



Canadian International  
Development Agency

Agence canadienne de  
développement international

# **Three decentralized funds in the Balkans**

## **Evaluation Report**

**December 2003**

Canadian International Development Agency  
200 Promenade du Portage  
Gatineau, Quebec  
K1A 0G4

Tel: (819) 997-5006

Toll free: 1-800-230-6349

Fax: (819) 953-6088

(For the hearing and speech impaired only (TDD/TTY): (819) 953-5023

Toll free for the hearing and speech impaired only: 1-800-331-5018)

E-mail: [info@acdi-cida.gc.ca](mailto:info@acdi-cida.gc.ca)

**Canada** 

## **THREE DECENTRALIZED FUNDS IN THE BALKANS**

### **EVALUATION**



**PERFORMANCE AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT BRANCH  
CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

**December, 2003**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Management response</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Context, objectives and focus of the evaluation	1
1.2 Main elements of the evaluation methodology and report	2
<b>2. RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMS</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Overview of the context of intervention	3
2.2 Coherence of the Programs with CIDA policies	4
<b>3. PROGRAMS RESULTS</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 Introduction – Bases for analysis	4
3.2 The portfolios of the Programs	5
3.3 The projects making up the Programs	10
3.4 The projects' performance	17
3.5 The overall impact /contribution of the Programs	18
3.6 Sustainability of Programs results	19
<b>4. MANAGEMENT OF THE LIP/PRP/GSP</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1 Program management structure	20
4.2 Promoting the Programs	21
4.3 Project selection and approval process	22
4.4 Project monitoring and reporting system	25
4.5 Annual Program planning and reporting process	26
4.6 Conclusions on management	32
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>APPENDIX I</b> Summary description of LIP/PRP/GSP	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX II</b> Lists of Projects visited/discussed in field mission, persons interviewed and documents consulted	<b>42</b>
<b>APPENDIX III</b> Programs Performance Framework (May 03)	<b>48</b>
<b>APPENDIX IV</b> Lists of Projects Approved (FY 01-02 and 02-03) by Country/Province	<b>51</b>

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank all our partners in the Balkans and Canada for generously giving their time to provide us with very useful comments and suggestions for this evaluation. Their contributions have helped us get a clearer understanding of the *problematique* and the environment in which programming is being delivered.

We would also like to thank our consulting team from Interallia: Francine Trempe, Gaétan Blais and Louise Pesant.

Finally we extend our appreciation to our colleagues in the Central and East European Branch (CIDA-HQ and the field) for their insights and value-added comments.

Pradip Shastri  
Evaluation Manager  
Performance Review Branch

## **Acronyms**

BiH	Bosnia / Herzegovina
CECI	Centre canadien d'étude et de coopération internationale
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe Branch
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIDA HQ	CIDA Headquarters (Hull)
DFAIT	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade
EU	European Union
FRY	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
FY	Fiscal Year
GE	Gender Equality
GSP	Governance Support Program
HoA	Head of Aid
HoM	Head of Mission
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
KARs	Key Agency Results
KLIP	Kosovo Local Initiatives Program
LEP	Locally Engaged Personnel
LIP	Local Initiatives Program
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PAD	Program Approval Document
PAF	Project Appraisal Form
PO	Project Outline
PPF	Program Performance Framework
PRB	Performance Review Branch
PRP	Peacebuilding Response Program
RBM	Results-based Management
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
TORs	Terms of Reference
RZE	Central Asia and Caucasus

## Management response

The main purpose of the *Local Initiatives Program (LIP), the Peacebuilding Response Program (PRP) and the Governance Support Program (GSP) Evaluation* was to provide CIDA with an analysis and findings that would help support the decision to renew the LIP/PRP/GSP for future years, or develop a new mechanism that could respond better to local needs and improve CIDA development practices.

The evaluation concluded that the "***LIP/PRP/GSP - as a whole - is the most appropriate mechanism through which CIDA can respond to local needs and implement its programming in the Balkans***".

The Balkans and Graduating Countries Program has reviewed the evaluation and agrees with its findings and recommendations.

A new decentralized fund for the Balkans is in development using, as a basis, both the October 2003 Evaluation and the Balkans Development Programming Framework (BDPF). The new decentralized fund will incorporate Serbia and Montenegro - including Kosovo - and Bosnia and Herzegovina under a single program. This new program will focus on the priorities identified in the BDPF, such as health, education and the rule of law, while integrating gender and environment as crosscutting themes. Planned to be implemented until 2010, the program could amount to \$10 million for two countries and one UN administered entity. The previous three structures, LIP/PRP/GSP, totalled \$16,000,000 over three years for eight countries.

A number of recommendations were formulated about the management structure, the selection and approval processes, the annual planning, monitoring and reporting and the use of performance frameworks in the LIP/PRP/GSP. These issues will be addressed and/or incorporated in the development of the new program. Particular attention will be put on defining the program's sectors of intervention and on streamlining its management to ensure greater complementarity with other bilateral programs and projects and maximum efficiency. Discussions with program managers in the field as well as with the Central Asia and Caucasus team, who administer a similar LIP program, will help strengthen the management structure of the next generation of local initiatives in the Balkans.

The Balkans and Graduating Countries Program would like to underline our appreciation for the contribution of Performance Review Branch in this review process.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Introduction**

The Local Initiatives Program (LIP), the Peacebuilding Response Program (PRP) and the Governance Support Program (GSP) are decentralized, quick-response funding mechanisms covering nine countries/provinces in the Balkans. They allow Canada to respond to evolving priorities as identified by the field. These funds were designed in a context where a large part of the Balkans region had barely come out of armed conflicts, faced multiple humanitarian crises, crucial political changes as well as an economy deeply affected by the conflicts and by the on-going transition in the region. At the time of this evaluation, the LIP/PRP/GSP were moving into their final year of operation.

#### **The objectives of the evaluation were:**

- To assess the performance of the LIP/PRP/GSP against their stated objectives;
- To provide CIDA with a means to determine whether the LIP/PRP/GSP (as a whole) is the most appropriate mechanism to implement its new policy 'Strengthening Aid Effectiveness' as well as the associated underlying principles of local ownership, coordination and sectoral focus.

The LIP/PRP/GSP evaluation covered, at different levels, all three Programs for each of their geographic areas of implementation for the period starting in FY 2001-02. An evaluation team of two consultants undertook a field mission visiting 38 projects/recipient organisations (out of a total of 84) in Serbia, Kosovo, Romania and Croatia. The team reviewed documents, conducted interviews in Canada and the Balkans and debriefed partners. This report incorporates comments received from CIDA-HQ and from some of the posts in the Balkans. It will contribute to the decision on whether to renew the LIP/PRP/GSP or find new mechanisms for effective program delivery.

The lessons, good practices and recommendations outlined in this evaluation could also be applicable to other countries in post-conflict environments.

### **Description of the Programs**

- The goal of the LIP and PRP is to support international efforts to promote sustainable peace, prosperity and democracy in the region. Their objective is to support the Government of Canada's cooperation program in the areas of economic assistance, community based rehabilitation, peace building and democratic consolidation.
- For the GSP, the goal is to bring local support to international efforts to promote sustainable development and good governance in Romania, Bulgaria and Moldova. Its objective is to support sector objectives and Canadian programs in social development, governance, public administration & energy/environment, with a focus on reform & capacity development.

- The LIP/PRP/GSP support small local initiatives - projects - with a value in the range of \$50,000. If justified, larger initiatives may be considered for eligibility up to \$100,000. Programs recipients can include credible civil society organizations, local NGOs, Canadian NGOs working locally, local chapters of international NGOs, academic organizations, grassroots organizations and international or governmental institutions of the various countries.
- Projects are approved at CIDA/HQ in accordance with existing branch levels of authority.
- The Programs have a duration of three to four years. Each Program has its own budget and covers its own geographic area, as follows:
  - ⇒ LIP : \$12.5 for Albania, Croatia, Serbia / Montenegro, Kosovo, Macedonia;
  - ⇒ PRP: \$2M for Bosnia and Herzegovina; and,
  - ⇒ GSP – Northern Balkans: \$2M for Romania, Bulgaria and Moldova.

Programs have similar but also some different sectoral and thematic focus, which can be adapted according to the evolution of their respective contexts of intervention.

### **Evaluation Findings**

#### **Relevance of the Programs**

The findings of the evaluation, analyzed in the following sections, demonstrate that:

- The LIP/PRP/GSP are consistent with CIDA's policies and principles, such as:
  - respect for the principles of local ownership, coordination and sectoral focus;
  - development of transparent and accountable public institutions;
  - public sector reforms and enhanced social capital;
  - the conditions conducive to peace and stability;
  - promotion of human rights and equitable treatment of minorities;
  - the visibility and effectiveness of Canadian assistance collaborative partnerships;
  - effective programming synergies; and,
  - respect for the environment.

Furthermore, the findings of the evaluation indicate that:

- The Programs are appropriately designed and adequately implemented to address issues and respond to expressed needs related to: peace and security in the region, the democratization processes, good governance, improvement of the living conditions of the populations affected by the transition processes under way in the region, and building capacity of the recipient institutions and organizations that address these issues.



- With a few exceptions, related to their management, the Programs are appropriate and relevant to meet the objectives of the LIP/PRP/GSP.

## Program Results

**Portfolios and projects:** The project portfolios constitute, by the very nature of the Programs – decentralized funds - their first level results, or their main outputs. Results at this level can be summarized as follows:

The issue of transition to the establishment of democratic regimes and institutions as well as to responsible governance remains a concern throughout the region. There is a necessity to improve the social and economic conditions of the most vulnerable groups (women, refugees/displaced persons, ethnic minorities and young people), who are hard hit by unemployment in several countries and faced with limited availability of quality educational services accessible to all.

Each Program developed its own profile, had its own “color”, according to their respective contexts. However, beyond their specificity, the analysis of the various Program “profiles” shows that there are two dominant issues which need to be addressed: governance, which includes the democratization process, respect for human rights and minorities, the rule of law, relations between governments and civil society; and, the provision of basic social services in order to strengthen harmony and equity in interethnic relations. These two issues have a direct impact on the peace and security of the Balkans and the region’s political, economic and social development.

- In general, it can be affirmed that the managers of the various Programs have succeeded in defining and implementing coherent programming which is relevant to the contexts in which they intervene and responds well to the needs and priorities of the community as expressed by the recipient organizations targeted by the Programs.
- The breakdown of all projects aggregated by major theme/sector is approximately as follows:

- Democratic development	43%
- Social	26%
- Repatriation/reintegration of refugees /IDPs, returnees; humanitarian assistance and reconstruction	16%
- Economy (employment/income generation)	14%
- The portfolios show a great deal of diversity in terms of activities implemented, funding and implementing modalities, types of recipient organizations, primary clienteles, geographic range.
- Out of all portfolios, 25 projects, for a total value of \$1,176,540, specifically or primarily targeted women and, to a lesser degree, dealt with Gender Equality (GE) issues. (GE) is not the object of a thorough and adequate analysis in any of the Programs and the reports do not provide disaggregated data. This issue, although

meant to be a cross-cutting theme, is neither sufficiently documented, nor discussed in the LIP/PRP/GSP in close compliance with the CIDA policies in this matter.

- The strengthening of civil society has taken various forms and involved different types of projects and capacity building activities within the portfolios. The sum of all NGOs capacity building activities supported by the Programs have played a significant role, with other donors, in strengthening and developing the civil society in the Balkans. Moreover, the Programs, by choosing to select more national NGOs of a diverse nature, focus, and various ethnic communities present in the region have contributed to promote Canadian values of tolerance, and of harmonious cohabitation within multi-ethnic communities.
- With a few exceptions, the projects have delivered the planned outputs and met their objectives generally within the budgets allocated and the periods planned. Some projects of course pose more problems than others. This is notably the case of economic projects.
- This high success rate is essentially explained by:
  - Careful selection of the recipient organizations and the proposed projects;
  - The professionalism and competency of the managers of the LIP/PRP/GSP (LEPs and KLIP coordinator) in conjunction with the sustained and appropriate supervision provided by CIDA and DFAIT officers in the field.
  - The real commitment of the vast majority of recipient organizations to carry out their projects successfully;
  - The close relationship of the projects' components to the real needs and those needs felt to be priorities by the project beneficiaries;
  - The use of joint approaches, where several partners are simultaneously involved and thus interested in achieving results, and where both the contributions and the risks are thus shared;
  - Finally, the adequacy of the management mechanisms and procedures for this type of project has contributed to promoting effective and efficient implementation.
- This overall composition of project portfolios and its evolution is a good reflection of the contexts in which the different Programs intervene. Based on the previous evaluation<sup>1</sup>, humanitarian needs (reconstruction, provision of emergency material, etc.) are clearly lower than they were in the year 2000, shortly after the period of intense conflict in the region. However, the issue of repatriation and reintegration of refugees and IDPs remains present, particularly in Kosovo, Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

**Overall impact / contribution of the Programs:** On their own relatively limited scale (compared to other Canadian 'bilateral' and regional programs, and to other donors' often much larger programs), the Programs have contributed to peacebuilding, democratic

---

<sup>1</sup> Evaluation of the LIP and PRP Programs in the Balkans, Final Report, Interalia 2001

consolidation, and community-based rehabilitation through a large variety of projects and implementing organizations. Generally they have favoured/facilitated inter-ethnic communications and trust; have increased awareness on human rights; enhanced the importance of the rule of law; increased awareness on good governance issues and the capacity of institutions in relation to governance issues.

The LIP and PRP have facilitated the return of a large number of refugees, returnees and IDPs to their regions of origin and have contributed to improve their living conditions. The Programs have contributed to strengthening the role and capacity of civil society. They also have contributed to a better and more extensive delivery of social services to vulnerable groups. Overall, they have lessened the negative impacts of the conflicts that have affected the region, have promoted democratic values and, most of all, have ‘given peace a chance’.

The Programs have generated lessons with regard to “improved responsiveness of local government to the priorities of civil society”. On a smaller scale, the Programs have contributed to improve the economic conditions or to increase the income generating opportunities for vulnerable groups. Moreover, the Programs have provided visibility for Canada in the region. But, more importantly, they have promoted Canadians’ values on democratic issues, good governance, and the values of compassion for victims of conflicts and for minorities.

**Sustainability of Programs results:** In the majority of projects, the beneficiaries took ownership of the results. They contributed to identifying them because the results were closely linked to deeply felt needs. In addition, very few projects exceeded the absorptive capacity of the beneficiary groups/clients and few projects involved recurring costs that were out of the reach of those responsible for them.

The prospect of sustainability of Programs results, at the impact level, is harder to assess. Given the context of a fragile peace/security and continued substantial investments in improving the quality of life of the local population, impact level sustainability is beyond the scope and capacity of these Programs.

### **Management of the LIP / PRP / GSP**

**Programs management structure:** There exist a variety of management structures in CIDA’s “funds-type” initiatives. However, based on the results of the Programs, it can be asserted that the actual multi-level management structure, although highly centralized, is conducive to and favours good performance, notably due to the competence and dedication of the managers both at CIDA-HQ and the field.

**Promoting the Programs:** Judging exclusively by the large number of proposals received under each Program, the various promotional strategies are effective. The evaluation mission’s observations confirmed that the Programs are widely known to the organizations likely to submit projects, and to many of the donors present in the field,

some of which are co-donors under the LIP/PRP/GSP projects. Moreover, the various LIP/PRP/GSP promotional strategies have largely contributed to Canada's visibility in the countries where they are implemented.

**Project selection and approval process and related documents formats:** The selection process has proven efficient and appropriate. However, some complex projects, notably economic projects, would merit a closer preliminary analysis of the experience and capacity of the applicant organization. They should also include a rigorous feasibility and profitability analysis in their proposal.

Project approval remains the responsibility of the RZE division in the CEE Branch at CIDA. The distribution of roles and responsibilities between the various players at posts and CIDA-HQ, although clearly defined, has been a subject of lengthy discussions and misunderstandings that are solved on a case by case basis. This administrative procedure, which is common to many other CIDA's local initiatives funds, is justified mainly by accountability requirements and by overall strategic developmental considerations for Programs implemented in nine different countries. It should be noted that some of the posts managing the Programs have no CIDA staff present in the field. Generally the approval process has proven to respond well to the flexibility and speed required for this type of Programs.

While the components in the Project Outline (PO) format are largely appropriate, the evaluation mission observed that most of the project description documents do not contain certain key elements such as a detailed project schedule. Only the start and end dates are indicated. Moreover, in some cases, the POs contain too few quantitative measurements of activities or results. The lack of measurable data and especially the more systematic absence of an implementation schedule significantly limit the assessment of the projects' progress during monitoring.

Some Programs require applicants to produce Project Performance Framework in their proposal. Notwithstanding its intrinsic value, the evaluation team observed that the RBM methodology was rather heavy the financial level and/or scope of the LIP/PRP/GSP projects as well as the recipient organizations lack of familiarity with this methodology. Since the average project size is \$47,000, consideration should be given to simplifying the Project Performance Framework while maintaining the principles of the RBM approach.

**Project monitoring and reporting systems:** Monitoring of the vast majority of projects turned out to be adequate and sufficient to avoid any significant slippage and to allow an assessment of the projects' quality of implementation and the degree of probability of their success.

However some weaknesses were observed, such as: i) closer monitoring at project start-up could help better identify potential implementation problems and find solutions more quickly. ii) monitoring reports are not systematically produced and/or filed. iii) the information gathered during monitoring would gain relevance and quality if some key

benchmarks and measurement factors were systematically integrated into the documents used for monitoring and reporting.

The vast majority of the end-of-project reports examined, both narrative and financial, were of good quality and informative and showed rigour and probity on the part of the recipient organizations. However, some cases of significant delays were observed.

