

**Mid-term Evaluation of**

**UNIFEM-CIDA Project  
“Accountability for Protection of  
Women’s Human Rights”**

**(Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo)**

**Final Evaluation Report**

Landis MacKellar  
Evaluation Consultant  
02.04.08

## Table of Contents

<b>Acronyms .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Executive Summary.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation	
1.2 Key issues addressed	
1.3 Structure of the report	
<b>2. The project and its development context.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Regional context and identification of issues	
2.1 Goals and logical structure	
2.2 Implementation approach	
2.3 Main stakeholders and partners	
<b>3. Evaluation Methodology.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Evaluation questions	
2.2 Cross-cutting issues	
2.5 Implementation and evidence base	
2.6 Constraints and limitations	
<b>4. Results.....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Findings related to Evaluation Questions	
4.2. Strengths / weaknesses in design and implementation	
4.3 Sustainability	
<b>5. Overall conclusion, lessons learned, and recommendations .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Annex 1 The project logical framework in outline form.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Annex 2 Definitions of key evaluation terms.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Annex 3 Questionnaire analysis.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Annex 4 List of persons interviewed.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Annex 5 Documents consulted.....</b>	<b>38</b>

## Acronyms

- BiH:** Bosnia and Herzegovina
- CIDA:** Canadian International Development Agency
- CR:** Constitutional Reform
- CSO:** Civil Society Organization
- EQ:** Evaluation Question
- GA:** Gender Advisor
- GE:** Gender Equality
- GEA:** Gender Equality Advocates
- GEA:** Gender Equality Agency (BiH)
- GEC:** Gender Equality Council (Serbia)
- GEM:** Gender Equality Mechanism
- GEO:** Gender Equality Office (Montenegro)
- GES:** Gender Equality Sector (Serbia)
- GPP:** Government and Political Parties
- JC:** Judgment Criterion
- NGO:** Non-governmental Organization
- RBM:** Results-Based Management
- TA:** Technical Assistance
- UNDP:** United Nations Development Program
- UNIFEM:** United Nations Development Fund for Women
- WER:** Women's Economic Rights
- WHR:** Women's Human Rights

## Executive Summary

This report is a mid-term evaluation of the project “Accountability for Protection of Women’s Human Rights.” Using an explicit set of questions and criteria, and basing its findings on documents, interviews, and a questionnaire, the evaluation assesses progress towards outcomes, impacts, and standard Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria such as relevance and sustainability.

The project is found to be of generally high quality, much of which is ascribed to UNIFEM’s participatory approach to its partners and flexibility in the face of the rapidly changing situation. The evaluation documents that the project has resulted in substantial outcomes related to constitutional reform and that, while slower in coming, progress is being made towards achieving outcomes related to women’s economic rights. Whether the planned impacts are being achieved in a sustainable fashion is less certain, especially given the political situation, but at least some of the changes achieved are probably irreversible.

In its concluding section, the findings are set out in the form of a simple Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) analysis. UNIFEM’s greatest strengths consist of its comparative advantage in gender and its participatory approach; its weaknesses are very thin field presence and lack of experience/expertise in economics. Yet opportunities, especially the move towards implementation of reforms that have been put in place and the European integration process, are great. The main threat is identified to be the generally difficult political and cultural context in the Balkans.

Recommendations made are:

- Continue the strategic shift towards supporting implementation.
- Strengthen UNIFEM’s economics network.
- Develop partnerships with agencies and institutions driving economic restructuring and privatization.
- Integrate UNIFEM strategies fully into the European integration process.
- Continue to support capacity building in government agencies responsible for gender; promote innovative funding modalities for NGO partners.



## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

In addition to serving a general oversight function, this evaluation is intended to be forward looking and to elicit lessons that can be applied during the project's remaining months as well as inform UNIFEM's future programming. Transformed into recommendations, the lessons learned are designed to be relevant to UNIFEM's project monitoring framework, not only for this project, but for other aspects of the UNIFEM programme as well.

### 1.2 Key issues addressed

To quote the Terms of Reference, this evaluation should, through an analysis of project outputs, assess the extent to which project outcomes have or have not been achieved, consolidate lessons learned, and make recommendations relevant for the remainder of the project and for UNIFEM programming more generally. It should address issues of project management, but from the standpoint of overall strengths and weaknesses. More generally, the evaluation should assess whether the project is strategically on track, the overall quality of the project, and whether and if so how UNIFEM adds value.

### 1.3 Structure of the report

In Section 2, a brief section describes the regional context, making no attempt to describe the various political events over the months during which the project has been in operation as this information is easily available elsewhere. The goals and logical structure of the project are presented in outline form and the project's implementation approach, i.e. the forms of support stressed (technical assistance or TA, training and capacity building) and staffing arrangements, are described. Partners and stakeholders are identified, and it is argued that the latter go far beyond the former.

Section 3 describes the approach taken to this evaluation. Section 4, the heart of the Report, presents results, that is, the answers to the questions posed that have emerged from the evidence base. Section 5 summarises these results in the form of overall conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned. A memorandum, "Ideas for First Steps," submitted separately, describes some of the consultant's ideas on steps that could be taken immediately.

A set of four Annexes presents supplementary material.

## 2. The project and its development context

### 2.1 Regional context and identification of issues

Between guaranteed employment and guaranteed social benefits, women in ex-Yugoslavia and large parts of the rest of the formerly socialist world were assured a high degree of lifetime security. That security is a thing of the past. The successor nations of Yugoslavia are coping with a double shock: they are both post-conflict and (rhetoric aside) post-socialist. Conflict killed or disabled breadwinners, uprooted families, and economically devastated wide swathes of territory. Needed fiscal reforms have required the downsizing of pension, health, and social protection systems in the region, all with disproportionate impact on women (particularly older women). Middle-aged women with less than university education are perhaps at greatest risk in the labour market, but the evidence also points to high unemployment rates among younger skilled women as well. Rationalisation, often privatization, of publicly owned enterprises, while needed in the context of globalization and European integration, has put many female workers out of work. The social sector and public services, the traditional sources of employment for women, have been disproportionately affected. Markets do little to stand in the way of discrimination. With the dismantling of government structures that guaranteed at least superficial equality in the labour market, widespread and overt discrimination against women has emerged. Women belonging to traditionally excluded groups such as the Roma have suffered in particular, and new ethnic minority groups have been created by the boundaries resulting from civil war.

Yet, the Balkan crisis also contains the seeds of change for the better. With new constitutions being drafted and new labour laws being developed, there is a unique opportunity to advance gender equality and women's human rights in ex-Yugoslavia. The potential for integration into the European Union offers strong inducements to eliminate discrimination and otherwise respect human rights, to modernize labour market institutions and to ensure the rule of law. The project should be interpreted as an attempt to exploit these opportunities.

### 2.2 Goals and logical structure

The project's overarching long-term goal is to advance gender equality (GE) and women's human rights (WHRs) in line with international agreements, covenants, and commitments.

The project's logical framework consists of

- Two impacts that can be identified by reference to the designated target groups, namely impact on government and political parties (GPPs) and impact on gender equality advocates (GEAs) in all four entities. These are
  - o GPPs demonstrate increased capacity and accountability to fulfill commitments to GE and WHRs in the context of constitutional reform (CR) and implementation of women's economic rights (WERs).
  - o GEAs gain knowledge and confidence to advocate for the integration of GE priorities within CR processes and with respect to implementation of WERs.

- Two sets of outcomes giving rise to impacts; four related to GPPs and three related to GEAs. Not all outcomes are foreseen in all four entities.
- Two types of output giving rise to impacts; three having to do with CR and five with WERs. Not all outputs are foreseen for all four entities.

In Annex 1, the relationship between outputs, outcomes, and impacts are given in a schematic outline form.

## *2.2 Project implementation approach*

The project is a component of UNIFEM's Southeast Europe (SEE) programme and was in line with UNIFEM's 2004-07 Multi-Year Funding Framework (MYFF). Individual activities were aligned with national Poverty Reduction Strategy Plans, gender equality Action Plans, or emerging legislative frameworks. Originally scheduled to begin in August 2006, project activities actually started at the end of October 2006 due to administrative delays in the transmission of funds from UNIFEM New York to the field. In response, CIDA approved a one year no-cost extension, so the project will run through March 2009.

Central to project design was the perception that the time was right for substantial progress in gender issues both at the level of policy and implementation and that, in view of shared history and challenges, a multi-entity regional approach was appropriate. However, in light of lessons learned from previous work in the region, it was decided to build considerable flexibility into project design, so that the project could tailor its activities in each of the four entities, Serbia, Kosovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Montenegro, into the project work plan.

