference and therefore better sustainability',²⁷.

There is a detailed discussion in the Effectiveness section above with regards IPARD Axes 2 and 3 which will not be repeated here. It is worth noting in the context of sustainability however that the JP's inputs in the Measures, as well as its work on LEADER approaches and 'LAG' formation, are likely to contribute to on-going MAFWM initiatives and national outcomes over the coming years.

In this context, it is noted that the JP (and national partners) and its outputs and outcomes would have benefitted from a follow-up programme. JP outputs are exactly of the type that can grow and expand with support, given their potential for economic benefit. Significant time and energy was put into development of a detailed follow-up design (and there is support within Agencies and national partners), but no energy or time was put into any initiatives with potential funding bodies interested in discussing financing possibilities. Given the success of the JP at both the national and local strategy level, as well as at the local level in creating real products and services that will generate income for individuals and organisations, *and*, the potential for building on these successes, it is unfortunate that greater emphasis was not placed on a potential follow-up. There is only 'upside' in terms of rural tourism development in Serbia, and the JP has laid a foundation that should be built on - a 'development' activity, focused on small and medium enterprises, NGOs and Municipalities, with strong national support.

²⁷ From an interview with the representative of a national partner.

5 Conclusions, Including Recommendations And Lessons Learned

5.1 Conclusions

The following summarises the conclusions of the evaluation process.

The JP has demonstrated completion of activities and delivery of outputs, and as a result, the intended outcomes have been achieved that have the potential to contribute to sustainable outcomes and impact level effects.

There is a legal and policy framework for diversification of the rural economy through tourism, and a significant level of commitment by MFE and the Government of Serbia to the intent and detailed planning which is included in the RTMP. All three related outcomes have been achieved, and outputs designed to contribute to the legal and policy framework (nationally and locally) have been delivered:

- The RTMP was developed and submitted to Government and has been approved.
- Rural development programme planning has taken place, with the development of the national programme for IPARD Axes 2 and 3. Further Government of Serbia initiative is required to mainstream these in national policies, although indications are that this process will occur in the foreseeable future.
- The RTMP provides a framework and impetus for sustainable tourism investments, and there is evidence of growth in allocations from national budgets to sustainable tourism investments.

There is better linkage between and organisation of local rural tourism providers and support agencies (NTOS/ LTOs/ Municipalities), and stakeholder capacity has been improved. This has been done within the framework of the RTMP, and the relationship between the national strategy and policies and local capacity and networking interlinks well in terms of future sustainability. Local product providers, LTOs and Municipalities *all* specified networking outcomes as the most important achievement of the JP, and the organising and linking achieved through the JP will likely be of lasting significance. Both related outcomes have been delivered:

- Precursor organisations for the establishment of LAGs have been established and are functioning; a group of trained individuals exist whose focus and interest is on rural development networks and their ability to assist rural development processes in conjunction with EU, Government and local initiatives. Local planning has been undertaken to better develop and implement development strategies, and individuals and organisations have a wider range of knowledge in a number of areas of direct importance to and impact on rural tourism and rural development.
- Tourism governance in the target regions, through dedicated tourism organisations (LTOs as well as local providers) and recipients of funding for pilots and investment promotion has been enhanced. MFE and the Government are providing strategic and policy support that will enhance local structures and products.

5.1.1 Strengths of the JP

The overall design of the JP at outcome level had strong support across national and local partners, and national partners expressed and demonstrated a high level of ownership of design and implementation. The JP made specific, detailed and directly relevant contributions to Government of Serbia strategy and planning.

National partners demonstrated the level of technical and management expertise necessary to take JP initiatives and outputs/ outcomes into the future, as part of Government of Serbia policy and procedural frameworks.

Local partners demonstrated a commitment to improvements in servicing, and a belief in the development of tourism networks, that were the focus of the JP. The most important aspect of the JP, as stated by local partners, was the development of a network of people across the 4 regions and 19 Municipalities who coordinate and communicate well with each other in the field of rural tourism.

The specific products of the JP – ie the RTMP, local product/ service development through the grant schemes – have made a direct and visible contribution to the development of Serbia’s rural tourism. Further, the work done with school tourism and the work on IPARD measures can, with further involvement of relevant Ministries, can also have a direct contribution.

There is visible capacity within local partner organisations. A range of individuals (and their organisations) demonstrate an increase in the knowledge and skills necessary to further develop rural tourism in their community.

The JP contributed to a process of growth in communication and coordination between UN Agencies. Further, the involvement of non-resident Agencies generally contributed both to the JP and to the role of the UN in Serbia.

5.1.2 Weaknesses of the JP

The role played by MAFWM was not as strong as anticipated or needed, and as a result the *rural development* aspect of the JP was not as strong as the *rural tourism* aspect. It is noted that programmed activities took place and outputs were delivered, but without MAFWM engagement they are, at this point, only *potentially* important to development of Serbia’s IPARD processes. The MAFWM participation was hampered by a number of factors, not least changes in its own internal structures and leadership, meaning there was a lack of consistency in participation from the Ministry. Leadership changed, priorities changed, assignments changed and focus on the JP was lost. This happened more than once. There were more fundamental issues within the Ministry and Government themselves, in relation to the directions of agriculture and rural development, issues which took away from a clear direction and purpose, affecting MAFWM participation in the JP.

Transference of initiatives, outputs and outcomes from the JP to relevant national structures was not as strong as it could have or should have been.

The JP was perfectly placed for a follow-up, indeed for scaling up, with strong national support, strong local support and strategic opportunities for funding, locally and internationally. The follow-up has not been pursued, and the potential for serious impact is likely to be missed. An initiative for a follow-up programme was a recommendation of the mid-term evaluation. The follow-up programme was designed, and signed-off by national partners, but it has not been submitted to any potential donors.

5.1.3 Results Summary

- The Rural Tourism Master Plan was submitted to Government and has been approved. The RTMP includes
 - A Diagnostic.
 - A Strategy.