**The annual Program planning and reporting process:** The field managers have made a substantial effort to produce the Annual Workplans, the main lines of which conform to the various headings of the Outline provided by CIDA (external and internal context, implications for the Program, planned achievements for the year, etc). However, each person's understanding of what is expected or required by CIDA is fairly different depending on the Program, despite the indications given in the Outline.

The introduction of an annual planning process certainly enabled the LIP/PRP/GSP managers – and therefore the CIDA-HQ managers – to better define the stakes and priorities of their respective annual programming, taking into account the changing contexts in which the Programs operate. This planning process offers more clearly defined guidelines and benchmarks so that a report can then be made.

However, despite the quality of several of the documents examined, the planning exercise followed by annual reporting still seems to be perceived by most managers as a chore, a compulsory task required by CIDA-HQ in which they have to complete each heading and fill in the tables. The process is not perceived as a useful and necessary exercise of the Program's performance management that meets the needs for planning and programming as well as for assessing what has actually been achieved.

The evaluation team considers that the exercise of assessing the annual achievements, in Annual Reports, should focus on the contribution of the respective portfolios to the Programs major objectives and the degree of relevance of these portfolios to the priority issues and themes identified in the Annual Workplans.

The outlines provided by CIDA contain all the necessary elements for the production of the Annual Workplans and Reports, both in terms of required headings and instructions. However, they ought to be simplified, less repetitive and, above all, more focused on the essential so that they are truly user- friendly and useful for the managers who have to produce them.

**The Program Performance Framework (PPF):** The LIP and PRP managers have made efforts to use the new PPF as a reference in their Annual Workplans for the short and medium-term results – which are often repeated verbatim. In some cases, they have attempted to add, “planned annual achievements” and have tried to report annually in relation to these same achievements.

However, using the PPF has proved to be a somewhat burdensome exercise which neither accounts for the actual and specific priority orientations of the respective Programs nor for the actual achievement of results under each Program.

In this perspective, we should re-examine the feasibility of establishing extensive PPFs in such “decentralized fund” Programs which are responsive and hence should remain flexible. Certainly, the major objectives, goals and priority themes or sectors must be clearly identified in advance, with a view to serving as the primary guide for their implementation. But the formulation of the expected results and the indicators that allow them to be measured will always remain complex and difficult especially in the case of regional Programs such as LIP/PRP/GSP. Such an exercise will have to be practical and useful to the program field managers, who should be the primary users of this type of planning and reporting tool.

The PPF should be simplified with the participation of the field managers and beneficiaries at a work session where everyone could discuss and form a consensus on its contents. This would ensure its adequacy and ownership by all partners.

### **Conclusions and recommendations**

One of the central reasons for this evaluation was to provide CIDA with elements allowing it to determine whether *“the LIP/PRP/GSP – as a whole – is the most appropriate mechanism through which CIDA’s principles and policies can be implemented in the Balkans”*. These principles include: local ownership, improved donor coordination, stronger partnerships, a results-based approach, greater coherence; and factors of central importance such as: good governance; building capacity in the public and private sectors; and, engaging civil society. This central question is the main object of this conclusion.

The analysis of the overall performance of the Programs and their relevance to the contexts and needs they address make it possible to affirm that the LIP/PRP/GSP mechanism has proven its appropriateness in relation to the aforementioned principles, and by its results as well as their coherence with the major issues confronting the region.

Moreover, the mechanism’s very characteristics – decentralization of the definition of program content, flexibility, rapid decision-making, responsiveness and adaptability to local demand – make it a particularly appropriate tool to act in contexts that themselves are characterized by their various deep transition processes from conflicts and humanitarian crises to the search for peace and stability.

Other mechanisms or “programming arrangements” are available in CIDA to address other issues and themes/sectors that are at the heart of the Programs. However, the “local initiative fund” mechanism presents characteristics of responsiveness, flexibility, as well as the possibility to support directly local organizations that are well adapted to multi-level transition contexts such as the Balkans. Should CIDA want to pursue, in its future

program for this region (or other post-conflict environments), it may wish to consider similar goals as defined for the LIP/PRP/GSP.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the positive effects, clearly greater in scope than the financial investments allocated, that the LIP/PRP/GSP have had on Canada's visibility and the values to which Canadians adhere. In the absence of other large-scale programs – bilateral or otherwise – the LIP/PRP/GSP can contribute effectively to this visibility in the future.

## **Recommendations**

The main recommendations of the evaluation are as follows:

### **Knowledge Management:**

- Consideration should be given to conducting an in-depth study on the factors and conditions favouring the strengthening of civil society in post-conflict and multi-transition contexts. This initiative would be useful to the Programs, similar CIDA decentralized funds and other regions in the world. LIP/PRP/GSP managers and NGOs present in the Balkans specialized in capacity building would be key resource persons.

### **Program Planning and Reporting:**

- If the funds are to be renewed for a third generation, consideration should be given to aligning their strategic orientation to some of the findings and recommendations outlined in this evaluation.
- The whole process of planning and reporting should be designed in such a way that it is primarily aimed at managing performance related to program and management concerns on the part of Program managers (rather than be perceived as an obligatory task responding primarily to CIDA-HQ needs). The following recommendations or suggestions are in this respect:
  - The Annual Workplan and Report Outlines ought to be simplified, more focused so that they are truly “user friendly” and less redundant. They should be discussed and revised in close collaboration with all Program managers, ideally within a working session that could be integrated into the annual regional Program team meeting.
  - If a comprehensive Program Performance Framework is to be maintained as a reference tool for Programs workplans and evaluations, its contents should be discussed, and as needed revised, through a concerted effort – e.g. at a collective work session integrated as well into the annual regional Program team meeting. This should ensure the closest possible relevance and ownership by the field managers
  - The exercise of reporting the Programs annual achievements should be focused on the degree of contribution of the respective portfolios to the Programs' major objectives, and the degree of relevance of these portfolios in relation to the

priority issues and themes as identified in the Annual Workplans. This applies for CIDA-HQ as well as for Program managers.

- Gender analysis should be part of the Annual Workplans and serve as one of the basis for programming and reporting.

**Training / Support to Program Managers:**

- Advanced analysis and operational training on GE issues should be provided to all Program managers.
- Sustained support, in terms of guidance, feed-back, training on management and developmental issues, as well as field visits, from CIDA-HQ should be increased for Programs where there is no CIDA personnel.
- A sustained and specific support from CIDA-HQ will still be required in the GSP to discuss and find ways conducive to an optimal effective, efficient and smooth implementation.
- Training and/or specialized consultant support related to specific issues pertaining to economic development projects should be offered by CIDA to all Program managers who intend to include such projects in their programming.

**Project Selection:**

- Program managers should be provided with clarifications and details regarding “overhead costs” and “operating costs”. The admissible maximum of 15% may need to be revised as far as “operating costs” are concerned.
- In order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall selection and approval process in the GSP, the pre-screening step should be simplified and be mainly under the responsibility of the LEP Technical Program Officer.
- A close assessment of “Good governance”, notably transparency and accountability to their constituency, within applicant organizations should be part of the selection criteria prior to projects being recommend for approval. The experience and capacity of applicant organizations submitting “economic projects” should be more closely assessed during the selection process.
- Lessons should be drawn and shared regarding the results of the on-going experience of “calls for proposals” in the Kosovo and Serbia/Montenegro LIPs.

**Project Description Document:**

- Proposals for economic projects (income generation activities, support to entrepreneurs and to SME, etc.) should address issues of feasibility and profitability.
- Project description included in the PADs and in the Contribution Agreement should systematically include: observable qualitative and measurable quantitative data with regards to results expected and/or activities; and, a project implementation schedule.
- In their proposals, applicant organizations should be required to offer a gender equity analysis and, if applicable, a GE strategy with measurable results.



- As stated previously, Project Performance Frameworks should be simplified and integrated into the Contribution Agreements for monitoring and reporting.

**Project Monitoring and Reporting:**

- The use of a consultant to help in the monitoring process should be considered for Programs where the scope and the complexity of the portfolio justify it - notably to Bosnia Herzegovina PRP.
- Monitoring grids should be prepared for each project visits, and should include main questions to be addressed and specific key benchmarks to be assessed – on the basis of Project Description Document included in the Contribution Agreement.
- Monitoring reports should be systematically produced and filed. It is also recommended that these reports be shared with the visited recipient organization as a tool for follow-up but as well as a mean for capacity development.
- Recipient organizations should be required to offer gender-specific disaggregated data in their end-of-project reports.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Context, objectives and focus of the evaluation<sup>2</sup>**

#### ***Context***

The Local Initiatives Program (LIP), the Peacebuilding Response Program (PRP) and the Governance Support Program (GSP) are decentralized, quick-response funding mechanisms which allow Canada to respond to evolving priorities identified by the field.

In April-May, 2001, Interallia had already evaluated Phase One of the LIP and PRP. At the same time, CIDA's Performance Review Branch (PRB) undertook an audit of the financial management aspects of the LIP/PRP. Based on the recommendations of the evaluations, Ministerial approval was granted for a second phase of the LIP/PRP (2001-2004) and the GSP was also initiated. The second phase, of the LIP/PRP, reflects the new political situation that has taken hold in the region such as important democratic gains in Serbia/Montenegro and Croatia as well as the peaceful resolution of an ethnically - motivated conflict in Macedonia. The LIP/PRP/GSP<sup>3</sup> mechanism has also become more strategic in its orientation and implementation.

#### **Reasons for and objectives of the evaluation<sup>4</sup>**

Since the LIP/PRP/GSP are moving into their final year of operation, the main purpose of this evaluation was to provide CIDA with an analysis and findings that will help support the decision process to renew the LIP/PRP/GSP for future years, or to develop a new mechanism that can respond better to local needs and improve CIDA development practices.

In this perspective, the evaluation aimed at:

- Assessing the performance of the LIP/PRP/GSP against their stated objectives;
- Providing CIDA with a means to determine whether the LIP/PRP/GSP (as a whole) is the most appropriate mechanism to implement its new policy 'Strengthening Aid Effectiveness' in the Balkans.

The evaluation also had to assess the extent to which the LIP/PRP/GSP contribute to the CEE Branch Results. Furthermore, the LIP/PRP/GSP mechanism was examined within the context of the region's peace and conflict dynamic; the key peacebuilding and transition priorities as determined by the local population and national governments; and, international actors on the ground. The evaluation was also to provide both CIDA's HQ and field representatives with an analysis of linkages between projects themselves, and between projects and international and local initiatives, the latter being a key exercise for determining the prospects of sustainability for programming results.

---

<sup>2</sup> Excerpts from the Evaluation TORs

<sup>3</sup> Most often referred to as the Programs in this report

<sup>4</sup> As understood from the consultants' TORs

Finally, recommendations were to be offered on how this programming mechanism could be improved.

The lessons, good practices and recommendations outlined in this evaluation could also be applicable to other countries in post-conflict situations.

## **1.2 Main elements of the evaluation methodology and report**

This evaluation focused on the Programs as a funding mechanism and on strategic programming and management issues (vs. LIP/PRP/GSP projects as such). It is recognized that it is essentially through each Programs' projects portfolios that LIP/PRP/GSP results are delivered. Hence, while the main questions of the evaluation focused on the Programs, the various projects portfolios were also examined and analysed in order to assess the Programs relevance and performance.

The LIP/PRP/GSP evaluation covered, at different levels, all three Programs for each of their geographic areas of implementation for the period starting in FY 2001-02 (following the first phase evaluation). The evaluation methodology closely followed CIDA's requirements and tools for such exercises as developed by PRB. The evaluation methodology included: 1) a detailed workplan defining the main questions and sub-questions to be addressed with related indicators and/or types of information/data to be collected; 2) a sampling of recipient organizations and projects to be visited in the field; 3) interviews with the programs' managers at CIDA headquarters and in each country visited, with representatives of recipient organisations and with beneficiaries, and with other donors involved in similar programs<sup>5</sup>; 4) a substantive review and analysis of available documents at CIDA/HQ and in the Posts visited.

Two consultants undertook a field mission and visited a total of 38 projects/recipient organisations in Serbia, Kosovo, Romania and Croatia.

This final report of the evaluation includes reviewed comments received from CIDA-HQ and from some of the posts. It contains a summary description of the Programs, the evaluation findings and analysis on their relevance, their results and their management and finally the conclusions and recommendations.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix II for a list of persons interviewed, the list of projects discussed/visited in the field and the list of documents reviewed.

## **2. RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMS**

The relevance of the Programs was assessed by examining their degree of coherence with CIDA's principles and policies for the region, the contexts in which they intervene and the problems they intend to address. The adequacy of the management mechanisms supporting implementation of the LIP/PRP/GSP was also part of the relevance assessment.

### **2.1 Overview and context of the Programs**

The LIP, PRP and GSP were designed to address problems in the Balkans – a region which was just coming out of armed conflicts, facing multiple humanitarian crises, crucial political changes and an economy deeply affected by conflicts and on-going transition.

In this context, characterized by multi-level transitions, the various national public administrations were in turmoil. Civil society was also undergoing various changes in its composition and orientations. Civil society organisations were rapidly multiplying and diversifying while trying to cope with numerous problems as well as the needs of their constituencies and the population in general.

The international community has responded to the Balkans crisis. Since 1999, the level of support has been substantial (approximately \$9.0 billion per annum). At its peak (1999) Canada's assistance was approximately \$92 million or 1 percent of total aid flows to the region.<sup>6</sup> Although still very important, the international assistance to the Balkans tends to decline at a significantly slower rate than CIDA's funding. Donor assistance, first highly focused on the humanitarian crisis, has since shifted on developmental issues. The European Union is the biggest donor in the region, with a commitment of \$6.5 billion for the period 2000-06, and is increasingly assuming the lead on developments in the Balkans.

Peace, stability, governance, economic stabilization and growth are at the heart of the international donors efforts, while national civil societies concentrate mostly on issues related to democratization, human rights and basic human needs of the most vulnerable groups. During the 'emergency period' a large number of international NGOs (INGOs) were present in the Balkans and, with the international donors, they have played a significant role in the development of the national civil societies. However, since 2000, the number of INGOs in the region has decreased dramatically, while many of the civil society organisations were – and are – still faced with both institutional and operational capacity development / reinforcement needs.

---

<sup>6</sup> Source: CIDA in Central and Eastern Europe – Charting a course to 2010. Consultation Document. Fall 2002

## **2.2 Coherence of the Programs with CIDA policies**

The findings of the evaluation, analyzed in the following sections, demonstrate that:

- The LIP/PRP/GSP, in both their design and implementation, are coherent with CIDA's policies and principles, such as:
  - respect for local ownership, coordination and sectoral focus;
  - development of transparent and accountable public institutions;
  - public sector reforms and enhanced social capital;
  - the conditions conducive to peace and stability;
  - promotion of human rights and equitable treatment of minorities;
  - the visibility and effectiveness of Canadian assistance collaborative partnerships
  - effective programming synergies;
  - gender equity and respect for the environment.

Furthermore, the findings of the evaluation conclude that:

- The Programs are appropriately designed and adequately implemented to respond to expressed needs related to: peace and security in the region; the democratization processes; good governance; improvement of the living conditions of the populations affected by the transition processes in the region; and, building capacity of the recipient institutions and organizations.
- With a few exceptions, the management mechanisms, allocated resources and procedures defined and utilized in the Programs, are appropriate and relevant to meet the objectives and the expected results of the LIP/PRP/GSP.

## **3. PROGRAM RESULTS**

### **3.1 Introduction – Bases of the analysis**

The reference documents on which the overall performance review and comprehensive analysis of the LIP/PRP/GSP are based, the Program Approval Documents for each of the three Programs, the various Program Performance Framework, sometimes contain significant variances in the formulation of the objectives, goals and results expected for each initiative. The PPF went through very different formulations during the two-year period covered by the evaluation. It is sufficient to refer, on the one hand, to the objectives and results described in Section 2 of this report, and on the other hand to the most recent "global" PPF, as well as the specific PPF adopted by the GSP, to realize that it is difficult to rely on these documents to analyze and assess the achievement of the results of the three Programs simultaneously.

The evaluation team therefore attempted to consolidate and summarize the points common to all three Programs in terms of strategic orientations, objectives and general

goals by reviewing the degree to which the various project portfolios of the Programs contributed to these major objectives as well as the relevance of these portfolios to the priority needs of the contexts in which they are implemented. The overall major objective of these Programs was therefore reformulated as follows:

***“Contribute to sustainable peace and security, to the consolidation of democracy and a better governance, and to the improvement of the people’s living conditions in the Balkans region.”***

As first level results, the Programs essentially seek to support projects in the social, governance, economic and humanitarian fields. For the GSP, the energy sector is also specified as one of the focus of this Program.

The demonstration of Canada’s commitment to peacebuilding and rehabilitation in the region is added as a concomitant result.

The analysis of the various program reports, the summary project lists for the two years covered, the interviews conducted and the observations made on a sample of projects during the field mission served as the main sources for review of the Program results. In addition, the report of the evaluation conducted in May 2001 essentially made it possible to assess the evolution of these Programs over the past two years.

### **3.2 The project portfolios of the Programs**

The project portfolios constitute, by the very nature of the Programs – decentralized funds - their first level results or their main outputs. Hence, they are described and analyzed in length below.

It is appropriate to note that all the portfolio data provided in this section – whether related to the breakdown by theme/sector, the types of recipient organizations and the primary clienteles, etc. – have essentially been developed from summary project lists and also on the basis of Program reports or information gathered in the field. The breakdowns by category are not always very accurate or exclusive: *they are primarily indicative of major trends*. In fact, many projects, taken individually, could fall under several categories simultaneously. Moreover, the Programs do not have a standardized system for categorizing their projects.

#### ***Overview of Country Programs***

The following tables<sup>7</sup> indicate the total number of projects and funding approved by country and summarize the breakdown of projects by themes/sectors.

