

JANUARY 31, 2022

# Final Evaluation of the Integrated Local Development Project (ILDIP) Phase III

Final Evaluation Report

PRESENTED BY

Halcyon Louis, International Development Consultant  
halcyon.louis@gmail.com

# Acknowledgements

---

The fieldwork for this evaluation would not have been possible without the cooperation of the key project stakeholders of the Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP), including:

- The Resident Representative and staff of the UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina Country Office and in particular, the ILDP team;
- Key informants at the level of the two entities; the Brčko District; local and cantonal governments; and civil society;
- Senior officials of the Embassy of Switzerland/ Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina; and
- The external translation team.

The contribution of all parties is hereto noted, with thanks.

# Executive Summary

---

## Introduction

This report presents the results of the final evaluation of the Integrated Local Development Project, Phase III (ILDP Phase III). The purpose of the evaluation was to provide an impartial review of the Project based on five criteria (relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability), to determine overall project performance; management; and achievements. To safeguard the rights and confidentiality of all project stakeholders, the evaluation adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation. The evaluation also complied with the international standards of UNDP and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee to ensure quality.

## The Integrated Local Development Project, Phase III

ILDP is a system-building project that was developed to support the establishment of regulatory; operational; and institutional frameworks at the subnational level in BiH, to facilitate functional development planning and management. Prior to the launch of ILDP Phase III in 2017, strategic country-wide development planning in BiH had been challenged by the lack of a consolidated system to prioritise and facilitate development. BiH governments were especially challenged by limited human resource capacity and technical expertise to facilitate effective strategic development planning. As a result, there has been an absence of uniform strategic planning and development management systems at the national and sub-national levels. Consequently, Phase III of the Project involved scaling up and consolidating the knowledge and systems that were generated during the previous two phases of the Project, to contribute towards better development results in BiH, by supporting i) country integration into the European Union; and ii) a visible improvement in citizen quality-of-life, by facilitating increased access by citizens to better local services and livelihood opportunities.

ILDP Phase III is a joint initiative of UNDP BiH and the Government of Switzerland, through the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. The Project partners for ILDP Phase III were the entity-level governments; Brčko District BiH; government ministries; and the two Associations of Municipalities and Cities. Relatedly, the target beneficiaries of the Project were the local and cantonal governments, and civil society organisations in each locality. The main steering mechanism of the Project has been the Project Board, comprising senior officials from

all levels of government; AMC representatives from both entities; senior officers of the Government of Switzerland at the Embassy of Switzerland in BiH; and senior staff of UNDP BiH. Daily project management has been the responsibility of the ILDP Project Manager, who has been supported by the ILDP Project Team at the UNDP BiH Country Office. The Project Team has comprised technical specialists in the areas of policy; development management; and capacity development, and a team of field officers, who have supported local level project implementation.

Project implementation has comprised two sets of activities: i) the establishment of comprehensive regulatory and methodological frameworks at the entity level and within BD BiH, to enhance development planning and management.; and ii) technical assistance to local and cantonal governments, to enable them to build critical institutional capacities and develop effective and efficient practices for improved public service delivery.

## Evaluation scope and objectives

The scope of the evaluation covered results achievement over the four-year implementation timeframe (2017 – 2021), against the established targets of the results framework for ILDP Phase III. As its main objective, the evaluation examined overall project performance, with a focus on the extent to which expected results were achieved.

## Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation of ILDP Phase III was theory-based and was conducted using a client-approved evaluation matrix. It was further supported by an inclusive participatory approach; utilisation-focused principles; mixed-methods; and purposive sampling. All categories of relevant project stakeholders were engaged during the evaluation and were selected through purposive sampling (for consultation by interview).

There were four limitations to the evaluation: i) the COVID-19 travel restrictions; ii) resource limitations; iii) the unavailability of some stakeholders for consultations; and iv) language. These limitations were mitigated to ensure the validity of the evaluation results. In the interest of quality assurance, was also compliant with international standards for evaluation and data protection.

## Main Findings

### Relevance

Relevance was measured as the extent to which the objectives and design of ILDP Phase III responded to existing stakeholder needs; policies; and priorities. The evaluation has noted, therefore, that ILDP Phase III has been relevant at the country-wide level and has responded to the need for increased technical capacities within subnational governments to inform public sector reform. By aligning with the international development agenda, ILDP Phase III has further contributed to the attainment of country-level development priorities.

### Coherence

The coherence criterion was measured as the compatibility of ILDP Phase III with other development interventions in BiH, including at the sectoral and institutional levels. The evaluation has shown that ILDP Phase III intervention strategy was distinctive given its emphasis on subnational development that is systematic; inclusive; and based on multiple stakeholder collaboration. As a result, the Project complemented other development interventions at the country level.

### Effectiveness

Project effectiveness was measured as the extent to which ILDP Phase III achieved its expected results, taking into consideration any differences across the target stakeholder groups. Consequently, the Project has been effective in spite of the challenges of and unstable socio-political environment and the COVID-19 pandemic. It has contributed towards a harmonised approach to strategic subnational development through vertical coordination and horizontal cooperation. Project achievements have also included functional development planning and management systems at the entity level that have been equipped with: regulatory and operational frameworks; institutional structures and capacities; strategic documents; partnerships; vertical and horizontal coherence; and accountability mechanisms. The Seed Funding deployed by the Project has further contributed towards development management at the local and cantonal level, resulting in improved livelihoods and services for 0.27 million citizens. The Project has also facilitated increased awareness among civil society organisations and the media about strategic development to support their contribution to development management processes. There was, however, limited evidence of media engagement.

### Efficiency

Project efficiency was measured as the extent to which ILDP Phase III has been able to deliver expected results in an

economic and timely way. The evaluation results have shown that the Project has created good value for money, by maximising its impact relative to the resources that were made available for project implementation. Local and cantonal governments also demonstrated a resilience to the COVID-19 pandemic by developing a sense of ownership for project results. Through its intervention strategy, ILDP Phase III has further contributed to the nationalisation of Agenda 2030, which has led to country ownership of the SDGs.

### Cross-cutting themes

The evaluation examined the extent to which three cross-cutting themes were integrated into the project: gender equality; the application of a rights-based approach; and the facilitation of human development. As a measure of gender equality, the analysis was used to determine the extent to which equal rights; responsibility; and opportunities were provided to women and men. To measure the extent to which the Project applied a rights-based approach, the analysis was used to identify evidence of development programming that recognised the entitlements of all human beings to civil; cultural; economic; political; and social rights. The measure for the facilitation of human development was evidence of sustainable; people-centred development. Consequently, the results of the evaluation indicated that as the cross-cutting themes are not mutually exclusive, the Project successfully contributed to the integration of gender equality considerations by facilitating rights-based human development. The efforts of the Project during this process were challenged, however, by the COVID-19 pandemic and the gender dynamics of political bodies.

### Impact

As a measure of impact, the focus of the analysis was on the extent to which the Project generated significant higher-level effects, whether positive or negative, as well as whether they were intentionally generated or unforeseen. The evaluation results indicated, therefore, that ILDP Phase III contributed towards a new, regulated system for subnational development planning and management that uses an integrated and inclusive methodology to incorporate legitimate development priorities into strategic institutional planning, including budget planning. As the local and cantonal governments have been at different stages in developing and implementing their strategic plans, however, they have differed in the extent of their contribution towards improved citizen quality of life.

### Sustainability

The sustainability criterion was measured as the likelihood for the continuation of the net benefits of ILDP Phase III beyond the project end date. In this respect, the results of

the evaluation have shown that the Project has demonstrated a strong potential for results sustainability based on the combined workings of its exit and intervention strategies. Lead planning institutions at the entity level and within BD BiH have gained access to capacities and frameworks (legal; methodological; financial; and institutional) to independently steer a new system for development planning and management. By supporting strategic planning that has prioritised local development needs using an inclusive approach, the intervention strategy has further contributed to a sense of results ownership among project stakeholders at the local and cantonal levels.

## Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons learned

### Conclusions

The main objective of ILDP Phase III was to facilitate a system for the intensified implementation of development priorities, as identified by citizens, as a contribution towards an improvement in their quality of life. Although project implementation was challenged by the complex socio-political environment of BiH and the unanticipated emergent effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been evidence of the achievement of expected project results and the attainment of milestones. ILDP Phase III has also provided examples of good practice that can be used to enhance future project phases or the implementation of future similar development interventions.

### Recommendations

#### Strategic recommendations

**Recommendation 1:** It is recommended that UNDP BiH, in collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, should work with working with the public audit offices at the entity level in the future, so that they include a performance audit of the development planning and management systems in their work **(Related to all Findings; High priority)**.

Notwithstanding the advancements that have been made over pre-project conditions at the subnational level, there is a conceivable risk to the sustainability of the results that have been achieved. An auditing facility should be established, therefore, to quality assure the development management system and facilitate system efficiency and effectiveness, with emphasis on transparency and accountability for results achievement.

**Recommendation 2:** UNDP BiH should, in collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, explore the potential for enhancing development planning and management in future similar interventions through increased collaborations and partnerships that further

support the localisation of the BiH Framework for SDGs **(Related to all Findings; Moderate priority)**.

In light of the successful introduction of new legal and methodological frameworks during ILDP Phase III, and the perceived need for the entire system to remain contextually applicable, there is potential to diversify the implementation of new development strategies. The emphasis will be on incorporating more innovative approaches during strategic development planning and management, to not only address the need for contextual applicability, but contribute towards sustainable approaches and results, as well as the localisation of the BiH Framework for SDGs.

**Recommendation 3:** In collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, UNDP BiH should further explore the contribution of post-Project activities to the EU Accession Agenda and the SDG Framework in BiH, to address existing gaps and facilitate increased capacities at the subnational level to apply for external funding **(Related to all Findings; High priority)**.

Given the commitment of BiH to contribute towards the achievement of the SDGs, it would be worthwhile for post-Project activities to support this effort, in the interest of strategic national development. Based on the objective of ILDP Phase III, to contribute towards country integration into the EU, efforts to sustain the results of the project should further include support for the BiH EU Accession Agenda.

#### Operational recommendations

**Recommendation 4:** UNDP BiH, under the direction of the ILDP Project Manager, should continue to work closely with the lead planning institutions and the relevant EU project during the phasing out period, to ensure that programme-based budgeting is fully integrated into strategic development processes at all levels of subnational government **(Related to all Findings; High priority)**.

A central requirement for the effective scaling-up of subnational development efforts has been the need to link strategic planning with programme-based budgeting. The objective would be to facilitate horizontal coordination by ensuring that strategic development is anchored in a process of accountability for development results.

**Recommendation 5:** UNDP BiH, under the direction of the ILDP Project Manager and in collaboration with the lead planning institutions at the entity-level and within BD BiH, should continue to implement the Project Exit Strategy during the remaining project timeframe to ensure effective handover of responsibilities and the scaling up of the good practices for strategic development that emerged during the Project **(Related to all Findings; High priority)**.