- An Action Plan.
- An Implementation Plan.
- The RTMP is being implemented, in line with the Implementation Plan.
- Principles and a Framework for child-related tourism were developed and are contained in the RTMP.
- A national study on sustainable tourism was undertaken – the contents of the study were used in the formulation of the RTMP.
- A study on the potential contribution of rural tourism to the small farming sector was undertaken – the contents of the study were used in the formulation of the RTMP.
- A Tourism Investment Conference was held which brought together a wide range of tourism stakeholders, including industry representatives with an investment interest in Serbia. There is a potential for significant international tourism investment as a result of the Conference, although this can not at this stage be assessed.
- An IPARD Axis 2 and 3 sectoral analysis was undertaken.
- Measures fiches were prepared for IPARD Axes 2 and 3.
- The IPARD life conditions study was completed.
- The National Rural Development Council was constituted.
- An analysis was undertaken of local and national budgets in relation to rural tourism, contributing to an understanding of the allocation of resources and inputs to the RTMP.
- Guidelines for Public-Private Partnerships in rural tourism in Serbia were prepared.
- Capacity has been enhanced in a number of precursor organisations for the establishment of LAGs – capacity development includes planning, strategy development, group formation.
- Capacity has been enhanced with a group of rural development implementers, including individuals and groups – capacity development includes the ability to assist local stakeholders in preparation of local development strategies and in improving the skills of local groups in management of the project cycle.
- Local development strategies have been developed in all Municipalities in each of the 4 target regions.
- Capacity has been enhanced for local and national stakeholders involved in the development of child-focused educational tourism.
- Guidelines for child-focused tourism were developed.
- Networking of rural tourism oriented groups and individuals (providers, LTOs, Municipalities, civil society) is occurring (and is mentioned by those involved as critical to their likely future success).
- Serbia's rural tourism product has been improved (without over-stating the extent of this improvement nor to make any reference to this improvement and the RTMP implementation, neither of which can be assessed through this study).
- The capacity and role of LTOs in target regions has been enhanced. They are better prepared to assist local providers, and are performing an enabling role.
- The Joint Fund For Sustainable Rural Tourism provided assistance to a range of partners and beneficiaries, assistance which contributed to many of the results listed above. Tourism providers were direct beneficiaries of grants provided by the Joint Fund, as was the networking relationship inherent in the PPPs that were developed at the Municipal level.

5.2 Lessons Learned

Design, and the role of national partners.

It is worth reiterating here that one key to the success of the JP was the detailed and committed involvement of national partners. There are many examples in development assistance of project initiatives being implemented with ‘national partners’ that have little or no knowledge of or involvement in the project. Indeed, the role played in the JP by MAFWM is not unusual. The JP has been successful to a certain large extent because national partners (MFE and NTOS in particular) treated the JP as their own. In owning the programme, its activities and outputs, as well as its governance, they gave the JP the coherence, as well as the impetus, needed to be successful. The processes of involvement of national partners, from design through implementation and follow-up, can be complex and time-consuming. The lesson from this JP is that the effort expended at the ‘front-end’ can make all subsequent processes much more effective.

National partners emphasised this aspect as well, with one specific comment being ‘the willingness of the JP team to be open to evaluation and feedback from national partners, and to then make a change in direction, was important’²⁸.

Having said this, one area where the JP could have improved its processes (and its effectiveness/ sustainability) is in the detailed relationship with national institutions. Here we speak not of ‘national partners’, but those other institutions with whom the JP interacted. A better understanding about how local and national institutions function, and better approaches to them, can offer greater possibilities of sustainability of initiatives. There is no way to know from the perspective of today, but the processes of strategy, policy and implementation of tourism policy within the MFE are more likely to be sustainable than the child-focused tourism initiatives, simply because one is now a Government initiative and the other is not.

5.3 Recommendations

Structure and management of a JP.

The current joint management and joint funding arrangements are neither the most effective nor most efficient approaches for implementation of the UN’s joint programmes. Inefficiencies include duplication of administrative arrangements, parallel processes (the grant programme of this JP being a good example) and an inability of joint programme management to control financial processes. Notwithstanding the success of the JP, effectiveness was hampered through parallel management/ oversight arrangements, the inability of joint programme management to actually manage staff and other resources, and the cumbersome nature of planning/ thinking/ strategising processes which lead the PIU away from innovative solutions and forward thinking.

It can be argued that this JP was not really of sufficient size and scope to be called a ‘programme’. While the variety of Agency representation can imply such a scope, the relatively small budget, relatively limited number and complexity of outcomes and relatively short timeframe, leave room for arguing that this was indeed a project, not a programme. This view then opens the potential for analysis of some of the management and governance ‘inefficiencies’ that have been discussed throughout the JP. It would be useful for implementing and funding agencies to consider the following scenario in development of further JPs:

²⁸ National partner comment during field interviews.

- Design a *programme framework*, with a set of outcomes within the framework. This programme framework (and outcomes) would be developed with national stakeholders and would be undertaken within the UN goal and strategy structures.
- Invite Agencies to develop *projects*, whose activities, outputs and outcomes are designed with the *specific intent* of contributing to the outcomes of the *programme framework*.
- Funding for such an approach would be provided on an Agency-by-Agency basis (project basis) with additional direct support to the lead or administering agency for the purposes of engaging a programme coordinator. Careful thought would need to be given to the role and function of a coordinator, although it is anticipated that such a role would be important in ensuring Agency focus remained on project implementation *within the framework of* programme objectives.

With further development, the simple approach could encourage furtherance of the more effective coordination and communication between Agencies without the burden of unrealistic goals for ‘joint delivery’ which impacted on this JP, within the PIU as well as in the relationship national partners took to Agency governance and delivery mechanisms and decision-making.

6 Annexes

Annexes

6.1 Annex 1 – List Of Documentation Produced By The JP

No.	Publication Name	UN Agency	Author (s)	Year
1	Capacity building for Project Cycle Management - for each of four regions	FAO	Boban Ilic; Irena Dzimrevska MSc	2010
2	Rural Development Strategy for the group "Banatska oaza"	FAO	South Banat working group and Jelena Milovanovic	2010
3	Rural Development Strategy of group "Basta Srbije" - draft	FAO	Central Serbia working group and Jelena Milovanovic	2010
4	Rural Development Strategy of group "BIS 5"	FAO	Eastern Serbia working group and Jelena Milovanovic	2010
5	Rural Development Strategy of group "Ruralni duh Dunava"	FAO	Lower Danube working group and Jelena Milovanovic	2010
6	Introduction to GlobalGAP and Introduction to quality standards & certification - HACCP	FAO	Dragan Angelovski	2010
7	Assessment of the potential contribution of rural tourism to small farming sector and rural development in general	FAO	Natalija Bogdanov PhD	2010
8	Preparation for implementation of actions relating to the environment and countryside IPARD measure fiche	FAO	Vyara Sefanova; Sergej Ivanov	2010
9	Agri-environmental Situation Analysis of Republic of Serbia and proposed IPARD measures of the Axis 3	FAO	Vyara Sfefanova; Sergej Ivanov	2010
10	The assessment of the sector and proposed Axis 3 IPARD Measures related to rural economy diversification with emphasize on rural tourism	FAO	Tugomir Majdak; Vesna Vandić	2010
11	Market Analisys of traditional and regional products and craft markets in selected regions	FAO	Jasna Mastilovic PhD Zarko Kevresan PhD Aleksandra Novakovic Tatjana Radusin Elizabeta Janjic Hajnal	2010
12	Products of importance for Rural tourism - for each of four regions	FAO	Jasna Mastilovic PhD Zarko Kevresan PhD Aleksandra Novakovic Tatjana Radusin Elizabeta Janjic Hajnal	2010
13	Food standards for rural tourism households offering meals	FAO	Petar Gajic Novak Fidanovic	2011