---

<sup>7</sup> Source: CIDA-HQ project summaries and Programs’ Annual Reports. – For detailed lists of each Programs’ projects, ref. to Appendix III

### LIP ALBANIA

Themes/Sectors	No. Projects	Total approved \$Cdn	% in Portfolio
Democratic Development, Governance, Human Rights, Civil Society	8	\$383,529	44%
Social (Education, Minority, Child Protection)	8	\$302,337	35%
Economic Growth	3	\$141,500	16%
Environment	1	\$45,892	5%
<b>Total Albania</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>\$873,258</b>	

### LIP CROATIA

Themes/Sectors	No. Projects	Total approved \$Cdn	% in Portfolio
Democratic Development, Governance, Human Rights, Civil Society	10	\$417,213	27%
Social (Capacity Building, trafficking)	3	\$123,802	8%
Employment Generation	11	\$466,584	30%
Refugees, IDPs and Returnees	13	\$533,634	35%
<b>Total Croatia</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>\$1,541,233</b>	

### LIP FRY (Serbia, Montenegro)

Themes/Sectors	No. Projects	Total approved \$Cdn	% in Portfolio
Democratic Development, Governance, Human Rights, Civil Society	27	\$1,564,369	62%
Social (Education, Health)	8	\$535,840	21%
Income Generation	2	\$80,323	3%
Refugee Return, (Re)Integration & Humanitarian Assistance	4	\$352,498	14,0%
<b>Total FRY</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>\$2,533,030</b>	

### LIP KOSOVO

Themes/Sectors	No. Projects	Total approved \$Cdn	% in Portfolio
Democratic Development, Governance, Human Rights, Civil Society	14	\$593,551	26%
Social (Youth, Education, Health, Trafficking)	21	\$827,464	36%
Income Generation, economic growth	14	\$527,445	23%
Refugees, Returnees, IDPs	3	\$129,342	6%
Emergency Relief	3	\$178,323	8%
Others (Culture, Reconstruction)	2	\$30,300	1%
<b>Total Kosovo</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>\$2,286,425</b>	

### LIP MACEDONIA

Themes/Sectors	No. Projects	Total approved \$Cdn	% in Portfolio
Democratic Development, Governance, Human Rights, Civil Society	11	\$544,267	45%
Social (Soc. Development, Education, Trafficking)	8	\$407,304	34%
Income Generation	1	\$58,000	5%
Rehabilitation	3	\$203,027	17%
<b>Total Macedonia</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>\$1,212,598</b>	

### PRP BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA

Themes/Sectors	No. Projects	Total approved \$Cdn	% in Portfolio
Democratic Development, Governance, Human Rights, Civil Society	14	\$553,666	58%
Social (Health, Education, Child)	5	\$203,146	21%
Income Generation	1	\$48,930	5%
Refugees, IDPs, Returnees	2	\$146,003	15%
<b>Total Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>\$951,745</b>	

### GSP ROMANIA

Themes/Sectors	No. Projects	Total approved \$Cdn	% in Portfolio
Civil Society (Medias)	1	\$46,500	21%
Ethnic Minorities	1	\$40,781	19%
Social	2	\$84,448	38%
Energy	1	\$47,848	22%
<b>Total Romania</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>\$219,577</b>	

### GSP BULGARIA

Themes/Sectors	No. Projects	Total approved \$Cdn	% in Portfolio
Civil Society (Medias)	1	\$48,000	100,0%
<b>Total Bulgaria</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$48,000</b>	

### GSP MOLDOVA

Themes/Sectors	No. Projects	Total approved \$Cdn	% in Portfolio
Civil Society (Medias)	1	\$36,570	100,0%
<b>Total Moldova</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$36,570</b>	



These tables essentially show the following:

- For all Programs, 207 projects were approved in 01-02 and 02-03, for an aggregate amount of Cdn \$9,702,436, thus fairly close to the total budgets available for those years, of Cdn \$10,400,000. The average budget by project turns around \$47,000.
- All the Country Programs, except for the GSPs, successfully identified and obtained approval of projects more or less in line with the respective total budgets that had been allocated to them for FY 01-02 and 02-03<sup>8</sup>.

The low number of projects approved under the GSP is essentially explained by the difficulties experienced by this Program, particularly during its startup, (clarification of the orientations and objectives and certain internal problems within the team, which also went through personnel changes in the past year). It is also appropriate to note that this team has to cover three countries with very different contexts.

- The breakdown of all projects aggregated by major theme/sector<sup>9</sup> is approximately as follows:

- Democratic development	43%
- Social	26%
- Repatriation/reintegration of refugees /IDPs, returnees; humanitarian assistance and reconstruction	16%
- Economy (employment/income generation)	14%

Although this project categorization is approximate (e.g. several economic projects in Croatia address problems regarding refugees/IDPs), it nonetheless provides a fairly good reflection of the overall programming trends and, specially the relative importance of the issues addressed by the Programs taken as a whole.

Although it is difficult to compare this theme/sector breakdown rigorously with that of the year 00-01, (since the categorizations are not similar), some evolution is noted in the portfolio breakdowns, particularly net decrease of humanitarian assistance and significant growth of projects with an economic nature. However, since the beginning of the LIP and PRP democratic development has remained at a relatively similar level.

---

<sup>8</sup> See previous tables.

<sup>9</sup> Included in 'democratic development' are governance, support for reforms, the 'rule of law', human rights, strengthening civil society, etc. The 'social' category includes projects that concern health and education, as well as youth and 'trafficked persons'.

This overall composition of project portfolios and its evolution is a good reflection of the contexts in which the different Programs function. Thus, humanitarian needs (reconstruction, provision of emergency material, etc.) are clearly lower than they were in the year 2000, shortly after the period of intense conflict in the region. However, the issue of repatriation and reintegration of refugees and IDPs remains present, particularly in Kosovo, Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, although less acutely and to a lesser scale, than in that period.

The issue of transition to the establishment of democratic regimes and institutions and to responsible governance remains a concern throughout the region, as well as the necessity to improve the social and economic conditions of the most vulnerable groups (women, refugees/displaced persons, ethnic minorities, young people) who are hard hit by unemployment in several countries and faced with the limited availability of quality educational services accessible to all.

### **The specific “profile” of each Program by country**

A more detailed review of each project portfolio of the Programs (see Appendix III, for the list of projects by country/province, approved in 01-02 and 02-03), makes it possible to observe the following regarding the breakdown of projects by theme/sector:

- The Albania LIP essentially concentrates on the issue of “rule of law” and on capacity building in the social services sector.
- The Croatia LIP focuses the vast majority of its resources on *repatriation and harmonious integration of refugees, returnees and IDPs*. A large proportion of the economic projects are targeted to these clients, including a significant proportion of projects categorized under “democratic development”. Projects under the category of “refugees, IDPs and returnees”, are often more humanitarian in nature or pertain to the reconstruction of basic infrastructure.
- The Serbia/Montenegro LIP concentrates mostly on the *issues related to democratic development* (62% of the project budgets). Moreover, a large proportion of the projects in the “social sector” address issues of reforms (education) or the rights of vulnerable minorities (youth and HIV, trafficked persons) and are related to issues of governance.
- As in 00-01, the Kosovo LIP remains highly diversified in its composition and thematic distribution. A closer examination of the various projects under this Program reveals the priority given to certain types of clients. Projects targeting youth take up slightly over 17% of the budgets; projects focusing on women account for 18.6%; and slightly over 14% of the budgets are allocated to projects intended for minorities and/or displaced/refugee/returnee populations. However, the specific issue of interethnic relations in Kosovo is a cross-cutting theme throughout this Program.

- For the Macedonia LIP, projects addressing issues related to rights of minorities, vulnerable populations and interethnic relations very clearly dominate the Program.
  - Most of the Bosnia-Herzegovina PRP project portfolio focuses on issues related to democratization and governance, with several projects addressing policy and reform issues. This program also plays a key role in the country's governance (e.g. Office of High Representative and elections).
  - Finally, the GSP portfolio shows a subregional approach, with three projects of the same nature (NGOs and the Mass Media) carried on in the three countries covered by this Program. Three of the GSP-Romania projects are being conducted simultaneously in several municipalities and are characterized by having institutions, public services and civil society working in close collaboration.
- The Program “profiles”, and particularly their priority foci, conform on the whole to the specific orientations that had been indicated in the respective PADs of the LIP, PRP and GSP<sup>10</sup>.

However, it is essentially on the basis of their own analyses of the contexts, issues and priorities as defined by the Program managers that these Program profiles acquired their own “colour” and specificity.

Beyond their specificity, the analysis of the various Program “profiles” shows two dominant major issues that the LIP/PRP/GSP have taken on: governance, which includes the democratization process, respect for human rights and minorities, the rule of law, relations between governments and civil society; and, the provision of basic social services in order to strengthen harmony and equity in interethnic relations. These two issues have a direct impact and bearing on the peace and security of the Balkans and the region's political, economic and social development.

In general, it can be affirmed that the managers of the various Programs have succeeded in defining and implementing coherent programming, relevant to the contexts in which they intervene by responding well to the needs and priorities of the community, as expressed by the recipient organizations targeted by the Programs. In the case of the LIP and PRP, the Programs have essentially used the budgets allocated to them, thus meeting the financial objectives of these Programs.

### **3.3 The projects making up the Programs**

The 207 projects implemented with the support of the Programs are highly diversified, in terms of the types of activities supported, implementing and funding modalities, the types of recipient organizations/lead agencies, their principal or priority target clienteles and geographic coverage.

---

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix II

## **Project diversity**

### **Types of activities supported**

The activities supported by the projects can be found, exclusively or simultaneously, in the following major categories: training; rehabilitation or construction of collective and individual infrastructure; establishing micro-enterprises and small businesses; increasing awareness of the Programs' priority themes; provision of services (primarily legal and social); emergency procurement of material to meet essential needs; symposia/conferences; election monitoring; supply of equipment necessary for the functioning of institutions/organizations; and finally, but to a very small degree, institutional support (salaries, premises, etc.), generally via overhead or operations directly related to the projects' primary activities.

It cannot be said that one type of activity is more relevant than another. Each activity meets very specific needs and is generally well justified by the context in which it is implemented.

Notwithstanding the context of humanitarian crises, questions have been raised concerning the relevance of supporting projects focusing on infrastructure construction or rehabilitation activities. In this regard, the Evaluation Team was able to observe<sup>11</sup> that it is not only the express need for this infrastructure that serves as the main justification for this type of project, but also the fact that they are defined and carried out with the joint participation of public institutions (municipalities or central governments) and civil society. This approach often can serve as an example of collaboration in the community. In all cases involving this type of project in Croatia, the infrastructure projects are located in sensitive zones of past conflicts between Croats and Serbs, and generally have the purpose of alleviating tensions between these two communities (e.g. Rehabilitation Kakma Water System; Emergency Repair Family Houses for Returnees). A summary review of similar projects in other Programs leads to the conclusion that these factors are also present in a majority of these other projects.

As previously stated, economic initiatives aimed at establishing micro-enterprise, small business or training independent entrepreneurs (e.g. craftswomen in Croatia), or building production capacity of peasant groups or individuals, involve risks and relatively high potential for medium-term failure which are not always assessed either by the recipient organizations or by the Program managers. In fact, this type of project requires very specific competencies that are neither found in "traditional" NGOs, (which are sometimes primarily charitable), nor in most public Program managers. It is appropriate to note that Kosovo LIP was able to compensate for these limited competencies by retaining the services of a specialized institution that coached the different projects of this type in their planning and implementation. This approach made it possible to avoid several errors and produce results. It could be replicated in all Programs that intend to support economic projects.

---

<sup>11</sup> Through visits in the field and interviews with recipient organizations and beneficiaries of such projects, as well as through files review and discussions with program managers.

### **Implementing and funding modalities**

The vast majority of the projects supported by the LIP/PRP/GSP consist of specific activities that either fit into the medium-term programs of the partner organizations, or constitute a component of a broader specific project. There are few projects that could be described as “stand-alone”, i.e. projects completely funded by the Programs from beginning to end which are not part of a partner’s longer-term programming.

Moreover, a large proportion of the projects – more than half<sup>12</sup> – are the object of joint funding. Resources other than LIP/PRP/GSP come either from the recipient organization, from other international donors or, as is most often the case, from all of these sources simultaneously. The relative share of the funding provided by LIP/PRP/GSP vary very significantly from one project to another, and may range between 10% to about 80% of a project’s costs.

**Joint funding makes it possible to support projects on a larger scale than the one imposed by the financial limits of the LIP/PRP/GSP projects: Canadian funding certainly has considerably more leverage in this type of project. Furthermore, joint funding with other donors enhances programming synergy, collaboration and coordination with other donors.**

**Moreover, joint funding projects offer an opportunity for visibility of the Canadian contribution that often goes far beyond the amounts invested. However, achieving the results of these projects is sometimes difficult to measure or solely attributable to the LIP/PRP/GSP contribution. Of course, it often depends on the performance of a greater number of players.**

**In some cases, LIP and PRP funding has complemented larger Canadian projects (e.g. Queen’s University Program in BiH and Serbia; OSCE Police Education... in Serbia), thus contributing to one the Programs’ expected results.**

### **The recipient organizations**

The recipient organizations of LIP/PRP/GSP funding are quite diverse. However, despite the incomplete data, it can be approximately estimated that:

- Over half of the projects – all Programs combined – are implemented by local NGOs and most of them are national in scope.
- These are followed by the international NGOs (e.g. CARE, World Vision, ADRA, etc.), which implement about 25% of the projects, in most cases with a local partner.

---

<sup>12</sup> The Evaluation Team does not have enough reliable data for a completely accurate quantification of this aspect of the projects under all of the Programs.

- National or local institutions – government departments, municipalities and universities are responsible for the implementation of approximately 10% of the projects.
- Finally, international institutions (e.g. United Nations Agencies, OSCE) are the executing agencies for barely 7% of the projects.

The following observations can be drawn from this breakdown:

- The national NGOs have acquired clear importance in the various Programs, compared to the previous evaluation period. This is explained, in part, by the departure of a large proportion of the international NGOs that were present in greater numbers during the humanitarian crisis that followed the conflicts in the region. At the same time, the national NGOs have gained experience, and several Program managers have made them preferred partners thus seeking to build the capacity of civil society, while also relying on the in-depth knowledge that these organizations possess of the environments in which they operate.
- To a large extent, the international NGOs are still primarily involved in projects of a humanitarian nature or actions directly related to ‘post-conflict’ issues. In many cases, they also provide a ‘coaching’ function for the national organizations with which they work. It should be noted that Canadian NGOs (e.g. CARE, CECI) are part of this category of recipient organizations supported by the Programs.
- Compared to 2000-01, the significantly greater presence of central government institutions, although still fairly limited, primarily allows the Programs to support activities aimed at reforms or at building the capacity of public services. These projects are generally in partnership with other international institutions. Several examples of this type of partnership are found, particularly in the Bosnia-Herzegovina and Serbia/Montenegro Programs.

A number of projects are carried out with municipalities. This is particularly the case in Croatia. The GSP also works with municipalities, although as partners rather than implementing agencies. This relatively new type of project offers opportunities to strengthen the dynamics of proximity democracy, where the institutions work in cooperation with their constituents and civil society.

- Finally, the international institutions still play a relatively important role in the Bosnia-Herzegovina. This is understandable given the crucial role these institutions play in this country’s governance. However, the BiH Program intends to increase the number of national NGOs in its 2003-04 portfolio.

It should be noted that in the Serbia/Montenegro Program the two projects carried out with such institutions have experienced difficulties which are essentially related to a cumbersome and bureaucratic mode of functioning as well as frequent personnel changes. Following this experience, the Program drew a lesson of not taking the implementation and management capabilities of such institutions for granted.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> To be verified whether the BiH Program in particular has also experienced similar problems with this type of institution.

### **The primary target clienteles**

Though it is difficult to establish proportions for all of the projects regarding their primary target clients, they can be grouped in three main categories:

- vulnerable populations – these include: refugees, IDP and returnees, trafficked persons; children and women; ethnic minorities, including the Roma as well as minorities within communities in which the majority has another ethnic origin;
- the general public; and,
- personnel of public institutions and of organizations of civil society.

These target clients conform to what is expected of the various Programs in the PADs and in the PPFs.

The major emphasis on vulnerable populations, particularly on those that were especially affected by the conflicts in the region, is relevant and consistent with the rationale, major orientations and objectives of the LIP/PRP/GSP.

A review of the different portfolios shows that the refugee, IDP and returnee populations, as well as ethnic minorities, including the Roma populations, are at the heart of a great many projects. Youth, particularly in LIP Kosovo, but also, though to a lesser degree, in Serbia and Macedonia, were among the projects' priority target clienteles.

Some Programs have developed part of their project portfolio addressed specifically to women as the primary clientele. These projects are found mainly in the social sector (health, education), in economic projects, and in projects addressing the issue of trafficked persons.

Out of all portfolios, 25 projects, for a total value of \$1,176,540, specifically or primarily targeted women and, to a lesser degree, dealt with the GE issue as such. The Kosovo Program includes the greatest number (11 / 57) for a little over \$425,000. Moreover, all things considered, LIP Albania has the highest percentage of funding (27%) allocated to projects primarily targeting women or the delivery of services addressed to them. In the GSP, 2 of its 7 projects deal with issues where women are primarily concerned (domestic violence and family planning).

The gender equality (GE) issue is not the object of a thorough and adequate analysis in any of the Programs and the reports do not provide disaggregated data. This issue, although meant to be a cross-cutting theme, is neither sufficiently documented, nor discussed in the LIP/PRP/GSP in close compliance with the CIDA policies. In this perspective, advanced training – especially operational training – in gender analysis would be useful to all the Program managers.

Finally, projects where the clients are primarily personnel of public institutions and civil society, meet capacity building needs related to good governance. It is appropriate to add that NGO capacity building is also achieved via the backing and support provided by the Program managers during the various project management phases.