In approaching women's rights and gender equality, the project oriented itself strongly with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which provides the international legal framework for national actions to advance gender equality. This emphasis on CEDAW was natural, because a number of entities covered were in the process of their first reporting on implementation of the Convention.

As described in the Annual Report to CIDA 2006-2007, the original plan was for an international Programme Manager to take responsibility for the entire project. Due to difficulties in finding a candidate with suitable regional experience, the Gender Advisor in Belgrade took the lead in managing the CR component and the post was re-advertised with increased emphasis on the WER component. There were again difficulties in recruitment, and a stroke of bad luck when one suitable candidate was unable to take up the post. In response, UNIFEM re-defined the post as that of a national Project Coordinator, and the post was filled in May 2007. International consultants were hired to provide backup both on CER and WER. The Regional Programme Director in Bratislava, the CEE Programme Specialist, and the South East Europe Programme Manager posted to Macedonia also contributed significantly to the project. The Annual report to CIDA specifies the different contributions of these experts. The RPD played an important role in facilitating high-level contacts, the Programme Specialist contributed to quality control of project outputs, while the Programme Manager assumed considerable hands-on responsibility for project management.

To summarise, the project implementation approach has been based on the flexible deployment of resources as needed, with a minimum of fixed dedicated

resources in place. This has maximized efficiency and allowed flexible response, however, as we have discussed below, resources are also stretched very thin.

The project revolved around heavy emphasis on the identification of needs in consultation with national partners, the recruitment of national consultants to provide support to GPPs and GEAs as needed, and the convening of regional workshops to disseminate experience and expertise.

### *2.3 Main stakeholders and partners*

The list of persons interviewed in Annex 4 identifies GPPs and GEAs who were directly implicated in the project. These partners were government agencies that are dealing with issues of women's rights and gender equality, and non-governmental organizations that are active in the field. More general stakeholders in the project are women in the region, and most particularly those who have been adversely affected by the rapid social and economic changes described above. This would apply particularly to women of middle age and above, and women belonging to vulnerable groups such as ethnic minorities. As national and international groups and organizations promoting reform and European integration are confronted daily with accusations that their activities are adversely affecting women, these groups, as well may be considered as having a stake in the success of the project. By the same logic, so are governments in the entities where the project was active.

### 3. Evaluation Methodology

This is no place for an extended discussion of evaluation methodology. However, to summarise the consultant's views in a nutshell:

- Formalism in development project / programme evaluation rarely adds much unless what is being evaluated is a "classic" development project (a vaccination programme, for example), and often crosses the line into pseudo-science.
- Nonetheless, it is crucial that text be carefully constructed. Precise questions should be set forth and the criteria by which they will be answered should be identified.
- The evidence base used to assess criteria should be made explicit and, where possible, cited.

The approach described below largely reflects the approach taken by the Evaluation Unit of the European Commission (EC), however, it is completely consistent with UNDP's impact evaluation procedures and Results-Based Management (RBM) more generally.

#### 3.1 Project quality criteria, evaluation questions, and judgment criteria

The evaluation was structured around the standard Development Assistance Committee (DAC) quality criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability (defined, with other basic concepts, in Annex 2). The issue of coherence with the institutional context – not a DAC criterion but clearly a matter of interest -- was also probed. In order to impose logical consistency on the evaluation, a set of Evaluation Questions (EQs) and associated Judgment Criteria (JCs) was proposed and, following discussion with project staff, adopted. Taken as a whole, the questions span the DAC quality criteria. The EQs and JCs are given in textbox form in Section 4.

#### 3.2 Cross-cutting issues

In addition, a set of cross-cutting questions was defined:

- Was the regional dimension adequately taken into account and the advantages of regional exchange exploited?
- Were links between CR and WER taken into account? Were synergies, such as the spillover effects of progress in one area on the situation in the other, exploited?
- Was the relationship between the two classes of target groups – GPPs and GEAs taken into account? Did the project promote constructive partnerships between entities from the two groups?
- Was the human rights perspective effectively used to promote project objectives? How were the human rights and economics perspectives combined; were synergies realized?

Finally, it was decided that the evaluation should reach an overall answer to two questions "Have project activities resulted in tangible progress towards the overarching long-term goal of advancing GE and WHRs?" and "Has UNIFEM added value through its engagement with WHRs through this project?" More precisely "Has UNIFEM achieved

positive results that would not have been achieved had the same money been spent in the area by other donors?”

### *3.3 Implementation and evidence base*

The evidence base for the evaluation consisted of

- *Project documentation provided by UNIFEM.* The project Annual Report to CIDA, August 2006-August 2007 was a primary document; UNIFEM staff / consultants briefed the consultant on project developments since August 2007.
- *Stakeholder interviews.* These spanned UNIFEM current and former staff / consultants, donor staff, representatives of stakeholder government agencies in the four entities, representatives of stakeholder NGO partners in the four entities, and UNDP staff. Some of these interviews were conducted during the consultant’s visit to Belgrade on 7-8 Feb 08; others were conducted by telephone in the two weeks following.
- *Questionnaire responses.* A questionnaire, developed with substantial input from UNIFEM staff / consultants, was mailed to 13 stakeholders, of whom 8 responded. An analysis of results is given in Annex 3.

In the interests of confidentiality, interview notes (which run to 10 single-space Ariel 11 pages) are not given in Annex. However, if there are issues or queries that UNIFEM wishes to explore further, the consultant can provide additional information. Numbers in square brackets, e.g. [1], reference interviews. Also in the interest of confidentiality, individual questionnaire responses are not published as part of this Report. When the questionnaire analysis in Annex 4 is cited as evidence, the reference [QA] is given.

### *3.6 Constraints and limitations*

In an ideal situation, the consultant would have spent 2 days in each of the entities involved in the project, not just 2 days in Belgrade. However, telephone interviews proved an effective modality and considerable expense was saved in this way. In point of fact, it would have been difficult for the consultant to disengage the time necessary to make the additional field visits.

In many interviews, it was far from clear in the case of many interviews and questionnaire responses, that stakeholders fully distinguished this UNIFEM project from other UNIFEM projects and activities more generally. The situation is complicated by the fact that, in some cases, UNIFEM has more than one project through the same partner [5]. Therefore, some of the generally positive views expressed have to do with UNIFEM as a whole, and not particularly with this project strictly defined.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Findings related to Evaluation Questions

#### 4.1.1 Questions related to relevance.

Evaluation Questions	Judgment Criteria
Does project design, as set forth in the Project Document, and actual implementation to date reflect national priorities and receive support from key partners?	Adequate baseline analysis and project preparation. Consultations with major stakeholders. Demonstrable national buy-in.
Did project successfully evolve and adapt in line with changing political situations (and other evolving variables) over the life of the project to date?	Timely work plan revision; revision of strategic goals as needed. Effective monitoring, use of monitoring results.

The project has benefited from the fact that the Project Document is of very high quality. This is particularly true of the logical framework, which has permitted the elaboration of a clear work plan and effective monitoring of progress towards goals. Stakeholders interviewed – whether from partner NGOs, government agencies, the funding agency, or sister agencies such as UNDP – have almost universally praised UNIFEM’s consultative and participatory approach to project planning. Whether this has been the key to project success is perhaps an empirical question, but there is no doubt from the evidence collected in this evaluation that stakeholders *perceive* it to be the key to success. Again with only a handful of exceptions [7,8], government agency representatives interviewed were totally supportive of UNIFEM’s engagement [e.g. 3,4,21].

It must be added by way of caution, though, that we are interpreting “in line with national priorities” in the sense of “in line with the priorities of the partner agencies, i.e. gender equality mechanisms (GEMs), in national governments.” The fact is that gender is often marginalized within governments and not all GEMs have substantial resources or impact [16,20]. One way of approaching the question of whether UNIFEM attracted the support of key partners is to focus on UNDP – and there is concrete evidence in Serbia and Montenegro that UNDP provided needed support to UNIFEM.

A number of persons interviewed pointed out that the project had been nimble in exploiting opportunities when they arose and had adapted its work plan, and even re-defined its strategic priorities, in line with the changing situation [17]. Concrete examples of adaptability include:

- The narrowing of the economic focus to privatization when this subject emerged as a priority area in the course of stakeholder consultations.

- The re-definition of posts and mobilization of consultants when difficulties were experienced with international recruitment [17].
- The re-tooling of the Bosnia-Herzegovina WER component to deal with access to justice in the context of discrimination complaints when, due to delays, it became apparent that Government had already tackled the problem originally targeted (labour inspectorates) [8].
- Responding flexibly to requests to support the CEDAW reporting process [14].