14	Food standards for small on-farm handcraft meat processing	FAO	Aleksandra Novakovic MSc Tatjana Radusin Elizabeta Janjic Hajnal	2011
15	Food standards for small on-farm handcraft fruits & vegetable processing	FAO	Aleksandra Novakovic Tatjana Radusin Elizabeta Janjic Hajnal	2011
16	Agriculture and non-agriculture producer groups related to selected products from 2010 assessment	FAO	Jasna Mastilovic PhD Zarko Kevresan PhD Aleksandra Novakovic MSc Tatjana Radusin Elizabeta Janjic Hajnal	2011
17	Product creation and management, competitiveness, marketing and commercialization on selected products from 2010 assessment - for each of four regions	FAO	Jasna Mastilovic PhD Zarko Kevresan PhD	2011
18	The Analysis of the current situation in the rural development support sector in Serbia	FAO	Tugomir Majdak	2011
19	Training on negotiations with the European Commission	FAO	Miroslav Bozic MSc	2011
20	Branding of products and regions	FAO	Ana Marušić-Lisac	2012
21	Održivi turizam u funkciji ruralnog razvoja - Srpsko malo farmerstvo i ruralni turizam	FAO	Suzana Djordjevic Milosevic PhD Jelena Milovanovic PhD	2012
22	Review of the recommendation for strengthening local development strategies with focus on tourism, in municipalities included in MDGF programme	UNDP	Mobilis	November 2012
23	Local capacity building for rural development aimed at promoting tourism	UNDP	Leopold Rollinger	January 2012
24	Public private partnership in rural tourism	UNDP	Svetlana Djurdjevic – Lukic	March 2011
25	An analysis of the inclusion of tourism in local development strategies	UNDP	Bojan Zecevic PhD	January 2011
26	Importance of partnerships for rural and cultural tourism	UNDP	Jan Rohac	January 2011
27	Importance of cultural heritage for rural development (Examples of good practice from World	UNDP	Antonella Versaci	January 2011

	Heritage Program and MBA reserves)			
28	Gender equality inclusion in local development strategies of 19 municipalities in Serbia	UNDP	Aleksandra Vladislavljevic	February 2011
29	The public private partnership concept and its application in the development of rural areas	UNDP	Natalija Bogdanov PhD	July 2010
30	Local Action Groups (LAG)	UNDP	Natalija Bogdanov PhD	September 2010
31	Social infrastructure in rural areas in Serbia and possibilities for forming local action groups	UNDP	Natalija Bogdanov PhD	June 2010
32	Basic assessment of the rural tourism situation in Serbia	UNDP	Bojan Zecevic PhD	May 2010
33	Evaluation of Call for grant proposal process within the JP Sustainable tourism for rural development	UNDP	Jadranka Pelikan	July 2011
34	Regional environmental studies (4 target regions) (not yet completed).	UNEP	Young Researchers Serbia	
35	Study on tourism investments and policy reforms study	UNEP	National Corporation for Tourism Development	June 2011
36	Master Plan for Sustainable Rural Tourism Development in Serbia	UNWTO	Tourism and Leisure	2010
37	Diagnostic of Rural Tourism in Serbia	UNWTO	Tourism and Leisure	2010
38	Strategy for Sustainable Rural Tourism Development in Serbia	UNWTO	Tourism and Leisure	2010
39	Action Plan for Sustainable Rural Tourism Development in Serbia	UNWTO	Tourism and Leisure	2010
40	Implementation Plan for Sustainable Rural Tourism Development in Serbia	UNWTO	Tourism and Leisure	2010
41	Quality Guidelines for Upgrading Quality in Rural Tourism Serbia	UNWTO	Mery McKeon	2012
42	Guidebook to Applying for EU Funds in Support of Rural Tourism Initiatives in Serbia	UNWTO	Simon Forrester	2012
43	Marketing and Promotion in Rural Tourism in Serbia Handbook	UNWTO	Gavin Bell	2012
44	Concept Note On Rural Tourism Governance	UNWTO	James Flannery	2012
45	Potentials for Child and Youth	UNICEF	Education Forum: Ana	2010

	Educational Tourism in Serbia		Pesikan , Slobodanka Antic	
46	Access for women and children to services in the rural areas of Serbia and proposed measures to improve their situation	UNICEF	SeConS: Natalija Bogdanov PhD, Smiljka Tomanović PhD, Slobodan Cvejić PhD, Marija Babovi, PhD, Olivera Vuković; SWG RRD: Tugomir Majdak	2011
47	Child and Youth Educational Tourism in Slovenia	UNICEF	Vedrana Trisic, Vera Jovanovic	2011
48	Child and Youth Educational Tourism in Italy, Veneto	UNICEF	Vera Jovanovic	2011
49	Guidelines for Development and Realisation of Tourism Services for Children and Youth	UNICEF	Iskra Maksimovic	2012
50	Child and Youth Educational Tourism in Rural Areas	UNICEF	Vera Jovanovic	2012
51	Regulatory Framework in Child and Youth Tourism	UNICEF	Marija Zikic	2012
52	Pricing Strategy in Tourism	UNICEF	Marija Zikic	2012
53	Basic Workshop Skills	UNICEF	Marijana Todorovic	2012
54	Manual on Setting-up Educational Tourism Centre	UNICEF	Iskra Maksimovic	2012

6.2 Annex 2 – List Of Persons Interviewed During For The Evaluation

6.2.1 National Partners

Name	Agency
Dragan Mirkovic	Head of Department for Rural Development , MAFWM
Renata Pindzo	Senior Advisor, MFE
Kristina Kujundzic	Advisor, NTOS

6.2.2 PIU Staff

Name	Agency/ Position
Karlo Puskarica	UNDP, JP Manager
Vera Jovanovic	UNICEP, Programme Officer
Suzana Djordjevic Milosevic	FAO Team leader, RD Programme Officer
Dragan Stefanovic	UNDP and UNEP, Programme Officer
Vanessa Satur	UNWTO, Programme Officer
Milos Zivkovic	UNDP, Technical advisor (provided specific inputs on the grant scheme).

6.2.3 UN Agency Representatives (Backstops etc)

Name	Agency
William Infante	UNDP, Resident Coordinator
Borka Jeremic	UNDP Belgrade, Coordination Office

6.2.4 Local Partners

Name	Agency
Bosko	Red Cross, Vrsac
Zorica Velimirovic	Agroznanje, Vrsac
Snezana Kremic	Agroznanje, Vrsac
Ivana Varga	Tourist Organisation of the Municipality of Vrsac
Sonja Jovic	Selecta Wines, Gudurica
Vladimir Ivanovic	Serbian Rural Tourism (Selo), Ljig
Mile Gošnjic	NGO 'Moba', Ljig
Slavica Ciric	Association Grlica
Bratislav Zlatkov	Tourism Organisation of the Municipality of Pirot
Predrag Petric	Regional Rural Centre for Development, Kladovo; Association for Development of Kladovo
Snezana Jurisic	Association for Development of Kladovo
Nikola Markovic	Office of Young People, Kladovo
Nikola Bukatovic	
Nevenka Boldorac	Tourism Organisation of the Municipality of Kladovo
Zdravko Gajanovic	Tourism Household Gajanovic, Donji Milanovac
Ankica Jonovic	Cultural Association 'Deli Jovan', Crnajka village
Vesna Vandic	Tourism Organisation of the Municipality of Majdanpek
Vladimir Nojkovic	Tourism Organisation of the Municipality of Majdanpek
Marijana Djordjevic	Development Department, Municipality of Negotin
Ljiljana Mimajlovic	Association 'Izvor', Knjazevac
Dragica Ivanovic	Tourist Association Knjazevac
Lela Marjanovic	Association 'Izvor', Knjazevac
Snezana Nikolic	Association 'Izvor', Knjazevac