### **Geographic range of projects and “ethnicity” balance**

The projects vary widely in geographic scope, depending on their nature (e.g. national for election monitoring projects, support for public reforms; and local for certain training projects or support for setting up small businesses). This variation also depends on the geographic scope of the organizations responsible for the projects.

Some Programs (e.g. Serbia/Montenegro, Croatia, Kosovo) have targeted specific geographic zones, primarily due to the sensitivity of these zones linked to the ethnic tensions related to the conflicts that have affected the Balkans.

Last year, in collaboration with BiH PRP, the Serbia/Montenegro Program supported a transnational project related to the return of refugees. It will be interesting to draw lessons from this project for future interventions in this sense. The GSP ‘NGOs and the Medias’ project in Romania, Bulgaria and Moldova could also provide lessons.

In all Programs efforts have been made to balance the projects portfolios between local NGOs based in the capitals and NGOs, often smaller or less-experienced ones working in rural communities or small cities. However, this programming strategy, aimed at reinforcing a larger scope of the civil society, is resource consuming for the Programs management teams (first to assess the proposals and also for monitoring the projects). The use of part-time national consultants in some Programs (Serbia, Croatia, Kosovo) has facilitated the implementation of this strategy. This management opportunity is to be pursued or introduced in Programs such as BiH and possibly Macedonia, should they increase their support to recipient organizations and/or projects in rural or remote areas.

Although not specifically expressed in programming strategies, considerations of “ethnic balance” are present in Programs portfolios. This approach is crucial to address peacebuilding and reconciliation issues, and/or to reinforce the capacity of organizations addressing human rights issues as well as the needs of vulnerable groups such as the Roma.

### **Strengthening of the civil society**

The strengthening of civil society has taken various forms and involved different types of capacity building activities within the portfolios and direct inputs from the Programs management teams:

- Projects supporting various types of NGOs’ capacity building activities implemented by national and international organizations whose main role is the strengthening of civil society in different sectors such as: Partners-Albania Centre for Change and Conflict Management in Albania; Serbian Democratic Forum in Croatia; CRNSP,



Centre for Development of NGOs; CARE-Yugoslavia, and CRS in FRY; Kosovo Action for Civic Initiatives, Kosovo Institute for NGO Law, World Vision, CARE Int'l in Kosovo; Center for Legal Resources, Centras in Romania, Resource Centre Foundation in Bulgaria and CONTACT Centre in Moldova.

These projects cover a wide range of capacity building activities: training and/or coaching in organizational / management capacities; specific technical capacities (legal aid, human rights, media relations, micro-credit, agriculture, etc.); production of studies, management tools, directory of NGOs, etc; and, collective advocacy actions (ex. re NGO law, anti-corruption campaigns, national poverty reduction strategy).

- The constant capacity building support provided by the Programs managers to the recipient organizations through the various phases of a project (from the critical review of the proposal with the recipient and the monitoring activities during implementation to the review of final financial and narrative reports) include advice and management tools, where needed, to improve the performance of the recipient organization.
- Additionally, the support provided by the Programs managers, through their coordination or public relations activities with other donors, is aimed at seeking or assessing co-funding opportunities for their strategic field of activities or for specific proposals requiring larger investments.
- In some cases, knowledge and awareness of the scope of civil society organizations have also led Program managers to seek and facilitate synergies between projects/organizations within a specific sector or geographic area. Good examples of this are the previously mentioned transnational project related to refugee return supported both by the FRY-LIP and the BiH PRP as well as the three projects “NGOs and the Mass Media” supported by the GSP in Romania, Bulgaria and Moldova.

In the context of post-conflicts and multi-level transitions, strong civil societies are key actors in building a pluralistic democracy and encouraging better governance practices.

In cooperation with other donors, the sum of all NGOs capacity building activities supported by the Programs have played a significant role in strengthening and developing civil society in the Balkans.

By selecting more national NGOs of diverse nature, focus, and ethnic communities present in the region, the Programs have contributed to promotion Canadian values of tolerance and of harmonious cohabitation within multi-ethnic communities.

Compared to the larger ones based in the capitals, many NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs) based in rural or remote areas are still struggling to attract funding. There is still a need to reinforce their management capacities and institutional development. If the strengthening of civil society remains one of CIDA's objectives in the region, it would be useful to conduct a study on the factors and conditions favoring its achievement, especially in the context of such post-conflict and multi-level transitions. Program managers have gained experience in that field and would be a tremendous

source of information along with national and international (e.g. Open Society/Soros Foundation) organizations specialized in NGOs capacity building present in the region.

While visiting some NGOs, the evaluation team observed a weakness in governance and transparency practices. For example, boards and general assemblies – when they exist - are not always called upon to play their full roles, and formal reliable reporting, notably on finances, to constituencies is not yet a common practice. As recommended in the last LIP/PRP evaluation, good governance within applicant organizations should be part of the Programs selection criteria, meaning a close assessment of this aspect prior to recommend projects for approval.

### 3.4 Project performance

The degree of performance is primarily assessed on the basis of analyses and observations of the projects visited, interviews, and specific questioning<sup>14</sup> of the Program managers encountered during the mission. To summarize briefly:

**On the whole, the projects have delivered the planned outputs and met their objectives to a large degree, and, with a few exceptions, generally within the budgets allocated and the periods planned.**

Some projects of course pose more problems than others. This is notably the case of economic projects (see Section 4.3) and the quality of the results achieved is not always consistent or up to the exact level of what was planned. But these few variances are insignificant on the whole, and a few failures or weaknesses are necessarily part of the norm in the world of reconstruction and development, where not everything can be foreseen and planned.

**This high success rate is essentially explained by:**

- **Careful selection of the recipient organizations and the proposed projects;**
- **The professionalism and degree of competency of the primary managers of the LIP/PRP/GSP (LEPs and KLIP coordinator) in conjunction with, in most cases, the sustained and appropriate supervision that the CIDA and DFAIT officers have provided in the field. All the management teams display great interest in their respective Programs and devote the required attention to them.**
- **The real commitment of the vast majority of recipient organizations to carry out their projects successfully;**

---

<sup>14</sup> During the mission, the LEP managers in Serbia/Montenegro, Croatia and Kosovo were asked to rate the degree of performance of each of their projects on a scale of 1 to 10 and to explain their level of assessment. Even though this method is not very scientific or objective, we believe, based on our own observations of the projects examined and visited in the sample, that these assessments on the whole were rigorous and fair (sometimes possibly even too severe!).

- **The close relationship of the projects' components to the real needs and those needs felt to be priorities by the project beneficiaries;**
- **The use of joint approaches, where several partners are simultaneously involved and thus interested in achieving results, and where both the contributions and the risks are thus shared;**
- **Finally, the adequacy of the management mechanisms and procedures for this type of project has contributed to promoting effective and efficient implementation.**

### **3.5 The overall impact/contribution of the Programs**

On a relatively limited scale (compared to other Canadian 'bilateral' and regional programs, and to other donors' often much larger programs), the Programs have contributed to peacebuilding, democratic consolidation, and community-based rehabilitation through a large variety of projects and implementing organizations. As a whole, they have favoured and facilitated inter-ethnic communications and trust; have made it possible to increase the awareness on human rights and to promote the respect for human rights, to enhance the importance of the rule of law; to increase the awareness on good governance issues and the capacity of institutions in relation to governance issues.

The LIP and PRP have facilitated the return of a large number of refugees, returnees and IDPs to their regions of origin, and have contributed to improve their living conditions. The Programs have contributed to strengthening the role and capacity of civil society. They also have contributed to a better and more extensive delivery of social services to vulnerable groups. Overall, they have lessened (within their own limited means) the negative impacts of the conflicts that have affected the region, have promoted democratic values and, most of all, have 'given peace a chance'.

The GSP, even with still a small number of projects in implementation, has managed to develop a portfolio that includes innovative approaches, where local government institutions, national and local organizations and institutions found ways to collaborate on crucial social and economic community issues such as domestic violence and energy efficiency. Lessons can be generated by the Programs from these experiences, with regard to results such as "improved responsiveness of local government to the priorities of civil society"<sup>15</sup>.

On a more limited scale, the Programs have contributed to improve the economic conditions or to increase the income generating opportunities for vulnerable groups.

Moreover, the Programs have provided real – and high – visibility for Canada in the region: as one donor said "Canada has managed to do a lot in terms of its visibility, considering the amounts involved in the LIP. This Program has a good leverage strategy!" But, more importantly, they have enhanced Canadians' values on democratic

---

<sup>15</sup> One of the medium term results stated in the LIP/PRP/GSP Performance Framework.

issues, good governance, and the values of compassion for victims of conflicts and for minorities.

### **3.6 Sustainability of the Program results**

The issue of results' sustainability is addressed below at the projects and Programs levels. Elements examined to assess the sustainability potential of results achieved were mainly: i) the degree of ownership manifested by the projects implementing organizations and the direct beneficiaries; ii) their interest and concrete commitment as well as their own capacity to maintain and/or increase the benefits gained from the projects; iii) where applicable, the coherence with national policies and programs.

In the majority of projects, the beneficiaries took ownership of the initiatives: they contributed to these results and identified with them because they were closely linked to deeply felt needs. In addition, very few projects exceeded the capacity of the beneficiary groups/clienteles to absorb them, and few projects involved recurring costs that were out of the reach of those responsible for them. Also, for the vast majority of projects, it can be assumed without great risk that the results obtained will be maintained and even increased in the long term by the beneficiaries.

However for some projects that are more problematic, such as economic projects or projects conducted by organizations with little potential for fund-raising or financial backing and/or young organizations that have not yet solidly established their credibility in their community, the sustainability of the results may be considerably less. However, it is estimated that the proportion of such projects in all portfolios is relatively low.

The prospect of sustainability of Programs results, at the impact level, is harder to assess. Achieving sustainable results in a context of fragile peace and security; consolidated democratization processes; better governance practices; and, the need to improve people's living conditions will still require substantial support from the international community in the region. Sustainability, at the impact level, is beyond the Programs capacity and reach.

However, the flexibility of the Programs to respond to expressed needs and the effectiveness of their management, have enhanced the relevance of results achieved and their local ownership - both conditions crucial to the sustainability of results.

In other respects, the institutional sustainability of the supported NGOs and other recipient organizations is totally dependent on: their usefulness in a given context; the interest they can arouse in international donors or national governments; and, among the public likely to provide them with financial or other backing. In this perspective, the question of recipients' sustainability should be raised with regards to the usefulness of these organizations and the interest they arouse. Creation of new NGOs in contexts where resources are scarce and heavily solicited should not be encouraged. On this point, the Programs have shown great prudence.

#### **4. MANAGEMENT OF THE LIP/PRP/GSP**

Programs management is described below and then evaluated in terms of adequacy and efficiency or effectiveness for its various components: the management structure and resources by country/province, the procedures used at the “Program” and “project” levels, the management tools supplied by HQ and/or developed in the field. We should point out that the financial management of the Programs was not the object of this evaluation.

##### **4.1 Programs management structure**

As described in the Program Approval Documents (PAD), the LIP/PRP/GSP are decentralized Programs, for which the overall management and project approval are the responsibility of CIDA-HQ (CEE – RZE). The Programs management structure in the field varies somewhat depending on the nature of the posts. It involves personnel from the CIDA or DFAIT (where there is no CIDA representative); and locally engaged persons (LEP); personnel of the Program Support Unit (Kosovo) and the Heads of Missions (Ambassadors). In the Serbia/Montenegro and Croatia Programs, the services of local consultants were retained to support project monitoring.

The main findings regarding the management structure and the human resources assigned to the Programs are as follows:

- The distribution of roles and responsibilities among the various resources in the field - Head of Aid or DFAIT Officer, locally engaged Program Officer and Head of Mission is similar in all Programs, except in Kosovo where the Program’s everyday management is handled by the Support Unit. Each person’s assignments are clearly defined and the distribution of roles and responsibilities is appropriate to the management needs of this type of Program (decentralized funds).
- Moreover, to run smoothly, this management structure in each Program, implies a common vision and understanding of the Program, its objectives and its procedures, as well as a management style that allows for a climate of trust. The evaluation mission was able to observe that these factors are present in three of the four country Programs visited.
- The GSP experienced difficulties within its team. An internal misunderstanding prevailed for some time regarding each person’s assignments in the management process, particularly regarding the role of the Head of Mission in the project approval process. On the other hand, this Program’s team also experienced difficulty understanding the GSP’s orientations and priorities and in translating them into operational terms. It should be noted that the formulation of the GSP PAD is confusing, particularly regarding its priority intervention sectors and targets. These two factors combined had the effect of significantly slowing down the GSP programming process. However, during the last year, changes occurred in the team and efforts have been made to redress the situation, with the support of CIDA-HQ. The results of such efforts should be manifest in the 2003-04 annual programming.

- On the whole, the human resources allocated to the various Programs are sufficient and have the necessary competencies to assure adequate management. It should be pointed out that recruiting local consultants to support project monitoring contributed to improving management of the Programs that adopted this practice. It should particularly be extended to the Bosnia-Herzegovina Program, which has expressed the need for this type of recruiting, justified by the scope of its programming and the complexity of the intervention context.
- Moreover, the evaluation mission was able to observe that where there are no CIDA personnel present, the LEPs, who do not benefit from the sustained guidance of a CIDA person, and who are not immersed in the Agency's organizational and developmental culture, sometimes have difficulty in implementing certain Program management procedures and processes. This was especially obvious in the formulation of some Annual Workplans/Reports, but also, in some cases, in the analysis of proposals requiring special technical competencies and/or high risks in terms of their sustainability (e.g. economic projects).

In such Programs, the support provided up to now by CIDA-HQ – regular guidance and feed-back on management and programming issues, training or consulting services on specific aspects of management – has been quite useful and greatly appreciated. This support should be continued, even intensified on the basis of a specific analysis of each Program's reinforcement needs, should the current LIP/PRP/GSP scope be maintained or increased in the future.

## **4.2 Promoting the Programs**

Promotion of the Programs, with a view to publicizing their objectives and stimulate project proposals, is essentially accomplished by i) formal presentations at special events; ii) providing information and documents to the organizations that request them, and, in the case of the GSP, presentation of the Program and its documents on the Web site of the Canadian Embassy in Romania.

- All recipient organizations are required to promote Canada's contribution to their project (e.g. installation of logo on buildings, press coverage, etc.). The evaluation mission was able to observe that all the projects visited were in compliance with this requirement. It is worth noting that the CIDA Section of the Canadian Embassy in Belgrade has developed guidelines for organizations receiving Canadian funding. The organizations encountered considered these guidelines very relevant and most of them apply them systematically.
- All members of the various Program management Posts (LEP, Head of Cooperation or DFAIT Officer, and support staff) are actively involved in this promotion. The Ambassadors also play here a preponderant and effective role at various events in which they participate.

**On the whole, judging exclusively by the large number of proposals received under each Program, the various promotional strategies are effective. The evaluation mission's observations confirmed that the Programs are widely known to the organizations likely to submit projects, and to many of the donors present in the field, some of which are co-donors under the LIP/PRP/GSP projects.**

**Moreover, the various LIP/PRP/GSP promotional strategies have largely contributed to Canada's visibility in the countries where they are implemented.**

### **4.3 The project selection and approval process**

#### **The different steps of the process**

The different steps and procedures regarding the project selection and approval process are summarily described in the PAD of each Program. They also include the general eligibility criteria and certain conditions to observe in the project proposals, as well as the various related document formats - Project Outline (PO), Project Appraisal Form (PAF) and Project Approval Document (PAD). The following observations analyze these steps:

- *General criteria* for project selection and approval have been modified since the last evaluation; they are now used in all programs, with additional considerations regarding their respective focuses/priorities. However, it should be noted that the criteria related to a maximum of 15% of '*operating costs*' is not sufficiently explicit - hence operating costs and salaries for personnel related directly to a project often constitute a large part of the budgets. For example, in many projects that mainly involve training activities, most costs are related to operations and personnel salaries. In most cases of this type examined by the evaluation team, these types of costs, although well over 15% of the budget, were justified by the sheer nature of the project and in fact were approved by CIDA-HQ. However, in some projects (e.g. NONE – Training Video Editing...LIP-Croatia) budgets in fact include nearly all operating costs of the organization during project implementation, and hence are more of the institutional support type. Clarifications and details should be provided to the Program managers as to what should be considered "overhead costs" and "operating costs", and the admissible maximum operating costs may need to be revised in some cases.
- The project "pre-screening" step, which serves to determine the eligibility of the proposals, is not described in the PAD-Programs. However, most of the posts generally entrust the LEPs with the responsibility for pre-screening, including rejection of proposals that do not meet a sufficient number of criteria and/or conditions. The reasons for rejection are recorded in writing and the applicant organization is informed by a standard form letter.
- Some Programs (e.g. Croatia) first submit to CIDA-HQ a summary of proposals that show some potential to verify their eligibility at this level. This approach is efficient especially for proposals where doubts persist as to their admissibility by HQ. It is

then possible to avoid continuing discussions with the applicant organization and the sometimes laborious drafting of a PAD.

- In the case of the GSP, however, the pre-screening procedure was too tedious and excessively time-consuming, especially with regard to proposals which, initially, were in compliance with the criteria and conditions established and/or do not show enough potential for subsequent development. It had, along with other factors, the effect of slowing down the GSP programming process. However, this pre-screening process has since been reviewed and simplified and should be conducive to greater efficiency.
- Moreover, some more complex projects, notably economic initiatives, would merit a closer preliminary analysis of the experience and capacity of the applicant organization. Their proposals should also include a feasibility and profitability analysis. This had been the object of a recommendation in the previous LIP/PRP evaluation, but it was not always implemented systematically, especially in Croatia.
- Project approval remains the responsibility of RZE within the CEE Branch at CIDA. Although clearly defined, the distribution of roles and responsibilities between the various players at the posts and CIDA-HQ has been, in some cases, a subject of lengthy discussions and misunderstandings with some negative effects on the management and on the speed of the approval process. However, these problems were solved on a case by case basis, with CIDA-HQ support and clarifications.