The ILDP Exit Strategy has provided a detailed and comprehensive overview of the steps that need to be taken to transfer project responsibilities to entity-level domestic institutions by project completion. It is in the interest of results sustainability, including continued progress towards project milestones that have not yet been attained, to ensure that the lead planning institutions receive scheduled guidance to: i) continue to build on results achieved; ii) ensure the proper functioning of frameworks and processes; and iii) support future system scale up to other local and cantonal governments.

**Recommendation 6:** UNDP BiH should explore the possibility of scaling up the results of the Project to allow for harmonised development planning and management at the state level, given the potential for Project results to contribute towards the achievement of the nationalised SDGs **(Related to all Findings; Moderate priority)**.

The SDG Framework in BiH defines a common position across all levels of government for the contribution of BiH towards the achievement of the SDGs. Scaling up the results of the Project to the State level would allow for BiH ownership of results sustainability and support the establishment of a consolidated national system for planning and development management, which is one of the requirements of the EU. It would also facilitate vertical and horizontal coordination of the national development effort.

### Lessons learned

- In a post-conflict setting that is characterised by decentralised governance, the socio-political climate can continue to influence efforts to facilitate strategic development, even within a regulated context;
- While there can be an emergent willingness by stakeholder institutions across BiH governments to take ownership of strategic development processes to support the achievement of anticipated results, there is a learning curve that needs to be addressed through built technical capacities at all levels of government to steer development efforts;
- The possibility for the sudden emergence of challenging circumstances that are beyond the control of development interventions signifies the need for contingency planning, as well as the exploration of alternative and/ or innovative approaches to project implementation;
- In the interest of maximising the effectiveness of interventions for strategic development, it is important to take stock of similar interventions that are being implemented by other development partners in the project locality; and

- Although there is an assumption that the topic of strategic development does not hold significant appeal to members of the media, there is a conceivable role for media houses to play in supporting development efforts at the subnational level.
- Policy making processes, regulatory changes and effective cross-governmental consultations take time. They require careful planning, management and the engagement of all relevant stakeholders, as well as flexibility in solution finding.

# Acronyms

---

<b>AMC</b>	Association of Municipalities and Cities
<b>BIH</b>	Bosnia and Herzegovina
<b>BD</b>	Brčko District
<b>COVID-19</b>	Coronavirus disease 2019
<b>CSO</b>	Civil Society Organisation
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>FBIH</b>	Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina
<b>GDP</b>	Gross Domestic Product
<b>GDPR</b>	General Data Protection Regulation
<b>ILDLP</b>	Integrated Local Development Project
<b>MiPRO</b>	Methodology for Integrated Strategic Planning
<b>OECD - DAC</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
<b>RS</b>	Republika Srpska
<b>SDC</b>	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
<b>SDGs</b>	Sustainable Development Goals
<b>ToR</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>ToT</b>	Training of Trainers
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNEG</b>	United Nations Evaluation Group
<b>USD</b>	United States Dollar

# Table of Contents

---

Acknowledgements .....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
Acronyms .....	7
I. Introduction.....	10
1.1. Overview.....	10
1.2. Evaluation purpose .....	10
1.3. Objectives .....	10
1.4. Scope .....	10
1.5. Structure of the report .....	11
2. The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP) .....	12
2.1. Project description.....	12
2.2. Governance and management .....	13
2.3. Country context .....	14
3. Methodology.....	17
3.1. Technical approach.....	17
3.2. Implementation and analysis.....	17
3.3. Limitations and mitigation measures .....	18
4. Main Findings .....	19
4.1. Relevance.....	19
4.2. Coherence.....	23
4.3. Effectiveness.....	24
4.4. Efficiency.....	37
4.5. Cross-cutting themes .....	40
4.6. Impact.....	41
4.7. Sustainability.....	43
5. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned .....	46
5.1. Conclusions .....	46
5.2. Recommendations.....	47
5.3. Lessons learned .....	50

# Exhibits

---

Exhibit 1: ILDP Project Partners ..... 13

Exhibit 2: Consolidated results of ILDP Phase I and 2 ..... 15

Exhibit 3: Overview of analytical methods ..... 18

Exhibit 4: Summary of results achieved, Outcome 1 ..... 29

Exhibit 5: Summary of results achieved, Outcome 2 ..... 33

Exhibit 6: Summary of results achieved, Outcome 3 ..... 37

Exhibit 7: Summary statistics ..... 38

# List of Appendices

---

Appendix I: Terms of Reference ..... 52

Appendix II: Approved Methodology ..... 62

Appendix III: Evaluation Criteria ..... 67

Appendix IV: Evaluation Matrix ..... 68

Appendix V: List of Documents Reviewed ..... 89

Appendix VI: Key Informants Consulted ..... 90

Appendix VII: Interview Protocols ..... 93

Appendix VIII: Overview of Project Achievements ..... 117

Appendix IX: Overview of Achievements – Gender and Social Inclusion ..... 122

Appendix X: Map of Findings and Recommendations ..... 127

# I. Introduction

---

## I.1. Overview

This evaluation report presents the results of the final evaluation of the Integrated Local Development Project, Phase III (ILDP Phase III), as commissioned by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) Country Office. The evaluation was conducted by an external evaluation consultant, Halcyon Louis PhD, over the period October 2021 – January 2022, following contract signature on 11 October 2021.

In line with the terms of reference for the consultancy, the evaluation was conducted remotely using the Zoom platform. To safeguard the rights and confidentiality of all project stakeholders, the evaluation adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The evaluation further complied with the international standards of UNDP and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) to ensure quality.

## I.2. Evaluation purpose

The purpose of this evaluation has been to provide an impartial review of ILDP Phase III based on five OECD-DAC criteria (relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability), to determine overall project performance; management; and achievements.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, the results of the evaluation will be used to strengthen the remaining project implementation period and inform future UNDP BiH programming.

## I.3. Objectives

As its main objective, the evaluation examined overall project performance, with a focus on the extent to which expected results were achieved. The specific objectives of the evaluation involved:

1. Examining if and how the delivered outputs contributed to improved performance by [the] Project's target group and beneficiaries, enabling:
  - i) functional development planning and

management ... at subnational levels; and ii) better quality of life for the citizens;

2. Conducting a substantive analysis of the effectiveness of the project approach and feedback from beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders;
3. Assessing cause and effect relations within the Project, identifying the extent to which the observed changes can be attributed to the Project;
4. Providing forward-looking recommendations to the Government of Switzerland and UNDP on the sustainability of the project results and the Project's scaling-up potential;
5. Considering the results of the Project's contribution to address the COVID-19 pandemic; and
6. Assessing the degree to which the Project supported or promoted gender equality; a rights-based approach; and human development

Source: ToR, Sections b) and c).

## I.4. Scope

Pending the end of the Project in December 2021, the scope of the evaluation covered results achievement over the four-year implementation timeframe (2017 – 2021), against the established targets of the results framework for ILDP Phase III. The key areas of focus for the analysis were:

1. Changes in development planning and management at the subnational level that can be attributed to the Project;
2. The emergent results of the approach taken by the Project to address the COVID-19 pandemic;
3. The Project's processes, innovations, strategic partnerships and linkages in the specific country context that proved critical in producing the intended outputs;
4. External factors that facilitated and/or hindered outputs achievement, in terms of the external

---

<sup>1</sup> ToR, Section 2a

environment, risks, and crisis caused by the pandemic; and

5. Internal factors that facilitated and/or hindered outputs achievement, including weaknesses in programme design, management and implementation, human resource skills, and resources.

Source: Adapted from ToR, Section 2c

- Section 3 presents the approved evaluation methodology;
- Section 4 discusses the main evaluation findings;
- Section 5 establishes the emergent conclusions; recommendations; and lessons learned; and
- Appendices I – X present supporting information to further qualify the discussion within the main report.

## **I.5. Structure of the report**

Further to the introduction, which provides an overview of the evaluation purpose; objectives; and scope, the structure of this report is as follows:

- Section 2 outlines the background and rationale for ILDP Phase III;

## 2. The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDLP)

---

### 2.1. Project description

The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDLP) was launched in 2008 to harmonise integrated and inclusive strategic planning at the subnational level in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). ILDP is a system-building project that was developed to support the establishment of regulatory; operational; and institutional frameworks at the subnational level, to facilitate functional development planning and management.

As its overall objective, Phase III of the Project involved scaling up and consolidating the knowledge and systems that were generated through the 2008 project launch. Based on this approach, ILDP Phase III was used to reinforce the effective delivery of public policies at the subnational level, by assisting project partners to establish functional development planning and management systems. In essence, the Project was designed to contribute towards better development results in BiH, by supporting i) country integration into the European Union (EU); and ii) a visible improvement in citizen quality-of-life, by facilitating increased access by citizens to better local services and livelihood opportunities (see sidebar).

The Project partners for ILDP Phase III were the entity-level governments; Brčko District BiH; government ministries; and the two Associations of Municipalities and Cities (AMCs) (see Exhibit I). They were selected for the Project as they are either responsible for administering a development planning portfolio or are strategically positioned to advocate for inclusive development. Relatedly, the target beneficiaries of the Project were the local and cantonal governments, and civil society organisations (CSOs) in each locality.

### ILDLP Phase III Outcomes

**Outcome 1:** Lead planning structures at entity government level steer the development planning and management systems characterized by vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards the citizens

**Outcome 2:** Local and cantonal governments effectively address needs of citizens and accelerate growth through inclusive development planning and management

**Outcome 3:** Citizens, civil society organisations and media take pro-active part in development management and benefit from improved services

Source: ILDP Phase III Logical Framework

ILDLP Phase III is a joint initiative of UNDP BiH (the Project implementer) and the Government of Switzerland, through the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (the Project donor). The initial budget for the Project was USD 5.4 million, 93% of which represented the financial contribution of the Government of Switzerland (USD 5 million). UNDP BiH provided co-financing for project implementation in the amount of USD 0.4 million (7% of the initial project budget). As project activities were to be implemented in partnership with government ministries and local governments, a commitment to co-finance the initial project budget was also made by the entity governments, in the amount of USD 1.3 million; the local governments, in the amount of USD 0.4 million; and the cantonal governments, in the amount of USD 0.2 million.

### List of Project Partners, ILDP

- BiH Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees
- Federation of BiH (FBIH) Development Planning Institute
- FBIH Ministry of Justice
- Government of Brčko District BiH (BD BiH)
- Republika Srpska Strategic Planning Department
- Republika Srpska Ministry of Administration and Local Government
- 10 cantonal governments (FBIH)
- 42 local governments
- Associations of Municipalities and Cities (FBIH; and Republika Srpska)

#### Exhibit I: ILDP Project Partners<sup>2</sup>

Project implementation has comprised two sets of activities. First, the Project has supported the establishment of comprehensive regulatory and methodological frameworks at the entity level and within BD BiH, to enhance development planning and management. Second, it has provided technical assistance to local and cantonal governments, to enable them to build critical institutional capacities and develop effective and efficient practices for improved public service delivery. To support built institutional capacities within local and cantonal governments, a seed funding mechanism was further established, to provide financial awards to local governments and cantons with the best-performing development management systems.