Ivan Todorovic	Web Master, Eastern Star Group, Knjazevac
Milomir Petrovic	Rural Tourism Household Kolida, Vlasko Polje

6.2.5 Others

Tanja Petrovic Young	Young Researchers Of Serbia
----------------------	-----------------------------

6.3 Annex 3 - c) File for the Joint Programme Improvement Plan (extract)

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

Evaluation Recommendation No. 1						
Beneficiaries. The PIU should prepare an assessment of intended JP beneficiaries, making use of existing material and a current assessment process and present a beneficiary analysis to the PMC for signing off.						
Response from the Joint Programme Management						
Prepare a beneficiary report (analysis) for PMC.						
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
1.1 Methodology and scope of the assessment defined	End October 2012	Project officers & JPM	Comments	Status done	Comments	Status
1.2 Compilation and analysis of data	End November 2012	Project officers & JPM		done		
1.3 Presentation to PMC	The last PMC meeting in 2012	JPM		done		
Evaluation Recommendation No. 2						
PMC Composition and Meetings. Agencies and national partners indicate to the PMC who their formal representative is, as well as indicating that the representative has decision-making authority. These representatives, or their formal delegates, should be present at each PMC meeting.						
Response from the Joint Programme Management						
PMC membership list updated and confirmed.						
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
2.1 Request for an update	07.10.2011	JPM	Comments	Status	Comments	Status
2.2 Formal answers received	14.10.2011	UN Back-stoppers & National partners' representatives		Done		
2.3 Presentation to PMC	21.10.2011	JPM		Done		
Evaluation Recommendation No. 3						
Results Focus. With regards to all field activities, but particularly						

<p>capacity building initiatives and the grant activities, <i>focus on outcomes</i> must be maintained within the PIU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (<i>enhancing tourism governance towards better linked and organised tourism and support industries where capacity is improved for delivering services</i>) not on the grants, which are simply an input – a tool. 							
<p>Response from the Joint Programme Management</p> <p>Ensure that the PIU members maintain their focus throughout the project activities bearing in mind measurable, results - oriented reporting and actual change achieved.</p>							
Key actions		Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
3.1 Regular PIU meetings on reporting		To the projects' end	JPM	Comments	Status Being done	Comments	Status
3.2 Institute follow-up mechanisms (survey, feedback...etc)referring to usefulness and application of the knowledge acquired through training		End March 2012	Project officers & JPM		Done		
3.3 Collect data from grantees		September 2012	Independent local expert		done		
<p>Evaluation Recommendation No. 4</p> <p>No-cost Extension. It is recommended that a no-cost extension be given in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More effectively deliver the Joint Fund. Better understand to <i>effect</i>, i.e. result of Joint Fund activities. Ensure the grant components intended in year two are <i>well conceived</i>, <i>have appropriate implementation time</i> in the field and are <i>able to be assessed against their intended outputs and outcomes</i>. 							
<p>Response from the Joint Programme Management</p> <p>Proposal for no-cost extension submitted.</p>							
Key actions		Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
1.1 Consultations with UN agencies, National partners and RCO		30 th April 2012	JPM	Comments PMC Decision	Status Done	Comments	Status
1.2 Preparation of the proposal		June/July 2012	Project Officers, back-stoppers & JPM		Done		
1.3 Approval by MDG-f Secretariat		?	?		done		
<p>Evaluation Recommendation No. 5</p>							

<p>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.</p>							
<p>Response from the Joint Programme Management Joint Call for Proposals is issued jointly.</p>							
Key actions		Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
2.1 Issuance of the call		25.08.2011	JPM	Comments	Status	Comments	Status
2.2					Done		
2.3							
<p>Evaluation Recommendation No. 6 Output 2.1.3 Product Development. The JP should re-focus activities on local tourism stakeholders actively participating in product development discussions and are active stakeholders in RTMP implementation.</p>							
<p>Response from the Joint Programme Management Ensuring stakeholders' active participation through already established and newly created mechanisms.</p>							
Key actions		Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
3.1 Create & implement appropriate mechanisms		To the projects' end	Project officers	Comments	Status done	Comments	Status
3.2							
3.3							
<p>Evaluation Recommendation No. 7 Output 1.3.4. – Investment Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. Programme management needs to ensure the responsible agency undertakes this activity as a way of ensuring that lessons learned from public tourism investments are understood and are able to be incorporated.</p>							
<p>Response from the Joint Programme Management Prepare public tourism investment analysis</p>							
Key actions		Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
1.1 Employing an expert		Mid-November 2011	UNDP Project Officer & JPM	Comments	Status Done	Comments	Status

1.2 Completing a study	Mid-March 2012	UNDP Project Officer & JPM		Done		
1.3 Implementation of conclusions	Beginning of June 2012	MoERD Sector for Tourism		pending		
Evaluation Recommendation No. 8						
Quality Assessment of Capacity Building Activities. It is recommended that the JP engage in a qualitative assessment of the JP's capacity building program (across all areas of activity) with a view to ensuring the anticipated quality of outcomes are being achieved.						
Response from the Joint Programme Management						
Assess the impact of capacity building activities.						
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
2.1 Agree responsibilities, design methodology and perform assessment	End June 2012	Independent evaluator	Comments	Status Done	Comments	Status
2.2 Presenting results	September 2012	Project Officers & JPM		done		
2.3 Final evaluation of the Assessment, analysis of the achievements and improvements, evaluation of the stakeholders' capacity level increase(production of case studies)	October 2012	MoERD Sector for Tourism		Partly done		
Evaluation Recommendation No. 9						
Grant Scheme Outcomes and Lessons Learned. The JP needs to ensure there is an appropriate assessment of the outcomes and lessons learned from the grant schemes – recommendations that will assist in the future, particularly donor organisations and the GOS, to ensure the priority areas of donation and the priority types of activities are most useful to anticipated outcomes.						
Response from the Joint Programme Management						
Perform reviews for Gran Schemes 2010 and 2011						
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
3.1 Performing reviews at the end of grant cycle	The end of each cycle	Respective Project Officers & back-stoppers	Comments	Status 2010 & 2011 done	Comments	Status
3.2 Compilation and presentation of the results	Upon completing reviews	JPM		done		