The project's performance in the area of monitoring, by contrast, has been weaker – despite the fact, mentioned above, that the excellent Project Document provided a strong foundation for monitoring. The Annual Report to CIDA is of excellent quality, but went for many weeks unread at UNIFEM Headquarters (not something for which the project bears the blame, but perhaps it should have followed up more aggressively). The draft report for this evaluation was, for reasons both good and bad, delivered three weeks later than called for in the originally agreed work plan; the consultant lived in dread of a telephone call, but none ensued. RBM is still relatively new at UNIFEM, and the Project Consultant is in the process of drawing up a performance-monitoring framework. The lack of a strong field presence throughout the region complicates monitoring.

This is an appropriate place at which to discuss the important issue of the project's involvement in WER. As we discuss in Section 4.1.3 below, the project has been less effective to date in this area than in the area of constitutional reform. Yet, despite this, the project scores high marks for relevance by taking on this new (for UNIFEM) area of concern. A number of stakeholders report that the issue of WER came out strongly in workshops and is increasingly viewed as central to empowerment of women [6,7,16].

#### 4.1.2 Questions related to coherence

Evaluation Questions	Judgment Criteria
Was the project as implemented suited to national institutional structures and capacities?	Identification and addressing of capacity building needs. Identification of the right partners.
Was the regional dimension taken into account and opportunities for regional exchange exploited?	Exchange of experiences, exchange of expertise.

UNIFEM was indubitably the pioneer in capacity building for gender issues in South East Europe [e.g., 2,4]. Through organization and facilitation of round tables, workshops, and international consultancies, UNIFEM has served as a catalyst for the region. With only one exception being voiced [7], expert consultancy services provided by UNIFEM have been highly regarded [QA, especially Questions 1, 2, 4, and 5 of Section 1 on technical assistance]. No doubts were anywhere expressed about whether needs for capacity building had been correctly identified.

The issue of whether UNIFEM has worked with the right partners is a delicate one. On the side of Government, choice does not really come into the question, and UNIFEM has successfully worked with GEMs in each of the four entities. On the side of NGO partners, the choice is broader, and the consultant does not feel qualified to comment on the choice of one NGO as opposed to another. In general, there is a lack of “watchdog” NGOs in the region [e.g., 16]. Not surprisingly, some representatives of government GEMs expressed the view that UNIFEM was too strongly aligned with NGOs [6,7,18]. Yet, there is a certain rationality underpinning this; UNIFEM has a comparative advantage in working with NGOs and UNDP has a comparative advantage in working with governments. In commenting on a draft of this report, project experts correctly noted that this view is a perception, not necessarily a statement of fact. UNIFEM has traditionally supported GEMs, who indeed received the lion’s share of financial support provided under the CR component of the project.

Perhaps the strongest view to emerge from interviews and questionnaire responses was the high value that stakeholders placed on learning regional and international experience, whether through the sharing of draft reports [10] or regional workshops [e.g., 18,19,21; QA Question 3 of Section 2 on training and capacity building]. One respondent expressed preference for sharing of experience from the region, not the world more broadly [7].

Specific venues at which regional experience were shared were:

- November 2006 constitutional conference in Montenegro
- March 2007 meeting on CEDAW reporting procedures, held in Belgrade
- May 2007 constitutional conference held in Bosnia-Herzegovina
- May 2007 regional experts meeting on gender equality in CR, held in Montenegro
- September 2007 regional conference on CEDAW reporting, held in Montenegro
- December 2007 Training on Results-based Management, held in Belgrade

Finally, several stakeholders [11,20] drew a favourable comparison between the UNIFEM project, which made every effort to adapt itself to national needs, and a predecessor UNDP gender project which was seen by partners as being overly centralized (in Sarajevo).

A criticism that can be made is that UNIFEM’s strategy, while it formed close links with partners for gender equality, does not appear to have reached out to other classes of partners whose interests are not in the area of gender equality, but who are clearly stakeholders nonetheless. The evidence base contains no indication that there was an attempt to forge links with agencies responsible for privatization or with international organizations that are active in promoting economic reform and European integration. In commenting on a draft, project experts expressed the view that project Mission Reports (not made available to the consultant) might document efforts that were not in the evidence base for this report. Two exceptions, moreover, should be noted. In Kosovo, new work on women and privatization is being done in the context of a cordial relationship with the agency responsible for privatization, the KTA. In Serbia, an upcoming round table will focus on employers, i.e. duty bearers.

### 4.1.3 Questions related to effectiveness

Evaluation Questions	Judgment Criteria
Were anticipated outputs produced? If not, why not?	Documented project outputs in project paper trail – publications, draft legislation and administrative guidelines, recommendations, trainings and workshops, etc.  Best practice, international experience disseminated.
Did these contribute towards outcomes as expected?	Demonstrable progress towards outcomes

The project Annual Report covers effectiveness issues through August 2007, and this section will only offer an update. Tables 1 and 2 below refer to Impact 1 (relating to GPPs) and Impact 2 (relating to GEAs) respectively. Columns refer to planned outcomes and rows refer to planned outputs. Outputs related to CR are in the first three rows and those referring to WER are in the next five rows. A crude colour-coding assigns green to outputs that have been substantially achieved, blue to outputs which have not been achieved but on which substantial progress has been made, and yellow to outputs on which there has been no substantial progress. There is only one of the latter: capacity-building in the area of WER achieved through regional exchange. Note, however, that there has been capacity building in this area via the provision of consultancies (e.g., Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo). “NA” or “Not applicable” marks cells in which the designated outcome was not expected to contribute to the designated impact.

Rough as it is, the scheme brings to the fore one theme already flagged in section 4.1.1 above -- the faster pace of progress in CR than in WER. The immediate reason was difficulties in recruiting an international consultant to cover WER. Part of this was simply bad luck: as mentioned above, a suitable candidate was identified but was unable to take up the post. The rest of the problem was that, as a number of persons interviewed pointed out, UNIFEM’s comparative strength was not in economics or even economic aspects of women’s rights [11]. Therefore, as opposed to CR, UNIFEM had no regional network in place on which it could call. The situation is being addressed in several ways:

- Specific foci on women and privatization and women’s rights in the workplace were identified.
- The international adviser post was converted into a national post and filled.
- National consultants are now active in all entities: Kosovo (preparation of a handbook on women and privatization, Bosnia-Herzegovina (completion of baseline research on the labour market to feed into reform of the complaints process), Serbia (round tables and an eventual handbook on women and

Table 1: Outputs (rows) and Associated Outcomes (columns): Where does the project stand with respect to planned impacts on GPP?				
	Constitutional reforms and/or reform processes integrate GE dimensions including respect for women's economic and social rights [all four entities]	Revised labour law reflects GE [Montenegro]	Labour regulatory agencies begin to enforce WER in employment [Bosnia-Herzegovina]. <i>Redefined to focus on complaints mechanism / access to justice.</i>	Governments begin to address gender dimensions of privatisation [Serbia, Kosovo]
Four case studies on national draft constitutions (all four entities)	Report completed and disseminated on Web 11.07.	Report completed and disseminated on Web 11.07	NA	NA
Increased skills and capacity for advocacy for gender advocates and NGOs (all four entities)	See Section 4.1.2	NA	NA	NA
Increased capacity for / better strategic action by governments / NGOs related to constitutions as results of regional exchange [all four entities]	See Section 4.1.2	NA	NA	NA
Handbooks increase knowledge and awareness on strategies for combating discrimination [Serbia, Kosovo]	NA	NA	NA	Plans to have handbook ready 05 / 06.08 in Kosovo and proceed to advocacy phase. In Serbia "trade union project" will develop handbook for women. Workshop to be held March / April for handbook producers in both countries.
Gender-sensitive labour law recommendations and amendments drafted with public participation (Montenegro)	NA	Draft law completed, reviewed at round table, re-drafting expected 2008. Made recommendations to gender Office; UNIFEM now supporting GEO to promote.	NA	NA
Increased awareness on the part of labour inspectorates [Bosnia-Herzegovina]	NA	NA	NA; advocacy for improved complaint process will commence once baseline analysis now underway completed.	NA
Increased capacity for evidence-based economic advocacy [all four entities]	NA	Gender analysis of labour law in Montenegro underway.	Baseline labour market analysis completed in Bosnia-Herzegovina	Analysis of privatisation for advocacy starting in Kosovo. In Serbia, sensitisation of decision makers by project now being developed by GEC; Association of Business Women round tables for employers in preparation.
Increased capacity for / better informed strategic action for GE related to WER as result of regional exchange	NA	No significant progress as result of regional exchange.	No significant progress as result of regional exchange.	No significant progress as result of regional exchange.