As most of the partner local and cantonal governments for ILDP Phase III were underdeveloped, they had limited access to resources to initiate timely development management reforms. By way of mitigation, the Project Board requested a cost extension to engage underdeveloped (and under-resourced) local governments from both entities, as they are generally excluded from this type of support by their governments and international organisations. The cost extension was used to: i) implement at least one priority project from the newly-adopted development strategy in under-resourced local and cantonal governments; ii) increase the volume of seed funding, to provide awards to a greater number of municipal governments; and iii) support underdeveloped local governments to prepare their development strategies. The request was approved by the Government of Switzerland in April 2019, and resulted in a financial

<sup>2</sup> Source: Project document

allocation of USD 1.04 million to the seed funding mechanism. Given the need to restructure and/ or reschedule project activities because of the COVID-19 pandemic, a non-cost-extension was also approved to February 2022.

## 2.2. Governance and management

ILDP Phase III has been governed by a Project Board, the members of which represent the donor agency and the project partners. The Project Board has been the main steering mechanism of the Project, and comprises senior officials from all levels of government; AMC representatives from both entities; senior officers of the Government of Switzerland, who are based at the Embassy of Switzerland in BiH; and senior staff of UNDP BiH (see text box). Based on its role as the project implementer, UNDP BiH has also served as the secretariat to the Project Board.

### Membership of the Project Board – ILDP Phase III

- BiH Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees
- FBIH Ministry of Justice
- RS Ministry of Administration and Local Self Government
- Associations of Municipalities and Cities (FBIH; RS)
- Government of Switzerland/ SDC
- UNDP BiH

Source: ILDP Phase III, Project document

The main role of the Project Board has been to provide strategic guidance for the implementation of ILDP Phase III. As the highest decision-making body for the Project, the Project Board has had oversight of project management and coordination, including among its responsibilities the approval of annual work plans and the supervision of project implementation progress. The meetings of the Project Board were to be convened at least once every quarter or upon the request of the ILDP Project Manager. Moreover, to enable its members to effectively perform their function collectively, the Project Board has been supported by a project assurance role. The project assurance role was assigned to the UNDP BiH Rural and Regional

Development Sector Lead, and has involved providing support to ensure that project milestones are managed and completed.

The daily management of the Project has been the responsibility of the ILDP Project Manager, who is supported by the ILDP Project Team. As the most senior team member, the Project Manager has been responsible for project coordination and team management, including the provision of technical guidance for project implementation; results achievement; and quality assurance. The ILDP Project Team is located within the UNDP BiH Country Office and comprises technical specialists in the areas of policy; development management; and capacity development, and a team of field officers, who support project implementation at the local level.<sup>3</sup> Administrative support to the Project has also been provided by UNDP BiH permanent staff on a part-time basis.

## 2.3. Country context

### 2.3.1. Country-wide context

Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) is an upper middle-income country with a population of 3.5 million that is gradually declining. Further to the 1995 Dayton Peace Agreement,<sup>4</sup> BiH has also had a complex, multi-tiered governance structure, which has been characterized by decentralised governance based on multiple constitutions and legal systems. Although the highest level of political decision-making is at the State level, decentralised governance occurs vertically, at the level of two entities and several local and cantonal governments, and horizontally, at the level of the entities and BD BiH. As the existence of multi-tiered decentralised governments has contributed towards limited cross-governmental collaboration, the political climate in BiH has been fragile. According to the Fragile States Index 2021<sup>5</sup>, BiH is ranked 77<sup>th</sup> among 179 fragile

states. While there are many socio-economic grievances at the national and subnational levels in relation to the rule of law and human rights, corruption has been a major challenge to country development. Public administration, in particular, has been used by the political elites to maintain control over socio-political processes and post-election appointments. This has been illustrated by mass public sector recruitment based on party affiliation criteria, which is used to buy social peace and keep elected officials in power. In essence, the process of public sector reform lacks the political support that is necessary for administrative modernisation, to provide better services to citizens, including across sectors (public; private; and non-governmental). As a result, BiH has experienced slow economic growth; high rates of unemployment; and socio-economic inequality.

The country has a high level of human development<sup>6</sup>, but is still below the average for the Europe and Central Asia region. Poverty remains a major concern, particularly in rural areas and among minorities<sup>7</sup>. Based on the results of the 2015 Household Budget Survey, the poverty headcount ratio showed that 17% of the population was living on less than 60% of the median national income, a lower value than in many countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Between 2018 and 2020, for example, the annual rate of gross domestic product (GDP) growth in BiH fell from 3.7% to -4%<sup>8</sup>. As a result, there has been fluctuating unemployment, demonstrated by the decline in the unemployment rate from 18.4% in 2018 to 15.7% in 2019, and a subsequent increase in 2020 to 16.8%. The BiH labour market has been further characterised by an aging and shrinking workforce and high inactivity, especially among women.<sup>9</sup> The emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic<sup>10</sup> in Europe also triggered an economic crisis in BiH that led to significant job loss, in particular within the services sector, given the government-imposed restrictions that were implemented to build health

<sup>3</sup> Three out of four field officers are based in UNDP regional offices, namely Bihac; Banja Luka; and Mostar.

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.osce.org/bih/126173>

<sup>5</sup> <https://fragilestatesindex.org/country-data/>

<sup>6</sup> Measuring average levels of income, health and education, the Human Development Index of BiH was at 0.769 in 2019, ranking it 75<sup>th</sup> among the countries with a high level of human development. [Human Development Indices and Indicators, 2019 Statistical Update, UNDP.](#)

<sup>7</sup> Household Budget Survey, 2015, BiH Agency of Statistics.

<sup>8</sup> World Bank, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG?locations=BA>.

<sup>9</sup> [http://bhas.gov.ba/data/Publikacije/Bilteni/2019/LAB\\_00\\_2019\\_TB\\_0\\_BS.pdf](http://bhas.gov.ba/data/Publikacije/Bilteni/2019/LAB_00_2019_TB_0_BS.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> Covid-19 is an infectious disease caused by the virus strain "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus" (SARS-CoV-2). In March 2020, the World Health Organization declared the coronavirus outbreak a pandemic and a public health emergency of international concern.

sector resilience and protect economic sectors and households. Yet, the pandemic did not negate the existence of structural weaknesses within BiH, including an unfavourable business environment and limited competitiveness<sup>11</sup>. With the per capita GDP at some 32% of the EU average<sup>12</sup>, the pace at which BiH has been converging with the EU remains among the slowest in the region. Moreover, elected governments were not all instated within BiH following the October 2018 General Elections<sup>13</sup>. As a result, high-level decision-making to establish policies and initiate public sector reform has been undermined by: i) a complex governance structure; ii) low technical capacities within government institutions; and iii) the inability of BiH governments to achieve political consensus.

### 2.3.2. BiH development planning and ILDP Phase III

Prior to the launch of ILDP Phase III in 2017, strategic country-wide development planning in BiH had been challenged by the lack of a consolidated system to prioritise and facilitate development. Moreover, BiH had not had a long-term development strategy since 2007. Although the RS and FBiH Governments had each made efforts to develop long-term strategic documents, neither process had been finalised. As similar efforts by local and cantonal governments were largely conducted independently, they also did not contribute towards a consolidated system for development, including the improvement of public services.

BiH governments were especially challenged by limited human resource capacity and technical expertise to facilitate effective strategic development planning. As a result, there has been an absence of uniform strategic planning and development management systems at the national and sub-national levels to facilitate:

1. A fully harmonized approach to planning across all government levels;
2. Vertical coordination and alignment of development priorities;
3. Effective implementation of development strategies through the linking of strategic

planning, institutional work planning and public budgets; and

4. The systemic monitoring of the implementation of strategic documents and development impact.

In spite of the challenging socio-political and economic environment that existed prior to ILDP Phase III, BiH made significant progress towards functional strategic development planning and management at the subnational level (see Exhibit 2).

Project Phase	Results
Phase I and II (2008 – 2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formulation and institutionalisation of a harmonised local development planning framework</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of systemic development management approach at the local level</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emerging development planning and management regulatory framework in FBiH entity</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of the entity-level Local Financing Mechanism</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to local economic development and job creation</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement of service delivery at the local level</li> </ul>

Exhibit 2: Consolidated results of ILDP Phase I and 2<sup>14</sup>

During ILDP Phase I and II, individual decentralised governments made efforts to develop strategic documents, such as sector-specific strategies, and regulatory frameworks for development planning. In 2010, for example, the introduction of a standardised approach to strategic planning at the local level contributed to a positive shift towards the harmonisation and systematisation of integrated local

<sup>11</sup> The [World Bank Doing Business Report for 2020](#) ranks BiH as 90<sup>th</sup> out of 190 countries globally. The Competitive Industrial Performance Index by the UN Industrial Development Organization ranks BiH 80<sup>th</sup> on the global scale of industrial competitiveness (latest available data for 2018), <https://stat.unido.org/country/BIH.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> [Eurostat](#), 2020.

<sup>13</sup> Governments were not established at the level of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) and two cantons.

<sup>14</sup> Source: ILDP Project document

development. As a result, approximately 50 % of the local governments developed local strategies using the standardised methodology.<sup>15</sup> By establishing relevant institutional structures and internal processes, an additional 30% of the local governments also facilitated an integrated approach to local development management. Over the period 2015-2017, in particular, local and cantonal governments provided the most advanced examples of development plans that were functional and systemic.

Notably, the introduction of the entity-level Local Financing Mechanism in 2014 contributed to job creation and improved services to citizens. Using an EU approach to grant scheme management, the Financing Mechanism supported the implementation of priority development projects, as articulated within strategic local development plans. Specifically, a vertical approach to implementation, involving co-funding by the Project and entity-level governments, was used to allocate over USD 3.5 million on a competitive basis, to more than 44 local and cantonal development projects.

ILDP Phase III facilitated several reform processes at the level of BiH governments. At the State level, for example, the Project contributed to the development and adoption of the Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Framework in BiH. In addition, although the Project was not engaged in the development of the Joint Socio-Economic Reforms for the Period 2019 – 2022 (Reform Agenda), ILDP Phase III contributed to its implementation. Specifically, the Project addressed the activity that was related to the coherent policy-making and planning system that was defined in the Action Plan for the Reform Agenda. Importantly, the SDG Framework is the first country-wide document that offers a unique opportunity for a common long-term sustainable development agenda. By extension, the BiH Council of Ministers endorsed the Reform Agenda in January 2020. As the Reform Agenda was similarly endorsed by the two entity governments

in October 2019, it has established development priorities that align with the recommendations of the EU Opinion and the priorities of the SDG Framework in BiH.

Relatedly, BiH has been a potential candidate country for EU accession since 2003. The Stabilisation and Association Agreement<sup>16</sup> with the EU was signed in 2008 and entered into force in June 2015, followed by its adaptation in 2017 to consider the accession of Croatia to the EU. Further to the formal application by BiH for EU membership in February 2016, a critical milestone in EU-BiH relations was reached in May 2019 when the EU Commission issued its Opinion on the BiH application<sup>17</sup>.