Evaluation Recommendation No. 10 Leveraging JP Results As An Advocacy Strategy. It is recommended that the advocacy and communication strategy give particular attention in the coming 12 months to using the JP to leverage increased MDG results, and citizen engagement in its activities, per the MDG-F Advocacy strategy							
Response from the Joint Programme Management Use evaluation and beneficiary analysis findings in future advocacy and communication campaigns.							
Key actions		Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
1.1 Organize promotional & communication events		To the projects' end	JPM & RCO	Comments	Status done	Comments	Status
1.2 Disseminate results and recommendations		To the projects' end	JPM & RCO		In progress		
Evaluation Recommendation No. 11 Follow-up Programme. A follow-up programme should be considered to sustain the development. This is particularly relevant in relation to Outcome 2.							
Response from the Joint Programme Management A follow-up programme developed through consultations with all relevant stakeholders and submitted to potential donors.							
Key actions		Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
1.1 Consultations with stakeholders		October & November 2011	JPM & RCO	Comments	Status Done	Comments	Status
1.2 Concept paper prepared		December 2011	JPM & RCO		3 drafts completed		
1.3 Follow-up programme developed and approved		June/July 2012	JPM, RCO & PMC		Developed but not approved		

Updated: 01.12.2012

By: Karlo Puskarica

6.4 Annex 4 – Terms Of Reference

Terms of Reference	United Nations Development Programme	
---------------------------	---	--

Title: Evaluator for Final project evaluation
 Project: Joint Programme “Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development”
 Reporting to: Programme Officer

Duty Station: Belgrade, Serbia

Duration: October – November 2012 (output based consultancy)

Contract Type: Individual Contract (IC) – for free lance consultant or Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) - if the consultant is working with institution or government or university

Background

a. **Purpose**

The purpose is to provide information about the results of the “Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development” Joint Programme implementation in order to inform the replicability or upscaling of the initiative.

b. **Objective**

The objective is to assess if and how programme outputs were achieved and the efficiency with which outputs were achieved and to provide recommendations for future engagement.

The Final Evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the JP, based on the scope and criteria included in this Terms of Reference. The unit of analysis or object of study for this Final 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 final (summative) evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

- Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase;
- To measure joint programme’s degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
- Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.
- To measure the joint programme contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic windows as well as the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level. (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).
- To identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform with the aim to support the sustainability of the joint programme or some of its components.

c. **Background Information**

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. 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, National Ownership and UN reform.

The MDG-F pursues a result oriented monitoring and evaluation strategy aimed at tracking and measuring the overall impact of the joint programmes. The MDG-F Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) strategy is based on the principles and standards of UNEG and OECD/DAC regarding evaluation quality and independence. The strategy builds on the information needs and interests of the different stakeholders while pursuing a balance between their accountability and learning purposes. The strategy's main objectives are:

1. To support joint programmes to attain development results;
2. To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes and measure their contribution to the 3 MDG-F objectives, MDGS, Paris Declaration and Delivering as one; and
3. To obtain and compile evidence based knowledge and lessons learned to scale up and replicate successful development interventions.

d. Description of the PSD joint programme (JP) in Serbia

The *Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development* project is an initiative within the Development and the Private Sector. The total budget of the programme was \$4,000,000. The initiative is being 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, Trade, Forestry and Water Management and;
- 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.

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.

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

Duties and Responsibilities

a. Scope of work

UNDP Serbia invites applications from qualified national/international consultants in order to perform the final evaluation of the “Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development” Joint Programme. The purpose is to provide information about the results of the “Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development” Joint Programme implementation in order to:

- Measure to what extent the joint programme has fully implemented their activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes and specifically measuring development results;
- Generate substantive evidence based knowledge, on one or more of the MDG-F thematic windows by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability).

The Final Evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the JP, based on the scope and criteria included in this terms of reference. The unit of analysis or object of study for this Final Evaluation is the JP, 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. Under the guidance of the JP Evaluation Reference Group (a role delegated to the PMC), and in close coordination with the members of the *Sustainable Tourism For Rural Development* team in Serbia, the consultant will be required to review the progress made in the production of the SMART outputs of the Joint Programme since its onset in May 2009 and appraise their relevance for the achievement of the joint programme outcomes.

The work of the Evaluator will be guided by the Joint Programme Document (in particular the result framework and the annual work plan), the Monitoring Framework agreed upon by participating UN Agencies, and the analytical framework appended in Annex V.

The Evaluator will be specifically required to:

- Appraise the quantitative and qualitative information collected to measure the impact of the activities implemented;
- In collaboration with the members of the JP team, interview stakeholders and conduct field visits to gather information on the performance of the JP;
- Systematize and analyse the data and information stemming from the implementation of the activities under the responsibility of each participating UN agencies;
- Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the activities carried out according to the analytical framework provided;
- Draft a summative evaluation report that:
 - synthesizes the overall performance of the JP;
 - describes innovative practices implemented;
 - identifies challenges encountered and the strategies deployed to address them;
 - provides recommendations and lessons learnt during implementation for further action.
- Finalize the report on the basis of the comments received by the Evaluation Reference Group.

The Evaluator will also review, analyze and provide conclusions and recommendations on the following:

- The status of the corresponding Country Programme outcome and estimate the degree of project's contribution to it;
- The degree to which the programme activities listed in the Project Document have been successfully implemented and desired outputs achieved;
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness;
- The efficiency of the programme approach in delivering outputs;
- Assessment of external factors affecting the programme, and the extent to which the programme has been able to adapt and/or mitigate the effects of such factors;
- The approach to project management, including the role of stakeholders and coordination with other development projects in the same area;
- The extent to which the target beneficiaries have benefited from the project activities;

- The level of beneficiaries' and partners satisfaction with programme implementation and results;
- The potential for continuation or upscaling of the initiative.

b. Methodology

The evaluation approach has to respond to standard international practices in project evaluation. The proposed steps in conducting the evaluation will be:

- Review of project documentation, monitoring records and progress and other relevant reports;
- Initial meeting with JP Team to agree the specific design and methods for the evaluation, what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives. Agree on the evaluation questions that will need to be answered, given limitations of time and extant data;
- Organization of interviews with key staff involved in the programme implementation;
- Prepare inception report with evaluation matrix*;
- Discussions with members of the JP team and project beneficiaries to assess project's relevance and effectiveness of project implementation take note of their perceptions of accomplishments and potentials for further development and provide suggestions for management response to evaluation findings. Objectively verifiable data should be collected whenever available, to supplement evidences obtained through interviews and focus group discussions;
- Prepare Draft Report and present it to the JP Team;
- Incorporate received feedback into the Final Report;
- Prepare the Final Report** with the Executive Summary.

The following set of information sources on the JP will be made available to the Evaluator:

- Joint Programme documents;
- Progress and technical reports;
- Mid-term evaluation report and monitoring reports;
- Key documents (policy analyses, researches, surveys, monitoring reports) produced by the JP;
- Training tools, learning packages and other publications.

Evaluation has to be carried out in line with ToR and UNEG standards and norms.