Table 2: Outputs (rows) and Associated Outcomes (columns): Where does the project stand with respect to planned impacts on GEA?			
	Civil society gains capacity to advocate with governments, and among women and the public, on gender equality standards and priorities relevant to CR [all four entities]	Cooperation between governments and civil society organisations improves monitoring and implementation of labour laws, policies, and regulatory frameworks [Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro]	Increased women's awareness of economic rights and how to exercise them during privatisation process [Serbia, Kosovo]
Four case studies on national draft constitutions (all four entities)	Report completed and disseminated on Web 11.07	NA	NA
Increased skills and capacity for advocacy for gender advocates and NGOs (all four entities)	See Section 4.1.2.	NA	NA
Increased capacity for / better strategic action by governments / NGOs related to constitutions as results of regional exchange [all four entities]	See Section 4.1.2.	NA	NA
Handbooks increase knowledge and awareness on strategies for combating discrimination [Serbia, Kosovo]	NA	Plans to have handbook ready 05 / 06.08 in Kosovo and proceed to advocacy phase. In Serbia "trade union project" will develop handbook for women. Workshop to be held 04 / 05.08 for handbook producers in both countries.	In Serbia, sensitisation of decision makers by project now being developed by GEC; Association of Business Women round tables for employers in preparation.
Gender-sensitive labour law recommendations and amendments drafted with public participation (Montenegro)	NA	Draft law completed, reviewed at round table, re-drafting expected 2008. Includes sexual harassment and parental leave. A UNIFEM consultant made recommendations to gender Office; UNIFEM now supporting GEO to promote.	NA
Increased awareness on the part of labour inspectorates [Bosnia-Herzegovina]	NA	NA	NA
Increased capacity for evidence-based economic advocacy [all four entities]	NA	Gender analysis of labour law underway in Montenegro. Baseline labour market analysis completed in Bosnia-Herzegovina.	Analysis of privatisation for advocacy starting in Kosovo. Baseline labour market analysis completed in Bosnia-Herzegovina
Increased capacity for / better informed strategic action for GE related to WER as result of regional exchange	NA	No significant progress as result of regional exchange.	No significant progress as result of regional exchange.

*Note to Tables: See text for explanation of colour codes; "NA" = "not applicable."*

- privatisation being prepared), and Montenegro (consultant on labour law now has recommended amendments, advocacy now underway).
- However, there does not appear to have been significant progress on mobilising a regional network of experts and the sharing of regional experiences in the area of women's economic rights. In some entities (e.g., Kosovo) there has been a

cordial relationship formed between UNIFEM partners and the agencies involved in privatisation, in others, e.g. Serbia, this does not appear to have happened yet.

To summarise,

- The outcomes related to the inclusion of gender in CR processes have largely been achieved.
- Amendments to the labour law in Montenegro are in the process of being made. There is every likelihood that this will be achieved by the end of the project.
- The outcome related to labour inspectorates in Bosnia-Herzegovina was modified to focus on the complaints progress, and baseline research has been done. While there will be further progress made, the range of actors to be involved – judges, trade unions, labour inspectors, and trade unions – is wide and it will be challenging to achieve this outcome by the time of the project's end.
- Progress is being made on the outcome related to improving GPP's and GEA's capacity to deal with the gender aspects of privatization in Serbia and Kosovo. There is every likelihood that this outcome will be achieved by the end of the project.
- There has been progress on the outcome related to improved cooperation between government agencies and NGOs to ensure better implementation of labour law in Montenegro and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

#### 4.1.4 Question related to efficiency

Evaluation Question	Judgment Criteria
Were project outputs produced at reasonable cost and within a reasonable time frame?	Planned and actual implementation timelines.  Budgeted and actual expenditure.

UNIFEM staff expressed a strong desire that the evaluation focus on programme management in the broad strategic sense rather than on details. By any metric, the project has achieved a great deal relative to the resources expended. The main issue, if anything, is whether UNIFEM is adequately resourced to carry out its ambitious programme of activities. Many respondents expressed the view that UNIFEM would benefit from a stronger field presence [7,14,20,21].

There was an initial delay of close to six months in implementing the project due to administrative difficulties at UNIFEM Headquarters. Following this, implementation has proceeded smoothly from an administrative point of view, subject to the difficulties on the economic component discussed above.

#### 4.1.4 Questions related to impact

Evaluation Question	Judgment Criteria
To what extent were anticipated project impacts relating to GPP capacity and accountability realized?	<p>Drafted legislation, regulations, etc. or related recommendations, in place.</p> <p>GE and WHR incorporated into Government programme or political party platforms.</p> <p>Action plans related to GE and WHR strategies (e.g., Poverty Reduction Strategies) in place.</p>
To what extent were anticipated project impacts relating to GEA empowerment realized?	<p>GEAs participate in high-level policy debates (parliamentary hearings, drafting groups, etc) related to CR and WER.</p> <p>GEAs participate in process of defining administrative rules and implementation guidelines relating to WER.</p>

Questions related to impact are notoriously difficult to answer, mostly because of the difficulty of assigning causality. In the general sense, there is little doubt that the UNIFEM project has empowered both GPPs and GEAs. UNIFEM was variously referred to as “a catalyst” for gender equality work [16] and as the agency that first engaged NGOs and formed capacity [2,4]. A number of GEAs have participated in high-level policy debates and had input into the drafting of laws and regulations through UNIFEM project support. We have reviewed the capacity building and sharing of international experience that was carried out under the auspices of the project. The general sense is that the UNIFEM project has had a significant impact, at least in some entities.

Specific examples of legislation implemented with gender equality aspects incorporated due to UNIFEM support are limited to the Law on Gender Equality in Montenegro, adopted July 2007. The Law benefited from UNIFEM technical assistance and from international experience disseminated in the May 2007 regional workshop in Montenegro. UNIFEM support had tangible impact on Montenegro’s reporting to CEDAW [14], and ongoing legal advice is expected to enable the GEM in Montenegro to suggest revisions to the labour law [3,13] and a gender Action Plan is in the pipeline for Montenegro.

Outside Montenegro, the tangible impact of UNIFEM support remains a project in progress. The Serbian Constitution is gender-sensitive, but due to the rushed nature of the process by which it was adopted, this does not reflect UNIFEM impact [6,7]. The Serbian law on gender equality was rejected three times and has yet to go before Parliament. Constitutional reforms have been proposed in Bosnia-Herzegovina [15] and a priority is to get the Gender Equality Plan into the programme of the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees.

As described in Annex 4, answers to questions in Section 3 (on impact) of the questionnaire were nuanced. While some impacts were identified, respondents warned

that in some cases, it was too early to see an impact, while others characterized impacts as tenuous because of the complexity and uncertainty of the political situation (perhaps as much a comment on sustainability as impact). Some “expectations management” is in order: a realistic view must take into account that gender is marginalized in governments and that civil society organizations are not always welcome at the table (even by GEMs).

#### 4.2. Strengths / weaknesses in design and implementation

Project design scores high marks for being carefully fitted to national circumstances and for having proved flexible as opportunities and / or problems arose. A comment often made was that the project could have been designed as four projects, one for each entity, but this would have left synergies and efficiencies unexploited. We have stated that UNIFEM’s presence in the field is very small, but constraints imposed were overcome by staff and consultants. The very positive responses to the section of the questionnaire dealing with project procedures speak well for the project [QA Section 4]. A number of respondents referred to excellent relations between the donor and implementing agency [17,20] and were of the view that cooperation between UNIFEM Belgrade and the regional office in Bratislava were good [11,20]. The role of the former UNIFEM Gender Adviser in coordinating the UN Theme Group on Gender Equality in Serbia was reported to have increased visibility and added value [9,16].

#### 4.2. Sustainability

Evaluation Question	Judgment Criteria
Is progress made related to GE and WHR so far and foreseeable in the remaining months of the project likely to be maintained once donor support ceases?	Self-sustaining Ministry and government Department units in place. Financially sustainable NGOs and civil society organizations active

There are GEM units in place in all four entities and each has made some progress. However, in no country can gender be said to be anywhere close to the centre of the government’s agenda. Because they do receive a modicum of financial support from governments, these GEMs are not likely to disappear. However, with the possible exception of Montenegro, they will not be able to continue to generate high-quality gender analysis in the absence of international support. Moreover, as a number of questionnaire respondents pointed out, the work of GEMs is very much at the mercy of political currents, which can change abruptly, as was the case in Serbia.

The situation in NGO partners is in a sense the opposite. In all four entities, NGOs have acquired substantial capacity during their years of existence. They are facile at identifying needed interventions, identifying possible funding sources, and swinging into action. However, none could be said to be financially sustainable without external support.

The situation regarding sustainability is not entirely bleak. In a number of cases, legal reforms have been implemented (Montenegro, for example) or are in the process of being implemented. If donor support ceases, the legal infrastructure created will remain in place. However, like an unoccupied building or an unused vehicle, legal infrastructure which does not acquire life through implementation falls into disrepair and eventually irrelevance. For this reason, the gradual and emerging shift in UNIFEM strategy towards implementation is a move in the right direction.