On the one hand, therefore, the integrated strategies of the local governments and cantons established objectives that ranged from economic to social development and environmental protection, thereby addressing key issues of societal concern in each locality. On the other hand, the effective implementation of these strategies required concerted cross-departmental interaction and consistent alignment with the budgets and approaches of the local and cantonal governments. In light of this context, ILDP Phase III was developed to address the country-wide gap in strategic development planning and management capacity, taking as its starting point, the need for increased capacities at the subnational level.

---

<sup>15</sup> [https://www.ba.undp.org/content/bosnia\\_and\\_herzegovina/en/home/library/poverty/methodology-for-integrated-local-development-planning-in-bosnia-.html](https://www.ba.undp.org/content/bosnia_and_herzegovina/en/home/library/poverty/methodology-for-integrated-local-development-planning-in-bosnia-.html)

<sup>16</sup> The Stabilisation and Association Agreement is the framework of relations between the EU and Western Balkan countries for the implementation of the Stabilisation and Association Process, i.e. the EU policy for the region regarding EU membership. As each agreement is country-specific, it has been the basis for the implementation of the BiH EU Accession Agenda.

<sup>17</sup> [Analytical Report accompanying the Commission's Opinion on BiH's application for membership of the EU](#), Commission Staff Working Document, 2019.

# 3. Methodology

---

## 3.1. Technical approach

The evaluation of ILDP Phase III was theory-based and was conducted using a client-approved evaluation matrix. It was further supported by an inclusive participatory approach; utilisation-focused principles; mixed-methods; and purposive sampling.

Theory-based evaluations are used to test the theory of change of an intervention, to identify the contextual factors that contributed towards results generation. As the ToR for the evaluation specified the need for the exercise to establish which contextual factors were ‘critical in producing the intended outputs,’ as well as those that ‘hindered progress,’ the theory-based approach has been applicable. To support this line of analysis, an evaluation matrix was used to conceptualise the evaluation under five OECD-DAC criteria: i) relevance; ii) effectiveness; iii) efficiency; iv) impact; and v) sustainability, in line with ToR requirements. Three cross-cutting themes, gender equality; a rights-based approach; and human development, along with the coherence and lessons learned criteria, were incorporated into the matrix to implement the summative component of the evaluation. Further, to facilitate the formative component of the evaluation and inform future project programming, a recommendations criterion was also incorporated (see Appendix III, where the evaluation criteria are defined, and Appendix IV, for the detailed evaluation matrix).

As project implementation involved partnerships with multiple stakeholder organisations, an inclusive participatory approach was used to: i) provide all categories of relevant project stakeholders with the opportunity to contribute towards evaluation design and implementation (as applicable); and ii) draw on their knowledge and experience as the key informants of the project experience. The overall advantage of this approach is the avenue it creates for generating better-quality data, to inform reliable results and appropriate recommendations, thereby increasing the potential for policy uptake of the evaluation results. Based on the understanding that the end-users are key informants of ‘the Project story,’ utilisation-focused principles were used to complement the inclusive participatory approach by facilitating an evaluation that was conducted for and by its end-users. As the evaluation

was managed by an external evaluator, however, the results that were generated were impartial, given that the evaluator was responsible for final data analysis and results synthesis.

Mixed methods were used where applicable, to align emergent results with the type of data that was being generated. The use of mixed methods has the advantage of supporting data triangulation across multiple sources, which creates the potential for increased data accuracy and credibility to inform the reliability of the evaluation results.

Purposive sampling based on a sequential approach was used to structure the evaluation around the main evaluation criteria and questions to increase results accuracy. In general, this approach supports the identification of the key informants who are best suited to provide detailed responses to the evaluation questions. When purposive sampling is supported by a sequential approach, it further allows for additional data generation at any stage of the evaluation, to facilitate results reliability and completeness. Given the existing differences across subnational governments at the local and cantonal level, simplified criteria was further used, where applicable, to increase the diversity of the evaluation sample. The criteria were applied to the cantonal authorities, in particular, which differ in terms of size and capacity for development management.

Key informants for the Republic of Srpska and the Federation of BiH, were also selected randomly, as they were more numerous for these subnational governments. Moreover, the key informants from these governments each had similar levels of project engagement.

## 3.2. Implementation and analysis

The evaluation was executed over five distinct, but overlapping phases: i) Inception; ii) Data generation; iii) Data analysis and results synthesis; iv) Reporting and validation; and v) Assignment management. To ensure ethical compliance, evaluation design and implementation complied with the international evaluation standards and guidelines of UNEG; UNDP; GDPR; and OECD-DAC.

During the inception phase, the evaluator and the evaluation focal points at UNDP-BiH participated in a remote start-up meeting to better understand key issues for evaluation start-up, including the needs and expectations of both parties; and the evaluation objectives and context. The key deliverable for this phase of the evaluation was the inception report, which was informed by client feedback and served as the client-approved evaluation guide.

Data generation involved an in-depth review of relevant documents and the literature; and key informant consultations. The in-depth review of relevant documents was guided by the key questions and sub-questions of the client-approved evaluation matrix. Key informant consultations were facilitated as individual and/ or small group interviews and were conducted remotely. They were also guided by data generation tools that were tailored to each category of key informant.

In order to purposefully influence analysis through cross-validation, to produce credible evaluation findings, data analysis was based on a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods (see Exhibit 3). The results of data analysis were used to inform results synthesis and the production of draft documents during the reporting phase. All draft documents were submitted to UNDP BiH through the evaluation focal points, for review and feedback to inform finalisation.

Method	Aim
<b>Descriptive analysis</b>	To understand and describe the main project components
<b>Content analysis</b>	To identify common trends/ themes/ patterns as well as diverging views
<b>Quantitative analysis</b>	To generate summary statistics on resource use for guiding the comparative analysis
<b>Counterfactual analysis</b>	To inform the comparison of baseline and endline values
<b>Comparative analysis</b>	To examine findings across emerging themes, and identify good practices/ innovative approaches/ lessons learnt for generating emergent hypotheses

Exhibit 3: Overview of analytical methods

### 3.3. Limitations and mitigation measures

The evaluation was challenged by four limitations: i) the COVID-19 travel restrictions; ii) resource limitations; iii) the unavailability of some stakeholders for consultations; and iv) language.

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, it was not possible for the evaluator to travel to the project country to facilitate in-person consultations with the key project informants. To mitigate the emergent circumstances of the pandemic, therefore, remote consultations were used to engage key informants across distance.

The evaluation of ILDP Phase III was time-sensitive. As a result, a restricted timeframe was allocated for intensive data generation; analysis; and reporting by an individual evaluator, which required a rapid turn-around to meet corporate deadlines. To successfully mitigate the limitations of time and human resource capacity, therefore, the evaluator collaborated closely with the ILDP Project Team to schedule consultations with key informants. During this process, purposive sampling was used to identify the key informants who were most suitable for providing detailed information on the Project. Alternative key informants were also selected, when applicable, to mitigate the challenge of the unavailability of some key informants for consultations.

As the evaluator was not versed in the local languages of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the difference in language was an additional challenge for the evaluation. With the support of the UNDP BiH Country Office, however, the evaluator gained access to independent translation support, which was used to facilitate remote consultations with key project informants, as required (see Appendix II for the full evaluation methodology).

## 4. Main Findings

---

In response to ToR requirements, this section of the report presents the main findings of the evaluation, which are discussed based on seven criteria: relevance; coherence; effectiveness; efficiency; cross-cutting themes (gender; rights-based approach; and human development); impact; and sustainability. Each criterion has been defined using standard OECD-DAC and UNEG definitions (see Appendix III). In addition, data analysis was informed by an in-depth review of relevant project documents and the literature, and key informant consultations.

### 4.1. Relevance

The relevance criterion was measured as the extent to which the objectives and design of ILDP Phase III responded to the needs; policies; and priorities of the target project beneficiaries; the project country; and the implementing partners, as well as global priorities, and continued to do so even if circumstances changed. Based on this approach, the evaluation results have shown that **the Project has been relevant at the country-wide level. It has been responsive to the need for increased technical capacities within subnational governments to inform public sector reform. The expected result of this process has been the enhanced delivery of public sector services for the benefit of BiH citizens. As such, the core project activities have addressed: i) the policy reform needs of public sector institutions at the subnational level; and ii) the need to enhance the lives of citizens through improved public service delivery. By aligning with the international development agenda, ILDP Phase III has further contributed to the attainment of country-level development priorities.**

**Finding 1:** From a conceptual perspective, ILDP Phase III has been contextually relevant to BiH, given its responsiveness to the need for increased technical capacities across subnational governments, to facilitate public sector reform for enhanced public service delivery.

A major challenge to country-wide development in BiH has been the absence of a consolidated system for prioritising and facilitating national development. At

the level of the two entity governments, in particular, there had been no evidence of efforts to facilitate harmonised strategic planning through vertical alignment and programme-based budgeting prior to ILDP. As strategic planning was harmonised at the local and cantonal level during ILDP I and II, by 2017 most of the local governments and all 10 cantons had produced development strategies using a harmonised approach.<sup>18</sup> At the local government level, strategic development planning and management was now based on an institutionalised and standardised planning methodology, and local strategies were being increasingly linked to municipal budgets. Moreover, approximately 70% of the local governments in BiH had produced local development strategies and a further 45% had applied a local development management model. Similarly, at the level of the cantonal governments, a harmonised development planning methodology was established and was used to produce integrated strategies in all 10 cantons. At least five cantonal governments had also taken steps towards introducing mid-term planning and budgeting within cantonal institutions.

Overall, 40 local governments and 10 cantons received support through ILDP Phase I and II, to initiate planning processes that were highly participatory. This support was provided as a requirement of the standardised methodology for integrated strategic planning (MiPRO),<sup>19</sup> which promotes contextual development planning and management through realistic approaches; results-based management; structures for development management; and the ownership of MiPRO by subnational governments. Relatedly, therefore, the planning processes engaged stakeholders from across the public; private and non-governmental sectors, as well as civil society, to inform evidence-based strategic planning. ILDP Phase III did not commence, however, with public consultations to identify and prioritise social issues for development intervention. Yet, it was informed by the critical need for planning systems at the entity level, to facilitate programme-based budgeting, as well as the vertical and horizontal alignment of policies. In addition, it took account of the challenges faced by the local and cantonal governments, in terms of their lack of access

---

<sup>18</sup> ILDP Phase III Project document, February 2017

<sup>19</sup> MiPRO is the standardised methodology of the Project.

to technical expertise, to scale up and/or implement their development planning methodologies.

In light of this context, ILDP Phase III was developed to: i) address the lack of an enabling environment for public sector reform at the subnational level; and ii) facilitate functional development planning and management through an integrated approach to harmonised local development. As a result, the project introduced a planning system to ensure: i) vertical coordination among entity-level institutions; local governments; and cantons in FBiH (in the first instance); and ii) the horizontal alignment of development strategies with mid-term and annual institutional work plans and budgets. This planning system has been relevant and, in effect, critical for strategic implementation, as well as systematic monitoring; evaluation; and reporting at the subnational level.

**Finding 2:** At the level of project implementation, the core project activities addressed the policy reform needs of the institutional project beneficiaries.