Consideration should be given to questioning the relevance of a multi-level review and approval process for projects with average budgets of approximately \$47,000. This administrative procedure (with regard to approval level of authority - and common to many other CIDA's local initiatives funds) is justified by accountability requirements and by overall strategic developmental considerations for the Programs. It should be noted that some of the posts managing the Programs have no CIDA staff present in the field.

Generally, the approval process has proven to be quick expedient (a few days, at most one to two weeks) except when the projects submitted require additional clarification. It should be noted that recipient organizations all agreed to recognize the exceptional speed of the approval process, compared to other donors' similar funds. In this sense, the project approval process, although centralized at CIDA-HQ, responds well to the considerations of flexibility and speed required for this type of Programs.

- Finally, the Serbia-Montenegro and Kosovo Programs have begun to experiment with a new way of soliciting and selecting proposals, by way of calls for proposals. In the case of Kosovo, it is already ongoing and the call covers all the KLIP priorities / themes. In Serbia, the intention is to increase the number and the quality of proposals addressing youth as a target group and/or youth issues. This approach (calls for proposals) is already well-known in the region, as the EU and some other large donors have used it for the past few years. When clearly focused this approach has the advantage of closely targeting what the program wants to support, and it also allows concentration of a large part of the screening and selection process in a shorter term.



The results of this approach should be examined to draw lessons that could be useful for other Programs or for future calls.

### **Document formats relating to the process**

CIDA has provided a standard Project Outline (PO) to all Programs. This format is given to all organizations wishing to submit a project.

- On the whole, the applicant organizations stick to this format, generally providing the information required under the various headings. However, the evaluation mission was able to examine some of the original proposals and observed significant differences, particularly in the level of detail of the content and the length of the proposals.
- Most of the original proposals selected for approval were rewritten to various degrees and, if necessary, summarized by the LEP, before being submitted to CIDA-HQ with the PAD form. While this approach can sometimes be fairly time-consuming, it is often necessary to standardize the project presentation and limit the document's volume. However, the evaluation mission found that the PO version submitted to CIDA is a good reflection of the project as submitted by the organization. It should be noted that this version then becomes an integral part of the Contribution Agreement – and thus of the contract with the recipient organization.
- While in most of these components the PO format is largely appropriate for this type of project, the evaluation mission observed that most of the project description documents do not contain certain key elements such as a detailed project schedule: only the start and end dates are indicated. Moreover, in some cases, the POs contain too few quantitative measurements of activities or results. The lack of measurable data and especially the more systematic absence of an implementation schedule very significantly limit the assessment of the projects' progress during monitoring.
- Since many of the organizations are unfamiliar with the RBM methodology, some Programs (LIP/Serbia-Montenegro, PRP/Bosnia-Herzegovina and the GSP), have taken the initiative of asking the organizations to provide a Project Performance Framework, which is then often developed with the LEP's support. This approach, although it involves 'capacity building' elements and offers a more complete results-based management tool, can also be time-consuming for the LEPs who are not all experts in this method. In addition, the evaluation mission found that these Project Performance Frameworks are neither included in the Contribution Agreement, nor are they used systemically for project monitoring.

On this point, the evaluation mission considers that the RBM methodology, strictly applied (with Project Performance Framework) is not really cost efficient or appropriate given the financial level and/or scope of the LIP/PRP/GSP projects. Thus Project Performance Frameworks should not be required of the applicant organizations. However, if they are provided and adequate, they should be integrated into the PAD and the Contribution Agreement and used systematically during monitoring and for the end-of-project report.

However, all POs (included in the PADs) should systematically include measurable qualitative and quantitative data in terms of the results expected and/or the activities to be undertaken in the projects, as well as relatively detailed project implementation schedules.

**All in all, the project selection and approval process, as operationalized in most cases, is effective and adequate for this type of Programs. However, some aspects could be improved, as already observed, to increase efficiency or foster a more informed choice of some types of projects.**

#### 4.4 Project monitoring and reporting system

Depending on the Program, all managers ensure some monitoring of their project portfolio with methodologies and tools that are relatively similar, but with varying means and resources:

- Monitoring is accomplished by regular contact with the recipient organizations and field visits, varying in frequency according to the number, nature and complexity of the projects as well as the resources available under each Program. In most cases, the projects are visited at least once during implementation. Nearly half the projects visited by the evaluation mission had two to three monitoring visits during implementation. These are generally complex projects, requiring regular monitoring or featuring special problems.
- Some managers establish a plan over several months for their projects' monitoring. This is particularly the case in Serbia-Montenegro and in Croatia, where these Programs have retained the services of an additional resource (a local consultant) to support this monitoring. It is also the case in the GSP and in LIP-Kosovo. Other managers (e.g. Macedonia) primarily proceed case by case, based on the needs and/or the means available.
- For all managers, the Contribution Agreement and more specifically the project description document, serve as monitoring references. As previously mentioned, this description document (PO) does not include all the elements necessary for rigorous monitoring. In particular, it generally does not include a relatively detailed implementation schedule that would allow evaluation of a project's progress at the time of the field visit, in relation to adequate benchmarks.
- Most of the managers interviewed have adopted a minimal monitoring tool (grid) indicating the main project parameters – title, contact information, objectives and major results expected. In the case of the GSP, the monitoring grid is more elaborate and customized, including a series of specific points to verify and questions for each visit. Such a tool assures better preparation and more thorough project monitoring.
- In all Programs visited, written monitoring reports are produced systematically and filed in the project files, except for Kosovo<sup>16</sup>, where this practice is inconsistent,

---

<sup>16</sup> It has also been the case in LIP-Macedonia, as stated in a recent independent Review Report. The evaluation team could not assess this aspect, through reports, for other non-visited Programs.

thereby limiting the subsequent usefulness and corporate memory of the monitoring. The monitoring reports examined are fairly informative regarding the implementation of the projects and the problems encountered. However, very few of them contain specific evaluation data on the degree of progress of the projects visited vs. the progress planned. This is due to the lack of predetermined benchmarks.

To optimize the usefulness of the project monitoring reports and make them a capacity building tool, the Evaluation Team proposes that these reports be shared systematically with the recipient organizations, so that they can also use them and, as the case may be, commit themselves to act on the recommendations contained in the reports.

- Finally, all the recipient organizations are contractually required to produce a narrative and financial end-of-project report. The evaluation mission observed that all the organizations comply with this requirement, though sometimes there are significant delays. The vast majority of the end-of-project reports examined, both narrative and financial, were of good quality and informative and showed rigour and probity on the part of the organizations.

**Despite the few weaknesses monitoring of the vast majority of projects turned out to be adequate and sufficient to avoid any significant slippage and to allow an assessment of the projects' quality of implementation and the degree of probability of their success.**

**In some cases, closer monitoring at project startup could help better identify potential implementation problems and find solutions more quickly, but the evaluation mission cannot affirm that the number of projects in these cases is really significant.**

**Finally, the information gathered during monitoring would gain relevance and quality if some key benchmarks and measurements factors were systematically integrated into the documents used for monitoring and reporting.**

#### **4.5 The annual Program planning and reporting process**

In 2002-03, CIDA introduced an annual planning and reporting process (Annual Workplan) for the LIP/PRP/GSP. Workplan and Report Outlines were developed at HQ and provided to all Program managers in the field. These Outlines include indicative information and suggestions regarding the types of information required under each heading. The managers henceforth will establish their work plans and produce their annual reports on the basis of these Outlines.

In addition, during 2002<sup>17</sup>, a new Program Performance Framework (PPF), was completely revised and submitted to the managers by CIDA-HQ. It would serve as a reference for the entire Program planning, reporting and evaluation process.

## **Annual Workplans**

The following findings emerged from the review of the Annual Workplans:

- Generally the LIP and PRP managers conformed to the Table of Contents of the Outline provided by CIDA. However, each manager had a significantly different interpretation of the indications regarding the types of content expected under the various headings. For 2003-04:
  - The external and internal contextual analyses are informative and sometimes based on published studies of the context. Some are more “macro” in scope while others are more specialized. However, while in some Programs the links between these analyses and the annual Program orientations are clear and established (e.g. Serbia/Montenegro, BiH, Kosovo), others do not clearly and explicitly focus on aspects of the context that could have affect the future programming in the country or in the region.
  - The risk analysis and mitigation strategy grid is systematically completed, but unevenly, i.e. fairly summarily and mechanically (patterned on the examples from the Outline provided), or more customized and directly related to the Program context. However, very few managers refer to it in the subsequent Annual Reports to review, when applicable, the variances between “planned” and “actual” and to assess the adequacy of the envisioned mitigation strategies.
  - Section 4, ‘Cross-cutting Themes/Priorities’, should address, among others, the GE issue. In most of the Annual Plans, the GE section deals strictly with women and not with the issue of gender equity as such. It should be noted that the managers are not required to produce a “gender” analysis of the context. Some of them offer statistical data and a few indications on the importance that will be given to GE in the programming, but in many cases, they limit their comments to recalling that all Programs recipients are required to indicate how they intend to deal with the question in their projects.

The environmental theme is generally raised to note that this issue is not a focus of the Programs but will be taken into account in accordance with Canadian Government requirements.

Moreover, the questions relating to minorities and the integration of IDPs and refugees are present and sometimes fairly well developed. They represent one of the priority focuses in most of the Programs.

- The managers took a fairly different approach to Section 5, ‘Planned Result Achievement’, in 02-03 and 03-04. In 02-03, many of them had developed results

---

<sup>17</sup> See Appendix III. NB: this version of the PPF is the most recent. It has been modified very slightly since 2002 and was distributed in May 2003.

specific to their Program/country. However, in the 03-04 Annual Workplans, all of them repeated the medium and short-term results of the PPF word for word, in most cases adding % or \$ indicators to the planned achievements for the year ahead. In such cases, most managers (except LIP-Macedonia) provided a rationale for their choices in the next section (6), gave indications of the types of projects likely to respond to them or the means envisioned to achieve them. Only the BiH and Serbia-Montenegro managers identified specific annual achievements for their Programs in relation to the PPF's major results.

- Section 6, 'Country Program Management' and the required sub-elements – Planning, Networking, Monitoring/Evaluation/Reporting, and Role in the Country – are all covered in the 03-04 Annual Workplans, but with varying degrees of elaboration for each Program. This section explicitly discusses the means (frequency, and sometimes methodology and resources) the managers intend to take to ensure achievement of results and the projects monitoring.

## **Annual Reports**

The Table of Contents of the Outline provided by CIDA for the Program Annual Reports contains essentially the same headings as for the Annual Workplans. Since such Workplans started being produced in 2002-03, the corresponding FY Annual Reports were examined with a view to analyzing the degree of correlation between these two documents as well as the relevance of the information provided. The evaluation team main findings are as follows:

- All the required headings are covered in most of the annual reports. However, as in the Annual Workplans, what is expected by CIDA is interpreted differently by the various managers and covered with varying degrees of relevant detail.
- The contextual analyses relating to the cross-cutting themes present in the Annual Workplans for the period covered are often repeated word for word, with additions in some cases specifying the changes observed.
- In most reports, the risk analysis makes little or no reference to the degree of relevance of the strategy that was envisioned to mitigate the risks identified.
- Most of the assessment of the "actual achievements" is based on the "planned achievements" for 02-03 with explanations of the variances, but in some cases this "actual vs. planned" relationship is not established systematically: either the planned achievements are repeated word for word, without comment, or the planned achievements have been reformulated and are used as the basis for reporting.

All in all, what emerges from the analysis of the Annual Workplans and Reports is as follows:

- **A substantial effort has been made by the majority of the field managers to produce these documents, the main lines of which conform to the various headings of the Outline provided by CIDA (external and internal context, implications for the Program, planned achievements for the year, etc.).<sup>18</sup> However, each person's understanding of what is expected or required by CIDA is fairly different depending on the Program, despite the indications given in the Outline.**
- **The introduction of an annual planning process certainly enabled the LIP/PRP/GSP managers – and therefore the CIDA-HQ managers – to better define the stakes and priorities of their respective annual programming, taking into account the changing contexts in which the Programs operate. This planning process offers more clearly defined guidelines and benchmarks so that a report can then be made.**
- **However, despite the quality of several of the documents examined, the planning exercise followed by annual reporting still seems to be perceived by most managers as a chore, a compulsory task required by CIDA-HQ in which they have to complete each heading and fill in the tables, instead of as a useful and necessary exercise of performance management of the Program, and especially an exercise that meets their own needs for planning, programming and assessing achievements.**

This latter observation is important. The Evaluation Team found that all managers interviewed had a lot more to say about their Programs – and with much more enthusiasm, nuance, “colour” and specificity – than can be found in the documents, both in terms of what is being sought (planning) and in terms of the Programs’ actual achievements and more comprehensive results.

At this point the question arises as to the feasibility and usefulness of identifying fairly precise “planned annual achievements” in “fund programs”, which must remain flexible and “responsive” to the local environment’s changing contexts and needs/problems expressed by the applicant organizations.

Moreover, the evaluation team observed that the Program managers are not primarily guided in the subsequent project selection process by the “planned annual achievements” or the medium and short-term results, as identified in the most recent PPF. Instead, it is the priority issues and themes they have identified – sometimes more or less explicitly – in the Annual Workplans, and their close knowledge of the contexts and needs of the target clientele that orient the composition of the project portfolios, while considering the Program’s major objectives and goals. Thus, it is at the level of the priority issues and themes – such as democratic reforms, good governance and respect for human rights,

---

<sup>18</sup> Note that LIP Albania did not produce an Annual Workplan for 03-04, since this Program is in the process of closing.

harmonious reintegration of displaced populations and refugees, and peaceful cohabitation of the various ethnic entities – that the Annual Workplans offer a strategic vision of the Programs and allow their strategic achievement.

**In this regard, the evaluation team considers that the exercise of assessing the annual achievements should focus on and take as its main reference the degree of contribution of the respective portfolios to the Programs' major objectives and the degree of relevance of these portfolios in relation to the priority issues and themes as identified in the Annual Workplans.**

The various observations regarding the content of the Annual Workplans and Reports, and the different ways the managers interpret what is required, led the Evaluation Team to closely examine the Outlines provided by CIDA. The observations are as follows:

- These Outlines are very comprehensive both in their expected content and corresponding instructions. However, they tend to be too repetitive (e.g. requesting the identification of priorities, themes, focus, planned (or achieved) annual results under several headings; having nearly the same headings and type of required content in both Outlines) rather than helpful in focusing on the different types of information required. The instructions under each heading may somewhat be too detailed, sometimes being taken as restrictive and copied more or less word for word rather than adapted to the Programs' specifics.

**In general, these Outlines contain all the necessary elements for the production of the Annual Workplans and Reports, both in terms of required headings and instructions.**

**However, they ought to be extensively simplified, less repetitive and, above all, more focused on the essential so that they are truly user friendly and useful for the managers who have to produce them.**

Following these observations, the Evaluation Team recommends that the Annual Workplan and Report Outlines be discussed and revised in close collaboration with the field managers concerned. For this purpose, a discussion session and practical collective work could be integrated into the annual Program team meetings.

### **The Program Performance Framework**

A new PPF was produced with the aim of better defining the short and medium-term results of the LIP/PRP/GSP and associated performance indicators. This document should guide the planning of the three Programs and the evaluation of the achievement of their results. While the production of this new PPF represents a praiseworthy effort to clarify and add detail to the original (very general) PPF, its adequacy (or that of any PPF for this type of Program) is questionable and its effective use is difficult and limiting for the LIP managers interviewed.

Thus each element, taken separately, of this PPF is relevant in itself, the formulation of the short and medium-term results remains silent as to the specific nature of the contextual challenges facing these Programs: i) the transition from a context of conflict to a situation of peace and security; ii) the political transition to a type of democratic governance; and finally iii) the transition from a socialist planned economy to a market economy. In fact, even with its reference to refugees and displaced persons, this PPF is generic and could apply to Programs carried out in any other kind of context (e.g. Mali, Thailand, etc.).

Moreover, the PPF is attempting to cover simultaneously all three Programs. The GSP is operating in quite a different context, with somewhat different objectives, and has thus developed its own PPF that is significantly different from this overall PPF. If the latter PPF also had to apply to the GSP, harmonization of the GSP orientations, objectives and specificities with the LIP and PRP need to be undertaken.

Some of the short-term results and the related indicators do not really represent an actual priority of the Programs (e.g. Increased capacity of local organizations to network with other civil society organizations – and “number of coalitions created”); or may go beyond the Programs’ actual scope of intervention (e.g. Increased capacity of local governments to manage programs in economic, good governance and social sectors - and “quantity of government programs delivered, quality of programs, reach of programs”).

The PPF’s internal logic is not always obvious, particularly within the chain of medium and short-term results, and between the results and the corresponding performance indicators. To be useful it requires streamlining and adjustment.

**The LIP and PRP managers have made efforts to use the new PPF as a reference in their Annual Workplans for the short and medium-term results – which are often repeated verbatim. In some cases, they have attempted to add “planned annual achievements”, and have tried to report annually in relation to these same achievements.**

**However, using the PPF proved, more often than not, to be a somewhat forced exercise in intellectual gymnastics, in which the boxes are filled in mechanically or with difficulty, but which does not account rigorously and faithfully for the actual and specific priority orientations of the respective Programs, nor for the actual achievement of results under each Program.**



**In this perspective, the evaluation team questions the feasibility of establishing elaborate PPFs in “decentralized fund” Programs which are responsive and hence should remain flexible. Certainly, the major objectives, goals and priority themes or sectors must be clearly identified in advance with a view to serving as the primary guide for their implementation. But the formulation of the expected results and the indicators that allow them to be measured will always remain complex and difficult, even more so in the case of regional Programs covering several countries. Such an exercise will have to be practical and useful to the Program field managers, who should be the primary users of this type of planning and reporting tool.**

**The PPF should be simplified with the participation of field managers and beneficiaries at a work session where everyone could discuss and form a consensus on its contents. This would ensure its closest possible adequacy and ownership by all partners.**

#### **4.6 Conclusions on management**

On the whole, the various elements – structure and human resources, processes and tools – involved in the management of the Programs have allowed their effective and efficient implementation. The essential proof is the overall quality of the project portfolios implemented and their actual or likely overall results.