#### 4.2 Cross-cutting questions

A series of important issues, not necessarily falling neatly into one or another of the DAC-criteria boxes, was identified and discussed with UNIFEM staff and consultants. These are given in the accompanying text box and, in large part, the answers have already emerged from the discussion above:

- The regional dimension was very effectively integrated. This lay at the heart of the project design and implementation.
- The emerging emphasis on WER reflected consultations in which it became clear that many stakeholders saw this as the cutting edge of implementing progress in legal and constitutional reform. Where labour law is concerned, or regarding anti-discrimination measures embodied in constitutions, the CR and WER tracks are indistinguishable. Synergies, we may say, were exploited. However, the project never formed an effective network of experts specialized in the economics of labour markets, economic reform (including

Cross-cutting Questions
Was the regional dimension adequately taken into account and the advantages of regional exchange exploited?
Were links between CR and WER taken into account? Were synergies, such as the spillover effects of progress in one area on the situation in the other, exploited?
Was the relationship between the two classes of target groups – GPPs and GEAs taken into account? Did the project promote constructive partnerships between entities from the two groups?
Was the human rights perspective effectively used to promote project objectives? How were the human rights and economics perspectives combined; were synergies realized?

- privatisation) and/or European integration. If such a network is formed, it will be possible to exploit synergies between CR and WER more effectively.
- Stakeholders interviewed all freely discussed the natural tension between GPPs and GEAs and were willing to work in constructive partnership. The constructive relationships formed reflect, at least in part, a project approach suited to the regional institutional context.

- As discussed, the project oriented itself strongly on CEDAW, which reflects a rights-based approach to gender equality. We have already commented, above, on the fact that the project could have (and perhaps still can) better exploit synergies between the human rights and economics perspectives.

## 5. Overall conclusion, lessons learned, and recommendations

This evaluation has found that outputs / outcomes related to CR have either been achieved or substantial progress has been made. As noted in UNIFEM's Annual Report to CIDA in August 2007, less progress has been made in the WER component.

Reasons include:

- The area is not as familiar to UNIFEM as CR. The network is therefore sparse.
- In part as a result, there were difficulties in recruitment.
- Not identified in the Annual Report is the fact that, as the area is new and emerging, considerable dialogue and interaction with stakeholders has been necessary to identify priority areas for action.

The project has flexibly identified ways of accelerating progress in the WER component and these are in the process of delivering results.

Using pre-defined Evaluation Questions and Judgment Criteria, and on the basis of a reasonable evidence base, this evaluation has assessed the quality of the project according to the DAC criteria and found it to be high. The project is relevant to national needs and priorities, project design and implementation is coherent with national institutional contexts, and the project has been relatively effective, subject to the cautions voiced about the WER track. Impact and sustainability are difficult to judge; in some cases, as where new laws have been passed, a tangible change has occurred and will remain in place. However, the political and cultural environments are challenging. Governments place low priority on gender issues and NGOs lack a sound financial base. Implementation of reforms once in place will not be easy, in response to which, UNIFEM has correctly identified implementation as its emerging priority.

The information gained in the process of this evaluation is easily cast in the form of a Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) analysis:

- **Strengths:** UNIFEM has added value by effectively exploiting its comparative advantage in gender issues. The project's participatory and consultative approach has won it much good will and many allies; it has also resulted in high-quality individual interventions. High quality staff and consultants have been deployed in a very efficient and flexible manner. When opportunities or constraints have emerged, project management has reacted fluidly, changing strategy as warranted. Capacity building of UNIFEM partners has been of good quality. Finally, partners have benefited from the regional approach, which has made possible impacts that would not have been achieved if the project had been split into four separate national components.
- **Weaknesses:** Project management is spread thin, attempting to cover four entities through short-term visits. More generally, UNIFEM's success appears to be highly dependent on personalities – in particular, high-quality staff / consultants and partners – rather than structures. As evidenced by recruitment difficulties, UNIFEM's economics network is very thin. Systematic monitoring has not been fully developed (a weakness now being addressed). While the project has reached out to advocates for WER, more could be done to forge strong links to the institutions and agencies that are driving economic reforms and privatization.
- **Opportunities:** Countries in the region are now moving towards the implementation of constitutional and legal reforms that have been accomplished.

This, together with the driving issue of European harmonization and eventual accession, offers a window of opportunity for advancing the women's rights agenda.

- Threats: Gender and women's rights are not government priorities in the region, and cultural bias against gender equality runs deep. We have noted in our discussion of sustainability that capacity in GEMs is limited and that GEAs, while they have acquired substantial capacity, do not have a secure funding base apart from the donor community.

### *Recommendations*

*Continue the move towards implementation of reforms accomplished.* Development interventions related to human rights have tended to fall into a trap whereby policies are adopted at the central level while, at the level of actual implementation, they are ignored. UNIFEM's move to the stage of strengthening implementation is strongly to be endorsed. UNIFEM should be aware though, that this will involve dialogue with an entirely new class of interlocutors, many of whom will be hostile to UNIFEM's agenda.

*Strengthen the economics network.* There is no shortage of national and international economists with Balkans experience who have worked on the area of social impacts of economic restructuring. Casual inquiries on the part of the consultant elicited responses along the line of "It shouldn't be that difficult to find someone ...". In building the network, do not confuse legal analysis of economic issues with economic analysis of economic (or for that matter, legal) issues. An analysis of a labour code is not the same thing as an analysis of a labour market.

*Develop partnerships with institutions and agencies that are driving economic restructuring and privatisation,* be they state agencies, Ministries of Finance, or international organizations. One of the main impediments to needed changes in the region is failure to deal adequately with those who are losers from reform. UNIFEM is already, through this project, promoting the protection of women's economic rights. UNIFEM can also use its comparative advantage in gender to suggest concrete measures through which women can be empowered to reap the gains of economic transformation and, for those who simply cannot do so, what forms and modalities of social protection are needed. By widening the base of institutions and actors with whom it works, UNIFEM would also increase its visibility.

Implicit in both recommendations above is the following: *strengthen the ties between the UNIFEM policy agenda and the EU accession process.* Donor strategic programmes that are successful are generally those that are synchronized with major national priorities, which in the region are strongly tied to Europe. Issues such as state aid (the phasing out of subsidies for firms) and legal harmonization will directly affect women. Through its access to international expertise, UNIFEM is in a strong position to serve as the lead advocate for women in the historic process of EU accession.

Lastly, *continue to support capacity building in government agencies responsible for gender* and promote innovative funding modalities for NGO partners.



## Annex 1: The project logical framework in outline form

In this Annex, the project's logical structure is set forth. We look at the project impact by impact, setting forth for each impact the associated outcomes and for each outcome the necessary outputs.

### Impact GPP

Key government institutions as well as political parties (GPPs) demonstrate increased capacity and accountability to fulfill commitments to gender equality (GE) and women's human rights (WHR) in context of constitutional reform and implementation of women's economic rights.

**Outcome GPP.1** Constitutional reforms and/or reform processes integrate GE dimensions including WER [All four entities]

Output CR1. 4 case studies on national draft constitutions. [All four entities]

Output CR2. Increased skills and capacity for advocacy for gender advocates and NGOs. [All four entities]

Output CR3. Increased capacity of / better informed strategic action by governments / NGOs for GE related to constitutions as result of regional exchange. [All four entities]

**Outcome GPP.2** Revised labour law reflects GE [(Montenegro)]

Output WER2. Gender-sensitive labour law recommendations and amendments drafted with public participation. [Montenegro]

Output WER4. Increased capacity for evidence-based economic advocacy. [All four entities]

Output WER5. Increased capacity of / better informed strategic action by governments / NGOs for GE related to WER as result of regional exchange. [All four entities]

**Outcome GPP.3** Labour regulatory agencies begin to enforce WER in employment [BiH]

Output WER3. Increased awareness on part of labour inspectorates. [BiH] *Note: Due to project delays, Government addressed the labour inspectorate issue on its own, whereupon UNIFEM shifted its focus to deal with access to justice in the context of the mechanisms for dealing with complaints regarding sexual harassment and discrimination.*

Output WER4. Increased capacity for evidence-based economic advocacy. [All four entities]

Output WER5. Increased capacity of / better informed strategic action by governments / NGOs for GE related to WER as result of regional exchange. [All four entities]

**Outcome GPP.4** Governments begin to address gender dimensions of privatization [Serbia, Kosovo]

Output WER1. Handbooks increase knowledge and awareness on strategies for combating gender discrimination in privatization. [Serbia, Kosovo]

Output WER4. Increased capacity for evidence-based economic advocacy. [All four entities]