The aim of ILDP Phase III has been to scale-up and consolidate the emergent knowledge and systems from its first two phases, to facilitate public sector reform and contribute towards an improved quality of life for all citizens, as well as the national EU Accession Agenda (see sub-Section 2.1). In addition to BiH citizens, therefore, the target beneficiaries of the Project have included planning institutions within the two entities and BD BiH, which have the capacity to steer strategic subnational development. Consequently, although the consolidation of a country-wide system for strategic development has been a work in progress throughout the project cycle, there has been evidence of the contribution of the Project towards public sector reform at the level of the entity institutions and BD BiH (see Appendix VII for the expected and achieved results of ILDP Phase III).

First, the core project activities included support to entity governments through their lead planning structures, to steer strategic development based on vertical and horizontal coordination. As an example, ILDP Phase III built on the full regulatory framework for development planning and management that was established by the FBiH Government during the project cycle. Specifically, the project collaborated closely with the lead FBiH planning structure (the FBiH Development Planning Institute), to increase the capacity of entity-level institutions for vertical and

horizontal development planning and management. This process involved the design and delivery of a Training-of-Trainers (ToT) programme, in collaboration with the FBiH Development Planning Institute, as well as the FBiH Civil Service Agency. The intention has been to:

- Inform policy development by the FBiH Government;
- Integrate methodologies for planning and development management at all levels of the FBiH Government; and
- Equip the lead planning structure with necessary technical capacities for the future independent functioning of the development planning and management system.

As a result, ILDP Phase III built on the 2017 FBiH Law on Development Planning and Management, which was finalised with the technical assistance of the Project. Of interest, FBiH has been the first entity/ country in the Western Balkans region to adopt this law, and was followed by Croatia<sup>20</sup> and Serbia<sup>21</sup>, in each of which, similar legislations were adopted in 2017 and 2018, respectively.

Second, project implementation addressed the need for enhanced capacities at the local and cantonal levels, to ensure that local development built on the results of ILDP Phase I and II (see sub-Section 2.3.2). Included among the achievements of ILDP during its previous phases was the facilitation of standardised strategic planning through inclusive participatory processes. The intention was to engage civil society in public consultations, with emphasis on vulnerable and/ or marginalised social groups (e.g. women; elderly persons; persons living with disabilities; etc.), to identify priority social and economic challenges within municipalities, for inclusion in local development plans (see Finding 1). ILDP Phase III continued to provide technical support to local and cantonal governments, therefore, to support the development and implementation of their local development plans. At the cantonal level, for example, there has been a lack of technical capacity for implementing approved strategic plans in the areas of annual planning; progress and results monitoring; and reporting. Based on collaboration with the FBiH Development Planning Institute; the FBiH Civil Service Agency and the FBiH AMC, therefore, the Project supported trainings to

<sup>20</sup> Law on the System of Strategic Planning and Development Management of the Republic of Croatia [https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2017\\_12\\_123\\_2798.html](https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2017_12_123_2798.html)

<sup>21</sup> Law on the Planning System of the Republic of Serbia <https://rsjp.gov.rs/en/news/law-on-the-planning-system-adopted/>

build the capacities of cantons (and local governments) in strategic plan implementation.

**Finding 3:** By facilitating improvements in public service delivery, ILDP Phase III has been of direct relevance to the priority development needs of BiH citizens.

During its third phase of implementation, ILDP facilitated increased access by local and cantonal governments to financial assistance for the implementation of local development projects. Access to financial assistance was provided through the Seed Funding that was managed by the Project and the Financing Mechanism,<sup>22</sup> which was co-funded by the Project and the entity-level governments.<sup>23</sup> Using the ILDP Seed Fund, the Project Board awarded seed funding to eligible local and cantonal governments based on two sets of allocation criteria: i) competitive performance-based awards against set development benchmarks; and ii) prioritised financial assistance for implementing local development projects in underdeveloped municipalities.<sup>24</sup>

Importantly, the rationale for prioritisation has been the limited access of underdeveloped municipalities to adequate institutional capacities and resources to facilitate strategic development. Within this context, municipalities that are under-resourced are challenged by a slower pace of public sector reform, to improve service delivery and the quality of life of citizens. Conversely, the competitive performance-based awards are allocated based on a performance assessment of partner local governments and cantons. Seed funding is awarded, in this instance, to the best performing local and cantonal governments based on concrete results in the area of strategic development. These results are structured around the adoption of local development strategies and the effectiveness of established development management systems. They further seek to encourage intermunicipal cooperation; partnerships with the private sector and civil society; the integration of considerations for gender equality and social inclusion; support to underdeveloped local governments; and innovative practice.

Invariably, both sets of criteria address the need for improved public service delivery. They have also facilitated the expressed needs of citizens, given the incorporation of priority citizen concerns into local development plans that have been awarded seed

funding. To illustrate, the projects that have been implemented with seed funding have included two projects in the Rudo and Berkovići municipalities, which can be categorised as being underdeveloped. Both projects were implemented in 2019. The project in the Rudo municipality supported the installation of a heating system within the sports hall of a secondary school, and the project in the Berkovići municipality involved road reconstruction. Upon completion, both projects had contributed towards improved services for 1,111 citizens (including 562 women and 33 agricultural households). In addition, the projects that were funded in Central Bosnian Canton and Western Herzegovina Canton supported the procurement and installation of modern diagnostic equipment to improve the healthcare system, and the facilitation of e-education services, respectively. A total of 250,000 citizens were identified as the target beneficiaries of both projects.

At the level of the RS entity, the RS Financing Mechanism for Support of Local Government also allowed for the implementation of projects in 13 municipalities and reached 58,000 beneficiaries, 6,000 of whom (10 %) were from socially excluded groups. As the contribution of the RS Government to the Financing Mechanism increased from 49% in 2019 to 61% in 2020, it further demonstrated a commitment by the entity government to improved public service delivery to enhance the lives of citizens

**Finding 4:** Project implementation has aligned directly with emergent ILDP development frameworks for subnational reform in the area of public administration and country-level priorities for the international development agenda.

In order to strengthen the capacities of subnational governments for development planning and management, ILDP Phase III has built on the results of its previous phases, as a contribution towards better public service delivery and a visible improvement in the quality of life of citizens. The results of ILDP Phase I and II have included, inter alia, the establishment of a harmonised approach to local development planning, and the entity-level Financing Mechanism for local development. Project implementation during these phases further contributed to the development of the FBiH Regulatory Framework, with emphasis on the 2017 FBiH Law on Development Planning and Management (see sub-Section 2.3.2), which was

---

<sup>22</sup> The Seed Funding Financing Mechanism is addressed in further detail in sub-Section 4.3, under Finding 8.

<sup>23</sup> The condition for the involvement of BD BiH in the seed funding facility was the establishment of a development strategy and basic development planning and management structures by the end of 2018 (Project document, p. 27). Neither the strategy nor the required structures were in place by this period.

<sup>24</sup> The Seed Funding Financing Mechanism is addressed in further detail in sub-Section 4.3.

adopted during ILDP Phase III. The common objective of all three phases has been general public sector reform through the enhanced functioning of government institutions. A central element this process has been the vertical alignment and horizontal coordination of strategic development across all levels of subnational government. The process of public sector reform has further included the facilitation of strategic financial management at the institutional level, by incorporating programme-based budgeting<sup>25</sup> into strategic planning processes.

As ILDP Phase III has focused on consolidating and scaling-up the achievements of its previous phases, there has been a direct alignment between the core project activities and the frameworks that have been generated for subnational development. Further, there has been evidence of an alignment between project implementation and BiH international development priorities. To illustrate, ILDP Phase III has contributed significantly to the harmonisation and strengthening of policy development and coordination at the subnational levels. The Project has contributed, for example, to the realisation of some of the objectives of the RS 2017 – 2021 Strategy for Local Self Government, in particular, the establishment of the Department for Strategic Planning within the RS General Secretariat.

The Project also committed its support for the designing of by-laws and capacity-development tools to launch the implementation of the RS Law on Strategic Planning and Development Management, following its adoption by the RS National Assembly in July 2021. As the lead planning structure of the RS Government, the RS Department for Strategic Planning is responsible for coordinating all planning activities. In terms of local self-government, however, the RS Ministry of Administration and Local Self-Government has played 'an important role in coordinating the overall issues of local self-government.'<sup>26</sup> Of interest, therefore, prior to the adoption of the law, neither institution had specific authority to coordinate local development planning. To resolve the existing ambiguity, the 2021 RS Law on Strategic Planning and Development Management expanded the responsibility for local development planning to the RS Department for Strategic Planning and the RS Ministry of Administration and Local Self-Government. As a result, both institutions are to

collaborate during the coordination of local development planning and management using the regulatory framework. ILDP Phase III has been providing support to both institutions to strengthen their internal capacities for this role.

ILDP Phase III has also supported the creation of institutional architecture and systems through which the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in BiH will be implemented. Notably, the 2019 BiH Voluntary Report to the UN indicated that the future implementation of the SDGs in BiH would be through strategic planning and development management systems. This was re-confirmed within the SDGs Framework in BiH, which was adopted by the BiH Council of Ministers in April 2021, following its adoption by the entity-level governments and the BD BiH Government. The SDG Framework in BiH was also incorporated into the development strategies that were produced by the FBiH Government and the BD BiH Government for the period 2021-2027. It was also incorporated into the 10 cantonal strategies and a number of local governments' strategies. In addition, there has been a direct alignment between project implementation and three of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for Agenda 2030, namely: i) SDG16, with its emphasis on peace and strong institutions; ii) SDG9, with its focus on building resilient infrastructure, promoting inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and fostering innovation; and iii) SDG10, where the focus is on reducing socio-economic inequalities. Specifically, project activities have facilitated inclusive local development through public sector reform; built capacities for strategic development planning and management; and improved public service delivery to contribute towards a better quality of life for all citizens.

As the project objective also involves contributing towards EU integration, it is worth noting that the emergent frameworks of ILDP Phase III have been relevant for policy development and coordination, which is one of the EU priorities for BiH.<sup>27</sup> Relatedly, therefore, the Project has supported the BiH EU Accession Agenda, which has entailed: i) strengthening public administration and facilitating institutional building at the subnational level, in the area of policy design and coordination; and ii) indirectly contributing

---

<sup>25</sup> Also referred to as results-based budgeting

<sup>26</sup> ILDP Exit Strategy, Revised version, April 2021

<sup>27</sup> COM (2019) 261 Final. Commission Opinion on Bosnia and Herzegovina's Application for Membership of the European Union. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council* [online]. pp. 14 – 16. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/opinion-bosnia-and-herzegovinas-application-membership-european-union-0\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/opinion-bosnia-and-herzegovinas-application-membership-european-union-0_en)

to Chapter 22: Regional Policy and Coordination of Structural Instruments.<sup>28</sup> As compliance with Chapter 22 facilitates access to pre-accession financial assistance for local development projects, BiH has had to provide evidence of strategic subnational development planning and management to gain access to development funding.<sup>29</sup>

ILDP Phase III also aligned with the strategic priorities of the 2015 – 2020 UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) for BiH, which placed emphasis on ‘the areas of governance; sustainable and inclusive development; and resilience.’<sup>30</sup> The Project also contributed to the development priorities of the Government of Switzerland, namely, the 2017 – 2020 Swiss Cooperation Strategy for BiH, which prioritized democratisation; local governance; and municipal services, inter alia. The combined priorities of the CPD and the Government of Switzerland have been reflected in project implementation during ILDP Phase III, given the focus of the Project on facilitating an enabling environment for functional strategic development.