However, certain aspects of management can be improved to ensure greater efficiency and allow the responsible field managers to be accountable, not only more rigorously but more easily – with greater enjoyment and the “flavour of experience” - for the realities of the changing contexts in which the Programs operate and on progress achieved. Such improvements may also facilitate the drawing of lessons learned from operating in such post-conflict and multi-level transitional environments.

The management problems encountered in the GSP have significantly affected the functioning and the performance of this Program. In the last year, consistent efforts have been made within its team to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the programming process. The GSP has not yet reached its programming “cruising speed”, that would allow for the use of all funds yearly available to this program. A sustained and specific support from CIDA-HQ will still be required to find ways which are conducive to an effective and efficient implementation.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the central reasons for this evaluation was to provide CIDA with elements allowing it to determine whether *“the LIP/PRP/GSP – as a whole – is the most appropriate mechanism through which CIDA’s principles and policies<sup>19</sup> can be implemented in the Balkans”*. These principles include: local ownership, improved donor coordination, stronger partnerships, a results-based approach, greater coherence; and factors of central importance such as: good governance, building capacity in public and private sectors and engaging civil society.

This central question is the main object of this conclusion.

The analysis of the overall performance of the Programs and their relevance to the contexts and needs they address make it possible to affirm that the LIP/PRP/GSP mechanism has proven its appropriateness both by the underlying or expressed considerations regarding the aforementioned principles, and by its results and their coherence with the major issues confronting the region. Moreover, the mechanism’s very characteristics – decentralization of the definition of program content, flexibility, rapid decision-making, responsiveness and adaptability to local demand – make it a particularly appropriate tool to act in contexts that themselves are characterized by their various deep transition processes – political, economic and social – and by a transition from conflicts and humanitarian crises to the search for peace and stability.

The evaluation’s central question should also be examined in the light of the new orientations proposed by CIDA for the region, which are found in the Consultation Document *“Charting a course to 2010”<sup>20</sup>*, and summarized very briefly below:

This document states that *“It is important to consider (...) if and how Canada can maintain a meaningful role for itself in the peace building and transition process in the Balkans”*, specifying that there is a *“need to moderate the rapid decline of resources that will precede the end of Cabinet-authorized incremental funding in April 2002”*. One of the possible approaches would be *“to have Canada reorient its program to combine activities that respond to both peace building and transition imperatives (...) addressing issues that assist with the reform process while simultaneously promoting regional and/or inter-ethnic collaboration”*. And, *“as the region continues to stabilize, Canada’s assistance program in the Balkans would increasingly be reoriented to focus on institutional development, (and) a two-pronged strategy is proposed for consideration: 1) improve governments’ ability to deliver public goods such as health, education, rule of law and 2) support to civil society to counter the strength of entrenched interests and to promote the development of open and transparent governing institutions”*. On the other hand, *“for political and economic reasons, two countries stand out in the western Balkans as priorities for an elevated level of Canadian engagement: Bosnia and Herzegovina, and*

---

<sup>19</sup> As defined in the Document *« Canada making a difference in the world – a policy statement on strengthening aid effectiveness »* - CIDA, Sept. 2002

<sup>20</sup> CIDA in Central and Eastern Europe - Charting a course to 2010. Consultation Document. CIDA, Fall 2002.

the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo”. Finally, the document explains “that a longer time frame and commitment is required [in the Balkans] for comprehensive reform to take root, and that “Canada [should] remain engaged in a meaningful way over the next decade”.<sup>21</sup>

Given these orientations, it appears that the LIP/PRP/GSP mechanism is still appropriate, particularly in the two countries (FRY and BH) more specifically targeted, where the issues of peacebuilding and political and economic transitions are still crucially important. As for Croatia, the issue of the return and harmonious reintegration of refugee/IDP populations will necessitate further concerted efforts, and the LIP has played and could still play a role on this issue if support and guidance related to economic projects is provided within the Program team. Regarding the other countries currently covered by the LIP and GSP, the major challenges are economic and political transition, the improvement of governments’ capacity to deliver basic services such as education and healthcare and the necessity to strengthen the rule of law. The question of equitable treatment of minorities, including the Roma, remains a major challenge throughout the region, as does the growing poverty of a significant part of the population.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the positive effects that the LIP/PRP/GSP have had on Canada’s visibility and the values to which Canadians adhere are clearly greater in scope than the financial investments allocated. In the absence of other large-scale programs – bilateral or otherwise – the LIP/PRP/GSP can still contribute effectively to this visibility in the future.

Other mechanisms or “programming arrangements” are available in CIDA to address one or the other issues, themes or sectors that are at the heart of the Programs. However, the “local initiative fund” mechanism presents characteristics of responsiveness, flexibility, as well as the possibility to support directly local organizations, that are well adapted to multi-level transition contexts such as the Balkans, and that are rarely simultaneously present in other “delivery mechanisms

The management modalities such as to entrust implementation of local initiative funds to external executing agencies (private firms or NGOs) may be considered, but the costs would most probably be quite high, and it would increase the number of intermediaries involved in each country. In this perspective, the “PSU/KLIP arrangement” should be assessed<sup>22</sup> as such and might serve as a model to analyse the relative merits of such a delivery mechanism.

---

<sup>21</sup> Idem. pp 24, 25, 26.

<sup>22</sup> Such an assessment was beyond the TORs of this evaluation. However, the Evaluation Team has found that the PSU, with its team of experts has had a significant contribution in the Programs, notably in the development of management tools and professional advice.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations are aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of LIP/PRP/GSP mechanism. As most of these recommendations are already discussed in the previous sections, they are summarized below:

### Knowledge management:

- An in-depth study on factors and conditions favouring the strengthening of civil society in post-conflict and multi-transition context would be useful to the Programs, similar CIDA decentralized funds and other regions in the world. LIP/PRP/GSP managers and NGOs present in the Balkans specialized in capacity building would be key resource persons.

### Program Planning and Reporting:

- If the funds are to be renewed for a third generation, consideration should be given to aligning their strategic orientation to some of the findings and recommendations outlined in this evaluation.
- The whole process of planning and reporting should be designed in such a way that it becomes primarily aimed at performance management of programmatic issues (rather than be perceived as an obligatory task responding primarily to CIDA-HQ needs). The following recommendations elaborate this issue:
  - The Annual Workplan and Report Outlines ought to be simplified, less repetitive and more focused so that they are truly “user friendly”. This should be discussed and revised in close collaboration with all Program managers- ideally within a working session that could be integrated into the annual regional Program team meeting.
  - If a comprehensive Program Performance Framework is to be maintained as a reference tool for Programs workplans, reports and evaluations, its content should be discussed, and as needed revised, through a concerted effort – e.g. at a collective work session integrated as well into the annual regional Program team meeting. This would ensure the closest possible relevance and ownership by the field managers
  - The exercise of reporting Programs annual achievements should be focused on the degree of contribution of the respective portfolios to the Programs’ major objectives, and their relevance to the priority issues and themes as identified in the Annual Workplans (rather than be based on somewhat hypothetical “planned annual achievements”). This applies for CIDA-HQ as well as for Program managers.
- Gender analysis in due form should be part of the Annual Workplans and serve as one of the basis for programming and reporting.

### Training / Support to Program Managers :

- Advanced analysis and operational training on GE issues should be provided to all Program managers.

- Sustained support, in terms of guidance, feed-back, training on management and developmental issues, as well as field visits, from CIDA-HQ should be increased for Programs where there is no CIDA personnel.
- For the GSP a sustained and specific support from CIDA-HQ will still be required to ensure effective and efficient implementation.
- Training and/or specialized consultant support related to specific issues pertaining to economic development projects should be offered by CIDA to all Program managers who intend to include such projects in their programming.

**Project Selection:**

- Clarifications and details should be provided to the Program managers as to what should be considered “overhead costs” and “operating costs” and the admissible maximum of 15% may need to be revised as far as “operating costs” are concerned.
- In order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall selection and approval process, pre-screening, for the GSP, should be simplified and be the responsibility of the LEP Technical Program Officer.
- The applicant organizations’ “good governance”, transparency and accountability to their constituency should be part of the selection criteria.
- The experience and capacity of applicant organizations submitting “economic projects” should be more closely assessed during the selection process.
- Lessons should be drawn from the results of the on-going experience of “calls for proposals” in the Kosovo and Serbia/Montenegro LIPs and they should be shared with the other Programs.

**Project Description Document:**

- Proposals for economic projects (income generation activities, support to entrepreneurs and to SME, etc.) should systematically include feasibility and profitability analysis.
- Project description included in the PADs and in the Contribution Agreement should include observable qualitative and measurable quantitative data with regards to results expected and/or activities to be undertaken as well as a relatively detailed project implementation schedule.
- Applicant organizations should be required to offer a gender equity analysis, and if applicable, a GE strategy, with measurable results more extensively documented in their proposals.
- As stated previously, the Project Performance Framework should be simplified and integrated in the Contribution Agreement for monitoring and reporting.

**Project Monitoring and Reporting:**

- The use of a consultant to help in the monitoring process should be extended to all Programs where the scope and the complexity of the portfolio justify it, notably to Bosnia Herzegovina PRP.
- Monitoring grids should be prepared for project visits, and should include questions to be addressed and specific key benchmarks to be assessed – on the basis of Project Description Document included in the Contribution Agreement.
- Monitoring reports should be systematically produced and filed. It is also recommended that these reports are shared with the visited recipient organization as a tool for follow-up but as well as a mean for capacity development.
- Recipient organizations should be required to offer gender-disaggregated data in their end-of-project reports.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Summary description of LIP/PRP/GSP**

## **SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE LIP/PRP/GSP**

### ***Goals, objectives and results expected***

The Programs' goals, objectives and expected results are stated in their respective Program Approval Documents (PADs).

*The Local Initiatives Program (LIP) and the Peacebuilding Response Program (PRP) share the following goal and objective:*

“The goal is to support international efforts to promote sustainable peace, prosperity and democracy in the region.”

“The objective is to support the Government of Canada's cooperation program in the areas of economic assistance, community based rehabilitation, peace building and democratic consolidation”.

The results expected from the LIP are:

- Improvement of people's life.
- Demonstration of Canada's commitment in peace building and rehabilitation in the region.
- Complementarities with Canada's bilateral cooperation projects.
- Improvement of capacities of local communities and regions to act in the fields of humanitarian, social, economics and democratic development sectors.
- Improvement of capacities of local institutions and organizations.

The results expected from the PRP are:

- Small – scale high impact community rehabilitation, reconstruction, humanitarian assistance, economic, good governance and democratization, human and minority rights, environmental development projects.
- The projects should complement Canada's overall approach and plan for the country and add flexibility and rapidity to Canada's response to the local realities and needs. They should also contribute to the local economy.

*The Governance Support Program (GSP) has its own goal and objective:*

“The goal is to bring local support to international efforts to promote sustainable development and good governance in Romania, Bulgaria and Moldova.”

“The objective is to support sector objectives and Canadian program in social development, governance, public administration & energy/environment, with a reform & capacity development focus.”

The stated expected results of the GSP are:



- Intermediate – scale projects that promise longer term results in terms of governance, institutional sustainability in RO, BG, MD / region.
- Projects that complement Canada's current programming and overall approach / framework for each country and the region.
- Projects that add flexibility and hasten Canada's response to local needs and priorities in the 3 countries / regions.

The same goals and objectives appear in a *Program Performance Framework* (PPF) developed in 2001-02 for the LIP. However, a modified PPF was later on developed (2002-03)<sup>23</sup> in CIDA (RZE) covering all three Programs and reformulating their overall orientations as follows:

Priorities: "Civil society policy role, good governance, basic human needs, gender equality as one of the priorities".

Goal: "To contribute to the consolidation of social stability, pluralistic democracy and sustainable peace in the Balkan region"

Objectives: "To contribute to the strengthening of civil society and effective democratic institutions in the Balkan region, as well as to promote the reintegration of returnees".

Long term result: "Increased engagement of and among local stakeholders in decision-making processes and in the governance structure",

Medium term results: 1) Strengthened advocacy role of civil society; 2) Improved responsiveness of local government to the priorities of civil society; 3) Improved quality of the target populations in the region.

A list of short term results is also provided, as well as Performance indicators, risks and mitigation strategies.

### **Programs overview**

The LIP/PRP/GSP support small local initiatives - projects - with a value in the range of \$50,000, but may be considered for eligibility up to \$100,000 with justification. Programs recipients can include credible civil society organizations, local NGOs, Canadian NGOs working locally, local chapters of international NGOs, academic organizations, grassroots organizations, international or governmental institutions of the various countries.

The approval of the projects comes from CIDA/HQ in accordance with existing branch level of authority.

The Programs have a duration of three to four years. Each Program has its own budget and covers its own geographic area, as seen in the table below:

---

<sup>23</sup> Ref. to Appendix II

**Global and Annual Budgets per Country / Province for Each Program**

<b>Country / Province / FY</b>	<b>00-01</b>	<b>01 - 02</b>	<b>02-03</b>	<b>03-04</b>	<b>04 - 05</b>	<b>2000-2005</b>
<b>LIP</b>						
Albania		400,000	400,000	400,000		1,200,000
Croatia		600,000	700,000	700,000		2,000,000
Serbia / Montenegro		1,300,000	1,200,000	1,200,000		3,700,000
Kosovo		1,400,000	1,200,000	1,200,000		3,800,000
Macedonia		600,000	600,000	600,000		1,800,000
<b>Total LIP</b>						<b>12,500,000</b>
<b>PRP</b>						
Bosnia / Herzegovina	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000		2,000,000
<b>Total PRP</b>						<b>2,000,000</b>
<b>GSP Northern Balkans :</b>		500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	<b>2,000,000</b>
Moldova						
Romania						
Bulgaria						

Source : PADs

## **APPENDIX II**

**Lists of projects visited/discussed with recipients organizations  
during field mission, of persons interviewed,  
and of documents consulted**

**List of LIP/PRP/GSP projects visited and/or discussed  
with recipient organizations during field mission**

**LIP – Serbia / Montenegro**

***CeSID***

Domestic Monitoring – Presidential Elections in Serbia

Monitoring of Local Elections in Montenegro

Monitoring of Elections in Southern Serbia

***OTPOR***

Anti-Corruption Campaign

***Center for Development of the Non-Profit Sector in Serbia (CRNPS)***

Printing the Directory of NGOs & Institutional Support

***Ministry of Education and Sports***

International Conference Support for Education Reform

***Humanitarian Law Center***

Training of Judges, Prosecutors (2 projects)

***CARE Yugoslavia / DUR***

Broadening Horizons of Roma Youth and Young Adults

Gender Awareness Program for School Teachers

Emergency Supply of Heating Stoves to Collective Centers

***Catholic Relief Services***

Civil Society Inclusion in Serbia PRSP Process

***Housing and Property Directorate - UN Habitat / UNMIK***

Media and Public Awareness Campaign in Serbia

***CHF / Cooperative Housing Foundation / USAID-OTI***

Confidence Building Measures

***Management Center***

Anti-Corruption Policy Training for Public Servants

***OSCE***

Management and Supervision Training for Police Managers

**LIP / Kosovo**

***Municipality of Obiliq and Women's committee for Human Rights***

Farmers' Market

***Kosovar Institute for NGO Law***

NGO Law Reform

***CARE international in Kosovo***

Consortium for Inter-Ethnic Dialogue

***Norma (Association for Legal Aid for Women)***

Women's legal Aid for Minorities

***CECI***

Sports Field and Community Space

***American Refugee Committee***

Emergency Winter Shelter for Vulnerable Minorities.