* Inception report and evaluation matrix formats will be provided at the mission's outset

** The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports (Annex I constitutes integral part of this ToR).

c. Deliverables and Timeline

It is expected that the evaluation will be completed within 30 working days, with the following deliverables due:

Deliverables	Duration	Deadline
Inception report including work plan and evaluation matrix prepared and accepted	5 days	7 days upon signing the contract
Draft Evaluation (see Annex I) Report on approximately 10 pages prepared and accepted	10 days	20 days upon signing the contract
Draft Evaluation Report (see Annex I) presented to the Project Team, Implementing Partner and beneficiaries	10 days	25 days upon signing the contract
Final Evaluation report with Executive Summary prepared and accepted	5 days	5 days upon receiving comments from UNDP on the draft report.

The evaluator is expected to travel to the country / regions:

<p>1. October 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p>Mission in connection with interviews (at least 7 working days, in target regions within the JP Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development)</p>
<p>2. October - November 2012</p>	<p>Final mission for presentation of results and debriefing (at least 3 working days, in target regions within the JP Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development)</p>

Travel costs (transport and accommodation) will be part of the overall lump-sum reimbursement of the consultancy.

Payments for the deliverables will be made in 2 installments:

- First installment: 20% of the total budget of the consultancy, after submission and approval of Inception report, by UNDP Programme Officer.
- Second installment: 80 % of the total budget of the consultancy, after submission and approval of the Final Evaluation report with Executive Summary, by UNDP Programme Officer.

The criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness will be used for assessing the quality of the evaluation report:

- The report has to be written in clear language (English);
- The Executive Summary should be an extremely short chapter, highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations;
- The information in the report has to be complete, well structured and well presented;
- The information in the report has to be reliable i.e. well documented and supported findings;
- The information in the report has to address priority or strategic information needs;
- Recommendations have to be concrete and implementable;
- Human rights and gender equality perspective has been taken into account.

The evaluation has to be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#). Code of conduct is enclosed as Annex II and constitutes integral part of this ToR.

Skills and Competencies

- Excellent analytical skills
- Displays ability to synthesize research and reach empirically based conclusions on related subject
- Strong writing skills
- Proven capacity to produce reports
- Displays capacity to provide experienced advice on best practices
- Possesses knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues
- Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback
- Good application of Results-Based Management
- Good communication, coordination and facilitation skills
- Consistently ensures timeliness and quality of work
- Treats all people fairly without favourism
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Demonstrates integrity by modeling ethical standards

Qualifications and Experience

Education:

Masters or equivalent in relevant field of Economy/Business/Economic development

Work experience:

- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience, preferably in international/multilateral development context
- Experience in evaluating and monitoring technical cooperation and development activities and projects

Knowledge

- Excellent understanding of Serbia's socio-economic situation
- Understanding of current policies and legislation on tourism and rural development
- Familiarity with the UN(DP) evaluation policy, norms and standards;
- Knowledge in the use of computers and office software packages and handling of web based monitoring systems.

Personal qualifications

- Ability to deliver when working under pressure and within changing circumstances
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude
- Excellent interpersonal skills

Language:

Excellent knowledge of written and spoken English. Knowledge of Serbian language would be an asset.

ANNEX I

(Integral part of ToR)

Evaluation Report

Purpose/Description of the Evaluation Report:

The evaluation report is the key product of the evaluation process. Its purpose is to provide a transparent basis for accountability for results, for decision-making on policies and programmes, for learning, for drawing lessons and for improvement.

Executive summary	Approximately 5 page long, this part of the report should summarize the main finding, conclusions and recommendations of the monitoring exercise. It should also include also a glossary of terms
1. Introduction	Brief description of purpose of the evaluation and of the methodological approach used. Remarks on the limitations of the methodology and problems encountered in information gathering and analysis.
2. Review of implementation	Description of the development intervention carried out JP strategy at approval and during implementation, including agreed revisions Highlights of main milestones and challenges encountered Status of implementation, delivery of activities, production of outputs and attainment of outcomes
3. Presentation of findings	Based on the key questions of the analytical framework, this part of the report should concentrate on key issues and provide clear indication on whether the outcomes of the JP were achieved.
4. Conclusions	Concluding assessment derived from the findings of the evaluation and main messages.
5. Recommendations	Recommendations should be presented in a concise and actionable manner, making concrete suggestions for improvements.
6. Lessons learned	Observations, insights, and innovative practices extracted from the evaluation exercise that are of general interest and contribute to wider organizational learning. This part should also highlight any good practices implemented during the JP.
7. Annexes	Any additional information deemed relevant for the comprehension of the report.

Quality Criteria:

A good evaluation report must be guided by the criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness as defined below.

Utility: An evaluation report is useful when the report is:

- Complete in providing information on the context for the evaluation to allow reader to decide on the value it will derive from the evaluation (i.e. evaluability assessment, stakeholder involvement, evaluator or institutional credibility, alignment of evaluators with national institutions, bases for interpretation, budget, timing, national involvement and alignment).
- The presentation of the evaluation process and findings are complete and well structured to provide ease in accessing information needed for decision-making and for assessing how justified conclusions are based on the linkages among the parts of the report.
- The recommendations are clear and actionable.
- Information on expected plans for follow-through with the evaluation by key stakeholders is provided.

Credibility: An evaluation report is credible when there is professional rigor for objectivity, validity and reliability of the procedures and instruments used.

- Evaluators are competent professionals and valid in the eyes of the users/stakeholders.
- There is accuracy and validity (programme content and contextual factors, instruments, information coverage/sampling, external validity or linkage with other development findings).
- There is reliability or consistency in the information provided.
- The bases for making judgments are transparent and based on negotiated agreements.

Relevance, appropriateness and added-value: A report is relevant, appropriate and adds value when information provided addresses priority or strategic information needs, is not duplicative, and is appropriate given institutional goals. The conduct of evaluation is aligned with national systems.

- The purpose and incentives for use are clear.
- There is alignment with national and government demands, harmonization and coherence within UN and organizational lens: human development and human rights.
- Addresses organizational mandate and the Strategic Plan priorities.
- Advances knowledge or priorities for development (equity, capacity, cooperation and others).

The following provides for each criterion, performance indicators which would provide the basis for assessing report quality in an objective and reliable manner.

1. Utility – Enhancing use and impact of information provided

1.1 The title page and opening pages provide key basic contextual information

- Title of the evaluation that includes a clear reference to the project / programme being evaluated.
- Links to the evaluation plan (with information on strategic value, national involvement and alignment, timing, resources and financing).
- Links to UNDAF outcomes and the Strategic Plan priorities.
- Geographical coverage of the evaluation.
- Name and organization of the evaluators and information in annex for assessment of competence and trustworthiness.
- Name of the commissioning organization (e.g. UNDP country office X).
- Date when the evaluation report is completed.
- Expected actions from the evaluation and dates for action.
- Dates for stakeholder meetings and status of meetings.
- Name of UNDP contact point for the evaluation (e.g. evaluation task manager).

1.2 For a joint evaluation or for the evaluation of a joint programme, the roles and contributions of the different UN organizations or other partners, are clearly described. The report should describe who is involved, their roles and their contributions to the subject being evaluated, including:

- Financial and in-kind contributions such as technical assistance, training and logistic support.
- Participation and staff time.
- Leadership, advocacy and lobbying.