## 4.2. Coherence

As a measure of coherence, the evaluation examined the compatibility of ILDP Phase III with other development interventions in BiH, including at the sectoral and institutional levels. **The results of this evaluation have highlighted the distinctiveness of the ILDP Phase III intervention strategy, given its emphasis on subnational development that is systematic; inclusive; and based on multiple stakeholder collaboration. By default, the Project has complemented other development interventions at the country level, and has not duplicated these efforts.**

**Finding 5:** As it has presented a distinct approach to functional subnational development, ILDP Phase III has complemented the intervention efforts of key development actors in BiH.

Given the complex political infrastructure of the project country, ILDP Phase III can be described as an intervention that has been implemented within a unique socio-political environment. Yet, several focal themes of the Project, in particular, built institutional capacities; inclusive development; and improved standards of living, are not exclusive areas of

intervention for the BiH context. Specifically, development interventions within BiH, including interventions by UNDP BiH, have focused on one or more of these thematic areas. As an example, over the period 2013 – 2020, UNDP BiH was the lead implementer for the Government of Switzerland/ Government of Sweden-supported Strengthening the Role of Local Communities/ Mjesne zajednice in BiH Project and the Government of Switzerland-supported Municipal Economic and Environmental Governance Project, both of which were based on the theme of inclusive development. A similar development intervention, the Strengthening Associations of Municipalities and Cities (AMCs) in BiH Project (2018 – 2022), has also been funded by the Governments of Switzerland and Sweden. This project has involved capacity enhancement for AMCs, to allow them to actively support local governments in the provision of efficient public services. It has further involved improving the role; status; and position of local governments relative to the higher levels of government in BiH.

The distinctiveness of ILDP Phase III, however, has been its support for strategic subnational development that is both systematic and inclusive, and involves collaboration among stakeholder networks. Notably, the focus of the previous two project phases was on standardising development planning across the local and cantonal governments, to support the establishment of strategic planning systems at the entity level and within BD BiH. Phase III of the Project has built on project achievements in these areas, by facilitating subnational development planning that is anchored in: i) vertical and horizontal cooperation across all levels of subnational government; ii) the continued engagement of socio-economic stakeholders in strategic development through an inclusive participatory process; iii) the provision of seed funding for local development; and iv) the facilitation of cross-governmental collaboration by establishing inter-ministerial/ multi-agency working groups. Following a similar process in FBiH, in 2018 the RS government established a working group to deliberate on defining the vision and principles for future development planning and management within the entity. As a result of this process, the RS Government-approved a regulatory impact assessment, which was conducted in

---

<sup>28</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/enlargement-policy/conditions-membership/chapters-acquis\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/enlargement-policy/conditions-membership/chapters-acquis_en)

<sup>29</sup> [https://www.euro-access.eu/calls/ipa\\_sectoral\\_programme\\_bosnia\\_and\\_herzegovina](https://www.euro-access.eu/calls/ipa_sectoral_programme_bosnia_and_herzegovina)

<sup>30</sup> Country Programme Document for Bosnia and Herzegovina (2015 – 2019), Section II, para.13.

2019 and was used to inform the draft Law on Strategic Planning and Development Management.

Importantly, therefore, the key informants who were consulted during the evaluation (see Appendix VI) concluded that the emergent results of ILDP Phase III could not have been achieved without the Project or would have materialised over a much longer timeframe. This view has been corroborated by document review, which has shown that ILDP Phase III has provided a distinct approach to strategic subnational development. As a result, the intervention strategy has supplemented other development interventions within BiH that have addressed similar thematic areas. In essence, there has been no evidence of duplication. To illustrate further, other projects have built on the achievements of ILDP based on collaboration with partner local governments from the first two project phases. These projects include the EU-supported Local Integrated Development Project and the Government of Switzerland-supported Municipal Economic and Environmental Governance Project. In supporting the entity governments to create strategic planning and development management systems, ILDP also built on results generated by the UNDP and the EU, as regards introducing mid-term and annual institutional planning. The UNDP BiH SDGs Roll-out and Private Sector Engagement Project (2017 – 2021), with the objective of empowering and preparing BiH private and public sector partners to implement Agenda 2030, also built on ILDP Phase III. In essence, based on the systems that have been built by the Project at the subnational level, ILDP Phase III has contributed towards a platform for implementing Agenda 2030, which has been nationalised through the SDG Framework in BiH.

Of further interest, the EU is currently supporting a project for introducing programme-based budgeting in BiH. The system for strategic development that has been created under the ILDP will be of importance, therefore, in fostering links for strategic planning; institutional coordination; and programme-based budgeting.

### 4.3. Effectiveness

In order to measure project effectiveness, the focus of analysis for the evaluation was the extent to which ILDP Phase III achieved its expected results, taking into consideration any differences across the target stakeholder groups. To meet corporate reporting requirements, the discussion within this section has been organised according to the expected project results, with emphasis on the achievement of outcomes and outputs. Further to the analysis, the results of

evaluation have shown that **ILDP Phase III has been effective in spite of an unstable socio-political environment and the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic. In response to the variation in capacities across subnational governments, the Project has contributed towards a harmonised approach to strategic subnational development through vertical coordination and horizontal cooperation. Project achievements have included functional development planning and management systems at the entity level that have been equipped with: regulatory and operational frameworks; institutional structures and capacities; strategic documents; partnerships; vertical and horizontal coherence; and accountability mechanisms. The Seed Funding has also contributed towards development management processes at the local and cantonal level, and priority local development projects, including within underdeveloped municipalities, that have facilitated improved livelihoods and services for 0.27 million citizens. The Project has also facilitated an increased awareness among civil society organisations and the media about strategic development to support their contribution to development management processes. There was, however, limited evidence of media engagement. The capacity of the Project to facilitate anticipated accelerated growth was further challenged by the COVID-19 pandemic.**

#### 4.3.1. Outcome I: Lead planning structures at entity level steer the development planning and management systems characterised by vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards the citizens

**Finding 6:** Although the Project has been challenged by political dynamics and the COVID-19 pandemic, it has contributed to strategic planning and management systems through legal and methodological frameworks and capacity development. As there is some variation in capacities across lead planning institutions, however, system implementation has been a work in progress.

Over the period 2019 – 2020, project implementation faced two major challenges that implicated the pace of results achievement. First, the Project was challenged by the operational instability that emerged from the BiH General Elections in October 2018 and the Local Government Elections in November 2020. At the level of the FBIH entity, in particular, the results of the General Elections led to changes in the composition of all 10 cantonal governments and significant delays to new government appointments. As of December 2020, for example, the new FBIH Government had not yet

been instated<sup>31</sup> Similarly, the government has not yet been appointed in Herzegovina Neretva Canton. In general, there were leadership changes within several large cities and municipalities across BiH as a result of the local government elections. Given the need for the new mayors to understand and support the functioning of municipal systems, and for newly elected officials to become familiar with the Project, delayed project implementation had been foreseen. Yet, the implications of the delayed political appointments on the Project have been significant. To illustrate, the FBIH Development Council has not been able to convene its members to agree on the key development directions for the entity.

Second, as the COVID-19 pandemic was unexpected and pervasive, project activities were considerably affected by the mandatory restrictions on staff movement; public gatherings; and the need for adjusted work modalities. These requirements also delayed project implementation for lengthy periods, given the need for the refinement and rescheduling of project activities.

In spite of the delays to project implementation, ILDP Phase III made significant progress towards achieving its established targets under Outcome Area #1 (see Exhibit 4 for an overview of results achievement under Outcome 1). Specifically, the Project contributed to regulatory; methodological; and institutional functions for strategic planning at the entity level, to provide oversight and direction for systematic development planning and management across subnational governments (see text box). The established functions have included strategies for mid-term and annual planning, and the alignment of each strategy with subnational budgets. Through the ToT programme (see Finding 2), ILDP Phase III has further contributed to capacity-strengthening among policy-makers and technical staff within both entities and BD BiH, for the systematic implementation of development strategies. This process has included vertical and horizontal coordination by entity-level institutions and measures for increased accountability to BiH citizens (such as, results-based reporting). There has been some variation, however, in the readiness of institutions, at the entity-level and within BD BiH, for implementing their development planning and management systems. Within this context, readiness refers to the capacities of institutions to implement the new legal and methodological frameworks.

## Status of Entity-level Development Planning and Management Systems

### FBIH:

- Full regulatory and methodological framework on development planning and management established
- Legal requirements in place for establishing vertical and horizontal linkages
- Lead planning structure (FBIH Development Planning Institute capacitated with regulatory frameworks and methodological tools to steer development planning and management system)
- Institutional capacity-strengthening through training programme on new legal and methodological frameworks to 324 civil servants
  - Training programme integrated into FBIH Training System to address future capacity gaps and facilitate sustainability

### RS:

- RS Law on strategic planning and development management adopted by RS National Assembly in July 2021
- Methodological framework (by-law) on design and evaluation of strategic documents adopted in September 2021
- Methodological framework on implementation documents to be submitted for Government adoption in December 2021
- Institutional capacity-strengthening through training programme on new legal and methodological frameworks to 263 civil servants
  - Training programme integrated into RS Training System to address future capacity gaps and facilitate sustainability

### BD BiH:

- Operational Plan for system building formally adopted by BD BiH Government in late 2019 given internal disagreements on selection of department to coordinate the process
- Strategic Planning Unit established within General Secretariat of the BD BiH Government, while the Department of Economic Affairs was responsible for coordinating the planning process in the transition period
- Legal framework adopted in December 2020
- Institutional capacity-strengthening through training programme on new legal and methodological frameworks to 338 civil servants

Source: ILDP Exit Strategy; Project Team

<sup>31</sup> ILDP Phase III, Annual Report, January – December 2020

In April 2021, for example, a full regulatory and methodological framework had been established by the FBiH Government. In contrast, the operational plan for system-building had only been formally adopted in BD BiH in late 2019 because of delays in selecting the department that would coordinate the process. Further, at the level of the RS entity, the methodological framework for implementation documents was scheduled to be submitted for adoption by the RS Government in December 2021.

The key developments under Outcome Area #1 are discussed further in the sub-Sections below according to the project outputs to which they pertain.