***Zavet Business Service***

Serb – Albanian Small Business Service

***Children's Aid Direct and American Refugee Committee***

Serb Youth Radio Programming

***International Aid***

Primary Health Care for Minorities

***Liria***

Sugar Packaging

***UMCOR and Youth Center***

Kids on the net

**GSP / Romania**

***Save the Children Romania***

Pre-School Education for the Roma Children

***Terra-Millennium III***

Good Practices in Energy Efficiency

***Center for Legal Resources***

Together Against Domestic Violence

***Centras***

NGOs and the Mass Media

**LIP / Croatia**

***Croatian Chamber of Craftsman and Trades (HOK)***

Internet Business Connection

***ADRA Croatia***

Emergency Repair Family Houses for Returnees

Winter Aid for Refugees & Returnees Lika Region

***Center for Global Development & Cooperation***

Economic Revitalization in Slunj

***Female Multimedia Centre - NONE***

Training Video Editing, Graphic, Web Design for Mine Victims

***Informativno Pravni Centar (IPC)***

Legal Services for Refugees, IDPs and Returnees

***Serbian Democratic Forum***

Accelerated Processing Reconstruction Applications

Legal Assistance in Novska

Cooperation NGO Sector and Local Self-Mgt

## **List of persons interviewed**

### **CIDA / Hull**

Hélène Corneau, Director RZE-CEE  
Yannick Hingorani, Program Officer, RZE-CEE

### **Serbia / Montenegro**

Ambassador McLellan  
Barbara Curran, Head of Aid, Technical Cooperation  
Srdjan Svircev, Program Officer, Technical Cooperation  
Gordana Miljevic , Ministry of Education and Sport  
Jelena Markovi, Ministry of Human Rights and Ethnic Minorities  
Branka Petrovic, Zarko Pauvonic, Zoran Markovic, CRNPS  
Marko Blagojevic, Galja Tomcanji, CeSID  
Nenad Konstantinovic, Slobodan Homen, Nenad Durdevic, OTPOR  
Nicolass Waterschoot, OSCE  
Olja Babic and Michiel Van der Ven, Embassy of Netherlands  
Thomas Garofalo, Catholic Relief Services  
Thimothy M. Madigan, Darko Radicanin, CHF international  
Sanya Pesek, Gordana Delic, Freedom House  
Howard Robinson, Director, Alexandra Levaditis, Program manager, UMCOR  
Aleksander Fatic, Maja Stosic, The Management Center  
Jury Jarviaho, Embassy of Finland  
Budimir Ivanisevic, Program Manager, Humanitarian Law Center  
Richard de la Falaise, HPD – UN-Habitat  
Jim Newkirk, CARE Yugoslavia  
Beneficiaries of projects visited, where available

### **Kosovo**

Tamara Sorger, Head of Aid  
Michelle Veilleux, Director of Program Support Unit (PSU)  
Nora Spahiu, Coordinator / KLIP Program, PSU  
Stojana Danic, Director, Women's Committee for Human Rights  
Musa Mjekigi, Chief Agricultural Sector, Municipality of Obiliq  
Gjylieta Mushkolaj, Director Kosovar Institute for NGO Law  
Flaka Surroi, Director, Community Development Fund  
Dimal Hoxha, Project Manager, Policy and Program Officer, CARE / CID  
Edita Kusari, Director, Gjyli Arifi, president, NORMA  
Luan Shllaku, Director, Foundation for Open Society  
Field Monitor, American Refugee Committee  
Cinky Ko, Advisor, Zavet Business Center  
Oliver Vujovic, Director, Communication for Social Development  
Thomas P. Dwyer, Head of Mission, UMCOR

Aferdlte Sylja, Manager, Youth Center, Djiljan  
Nazvje Bumjualas, Coordinator of Women Ass, Liria  
Shokje Rexhojov, Assistant project, Liria  
Beneficiaries of projects visited, where available

**LIP / Croatia**

Dennis A. Snider, Ambassador  
Drazen Focic, Technical Cooperation Program Officer  
Vanja Sikirica, Monitoring Consultant  
Durda Miklauzic, NONE  
Vladimir Zanic and Mr. Banda, Croatian Chamber of Craftsmen and Trades  
Tihomir Lipohar, Country Director, ADRA  
Ljubo Manojlovic and Miroslav Grozdanic, Serbian Democratic Forum  
Ljiljana Basura, President, IPC  
Mr. Malvik, Norwegian Embassy  
Mr. Verhejden, Netherlands Embassy  
Representant, Japan Embassy  
Beneficiaries of projects visited, where available

**GSP / Romania**

Ambassador Girard  
Annyick Amyot, Head of Aid, Technical Cooperation  
Ligia Marincus, Program Officer, Technical Cooperation  
Gabriel Petrescu, Executive Director, Open Society Foundation  
Gabriela Alexandrescu, President, Save the Children Romania  
Viorel Micescu, President, and Ioana Olteanu, Project Manager – Centras  
Victor Radulescu, Project Officer, USAID  
Lavinia Andrei, Project Manager, Terra Millenium III  
Gratiela Vantu, Center for Legal Resources  
Coziana Georgescu, Minodora Farcas, Municipality of Ploiesti  
Maria Pantaia, Gratiela Vantu – Police Office, Municipality of Ploiesti  
Representatives of local stakeholders – Project Together Against Domestic Violence

## **List of Documents Consulted**

### **CIDA Policy Documents:**

Canada Making a Difference in the World – A Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness, September 2002.

CIDA in Central and Eastern Europe – Charting a Course to 2010. Consultation Document. Fall 2002.

Technical Cooperation in South Eastern Europe – CIDA's Strategy for 2004-2010. Discussion Paper. CIDA, May 2003

### **CIDA HQ Program / Projects Documents:**

LIP/PRP/GSP Program Approval Documents (PADs)

Program Performance Frameworks (PPF) (2001, 2003)

CIDA's Outline for Annual Workplans

CIDA's Outline for Annual Reports

LIP/PRP/GSP Annual Workplans 2002-03, 2003-04

LIP/PRP/GSP Annual Reports 2001-02, 2002-03

General Correspondence in Programs' Files

Lists and Summaries of Projects by Country/Province

Sample of Project Approval Documents for countries not visited

Lists of Projects from all CIDA Sections for the Balkans Region

LIP Review – Macedonia, CIDA March 2003

### **In the Field (Serbia, Romania, Kosovo, Croatia)**

Sample of Project Files including:

- Correspondence with CIDA HQ and Recipient Organizations
- Project Proposals
- Project Approval Documents
- Monitoring Reports
- End-of-Project Reports

List of Proposals Received in each Program

Documents from Recipient Organizations

Documents from Other Donors

### **Others**

Evaluation of the LIP and PRP Programs in the Balkans, Final Report, Interalia 2001

Balkan News on the Net

CRNPS – Weekly Newsletters

UNDP - various reports on the Balkans

World Bank - various reports on the Balkans

EU – various reports on the Balkans

Le Monde Diplomatique – Articles on the Balkans

International Crisis Group – Articles on the Balkans



**APPENDIX III**  
**LIP/PRP/GSP PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK**  
**CIDA May 2003**

<b>Priorities:</b>	Civil society policy role, good governance, BHN, GE as one of the priorities			
<b>Project Goal:</b>	To contribute to the consolidation of social stability, pluralistic democracy and sustainable peace in the Balkan region.			
<b>Objectives:</b>	To contribute to the strengthening of civil society and effective democratic institutions in the Balkan region, as well as to promote the reintegration of returnees.			
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Short-term Results</b>	<b>Reach</b>	<b>Medium term results</b>	<b>Long term results</b>
<b>Sub-projects</b>	1.1 Improved knowledge, awareness of various democratic governance issues (i.e. gender equality, democratic principles, disability issues, ethnic minorities, youth, etc.) by members of the general public 1.2 Improved capacity of local civil society organizations to plan, implement, and manage projects 1.3 Increased capacity of local organizations to network with other civil society organizations (including regional level)	1.1 General population in the region 1.2/1.3 Civil society organizations	1. Strengthened advocacy role of civil society	Increased engagement of and among local stakeholders in decision-making processes and in the governance structures.
	2.1 Improved knowledge and understanding of priorities of general population (disability issues, ethnic minorities, youth, child protection, etc.) by target government institutions 2.2 Increased capacity of local governments to manage programs in economic, good governance and social sectors	2.1/2.2 Governmental organizations (various levels)	2. Improved responsiveness of local government to the priorities of civil society	
	3.1 Increased provision of basic human needs for target groups 3.2 Increased employment generation opportunities for target groups (training, SME support, entrepreneurship training)	3.1/3.2 Refugees, IDPs, minority groups, women)	3. Improved quality of life of the target populations in the region	

	Performance Indicators	Performance Indicators	Performance Indicators
	Performance Indicators	Performance Indicators	Performance Indicators
	<p>1.1a Attendance at events organized by applicants (disaggregated by sex)</p> <p>1.1b Perceived change in awareness of various democratic governance issues by the target population of the sub-projects</p> <p>1.2a Improvement in quality of project proposals presented by the organizations (in case of repeated requests)</p> <p>1.2b Quality of project management practices in the organization</p> <p>1.3 Number of regional conferences organized, number of new coalitions created</p> <p>2.1 Change in perception of various human rights and democratic development issues by government representatives</p> <p>2.2 Quantity of government programs delivered; quality of programs, reach of programs</p> <p>3.1 Number of beneficiaries reached (disaggregated by sex, age)</p> <p>3.2a Variety of training/support offered (disaggregated by sex, target group)</p>	<p>1a Change in behaviour of the target population (participation in elections, participation in public awareness campaigns, etc.)</p> <p>1b. Extent of NGO participation in regional networks on governance/human rights issues</p> <p>2a. Change in quantity/quality of sustainable programming geared towards target groups</p> <p>2b. Change in number/quality of deliberation with civil society on variety of democratic issues</p> <p>3a. Number of people finding jobs after the training/support received</p> <p>3b. Change in economic situation of the targeted population</p>	<p>Emerging national and regional policies reflecting participation of various groups</p> <p>Openness of government to local advocacy on human rights</p>
	Risks and Mitigating Strategies		
	<p>Lack of interest in LIP/PRP. This is a relatively low risk that will be mitigated by public relations activities by the posts.</p> <p>Civil sector organizations are weak and become fully dependent on LIP funding. This risk will be mitigated by assessment of possible self-sustainability of the organizations, by focusing on organizations showing good future potential.</p>	<p>There is a risk that civil society and government would not want to work together. The project will make sure to address both ends of the spectrum with a balance of support between government and civil society organizations/individuals. Targeting both will try to create change and cooperation opportunities between them.</p>	<p>Political instability in the region leads to reversal of democratic transition process. This is a moderate risk that is being mitigated by Canada and the international community's support for peacebuilding and reconstruction programming in the region.</p>

#### **APPENDIX IV**

##### **Lists of Projects Approved in FY 2001-02 and 2002-03 for Each Country/Province**

Sources: CIDA-HQ lists and summaries of projects & Programs Annual Reports

**LIP Projects 2001-02 and 2002-03 (1)****ALBANIA**

Theme / Sector	Year	Project Title	Executing Agency or Recipients	Total \$ Approved
<b><i>Human Development / Social Capital</i></b>				
Education	2001-02	Partnership in Active Learning	World Vision	\$30 000
Health	2001-02	Reproductive Health in Perondi (Women)	(2)	\$39 752
Minority Groups / Vulnerable Groups	2001-02	STD and HIV Aids	(2)	\$17 783
	2001-02	Psychosocial Support & Training	Help Life	\$15 200
	2002-03	...		
	2002-03	Slaves Never Again - Combating Trafficking (W)	Reparation Servant Sister of Mary	\$42 038
Child Protection	2002-03	Social & Legal Service & Comm. Dev. ...	Refugee and Migrant Services in Albania	\$43 505
	2002-03	Targeting Domestic Violence (w)	UNICEF	\$68 059
	2001-02	Mainstreaming of Child. With Difficulties	Children's Aid Direct	\$46 000
	<b><i>Social / Sub-Total</i></b>		<b><i>8 projects</i></b>	<b><i>\$302 337</i></b>
<b>Economic Growth</b>	2001-02	Rural Comm. Economic Social Dev.	Project for Civil Education Association	\$37 500
	2001-02	Social Economic Dev. Of Elbasan Region	Elbasan Regional Dev. Agency Association	\$16 500
	2002-03	Strength. Female Participation in Econ. Life (W)	Women, Time and Economy	\$87 500
<b><i>Economic / Sub-Total</i></b>		<b><i>3 projects</i></b>	<b><i>\$141 500</i></b>	<b><i>16%</i></b>
<b><i>Democratization / Rule of Law</i></b>				
	2001-02	Police Training on Human Rights	Free Albania Towards Europe	\$48 000
	2001-02	Publication Code Int'l Law & Training	European Centre	\$33 000
	2001-02	Community Policing & Educational	Institute for Democracy &	\$24 000

<b>Support to Third Sector (NGOs)</b>	2001-02	System Albanian Media & Respect of Minority Rights	Mediation Albanian Human Rights Group	\$34 620	
	2002-03	Public-Private Sector: Citizens Guide to Budget	The Public-Private Finance Institute	\$39 909	
	2002-03	Destruction of ammunition	NAMSA	\$100 000	
	2001-02	NGO Capacity Building	Int'l Rescue Committee	\$45 000	
	2001-02	Strength. Local NGO Cap. In Project Mgmt	Partners-Albania Ctre for Change & Conflict Mg.	\$59 000	
<b>Democratization / Sub-Total</b>		<b>8 projects</b>		<b>\$383 529</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>Environment</b>	2001-02	Local Agenda 21 (Environmental Education)	(2)	\$45 892	
<b>Environment / Sub-Total</b>		<b>1 project</b>		<b>\$45 892</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>TOTAL ALBANIA</b>		<b>20 projects</b>		<b>\$873 258</b>	

(1) One project from Annual Report 01-02 not included as information is missing in CIDA HQ and no financial information is provided in Report

(2) Annual Report does not provide information on Executing Agency

## LIP Projects 2001-02 and 2002-03

## CROATIA

Theme / Sector	FY	Project Title	Executing Agency or Recipients	Total \$ Approv.	%
<i>Social</i>					
Capacity Building	2001-02	Cap. Building for Local Social Work Officials	Society for Psychological Assistance	\$41 000	
		Conflict Mgmt & Community Social Reconstruction	Society for Psychological Assistance	\$40 765	
Trafficking	2002-03	Assist. Protection Women Rescued from Trafficking (W)	Int'l Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC)	\$42 037	
<b><i>Social / Sub-Total</i></b>		<b><i>3 projects</i></b>		<b><i>\$123 802</i></b>	<b><i>8%</i></b>
<i>Democratic Development</i>	2001-02	Electronic Archives of News Coverage 87-99	Electronic News Library	\$40 000	
<i>Human Rights, Civil Society</i>		Parliamentary Mission Staff Development	Croatia Office of National Democratic Inst.	\$40 000	
<i>Governance</i>		Judges Web Phase II	Judges Web and Microsoft Croatia	\$40 000	
		Alternative Methods of Labour Dispute Resolution	Croatian Law Centre (CLC)	\$44 036	
	2002-03	Intro. to Parl. System to High School Students	GONG	\$13 200	
		Youth Focused Voter Education Project	GONG	\$29 024	
		Coop. Non-Gov. Sector & Local Self-Mgmt	Serbian Democratic Forum	\$34 580	
		Public Has a Right to Know	Croatian Journalist Association	\$50 066	
		Accelerated Processing Reconstr. Applications	Serbian Democratic Forum	\$81 307	
		Citizens and their Rights	Croatian Law Centre (CLC)	\$45 000	

<i>Democratic, HR, Civil Soc. Sub-Total</i>		<i>10 projects</i>		<i>\$417 213</i>	<i>27%</i>
<i>Employment Generation</i>	2001-02	Cottage Industry & Handicraft Development (W)	Centre for Creative Alternatives	\$39 000	
		Construction of Market in Dvor	Int'l Rescue Committee	\$50 000	
		Economic Revitalization in Slunj	Centre for Global Dev. & Co-op.	\$35 630	
		Skilled Craftsmen Workshop	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	\$40 000	
		Dev. Video Production Employing Mine Victims	Female Multimedia Centre	\$27 737	
		Production of Humus	NONE		
			Farming Co-Operative Raseljka	\$42 400	
		Economic Incentive Program	Town of Benkovac	\$50 000	
		SME Dev. In Sibensko-Kninska	Local Econ. Dev. Agency of Sibenik-Kine	\$48 856	
	2002-03	Internet Business Connection	Croatian Chamber of Craftsmen (HOK)	\$43 821	
		Acquisition of farming equipment	Farming Co-operative Vila Velebita	\$40 292	
		Training Video Editing, Graphic, Web Design War Vic. (W)	Female Multimedia Centre	\$48 848	
			NONE		
<i>Employment Generation / Sub-Total</i>		<i>11 projects</i>		<i>\$466 584</i>	<i>30%</i>
<i>Refugees, IDPs and Returnees</i>	2001-02	Emergency Winter Relief for Returnees	Croatian Red Cross	\$33 350	
		Winter Aid to Returnees	ADRA	\$50 000	
		Reconstruction & Light Furnishing 6 Houses	Norwegian Refugee Committee	\$42 000	
		Legal Assistance in Novska	Serbian Democratic Forum	\$35 000	
		Cap. Building & Economic Revitalization	Centre for Global Dev. and Co-op	\$30 250	
		Community Water Infrastructure Needs	Catholic Relief Services	\$41 631	
		2002-03	Emergency Repair Family Houses for Returnees	ADRA Croatia	\$54 940



	Winter Aid for Refugees & Returnees Lika Region	ADRA Croatia	\$15 165	
	Hydro-geological Research Water Skabrnja	Municipality of Skabrnja	\$50 000	
	Legal Services Refugees, Displaced, Returnees	Informativno pravni centar (IPC)	\$49 417	
	Rehabilitation Kakma Water System	Municipality of Polaca	\$51 543	
	Reconstruction Comm. Ctre & Med. Clinic	Municipality of Lovas	\$41 536	
	Reconstruction School in Prekopakra	Municipality Pakrac, Elementary School	\$38 802	
<b>Refugees / Sub-Total</b>	<b>13 projects</b>		<b>\$533 634</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>TOTAL CROATIA</b>	<b>37 projects</b>		<b>\$1 541 233</b>	

**LIP / GSP / PRD Projects 2001-02 and  
2002-03**
**SERBIA / MONTENEGRO**

Theme / Sector	FY	Project Title	Executing Agency or Recipients	Total \$ Approved	%
<i>Social</i> Education	2002-03	Int'l Conf. Support for Educ. Reform	Ministry of Education and Sport	\$60 870	
		Integrated Education Activities in N. Montenegro	UNICEF	\$62 100	
Health	2001-02	Diminishing Discrimination	Youth of the Yugoslav Assoc. Against Aids	\$48 280	
	2002-03	Establishment Family Medicine Teaching Centre	Dom Zdravlja (Health Centre) Podgorica	\$100 000	
		Youth-Oriented Aids Awareness Raising Campaign	Youth of the Yugoslav Assoc. Against Aids	\$47 000	
Gender / Trafficking	2001-02	"Open Your Eyes" Awareness Raising Campaign (W)	ASTRA: Anti-Sex Trafficking Action	\$27 000	
		Gender Awareness Program for School Teachers (W)	Care Yugoslavia	\$99 067	
	2002-03	Anti Sex Trafficking Action (W)	Assoc. Women's Initiatives & ASTRA	\$91 523	
<b>Social / Sub-Total</b>		<b>8 projects</b>		<b>\$535 840</b>	<b>21%</b>
<i>Democratic Development</i> <i>Human Rights, Civil Society</i>	2001-02	Anti-Corruption Campaign	OTPOR!	\$91 000	
		Child-Rights Campaign	UN Commissioner for Human Rights	\$8 100	
		Training of Judges, Prosecutors ...	Humanitarian Law Centre	\$40 000	
		Printing the Directory of NGOs & Inst. Support ....	CRNPS	\$42 472	