Output WER5. Increased capacity of / better informed strategic action by governments / NGOs for GE related to WER as result of regional exchange. [All four entities]

### **Impact GEA**

Gender equality advocates (GEAs) gain knowledge and confidence to advocate for the integration of gender equality priorities within constitutional reform processes and with respect to implementation of WER. [All four entities]

**Outcome GEA.1** Civil society gains capacity to advocate for gender equality standards relevant to constitutional reform [All four entities]

Output CR1. 4 case studies on national draft constitutions. [All four entities]

Output CR2. Increased skills and capacity for advocacy for gender advocates and NGOs. [All four entities]

Output CR3. Increased capacity of / better informed strategic action by governments / NGOs for GE related to constitutions as result of regional exchange. [All four entities]

**Outcome GEA.2** Cooperation between governments and civil society improves monitoring and implementation of labour laws, policies, and regulations [BiH, Montenegro]

Output WER1. Handbooks increase knowledge and awareness on strategies for combating gender discrimination in privatization. [Serbia, Kosovo]

Output WER2. Gender-sensitive labour law recommendations and amendments drafted with public participation. [Montenegro]

Output WER3. Increased awareness and capacity on part of labour inspectorates. [BiH] *Note: Due to project delays, Government addressed the labour inspectorate issue on its own,*

*whereupon UNIFEM shifted its focus to deal with access to justice in the context of the mechanisms for dealing with complaints regarding sexual harassment and discrimination.*

Output WER4. Increased capacity for evidence-based economic advocacy. [All four entities]

Output WER5. Increased capacity of / better informed strategic action by governments / NGOs for GE related to WER as result of regional exchange. [All four entities]

**Outcome GEA.3** Increased women's awareness of economic rights and how to exercise them during privatization process [Serbia, Kosovo].

Output WER1. Handbooks increase knowledge and awareness on strategies for combating gender discrimination in privatization. [Serbia, Montenegro]

Output WER4. Increased capacity for evidence-based economic advocacy. [All four entities]

Output WER5. Increased capacity of / better informed strategic action by governments / NGOs for GE related to WER as result of regional exchange. [All four entities]

## Annex 2: Definitions of Key Evaluation Concepts

The following definitions of key evaluation concepts were taken from UNDP's *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results*, available online at <http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/HandBook/ME-HandBook.pdf>.

**Capacity development:** The process by which individuals, groups, organizations and countries develop, enhance and organize their systems, resources and knowledge - all reflected in their abilities (individually and collectively) to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve objectives. Capacity development is also referred to as capacity building or strengthening.

**Effectiveness:** The extent to which a development outcome is achieved through interventions. The extent to which a programme or project achieves its planned results (goals, purposes and outputs) and contributes to outcomes.

**Efficiency:** The optimal transformation of inputs into outputs. Closely related is cost-effectiveness. A project is more cost-effective when it achieves its results at the lowest possible cost compared with alternative projects with the same intended results.

**Impact:** The overall and long-term effect of an intervention. Impact is the longer-term or ultimate result attributable to a development intervention - in contrast to output and outcome, which reflect more immediate results from the intervention.

**Lesson learned:** Learning from experience that is applicable to a generic situation rather than to a specific circumstance.

**Logical framework (logframe) approach:** A methodology that logically relates the main elements in programme and project design and helps ensure that the intervention is likely to achieve measurable results. The "logframe matrix" can be used to summarize and ensure consistency among outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs, and to identify important risks or assumptions. It is also referred to as a results-oriented programme planning and management methodology. The approach helps to identify strategic elements (inputs, outputs, purposes, goal) of a programme, their causal relationships, and the external factors that may influence success or failure of the programme. The approach includes the establishment of performance indicators to be used for monitoring and evaluating achievement of programme aims.

**Outcome:** Actual or intended change in development conditions that interventions are seeking to support. It describes a change in development conditions between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact.

**Outputs:** Tangible products (including services) of a programme or project that are necessary to achieve the objectives of a programme or project. Outputs relate to the completion (rather than the conduct) of activities and are the type of results over which managers have a high degree of influence.

**Partnership:** Collaboration among institutions to achieve mutually shared and agreed upon objectives and goals that draws on individual strengths and maximizes synergies. Effective partnerships, where there is a clear understanding of the contribution of each partner to agreed outcomes, are central to achieving results.

**Relevance:** The degree to which the objectives of a programme or project remain valid and pertinent as originally planned or as subsequently modified owing to changing circumstances within the immediate context and external environment of that programme or project. For an outcome, the extent to which the outcome reflects key national priorities and receives support from key partners.

**Stakeholders:** People, groups or entities that have a role and interest in the objectives and implementation of a programme or project. They include the community whose situation the programme seeks to change; project field staff who implement activities; project and programme managers who oversee implementation; donors and other decision-makers who decide the course of action related to the programme; and supporters, critics and other persons who influence the programme environment. In participatory evaluation, stakeholders assume an increased role in the evaluation process as question-makers, evaluation planners, data gatherers and problem solvers.

**Sustainability:** Durability of positive programme or project results after the termination of the technical cooperation channeled through that programme or project; static sustainability - the continuous flow of the same benefits, set in motion by the completed programme or project, to the same target groups; dynamic sustainability - the use or adaptation of programme or project results to a different context or changing environment by the original target groups and/or other groups. For an outcome, it reflects whether the positive change in the development situation will endure.

### **Annex 3: Evaluation Questionnaire Results and List of Recipients**

Thirteen questionnaires were sent and 8 responses were received. These covered an acceptably wide range of countries, components (CR and WER) and partners (GPPs and GEAs). Some questions (notably those on project procedures) were answered by almost all respondents; other questions were answered by only a handful. In general, though, the questionnaires paint a complete picture of a project with a very good reputation.

Quality assessments (i.e., the checking of quality boxes) were overwhelmingly positive, with not a single “unacceptable” response received. “Good” responses numerically outweighed “Acceptable” responses by a wide margin.

The questionnaire also provided opportunities for comments and asked open-ended questions on issues ranging from impact to lessons learned. The following paragraphs provide a synthesis of these comments and responses. Following this synthesis, we present the questionnaire itself with a tally of quality-box responses. Finally, a list of questionnaire recipients is given.

#### *Technical assistance.*

Questions 1 (advisory services) and 2 (specific research and analytical studies). Most respondents gave examples of what they were referring to. In responding to Question 1, two respondents noted that timing factors in the CR process made it difficult for analytical work to have an impact.

Questions 3 (international and regional experience) and 4 (development of reform proposals and drafting). One organization that answered both 3a and 3b admitted that it had not been involved in CR but was answering based on reports of organizations that were involved. Another, which answered both 3a and 3b and both 4a and 4b stated that it had been directly involved in CR (Questions 3a and 4a) but was answering questions regarding the WER component based on experience at a conference organized by UNIFEM. One organization that did not answer Question 4 clarified that since its project had just started, it was too early to give an opinion.

Question 5 (empowerment). In the area of CR, there two clear “Yes” responses and two ambiguous responses (one “... very helpful in out work ” and the other “... contribution of CIDA and UNIFEM was of significant importance”) One respondent believed national women’s groups had been empowered regarding CR, but was more reserved on whether they were effectively using what they had gained. In the area of WER, there was one clear “Yes” and one ambiguous answer simply describing activities.

#### *Training and capacity building*

Questions 1 (trainings), 2 (workshops), and 3 (international / regional conferences). For reasons not clear, the response rate in this section was very low. Those who did respond did not elaborate beyond checking a quality box.

#### *Impact*

Almost all respondents had a view on the impact of technical assistance. One respondent saw no impact on GPPs (and obviously no sustainable impact), blaming weak democracies. The same respondent saw a discernable impact on GEAs, which

she argued was sustainable because lobbying tools have been created. A second respondent cited legislation passed with the help of UNIFEM technical assistance as strong evidence of sustainable impact relating to GPPs. This respondent interpreted ongoing advocacy and lobbying efforts as evidence of sustainable impact of UNIFEM technical assistance on GEAs. A third respondent's view was that technical assistance had increased the capacity of GPPs but noted that the political situation is complex, presumably a caution that the impact is fragile. A fourth respondent noted that the UNIFEM-sponsored CR conference had resulted in concrete, sustainable reforms to the constitution. A fifth respondent saw the adoption of a Gender Equality Law and ongoing constitutional processes as signs of the impact of technical assistance, but was unwilling to say yet whether the impacts were sustainable. A sixth saw some impact in the area of labour law, but none yet in CR because of the early stage of the process. A seventh respondent's answer relating to GPPs was ambiguous because it simply stated ongoing processes and did not directly address the issue of impact. This respondent saw no impact to date regarding GEAs.