### **Output I.1: Lead planning structures at entity level and BD BiH capacitated and equipped with policy and regulatory frameworks and instruments**

In spite of the differences in institutional readiness for system implementation, there have been significant developments at the entity level and within BD BiH to support strategic development planning and management. At the level of the FBiH entity, for example, the full regulatory and methodological framework on development planning and management has been established. Specifically, the FBiH Law on Development Planning and Management was adopted in 2017, and has been supported by methodological frameworks (by-laws) for designing strategic documents; mid-term and annual planning, monitoring and reporting; and the evaluation of strategic documents.<sup>32</sup> Further to the launching of the FBiH strategy designing process, the 2021 - 2027 FBiH Development Strategy was also finalised in 2021. The legal requirements have, therefore, been established for the FBiH lead planning structure (FBiH Development Planning Institute) to facilitate vertical and horizontal linkages for strategic development planning, and methodologies to integrate planning and development management into all levels of government in FBiH. The Project also provided technical assistance to inform the implementation of the new by-laws (on planning; monitoring; and reporting) at the institutional level, to facilitate programme-based budgeting. Trainings were also delivered to key decision-makers and technical staff across FBiH Government.

Similarly, at the level of BD BiH, the planning system has been established. The Regulatory Framework for Strategic Planning and Development Management was

developed by the Strategic Planning Unit within the General Secretariat of the Government of BD BiH in December 2020. The 2021-2027 Development Strategy of BD BiH was also finalised and adopted, while training on its implementation was delivered to both civil servants and decision makers within the BD BiH Assembly. Of importance, technical assistance that was provided through the Project supported the establishment of the regulatory and methodological frameworks. Moreover, the capacity-strengthening of the BD BiH Department of Department of Strategic Planning was facilitated through ILDP Phase III.

In Republika Srpska (RS), the planning system is being designed. The draft RS Law for Strategic Planning and Development Management was developed by a government-commissioned working group, comprising representatives from entity institutions and local government. Following its adoption by the RS Government in March 2021, the law was adopted by the RS National Assembly in July 2021. As there has been a delay in the law-making process,<sup>33</sup> the new planning process in RS has not yet been launched. Trainings on the implementation of the new frameworks were delivered, however, to key decision-makers and technical staff across government institutions. Specifically, the Project has facilitated extensive trainings on strategic planning, including strategy-based and budget-aligned planning; monitoring; and reporting to institutions at all levels of RS Government. The trainings were developed for entity- as well as local-level institutions, and have been delivered through the RS Training System following ToT trainings.

Importantly, the trainings that have been delivered at the institutional level have been integrated into the existing training systems of the two entity governments.<sup>34</sup> On the one hand, the trainings were developed to strengthen institutional capacities for implementing the new legal and methodological frameworks. On the other hand, by integrating the trainings into the existing entity-level training systems, the Project has equipped the lead planning institutions with a system for sustaining the training programme to address future gaps in capacity at the institutional level.

To further support strategic development at the entity level (through vertical coordination and horizontal cooperation), development councils and public mechanisms were formally established in all 10 FBiH

<sup>32</sup> These by-laws were developed in 2019.

<sup>33</sup> The delay to law making was caused by the need for adjusted work modalities in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

<sup>34</sup> Trainings at the level of BD BiH have been based on the entity-level programmes and have not yet been integrated into the government system.

cantons. The specific aim has been to engage representatives from local and cantonal governments in discussions on development challenges and solutions. Although these discussions were new to the subnational governance structure, they contributed towards strong network relations between and within local and cantonal governments for knowledge-exchange and the sharing of experiences. Importantly, inter-governmental exchange and networking emerged as an unexpected, but invaluable result of the Project, as it had not been anticipated but facilitated increased policy dialogue, as well as horizontal cooperation and coordination.

Of significance, there has also been strong evidence of the contribution ILDP Phase III to increased capacities for strategic development, at the level of the two entities and BD BiH. The establishment of legal and regulatory frameworks has been complemented by mechanisms and approaches for facilitating vertical and horizontal coordination during development planning and management. There has been considerable variation, however, in the capacity of the entity-level institutions to implement the new planning systems, and in essence, their readiness to steer (facilitate) the development process. The gaps in capacity have ranged from limited human resource availability within planning institutions to insufficient technical expertise to support development planning and management. In line with its consolidated phasing out strategy, therefore, the Project has taken steps to provide support to the entity-level planning institutions that are responsible for system implementation, to strengthen their capacity to steer strategic development at all levels of government.<sup>35</sup> As an example, the Project has produced practical training manuals to complement the FBiH ToT programme. The trainings provided through this programme have been aimed at building technical expertise within the entity-level planning structures, to implement the regulatory framework on development planning and management. These manuals have further provided detailed guidelines to inform strategic planning, with a focus on medium-term to annual planning processes. As an illustration, the manuals were used to support a training programme on the new legal and methodological framework to 324 civil servants (119 men; and 205 women) at all levels of FBiH Government (entity-level institutions; cantonal ministries; and local governments). The training was facilitated in partnership with the FBiH Development Planning Institute and was incorporated into the Training System for civil servants that is managed by the

FBiH Civil Service Agency. As a result, the training is now included in the standard training programme that is offered to FBiH civil servants, the funding of which is provided annually by the FBiH Government.

Overall, the benefits of strengthened capacities within the entity-level planning institutions have included an increased potential for vertical and horizontal coordination (see Appendix VIII for results achieved in this output area).

### **Output 1.2: Public financing mechanisms sustainably reinforce the development planning and management systems, resulting in improved livelihoods and service delivery for citizens.**

In the area of local development financing, Republika Srpska (RS) has emerged as an example of good practice for establishing the RS Financing Mechanism for Support of Local Government. The RS Financing Mechanism was established in 2014 by the RS Ministry of Finance and the RS Ministry of Administration and Local Self-government. Its purpose has been to support the implementation of the development priorities that are incorporated into strategic documents at the level of local government. This approach to strategic local development has been designed to contribute, in turn, to the implementation of entity-level RS policies. As such, the RS Financing Mechanism has been increasingly seen as an instrument that could be further expanded to support the contribution of BiH towards the implementation of its SDG commitments. In support of this process, the annual funding cycles of the financing mechanism have been managed by a well-trained team of employees of the RS Investment and Development Bank. Further, in the interest of efficient financial management, oversight of the financing mechanism is the responsibility of a Steering Committee, comprising representatives from both RS ministries; the RS Investment and Development Bank; donors; and UNDP BiH.

The RS Financing Mechanism is informed by the EU approach to grant scheme management and is supported by a manual for designing public grant schemes, which was developed during ILDP Phase III. Based on its compliance with EU standards, the financing mechanism has supported the transparent allocation of public resources for strategic local development, including the targeted financing of development priorities. It has further supported the capacity-strengthening of local governments, in the area of project design and management, which has

---

<sup>35</sup> ILDP Exit Strategy, Revised Version, April 2021

resulted in positive changes in the lives of over 0.23 million BiH citizens. Specifically, citizens have gained access to improved public services and revenue generation opportunities, which have contributed to an improvement in the quality of their lives.<sup>36</sup> To illustrate, 58,000 citizens within the RS entity, including 6,000 persons from socially excluded groups, benefitted from the RS Financing Mechanism in 2018.

Of note, the FBiH Ministry of Finance collaborated with ILDP Phase III to pilot a similar financing mechanism for local development. During the 2018 annual cycle, the Ministry supported 14 local projects in several areas, including electricity supply in distant rural districts and the digitalisation of municipal services. These projects addressed the need for better public services within FBiH, and contributed to an improvement in the lives of 58,000 citizens.<sup>37</sup>

The FBiH Ministry of Finance has indicated, however, that it is not ready to continue using the financing mechanism and the approach that it has advocated. As its rationale, the Ministry indicated that the approach was 'too complex.'<sup>38</sup> Importantly, however, the advocated approach involves transparent and targeted support for legitimating local government priorities, as a contribution towards relevant entity policies. It further includes financial monitoring, and the monitoring of effectiveness. Nevertheless, although the decision taken by the Ministry was elevated to the highest political level, involving discussions between senior officials of FBiH Government; the Embassy of Switzerland in BiH; and UNDP BiH, the FBiH Minister of Finance was not in favor of changing existing practice. Support for the implementation of the financing mechanism had also been expressed by the FBiH Prime Minister.

It is worth noting though, that the RS Financing Mechanism has reinforced the RS system for the planning and management of strategic development. Of importance, this approach has included vertical and horizontal coordination and cooperation. As a major outcome of this process, citizens have benefitted from improved public service delivery that has, in turn, improved the quality of their lives. At the level of the FBiH entity, however, notwithstanding the establishment of a full legal and methodological framework for the planning and management of strategic development, the incorporation of the financial mechanism has remained as a work in progress (see Appendix VIII for results achieved in this output area).

Project Outcome		Summary of results achieved		
Outcome 1: Lead	Indicator	Baseline 2017	Target 2021	Result
planning structures at entity level steer the development planning and management systems characterized by vertical and horizontal coordination and greater	Level of functionality of the subnational development planning and management systems	Partially functional system in FBiH, non-existent functional systems in the RS and Brčko District (BD)	Advanced functionality of all subnational development planning and management systems	All elements of the planning system are in place FBiH and in BD BIH. The system design process in the RS is underway
	# of public mechanisms engaging government	1	10	10 mechanisms fully established (Development

<sup>36</sup> ILDP Phase III, Annual Report, January – December 2020

<sup>37</sup> ILDP Phase III, Annual Report, January – December 2020

<sup>38</sup> ILDP Exit Strategy, Revised version, April 2021, p.6

accountability towards the citizens	authorities at different levels for improved vertical cooperation and concerted action in development planning and management			Councils in the 10 cantons)
				1 mechanism partly operational (FBIH Development Council <sup>39</sup> )
	# of institutions that apply the EU approach to public grant scheme management	2	4	3

Exhibit 4: Summary of results achieved, Outcome I

4.3.2. Outcome 2: Local and cantonal governments effectively address needs of citizens and accelerate growth through inclusive development planning and management

**Finding 7:** While there is evidence of inclusive development planning at the local and cantonal levels, to enable local authorities to better meet the needs of their citizens, there has been limited capacity to facilitate accelerated growth as a result of the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic and the social; economic; and political environment of BiH.

One of the defining characteristics of ILDP Phase III has been its support for the strengthening of local development frameworks, to enhance the capacity of local governments and cantons to improve their approaches to development planning and management. The main results that have been anticipated from this process have included: i) the establishment of harmonised and transparent development management systems at the level of local and cantonal governments; and ii) an improved quality of life for BiH citizens. To facilitate these objectives, project implementation during ILDP Phase III involved close collaboration with local governments and cantons to scale up their existing capacities and strengthen their development planning and management frameworks. As a direct result, the proportion of cantonal governments with functional development management structures increased from 10% in 2017 to

90% in 2021, exceeding the project target of 70% (see Exhibit 5).