	Library of Fed. Parliament of Yugoslavia ...	Federal Parliament	\$99 000
	Support to Dev. & Aid Coord. Unit (DACU)	Gov. of Serbia	\$42 703
	Mgmt & Supervision Training for Police Managers	OSCE	\$70 169
	Regional Youth Conference of Roma	Roma Information Centre	\$33 420
	Balkan Debate Forum	Belgrade Open School	\$43 000
	Removal of Architectural Barriers	Association of Disabled Students	\$44 215
	Tolerance Building for Youth in Sandzak Region	Care Yugoslavia	\$98 875
	Confidence Building Measures (7 projects)	USAID-OTI	\$98 825
	Eight Annual Congress	Independent Journalists' Association	\$5 060
	Yugoslav Lawyers' Committee for Human Rights (W)	Yugoslav Lawyers' Committee for HR	\$64 000
2002-03	Monitoring of Local Elections in Montenegro	CeSid	\$52 845
	Monitoring of Elections in Southern Serbia	CeSid	\$17 450
	Capacity Building Program 2002-03	Hajde da ...	\$28 600
	Anti Corruption Policy Training for Public Servants...	The Management Centre	\$30 080
	Strengthening of Civil Soc. In East. & South. Serbia	UMCOR	\$91 650
	Domestic Monitoring Pres. Elections Serbia	CeSid	\$77 845
	Monitoring Parl. Elections Montenegro Oct. 02	Centre for Monitoring (CEMI)	\$48 200
	Conference of Judges of Serbia 2002	Supreme Court of Serbia	\$48 200
	Civil Society Inclusion in Serbia PRSP Process	Catholic Relief Services	\$93 000

		Regional Aids Project "Include Them All"	Youth of Jazas	\$56 825	
		NGO Bulletin - Voice of NGOs	Centre for Dev. of NGOs (CRNVO)	\$45 835	
		Broadening Horizons of Roma Youth and Young Adlt	CARE and DUR	\$100 000	
		Training Judges, Prosecutors ...	Humanitarian Law Centre	\$93 000	
<b>Democratic, HR, Civil Soc. Sub-Total</b>		<b>27 projects</b>		<b>\$1 564 369</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>Income Generation, Economy</b>	2001-02	Economic Empowerment Women Rural Vojvodina (W)	Women's Multiethnic Group Seleus	\$21 123	
	2002-03	East Serbian Small Business Support Program	Timok Club	\$59 200	
<b>Income Generation / Sub-Total</b>		<b>2 projects</b>		<b>\$80 323</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Refugee Return &amp; (Re)Integration, Humanitarian Assistance</b>	2001-02	Emergency Supply of Heating Stoves to Collective Ctr	Care Yugoslavia	\$100 000	
		Media & Public Awareness Campaign in Serbia	UN Interim Admin. Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)	\$101 163	
	2002-03	One Step for Return	Refugee Return Service (RRS)	\$52 135	
		Winterization Program for Blind Persons	Adventist Dev. & Relief Agency	\$99 200	
<b>Refugees, Humanitarian .. / Sub-Total</b>		<b>4 projects</b>		<b>\$352 498</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>TOTAL SERBIA / MONTENEGRO</b>		<b>41 projects</b>		<b>\$2 533 030</b>	

## LIP Projects 2001-02 and 2002-03

### KOSOVO

Theme / Sector	FY	Project Title	Executing Agency or Recipients	Total \$	%
<i>Social</i>					
Social Sustainability: Child and Youth Protection	2001-02	Drop in Centre for Child. & Adolesc. at Risk	Triangle Generation Humanitarian	\$50 000	
		Sports Field & Community Spaces	CECI	\$53 000	
		Kids on the Net	United Methodist Committee on Relief	\$56 000	
		Kamenica Youth Centre	American Refugee Committee (ARC)	\$47 000	
		Serb Regional Youth Radio Programming	Media Action International	\$45 540	
		Income Generation for Youth Centre Network	Kosovo Action Together (KAT)	\$27 000	
		Youth Issues - Open Air Cinema	ORJER	\$3 600	
		Health, Youth Environment / Radio Program	Children's Aid Direct	\$49 877	
	2002-03	Creative Work & Play for Peaceful Future	Drejt Ardhmerise Pagesore	\$30 315	
Social Protection : Education	2001-02	Adult Education for Egyptians and Roma	Forum for Democratic Initiatives	\$48 500	
	2002-03	Student Newsletter "Future"	Independent Student Union	\$25 780	
Social Protection : Health	2001-02	Primary Care Support for Minority Populations	International Aid (IA)	\$49 000	
		Support Kosovo Institute Forensic Medicine	Kosovo Inst. of Forensic Medicine	\$29 000	
	2002-03	Waste Collection in Decan Municipality	AGIMI	\$27 000	
		Health House Repair	Care International	\$9 380	

		Tot HIV/AIDS Peer Educators	Youth of Jazas	\$9 000	
		Maternity Unit Equipment Improvements (W)	Canadian Public Health Association	\$5 775	
		Maternity Unit Air Conditioning (W)	University Hospital, Pristina	\$50 000	
Gender	2002-03	Linking Women's Initiatives BiH & Kosovo (W)	VITA	\$39 000	
		Response to Gender Based Violence (W)	Women's Wellness Centre	\$73 577	
Trafficking	2002-03	Crisis Shelter for Trafficked Persons (W)	Pristina Municipality	\$99 120	
<b>Social / Sub-Total</b>		<b>21 projects</b>		<b>\$827 464</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>Human Rights, Democratic</b>	2001-02	Civic Bridges, Empowering Citizen Groups	Kosovo Action for Civic Initiatives (KACI)	\$42 600	
<b>Development, Good Governance,</b>		Accountability Campaign : Elections 2001	The Forum	\$46 150	
<b>Civil Society</b>		Local Dialogue & Inclusion in Pec/Peya	Kosovo Centre for Human Rights (KCHR)	\$45 205	
		Human Rights Academy	Kosovo Centre for Human Rights (KCHR)	\$28 628	
		Language Training for Bosniac Minorities	Women for Women - Kosova	\$25 200	
		Society of Certified Accountants & Auditors	(part of World Bank's program)	\$37 340	
	2002-03	NGO Law Reform	Kosovo Institute for NGO Law	\$39 025	
		Civic Information Centre	Circle of Serbian Sisters	\$40 900	
		Communication Tools for Advocacy Dev.	Foundation for Democratic Initiatives	\$44 838	
		HR Review & Anti-Corruption Handbook	HR Centre, University of Pristina	\$49 500	
		Capacity Building of Rural Associations	World Vision	\$39 870	
		Legal Trng - Women's Legal Aid	Association for Legal Aid for	\$46 530	

		for Minorities (W) Consortium for Inter-Ethnic Development (CID) Serb-Albanian Small Business Services Office	Women Care International  Zavet Business Services Office	\$56 450  \$51 315	
<b>HR, Governance, Civil Society / Summary</b>		<b>14 projects</b>		<b>\$593 551</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>Income Generation, Economic Growth</b>	2001-02	Beekeepers of Decan Support to Velica Hoca Wine Growers' Assoc. Farm Equipment Rental Flour Millers' Revolving Fund Program Capacity Building of Agricultural Assoc.... Support Assoc. Of Micro-Finance Institutions Women's Strawberry Production (W) Mitrovica Business Development Centre (W) Women's Income Gen.:Carpet Manufacture (W) Packaged Sugar Production (W)	Beekeepers Association Inter Cooperation  Agroklina Shmk Flour Miller Association World Vision  World Relief International  Malteaser  Mitrovica Women's Business Assoc. Hareja Independent Women's Assoc. Liria	\$19 150 \$38 510  \$50 000 \$56 884  \$44 000  \$50 000  \$13 000  \$44 500 \$11 476 \$26 745	
	2002-03	Support to Dev. of Beekeeping Sector SME Training for Minority Communities Obilic Farmer's Market (W)  Pyramid Vegetable Producers	League of Kosovar Beekeepers (LBK) Regional Enterprise Agency Coord. Unit Women's Committee for Human Rights Intercooperation	\$79 000  \$39 460 \$16 270  \$38 450	
<b>Income Generation / Sub-Total</b>		<b>14 projects</b>		<b>\$527 445</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>Refugees &amp; IDPs</b>	2001-02	Serb Farmer Return Program	Multinational Brigace Centre & Farmer Groups	\$32 400	

Performance Review Branch

		Agricultural Assist. to Returnee Communities	Mercy Corps	\$45 492	
	2002-03	Host Group Minorities Project	Danish Refugee Council	\$51 450	
<b>Refugees / Sub-Total</b>		<b>3 projects</b>		<b>\$129 342</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Emergency Relief</b>	2002-03	Emergency Winter Shelter Vulnerable Minorities	American Refugee Committee (ARC)	\$99 613	
		Emergency Winter Shelter Returnee Comm.	American Refugee Committee (ARC)	\$67 705	
		Wood & Winterization Vulnerable Minorities	American Refugee Committee (ARC)	\$11 005	
<b>Emergency / Sub-Total</b>		<b>3 projects</b>		<b>\$178 323</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>Others</b>					
Cultural Promotion	2001-02	Kosovo Philharmonic Orchestra	Kosovo Philharmonic Orchestra	\$3 300	
Reconstruction	2001-02	Xerxe Village Water Project	Relief International	\$27 000	
<b>Others / Sub-Total</b>		<b>2 projects</b>		<b>\$30 300</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>TOTAL KOSOVO</b>		<b>57 projects</b>		<b>\$2 286 425</b>	



## LIP Projects 2001-02 and 2002-03

## MACEDONIA

Theme / Sector	FY	Project Title	Executing Agency or Recipients	Total \$ Approved
<i>Social</i>				
Social Development	2001-02	Shelter for Care of Women & Children	Shelter Centre	\$7 591
	2002-03	Audio Equipmt Institute for Deaf	Institute for Deaf and Mute	\$54 791
		Care of Women & Children	Shelter Centre in Macedonia	\$63 590
		Victims of Violence		
Education	2001-02	Better Parenting Initiative - Early Child Dev.	Lifestart Bitola	\$54 300
		Scholarship Fund for SEE Students	Teacher Training Fac. at SEE Univ.	\$52 582
		Renovation of Primary School	Shelter Now International (SNI)	\$54 207
		Teacher Training:Language Learning Lab	SEE University in Tetovo	\$75 243
Trafficking	2001-02	Transit Ctre for Victims & Stranded Migrants (W)	IOM	\$45 000
<b><i>Social / Sub-Total</i></b>		<b><i>8 projects</i></b>		<b><i>\$407 304</i></b>
<b><i>Human Rights, Democratic Development, Good Governance,</i></b>	2001-02	Office of the Ombudsman ...	Office of the Ombudsman ...	\$45 000
<b><i>Civil Society</i></b>		Inter-ethnic Cent. for Youth & Child. Babylon Tetovo	Centre for Balcanic Co-operation	\$46 000
		Inter-ethnic Cent. for Youth & Child. Babylon Tetovo	Centre for Balcanic Co-operation	\$55 000
Confidence Building		The Future of the Roma	Roma Community Centre (RCC DROM)	\$27 525
Human & Minority Rights		Public Relations Campaign	C4C	\$51 776
Elections		Multi-ethnic Media Desk	Multiethnic Media Desk	\$41 552

*Performance Review Branch*

Media	2002-03	Special Editions Daily Newspaper LOBI	IOM - CBI	\$22 303	
		The Future of the Roma - Non- Formal Education	Roma Community Centre (RCC DROM)	\$47 000	
		Media Monitoring	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights	\$31 000	
		Bilingualism in Macedonian Parliament	Nat. Democratic Inst. for Int'l Affairs (NDI)	\$98 341	
		Mobile Parliament	Civic Ass. For Dev. of Democratic Institutions	\$78 770	
<b><i>HR, Governance ... / Sub-Total</i></b>		<b><i>11 projects</i></b>		<b><i>\$544 267</i></b>	<b><i>45%</i></b>
<b><i>Income Generation, Economic Growth</i></b>	2002-03	Economic Revitalization & Reintegration	Mercy Corps	\$58 000	
<b><i>Income Generation / Sub-Total</i></b>		<b><i>1 project</i></b>		<b><i>\$58 000</i></b>	<b><i>5%</i></b>
<b><i>Rehabilitation</i></b>	2001-02	Reconst. Mosque, Church, Comm. Hall	Int'l Rescue Committee	\$76 206	
		Rehab. Of Mosque & Council Building		\$72 518	
		Mine and Unexploded Ordinance Removal	Ministry of Defence and Interior	\$54 303	
<b><i>Rehabilitation / Sub-Total</i></b>		<b><i>3 projects</i></b>		<b><i>\$203 027</i></b>	<b><i>17%</i></b>
<b>TOTAL MACEDONIA</b>		<b>23 projects</b>		<b>\$1 212 598</b>	

## PRP Projects 2001-02 and 2002-03

**BOSNIA / HERZEGOVINA**

Theme / Sector	FY	Project Title	Executing Agency or Recipients	Total \$ Approved	
<i>Social</i>					
Health	2001-02	Rehab. Family Medicine Teaching Centres Zenica	Queen's Univ. Program (QUFMDP)	\$25 570	
Education	2001-02	Parent Teachers Associations	World Vision BiH	\$48 560	
	2002-03	Brcko Schools Portal	UNDP	\$59 250	
Child Protection	2001-02	AIDS Awareness Campaign	Youth Against HIV/AIDS	\$34 465	
	2002-03	Playrooms for Hospitalized Children	Kosovo Clinic & General Hospital in Sarajevo	\$35 301	
<b><i>Social / Sub-Total</i></b>		<b><i>5 projects</i></b>		<b><i>\$203 146</i></b>	<b><i>21%</i></b>
<i>Human Rights, Democratic</i>	2001-02	Info. System of Ministry of European Integration	Council of Ministers of BiH	\$30 509	
<i>Development, Good Governance,</i>		Antifraud Dpt Forensic Audit Facility	Antifraud Dptm - Office of High Representative	\$39 055	
<i>Civil Society</i>		Political Resource Centre in Mostar	OSCE	\$50 059	
Cap. Building Public Admin.		"Who Represents Us?"	Centres for Civil Initiatives (CCI)	\$44 200	
		Alternative Dispute Resolution Training	Assoc. Judges & Prosecutors Rep. Srpska	\$49 500	
		Translation OHR's Treaty Reporting Manual	Min. Human Rights & Refugees + Council Min.	\$9 484	
		Political Resource Centre Doboj	OSCE	\$45 508	
		Training for Police Forces	Save the Children UK	\$24 160	
		Minority Return - TV Series	NOG Klub Doboj 92	\$21 600	
		Support to Public Broadcasting System	OHR Media Development Dptmt	\$28 000	

	2002-03	Publication Voter Ballots - Elections Commission	Gov. Of BiH	\$102 048	
		Int'l Council for Voluntary Agencies	Gov. Of BiH	\$53 143	
		Domestic Election Monitoring	Centres for Civic Initiatives (CCI)	\$17 146	
		Leaflets for Direct Mailing to Voters	BiH Election Commission, Office of High Rep.	\$39 254	
<b>HR, Democ., Governance,.. / Sub-Total</b>		<b>14 projects</b>		<b>\$553 666</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>Income Generation</b>	2001-02	Sustainable Empl. Opportunities in Forest Prod.	Economic Co-operation Network	\$48 930	
<b>Income Generation Sub-Total</b>		<b>1 project</b>		<b>\$48 930</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Rehabilitation / Reconstruction</b>	2001-02	Repair of Danilo Borkovic School	Multi-National Division South West	\$46 003	
<b>(Refugees, returnees)</b>	2002-03	Srebrenica Reg. Recovery Progr. Quick Impact Pr.	UNDP BiH	\$100 000	
<b>Rehabilitation / Sub-Total</b>		<b>2 projects</b>		<b>\$146 003</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>TOTAL BOSNIA / HERZEGOVINA</b>		<b>22 projects</b>		<b>\$951 745</b>	

**GSP Projects 2001-02 and 2002-03**

Theme / Sector	FY	Project Title	Executing Agency / Recipients	Total \$ Approved
<b>ROMANIA</b>				
Energy	2001-02	Good Practices in Energy Efficiency	Terra Millenium III	\$47 848
Ethnic Minority	2001-02	Pre-School Education for Roma Children	Save the Children Romania	\$40 781
Social	2001-02	Police & Comm. - Together Against Domest. Violence (W)	Center for Legal Resources	\$47 912
		"My Choice" Family Planning (W)	Ruhama Foundation	\$36 536
Civil Society (Medias)	2002-03	NGOs and the Mass Media	Centras	\$46 500
<b>TOTAL ROMANIA</b>		<b>5 projects</b>		<b>\$219 577</b>
<b>BULGARIA</b>				
Civil Society (Medias)	2002-03	NGOs and the Mass Media	Resource Centre Foundation	\$48 000
<b>TOTAL BULGARIA</b>		<b>1 project</b>		<b>\$48 000</b>
<b>MOLDOVA</b>				
Civil Society (Medias)	2002-03	NGOs and the Mass Media	CONTACT Centre	\$36 570
<b>TOTAL MOLDOVA</b>		<b>1 project</b>		<b>\$36 570</b>