Only two respondents had a view on the impact of training and capacity building; the answers were positive but slightly ambiguous (e.g., one referred to GPPs as "we" despite the fact that the respondent was affiliated with a GEA).

#### *Project Procedures.*

Questions 1-5. Very few respondents had comments additional to checking the quality box. These two noted the responsiveness of UNIFEM staff.

Question 6 (flexibility). Almost all respondents made comments, all of them highly favourable.

#### *Lessons Learned*

Almost all respondents identified lessons learned or, in most cases, offered ideas about future directions, which presumably reflect lessons learned from past experience. To summarise these individual responses,

- UNIFEM should focus on regional experience in economic issues.
- UNIFEM should better promote and disseminate project results and be pro-active in mobilizing other donors and sources of support.
- An important lesson learned is the significance of regional exchange and dissemination of international expertise.
- UNIFEM should organize an end-of-project high-profile workshop event.
- The project proposal process was characterized by openness, flexibility, transparency, and timely responsiveness. Longer project time horizons would, however, be useful.
- UNIFEM needs a stronger field presence; could serve as a link between the Office of the Coordinator Office for the Stability Pact and member countries; should concentrate on EU accession issues; and should ensure that there is cooperation with universities and space for younger women.
- UNIFEM's cooperative attitude fostered the exchange of opinions, knowledge, and good practice.

## *Conclusion*

Stakeholder questionnaires often suffer from low response rates, unwillingness of respondents to spend enough time, failure to understand questions, and other problems. In the current case, the response rate was reasonable and, as evidenced by the large number of descriptions of impact and lessons learned (often taking the form of suggestions for the future) respondents actually considered their responses.

Respondents overwhelmingly gave the project high quality marks and, going beyond the checking of boxes, favourably judged its flexibility, responsiveness, and overall management. Most discerned positive and sustainable impacts, and the very fact that answers in this area were often cautious or contingent raises the degree of confidence that can be placed in them.

**UNIFEM-CIDA Project “Accountability for Protection of Women’s Human Rights”  
(Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo)**

Name of responding institution / organization / agency.

--

1. Technical Assistance (TA) support received (expertise, advisory services, special studies, research and analysis, etc.): BRIEFLY identify and assess major technical assistance support received. If any form of TA identified was not provided, just leave blank.

Technical assistance	How would you assess? (Check one)				
		Good	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Additional information / Comments
1a. Advisory services and expertise made available to partners: Constitutional reform	Timeliness?	2	2	0	[Please give examples of the work you are referring to]
	Quality?	3	1	0	
	Usefulness?	3	1	0	
1b. Advisory services and expertise made available to partners: Women’s economic rights	Timeliness?	3	1	0	[Please give examples of the services you are referring to]
	Quality?	3	1	0	
	Usefulness?	2	1	0	
2a. Specific research and analytical studies on the national situation: Constitutional reform	Timeliness?	3	2	0	[Please give examples of the work you are referring to]
	Quality?	4	1	0	
	Usefulness?	4	1	0	
2b. Specific research and analytical studies on the national situation: Women’s economic rights	Timeliness?	5	0	0	[Please give examples of the work]
	Quality?	5	0	0	
	Usefulness?	5	0	0	
		Good	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Additional information / Comments

3a. Information on regional experience / international best practice: Constitutional reform	Timeliness?	5	0	0	[Sources might include regional seminars and international best practice studies. To what are you referring?]
	Quality?	5	0	0	
	Usefulness?	5	0	0	
3b. Information on regional experience / international best practice: Women's economic rights	Timeliness?	4	0	0	[Sources might include regional seminars and international best practice studies. To what are you referring?]
	Quality?	4	0	0	
	Usefulness?	4	0	0	
4a. Technical support in development of proposals for reform / reorganization and in drafting legislation or regulations: Constitutional reform	Timeliness?	3	1	0	
	Quality?	4	0	0	
	Usefulness?	4	0	0	
4b. Technical support in development of proposals for reform / reorganization and in drafting legislation or regulations: Women's economic rights	Timeliness?	4	0	0	
	Quality?	4	0	0	
	Usefulness?	4	0	0	
5. In your view, as a result of TA provided under the project, were national experts and partners empowered to provide independent analysis / expertise on issues related to women's human rights? Can you give examples?					

2. Training and capacity building: BRIEFLY identify and assess training and capacity building provided. If any form of training and capacity building identified was not provided, just leave blank.

Training and capacity building	How would you assess (Check one)				Additional information / Comments
		Good	Acceptable	Unacceptable	
1a. Trainings: Constitutional reform	Timeliness?	1	1	0	
	Quality?	1	1	0	
	Usefulness?	1	1	0	
1b. Trainings: Women's economic rights	Timeliness?	1	1	0	
	Quality?	1	1	0	
	Usefulness?	1	1	0	
2a. Workshops, roundtable discussions: Constitutional reform	Timeliness?	2	1	0	
	Quality?	2	1	0	
	Usefulness?	2	1	0	
2b. Workshops, roundtable discussions: Women's economic rights	Timeliness?	2	1	0	
	Quality?	2	1	0	
	Usefulness?	2	1	0	
3a. International / regional conferences: Constitutional reform	Timeliness?	2	1	0	
	Quality?	2	1	0	
	Usefulness?	2	1	0	
3b. International / regional conferences: Women's economic rights	Timeliness?	2	1	0	
	Quality?	2	1	0	
	Usefulness?	2	1	0	

3. BRIEFLY describe the IMPACT of support received on progress towards two key project objectives, and comment on the sustainability of progress made, if any. If any form of support was not provided, just leave blank.

	Government and political parties demonstrate increased capacity and accountability to fulfill commitments to gender equality and women's human rights in the context of constitutional reform and implementation of women's economic rights.	Gender equality advocates gain knowledge and confidence to advocate for the integration of gender equality priorities within constitutional reform processes and with respect to implementation of women's economic rights.
Technical assistance	Impact:	Impact:
	Is the impact sustainable after project support ceases? Why or why not?	Is the impact sustainable after project support ceases? Why or why not?
Training and capacity building	Impact:	Impact:
	Is the impact sustainable after project support ceases? Why or why not?	Is the impact sustainable after project support ceases? Why or why not?

4. Overall, how would you assess the PROJECT PROCEDURES?

Project procedures	How would you assess? (Check one)				Additional information / Comments
		Good	Acceptable	Unacceptable	
1. Procurement	Timeliness?	4	2	0	
	Quality?	5	1	0	
	Usefulness?	5	1	0	
2. Dissemination of results	Timeliness?	4	2	0	
	Quality?	5	2	0	
	Usefulness?	5	2	0	
3. Financial arrangements	Timeliness?	6	1	0	
	Quality?	6	1	0	
	Usefulness?	6	1	0	
4. Selection of consultants / partners?	Timeliness?	5	2	0	
	Quality?	6	1	0	
	Usefulness?	6	1	0	
5. Other (please specify)	Timeliness?	2	0	0	
	Quality?	2	0	0	
	Usefulness?	2	0	0	
6. Did project procedures allow for flexibility and responsiveness to partners' requests / special needs? How? If not, why?					

5. What lessons can be derived from your experience with the project to inform further UNIFEM support to programmes/projects targeting gender equality and women's human rights?

List of questionnaire recipients

**Serbia:**

	Full name	Position title	Organization	E-mail	Telephone
<b>GEMs</b>					
1.	Natalija Micunovic	Assistant Minister	Gender Equality Sector, Ministry of Labor and Social Policy	<a href="mailto:n.micunovic@minrzs.sr.gov.yu">n.micunovic@minrzs.sr.gov.yu</a>	+381 11 3345 665
2.	Dragana Petrovic	Secretary	Gender Equality Council, Government of Serbia	<a href="mailto:dragana.petrovic@minrzs.sr.gov.yu">dragana.petrovic@minrzs.sr.gov.yu</a>	+381 63 8251 511
<b>NGO Partners</b>					
3.	Vera Kurtic	Head of NGO	NGO Women's space	<a href="mailto:verakurtic@EUnet.yu">verakurtic@EUnet.yu</a>	+381 63 463 067
4.	Zorana Sijacki	Executive director	Gender Equality Institute (currently GA in CIDA Serbia)	<a href="mailto:zorana.sijacki@gmail.com">zorana.sijacki@gmail.com</a>	+381 63 8399 936
5.	Sanja Popovic Pantic	Project Coordinator	Association of business Women	<a href="mailto:sanjap@labtel.imp.bg.ac.yu">sanjap@labtel.imp.bg.ac.yu</a>	+381 11 2776 801