1.3 For a country-led joint evaluation, the framework for the leadership, governance, conduct, use and capacity development are clearly described, and norms and standards for the evaluation are delineated if necessary.

1.4 The information in the report is complete, well structured and well presented. The report should provide information on:

- The purpose of the evaluation.
- Exactly what was evaluated.
- How the evaluation was designed and conducted.

- What evidence was used in the evaluation.
- What conclusions were drawn.
- What recommendations were made.
- What lessons were distilled.

1.5 *The report should be clear and easy to read with complementary graphics to enhance understanding:*

- The report should apply a plain, non-specialist language.
- Graphics, tables and illustrations should be used, when applicable, to enhance the presentation of information.
- The report should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes.
- In the case of an outcome evaluation, the related projects should be listed in the annex, including timelines, implementation arrangements and budgets.

1.6 *The executive summary of the report should be brief (maximum 2-3 pages) and contains key information needed by decision-makers. It should contain:*

- Brief description of the programme.
- Evaluation purpose, questions and scope of evaluation.
- Key findings.
- Conclusions.
- Key recommendations.

The executive summary should not include information that is not mentioned and substantiated in the main report.

1.7 *The recommendations are relevant and realistic, with clear priorities for action.*

- Recommendations should emerge logically from the evaluation's findings and conclusions.
- Recommendations should be relevant to the purpose of the evaluation and decisions to be made based on the evaluation.
- Recommendation should be formulated in a clear and concise manner and be prioritized to the extent possible.

2. Credibility - accuracy, reliability, and objectivity

2.1. *The subject or programme being evaluated is clearly and accurately described.*

- The goals and objectives of the programme/project/subject are clearly described and the performance indicators presented.
- The conceptual linkages or logic theory among programme/project strategy, the outputs and the outcomes should be described, explaining their relation to national priorities and goals.
- The context in which the programme/project existed is described so its likely influences in the program can be identified.
- The level of implementation of the programme/project and major divergences between the original implementation plan or approach should be described and explained.
- The recipient /intended beneficiaries, the stake holders, the cost and the financing of the programmes/projects should be described.

2.2. *The report provides a clear explanation of the scope of the evaluation.*

- The objectives, scope and coverage of the evaluation should be explicit and its limitations should also be acknowledged.
- The original evaluation questions from the TORs should be made explicit as well as those that were added subsequently or during the evaluation and their rationale provided.
- The results of an evaluability assessment are noted for its effects on defining the scope of the evaluation. Evaluability is the extent to which *there is clarity in the intent of the subject to be evaluated, sufficient measurable indicators, assessable reliable information sources and no major factor hindering an impartial evaluation process*²⁹.

2.3. *The methodology is fully described for its role in ensuring the validity and reliability of the evaluation.*

Any description of the methodology should include the following in addressing the questions of the evaluation:

- The universe of data needed to answer the questions and the sources of this data.

²⁹ Norms for Evaluation for the United Nations System, para 7.2.

- The sampling procedure applied to ensure representativeness in collecting information from these sources (area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, limitations to sampling).
- Procedures applied (including triangulation) to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information collected.
- Bases for making judgements and interpretation of the findings including performance indicators or levels of statistical significance as warranted by available data.
- Description of procedures for quantitative and qualitative analyses.
- Innovations in methodological approach and added value to development evaluation.
- How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes.
- How a human development and human rights perspective provided a lens for the evaluation and influenced the scope of the evaluation.

2.4. *The findings of the evaluation address the following in response to the key questions of the evaluation.*

- Cost efficiency and relevance.
- UNDP partnership strategy and the extent to which it contributed to greater effectiveness.
- External factors influencing progress towards the outcome.
- UNDP contribution to capacity development and institutional strengthening.

2.5 *Conclusions are firmly based on evidence and analysis.*

- Conclusions are the judgment made by the evaluators. They should not repeat the findings but address the key issues that can be abstracted from them.
- Conclusions are made based on an agreed basis for making judgments of value or worth relative to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability.
- Conclusions must focus on issues of significance to the subject being evaluated, determined by the evaluation objectives and the key evaluation questions.

2.5. *Annexes are complete and relevant.*

- The original Terms of Reference for the evaluation.
- Details on the programme and its context in development.
- Details of data and analyses.
- Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, and surveys).
- Evaluation plan.

Relevance and Added Value

3.1. *The purpose and context of the evaluation are described.*

The reason(s) why the evaluation is being conducted should be explicitly stated.

- The justification for conducting the evaluation at this point in time should be summarised.
- Who requires the evaluative information should be made clear.
- The description of context should provide an understanding of the geographic, socioeconomic, political and cultural settings in which the evaluation took place.

3.2. *The report includes an assessment of the extent to which issues of equity and gender, in particular, and human rights considerations are incorporated in the project or programme.*

The evaluation report should include a description of, *inter alia*:

- How a human development and human rights perspective was adopted in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated.
- How issues of equity, marginalized, vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups were addressed in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated.
- How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes.
- How the evaluation used the human development and human rights lens in its defining the scope of the evaluation and in the methodology used.

3.3 *The report presents information on its relationship with other associated evaluations and indicates its added value to already existing information.*

Procedures and Accountabilities:

The primary responsibility for preparing the evaluation report rests with the evaluation consultant or the leader of the evaluation team (if a team is established). Those who commission the evaluation and those who

are actually evaluated can also contribute with their inputs. Particularly, key stakeholders should be involved in reviewing the draft report to check if there are any relevant factual errors or omissions, and to highlight any interpretation of the findings that they consider as incorrect. The evaluators should accept changes related to factual errors, but in safeguarding the principle of independence, they should be free to draw their own conclusions from the findings.

To ensure compliance with the criteria noted, a quality assurance and enhancement system at country level will be established and made operational.

ANNEX II

(Integral part of ToR)

Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business

Evaluators:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

ANNEX III

(To be given to the Evaluator at the mission's outset)

Sample Table of Contents for an Inception Report

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Objective of the Evaluation

1.2. Background and Context

1.3. Scope of the Evaluation

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Evaluation criteria and questions

- 2.2. Data collection methods
- 2.3. Risks and potential shortcomings

3. PROGRAMME OF WORK

- 3.1. Phases of work
- 3.2. Team composition and responsibilities
- 3.3. Management and logistic support
- 3.4. Calendar of work

ANNEXES

- 1. Tentative outline of the main report
- 2. Associated reference documents

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Evaluation matrix
- 2. Stakeholder map
- 3. Interview checklists /protocols

Annex IV

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

1. Relevance and strategic fit

- Did the JP activities address a relevant need? Were the needs identified continuously checked for relevance? How much and in what ways did the JP contributed to solve the (socio-economical) needs and problems identified in the design phase?
- To what extent this programme was designed, implemented and monitored jointly?
- To what extent joint programming was the best option to respond to development challenges identified?
- Have implementing partners taken ownership of the JP approach since the design phase? To what extent implementing partners had an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
- How is the JP aligned to Serbia's cross-cutting and sectoral strategies?
- To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable C&A strategy?