### Bosnia and Herzegovina:

	Full name	Position title	Organization	E-mail	Telephone
<b>GEMs</b>					
6.	Samra Filipovic	Director	Gender Equality Agency of BiH	<a href="mailto:samrahf@bih.net.ba">samrahf@bih.net.ba</a>	+387 33 204 990
7.	Ana Vukovic	Director	Gender Center of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina	<a href="mailto:genderc@fgenderc.com.ba">genderc@fgenderc.com.ba</a>	+387 33 6658 83
<b>Partners</b>					
8.	Amira Krehic	Project Coordinator	Centre of Legal Assistance for Women, Zenica (Center for free access to information)	<a href="mailto:amira.krehic@gmail.com">amira.krehic@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:aleksicg@panet.co.yu">aleksicg@panet.co.yu</a>	+ 387 33 23 86 51 (652)
9.	Dragana Dardic	Project Coordinator	Helsinki Citizens' Assembly Banja Luka	<a href="mailto:hcabl2@blic.net">hcabl2@blic.net</a>	+387 51 432 750

### Montenegro:

	Full name	Position title	Organization	E-mail	Telephone
<b>GEMs</b>					
10.	Nada Drobnjak	Head of GEO	Gender Equality Office of the Government of Montenegro	<a href="mailto:nadadr@cg.yu">nadadr@cg.yu</a>	+382 81 244 145
<b>Partners</b>					
11.	Daliborka Uljarevic	Constitutional consultant	NGO CRVNO	<a href="mailto:daliborka.uljarevic@gmail.com">daliborka.uljarevic@gmail.com</a>	+382 67 345 999

### Kosovo:

	Full name	Position title	Organization	E-mail	Telephone
<b>GEMs</b>					
12.	Besim Kajtazi,	Director of Legal Office	Ministry of Public Services	<a href="mailto:besim.kajtazi@ks-gov.net">besim.kajtazi@ks-gov.net</a>	+377 44 346 056
<b>Partners</b>					
13.	Mirlinda Kusari	Head of NGO	Women's Business Association <b>SHE – ERA</b>	<a href="mailto:Mirlinda.kusari@gmail.com">Mirlinda.kusari@gmail.com</a>	+381 390 323 194

## Annex 4: List of persons interviewed

### UNIFEM Project management:

	<b>Position title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Wenny Kusuma	SEE Programme Manager	UNIFEM	<a href="mailto:wenny.kusuma@unifem.org">wenny.kusuma@unifem.org</a>	+389 2 3109 307
Milica Minic	National Project Coordinator	UNIFEM	<a href="mailto:milica.minic@unifem.org">milica.minic@unifem.org</a>	+381 11 2451 043
Kristin van der Leest	Constitutional consultant	UNIFEM	<a href="mailto:kristinvanderleest@yahoo.ca">kristinvanderleest@yahoo.ca</a>	+32 487 577 120
Osnat Lubrani	Regional Programme Directore	UNIFEM Europe	<a href="mailto:osnat.lubrani@unifem.org">osnat.lubrani@unifem.org</a>	+421 2 59 337 160
Nanna Magnadottir	Former UNIFEM Gender Advisor	UNIFEM	Nanna.Magnadottir@coe.int	+381 38 243 749

### CIDA:

	<b>Position title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Suzanne Quinn	Senior Program Officer	Canadian International Development Agency	<a href="mailto:suzanne_quinn@acdi-cida.gc.ca">suzanne_quinn@acdi-cida.gc.ca</a>	819-994-7582

### UNDP

	<b>Position title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Vesna Ciprus	Team Leader	Poverty Reduction and Economic Development Cluster UNDP Serbia	<a href="mailto:vesna.ciprus@undp.org">vesna.ciprus@undp.org</a>	+381 11 2445 754
Kaca Djurickovic	Gender Programme Coordinator	Social Inclusion Cluster UNDP Montenegro	<a href="mailto:kaca.djurickovic@undp.org">kaca.djurickovic@undp.org</a>	+382 81 231 251

**Serbia:**

	Position title	Organization	E-mail	Telephone
<b>GEMs</b>				
Natalija Micunovic	Assistant Minister	Gender Equality Sector, Ministry of Labor and Social Policy	<a href="mailto:n.micunovic@minrzs.sr.gov.yu">n.micunovic@minrzs.sr.gov.yu</a>	+381 11 3345 665
Dragana Petrovic	Secretary	Gender Equality Council, Government of Serbia	<a href="mailto:dragana.petrovic@minrzs.sr.gov.yu">dragana.petrovic@minrzs.sr.gov.yu</a>	+381 63 8251 511
<b>NGO Partners</b>				
Vera Kurtic	Head of NGO	NGO Women's space	<a href="mailto:verakurtic@EUnet.yu">verakurtic@EUnet.yu</a>	+381 63 463 067
Zorana Sijacki	Executive director	Gender Equality Institute (currently GA in CIDA Serbia)	<a href="mailto:zorana.sijacki@gmail.com">zorana.sijacki@gmail.com</a>	+381 63 8399 936
Sanja Popovic Pantic	Project Coordinator	Association of Business Women	<a href="mailto:sanjap@labtel.imp.bg.ac.yu">sanjap@labtel.imp.bg.ac.yu</a>	+381 11 2776 801

**Bosnia and Herzegovina:**

	Position title	Organization	E-mail	Telephone
<b>GEMs</b>				
Samra Filipovic	Director	Gender Equality Agency of BiH	<a href="mailto:samrahf@bih.net.ba">samrahf@bih.net.ba</a>	+387 33 204 990
Ana Vukovic	Director	Gender Center of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina	<a href="mailto:ana.v@fgenderc.com.ba">ana.v@fgenderc.com.ba</a>	+387 33 6658 83

<b>Partners</b>				
Amira Krehic	Project Coordinator	Centre of Legal Assistance for Women, Zenica (Center for free access to information)	<a href="mailto:amira.krehic@gmail.com">amira.krehic@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:aleksicg@panet.co.yu">aleksicg@panet.co.yu</a>	+ 387 33 23 86 51 (652)
Dragana Dardic	Project Coordinator	Helsinki Citizens' Assembly Banja Luka	<a href="mailto:hcabl2@blic.net">hcabl2@blic.net</a>	+387 51 432 750

**Montenegro:**

	<b>Position title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
<b>GEMs</b>				
Nada Drobnjak	Head of GEO	Gender Equality Office of the Government of Montenegro	<a href="mailto:nadadr@cg.yu">nadadr@cg.yu</a>	+382 81 244 145
<b>Partners</b>				
Daliborka Uljarevic	Constitutional consultant	NGO CRVNO	<a href="mailto:daliborka.uljarevic@gmail.com">daliborka.uljarevic@gmail.com</a>	+382 67 345 999

**Kosovo:**

	<b>Position title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
<b>GEMs</b>				
Besim Kajtazi	Director of Legal Office	Ministry of Public Services	<a href="mailto:besim.kajtazi@ks-gov.net">besim.kajtazi@ks-gov.net</a>	+377 44 346 056
<b>Partners</b>				
Mirlinda Kusari	Head of NGO	Women's Business Association <b>SHE – ERA</b>	<a href="mailto:Mirlinda.kusari@gmail.com">Mirlinda.kusari@gmail.com</a>	+381 390 323 194
Cyme Mahmutaj	Senior Officer for Equal Opportunities	Government of Kosovo	<a href="mailto:Cyme.Mahmutaj@ks-gov.net">Cyme.Mahmutaj@ks-gov.net</a>	+377 44 247 923

The interview with Besim Kajtazi could not be completed due to schedule conflicts.

## Annex 5: Documents Consulted

UNIFEM CIDA Final Project Document "Accountability for Women's Human Rights," 10 August 2006

Annual Report to CIDA August 2006-August 2007

### Constitutional Reform Project Proposals

- Agency for Gender Equality, BiH
- Gender Equality Institute, Serbia
- Gender Equality Office, Montenegro
- Gender Centre, Federation of BiH
- Gender Equality Sector, Serbia
- Women's Space, Serbia
- Novi Sad School of Journalism, Serbia

### Women's Economic Rights Project Proposals:

- She-Era, Kosovo
- Helsinki Citizens' Assembly, BiH/RS
- Centre of Legal Assistance, BiH
- Association of Businesswomen, Serbia
- Trade Union Nezovisnost, Serbia

### Engendering Constitutions: Gender Equality Provisions in Selected Constitutions

(A Comparative Study accompanied with Case Studies in Bosnia and Herzegovina , Kosovo , Montenegro and Serbia )

Editor and author of comparative study: Kristin Van der Leest

Authors of case studies: Bergin Kulenovic ( Bosnia and Herzegovina ),

Besim Kajtazi (Kosovo), Daliborka Uljarevic (Montenegro), Mirjana Dokmanovic (Serbia )

### A Desk Top Research into the Current State of Affairs of the Labor Market in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Author: Jasminka Dzumhur

Editor: Kristin van der Leest