2. Validity of design

- Were the planned outputs and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did they need to be adapted to specific needs or conditions?
- Was the intervention logic coherent and realistic? What was adjusted?
- To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results?
- How effectively was the JP in monitoring performance and results?
- How appropriate and useful were the indicators described in the JP document in assessing progress and results?
- Were the targeted indicator values systematically collected and systematized? Was data disaggregated by sex and by other relevant characteristics? Were the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?

- Was information regularly analysed to feed into management decisions?

3. Progress and effectiveness

- Were the SMART outputs achieved? Were they achieved in the quantity and quality specified in the JP design?
- Are JP partners using the outputs? Are the outputs being transformed by JP partners into outcomes?
- How effective was the JP in establishing national ownership? Was project management and implementation participatory and did it contribute towards the achievement of the JP objectives? Was the JP appropriately responsive to the needs of the national partners and changing priorities?
- Was the JP appropriately responsive to economic and institutional changes in the project environment?
- Did the JP approach produce demonstrated successes?
- How have the linkages between JP components been designed? In which way do they strengthen and support each other in the achievement of objectives? Is the expertise of each partner Agency maximally taken advantage of in this respect? How can the links and coordination between component activities be enhanced?
- In which areas is the JP having the greatest achievements? How is the JP building on and expanding these achievements?
- In which areas is the JP having the least achievements? What are the constraining factors and why? How could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would be more effective in achieving the JP objectives?

4. Efficiency of resource use and effectiveness of management arrangements

- Were resources used efficiently? Were the activities implemented cost-effective? In general, did the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results have been attained with fewer resources?
- Were JP funds and activities delivered in a timely manner by participating agencies?
- What was the progress of the JP in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by agency? Where there are large discrepancies between agencies, these should be analyzed.
- Was the joint programme's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
- To what extent was the joint programme intervention model (group of agencies) more efficient in comparison to what could have been through a single agency's intervention?
- To what extent the governance at programme (PMC) and national level (NSC) contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of the JP? To what extent these governance structures were useful for development purposes, ownership, for working together as one? Did they enable management and delivery of outputs and results?
- To what extent and in what ways did the JP increase or reduce efficiency in delivering outputs and attaining outcomes?
- What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing Agencies used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?
- What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the JP face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
- To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation have an impact on the JP? Was it useful? Did the JP implement the improvement plan?
- To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation recommendations contribute to the JP's achievement of development results?

- Have the national partners a good grasp of the project strategy? How are they contributing to the success of the JP?
- How effective is communication between the project team and the national implementing partners?

5. Impact orientation and sustainability

- To what extent did the JP contribute to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes stated in the programme document?
 - To what extent and in what ways did the JP contribute to the Millennium Development Goals at national level?
 - To what extent and in what ways did the JP contribute to the goals set in the STRD thematic window?
 - To what extent (policy, budgets, design, and implementation) and in what ways did the JP contribute to improve the implementation of the principles of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action?
 - To what extent and in what ways did the JP contribute to the goals of delivering as one at country level?
- What types of effects are resulting from the JP in accordance with the sex, ethnic belonging, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population?
- To what extent has the JP contributed to fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF)
- To what extent the JP decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the JP?
- At local and national level:
 - To what extent did national and/or local institutions support the JP?
 - Did these institutions show technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the JP or to scale it up?
 - Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
- Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
- Are the JP results, achievements and benefits likely to be durable? Are results anchored in national institutions?
- Can the JP approach and results be replicated or scaled up by national partners? Is this likely to happen? What would support their replication and scaling up?
- Were there any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects as a consequence of the JP interventions? If so, how was the JP strategy adjusted?
- In terms of the JP sustainability, what financial resources are available ?

6.5 Annex 5 - Programme 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	MFE
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	MFE	MDG-F	National Rural Tourism Master Plan NPO Rural Tourism Development Administrative Assistant Vehicle, Fuel, Maintenance Supplies/Communications/Operations Misc. Domestic travel International travel ICT/Equipment/Furniture Agency Management Support (7%) Sub-total	30,000 13,000 7,000 3,210 4,000 1,000 3,000 1,500 5,000 4,740 72,450	30,000 13,000 7,000 2,000 8,278 4,219 64,497	 1,220 85 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	MFE	MDG-F	National Rural Tourism Master Plan NPO Rural Tourism Development Administrative Assistant Vehicle, Fuel Maintenance Misc. Domestic travel Agency Management Support (7%) Sub-total	230,000 6,000 3,000 3,000 1,000 3,000 17,220 263,220	230,000 6,000 3,000 16,857 255,857	13,401 938 14,339	103%

	1.1.1.d. Make formal official presentation of National Rural Tourism Master Plan.		UNWTO	MFE	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	MFE	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	71%
	1.1.2.b. Identify best practices from other countries.		UNICEF	MFE	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	MFE	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	MFE	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	MFE	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	
Development Program planning is mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies; National Program for Rural Development for IPARD Axes 2 & 3 developed & implemented for Consumption & Food Production	1.2.1.a. In cooperation with UNWTO and MFE, 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 tourism and measures related			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%

	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. Investment Mainstreaming: Sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in national policies.	1.3.1.a. Identify public, private and external resources that can leverage one another in rural tourism initiatives.			UNDP	MFE	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	MFE	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	MFE	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 group of public decision-			UNDP	MFE	MDG-F	Support for PPP initiatives Local consultants Agency Management Support (7%)	2,500 3,250 403		403	

	makers and private investors.					Sub-total	6,153	0,00	403	7%
	1.3.2.c. Support and monitor at least six PPP initiatives in rural tourism.		UNDP	MFE	MDG-F	Support for PPP initiatives Local consultants Agency Management Support (7%) Sub-total	2,500 3,250 403 6,153	0,00	403	7%
	1.3.3.a. Identify organizations and/or individuals to serve as SIFT focal point and/or working group members.		UNEP	MFE	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	MFE	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	10,000 700 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
Local Assessment for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural capacity development	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 Groups and support them in			UNDP	MOA	MDG-F	Local Action Groups (support & capacity development) Supplies/Operations/Communications Domestic travel Misc.	15,000 2,000 500 1,000	15,000	1,500 1,000	

	increasing benefits for rural population from available financing & donation instruments.					Agency Management Support (7%) Sub-total	1,295 19,795	15,000	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			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 needs.		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%	

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%
	UNEP	MFE	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%
	FAO	MFE	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%
	FAO	MFE	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%
	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	MFE	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	MFE	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	MFE	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	4,000	496	146	89%
							Programme Assistant	1,000	165	58	
							Local consultants	5,000	8,000	0	
							Agency Management Support (7%)	700	606	14	
							Sub-total	10,700	9,267	218	
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	MFE	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	MFE	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	MFE	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	MFE	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	MFE	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	MFE	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	5,511 751 0 438	96%
Total							243,136	58,978	15,450	31%