By November 2021, development management units had also been established by approximately 57% of local governments country-wide<sup>40</sup>, including the ILDP partner local governments, increasing from 30% in 2017. Moreover, development management units had become functional in 29 out of 30 partner local governments (approximately 97% of all partner local governments). Seven cantons also attracted increased funding against their established budgets, which were based on the cantonal development strategies. Reports provided by the cantons highlighted an increase in attracted funding from approximately 11% in 2017 to 22% in 2021. In contrast, the average percentage increase of additionally attracted funds based on local strategies had fallen from 40% in 2017 to less than 40% by 2021 for all partner local governments.<sup>41</sup>

ILDP Phase III further contributed towards an increase in the average number of citizens who engaged in development planning and management processes at the cantonal level. Importantly, 52% of these citizens were women. As a result of the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, however, the increase in citizen engagement was marginal between 2017 and 2021, reflecting an increase of only 1%. To the extent possible, local and cantonal governments used online channels (including websites) to compensate for this situation. It was difficult, however, for the Project to engage persons from vulnerable and/ or marginalised social groups (e.g. elderly persons) who do not necessarily have digital literacy or access to digital equipment. As a

<sup>39</sup> The FBIH Development Council was established in 2018 but has not been inaugurated

<sup>40</sup> Source: November 2021 AMC survey of development units and strategic documents at the local and cantonal level, as administered by both AMCs

<sup>41</sup> Source: Outcome Monitoring Summary Report, 03/2017 – 03/2021

result of the pandemic, there was also no change in the average number of citizens who engaged in development planning and management processes at the local and cantonal levels, between 2017 and 2021. Of note, as the majority of the planning processes for new planning cycle were implemented in 2020 and 2021, the timeframe has also been too short for the Project to contribute towards accelerated growth and development.

Insofar as local development plans have reflected the expressed priority concerns of citizens, ILDP Phase has provided evidence of inclusive strategic development. In effect, the Project has created an avenue for strategic local development to address the prioritised concerns of BiH citizens. Notwithstanding the resilience of the project to the emergent pandemic, however, the effects of COVID-19 have constrained the capacity of ILDP Phase III to facilitate the accelerated growth that has been anticipated (see the discussion below under each associated project output).

**Output 2.1: Local development planning and management frameworks and capacities are sustained and scaled up as part of a harmonised system, in line with EU requirements.**

Further to the results that were achieved during the previous two project phases, a critical aim of ILDP Phase III has been to establish legal and methodological frameworks at the entity level and within BD BiH (see Findings 2 and 4), to support the integration of development planning and management processes into all levels of subnational government. The core elements of the approach that has been used to facilitate this objective have entailed: i) establishing harmonised local development planning and management systems that are in line with EU standards; and ii) sustaining and scaling-up development frameworks and capacities at the level of local development planning and management. In general, this approach has been strongly supported by capacity-strengthening across subnational governments, to equip policy-makers and technical staff with the capacities and resources (knowledge; skills; and tools) that are needed for strategic development planning and management. By applying EU standards to local development processes, ILDP Phase III has further aimed to increase the capacity of local and cantonal governments to apply for (and successfully access) financial and technical assistance

through the European Union (EU) Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) programme.

Project results have shown that a significant number of local governments<sup>42</sup> have integrated development strategies into their respective planning processes, as part of a coherent approach to strategic local development planning and management. In 2017, for example, 65 local governments (45% of all local governments) had produced integrated development strategies. By December 2020, 128 local governments had adopted integrated development strategies. This percentage increase included underdeveloped local governments that were engaged by ILDP Phase III and also represented 88% of all local governments, exceeding the project target of 80%. Based on the laws (regulatory frameworks) that were adopted at the level of the two entities and BD BiH (see Output 1.1), the use of an integrated approach to strategic planning at the local government level has now been regulated by legal framework. A major development under ILDP Phase III, therefore, has been the mandating of an integrated approach to strategic local development. In essence, all local governments are required to design their development strategies using an approved integrated approach, whereby they apply the same methodology; participatory processes; timeframe; etc.

In terms of its operational frameworks, ILDP Phase III also contributed to an increase in the percentage of local governments with institutionalised operational frameworks. The purpose of these frameworks has been to regulate development planning and management responsibilities at the local government level. Of note, therefore, while 40 local governments (28% of all local governments) had established institutionalised operational frameworks in 2017, by December 2020 this figure had increased to 57 local governments (approximately 40% of all local governments). On average, 75% of the local governments had also implemented the annual implementation plan for their local strategies by this date. The annual implementation plan was implemented against planned financial resources, and the average rate of completion exceeded the project target of 55%.<sup>43</sup>

With the support of ILDP Phase III, the strategic approach to subnational development management was institutionalised at the entity-level and within BD BiH through the adoption of the legal regulatory

<sup>42</sup> Both partner local governments and local governments that were not engaged by the project

<sup>43</sup> This figure has been reported by formal local government reporting. ILDP Phase III, Annual Report, January – December 2020 reported a figure of 79% based on partner local governments that were engaged by the Project in 2017.

frameworks. The mandated approach has covered: i) strategic planning; ii) the design and implementation of development strategies that are closely linked with programme-based budgeting; iii) systematic results monitoring and evaluation; iv) annual and mid-term reporting; and v) vertical and horizontal coordination. By default, the Project has contributed to increased (scaled-up) capacities for harmonised development planning and management that addresses EU requirements. Further, by integrating strategic local development into the established legal frameworks, ILDP Phase III has made a strong contribution to the sustainability of the development planning and management frameworks, and the increased capacities that were generated at the level of local development (see Appendix VIII for results achieved in this output area).

### Output 2.2: Core development planning and management frameworks and capacities at cantonal level further advanced and sustained as an integral part of a harmonised public system and EU integration process.

In line with the BiH EU Accession Agenda, the approach to strategic development at the cantonal level was informed by EU standards. Moreover, to further support the scaling up and sustainability of a harmonised approach to strategic local development, ILDP Phase III contributed to enhanced capacities for development planning and management across all 10 cantons. First, the Project provided direct and indirect technical assistance to cantonal governments to enable them to produce their new development strategies for 2021-2027. As the new planning period (2021-2027), extends beyond ILDP Phase III, however, support from the Project was significantly informed by the local strategic planning voucher scheme, to encourage the increased ownership of strategic processes at the level of local development. The voucher scheme was applied in five of the 10 cantons, targeting the more advanced ones.<sup>44</sup> Each canton that participated in the voucher scheme received a voucher for the sum of USD 6,000 from the Project, for the purpose of hiring cantonal agencies to support the production of the local development strategies. While the vouchers were co-funded by the cantonal governments, cantons with limited resources were not required to co-fund the voucher scheme. As cantons with more advanced capacities in development planning were largely allowed to prepare their development strategies

independently, they received indirect support from the Project during this process, namely, through the quality assuring of their selection of supporting cantonal agencies. In contrast, cantons with less advanced capacities in development planning received direct assistance from the Project to hire the supporting agencies and manage the planning process (e.g. they received support to develop the assignment terms of reference; orient the selected agencies to the requirements of the assignment; etc.).

As an illustration of the support that was provided to cantons, approximately 780 cantonal representatives benefitted from technical support in 2020 to develop new strategic documents (development strategies; action plans; annual reports; etc.). Fifty-two percent (52%) of the persons who received this support (407 cantonal representatives) were women and the remaining 48% (373 cantonal representatives) were men. Both direct and indirect forms of support were preceded by an evaluation of the existing development strategy of each canton based on a participatory approach. While the results of this process were used to inform the new development strategies, the format of the evaluation has supported the sustainability of the approach to strategic development at the cantonal level. In essence, this approach can be used to inform future strategic planning by cantons, which is also being supported through the ILDP Exit Strategy, as it has committed the Project to additional support to cantons (and local governments) to further strengthen their capacities in strategic local development.

Second, the Project provided support to cantonal governments to enable them to implement their development strategies. This process involved supporting the establishment of development structures to lead strategic implementation, followed by the operationalisation of the established units. As an example, the Project provided a financial allocation of USD 90,000 to one canton (Canton Sarajevo) to support its efforts towards innovative strategic development.<sup>45</sup> The units that were established through ILDP Phase III to manage the implementation process included: i) inter-sectoral cantonal development boards, the role of which involves defining the implementation of the action plan for each development strategy and coordinating the production of development reports and new development strategies; ii) development councils, with responsibility for encouraging citizen participation in strategic

<sup>44</sup> The remaining five cantons, in which there were less developed capacities, requested direct support from the Project.

<sup>45</sup> Canton Sarajevo had taken steps to introduce an innovative approach to strategic and change management.

development and facilitating vertical coordination between cantons and local governments; and iii) development management units, to function as centres of 'knowledge and technical assistance for cantonal administration and municipalities'<sup>46</sup> through the appointment of a team of core staff.

As of December 2021, development councils had been established in all 10 cantons, exceeding the project target of 8 development councils, and reflecting a significant advancement over the 2016 baseline (1 partnership structure; see Exhibit 5). Each council was made up of representatives from cantons and local governments and had the advantage of bringing these political leaders together for the first time to discuss development challenges and deliberate on possible solutions. In total, there were 143 members, (23 women and 120 men) across all 10 councils, 16% of whom were women (23 members), while the remaining 84% were men (120 members). As the development councils are cantonal and local government bodies, their membership (including the lack of gender balance) is indicative of the gender representation at the level of the cantonal governments.<sup>47</sup> A development board was also established in each canton, and the total membership across all 10 development boards amounted to 273 members, reflecting a gender balance of 45% female (125 women) and 55% male (148 men).

Based on the support that was provided through the Project, the percentage of cantons that had institutionalised their operational frameworks increased significantly from 10% in 2017<sup>48</sup> to reach the project target of 70% in 2021.<sup>49</sup> At the level of the cantonal governments, the operational frameworks were used to regulate development planning and management processes, as a contribution towards increased harmonisation based on a whole-of-government approach. Following the assessment of cantonal performance, the average level of cantonal development planning and management index reflected an increase from 38% at baseline<sup>50</sup> to 73% in 2021,<sup>51</sup> exceeding the project target of 60%. Moreover, at the start of the Project in 2017 there had been no evidence of programme-based budgeting across

cantonal governments. Further to a target of 50% that was reached in 2019, however, 83% of the cantonal governments had implemented the annual implementation plans of their cantonal strategies against planned financial resources.

In general, IDLP Phase III provided significant support to cantonal authorities to ensure that harmonised planning processes and frameworks were fully institutionalised to facilitate strategic development at the cantonal level. The Project took steps to ensure compliance with EU standards to support the BiH EU integration process, and further invested in strengthening the capacities of cantons. Cantonal authorities gained access, therefore, to the knowledge; tools; and skills; that they require to implement their development strategies. The Project further encouraged cantons to take ownership of the capacity-strengthening process, to allow them to access further support from project-approved cantonal agencies beyond ILDP Phase III (see Appendix VIII for results achieved in this output area).

---

<sup>46</sup> ILDP Exit Strategy, Revised version, April 2021, p.17

<sup>47</sup> In line with the 2017 FBiH Law on Development Planning and Management, the members of the development councils were the cantonal prime ministers; the mayors of the local self-government units; and other socio-economic partners.

<sup>48</sup> The baseline figure was taken in 2016 and was applied to project start-up in 2017

<sup>49</sup> Source: ILDP Project Team. The 2020 ILDP Annual Report indicates that 90% of the cantons had operationalised their frameworks as of December 2020. As this is a work in progress, the figure was adjusted based on information received from the cantons in 2021.

<sup>50</sup> The baseline figure was taken in 2016 and was applied to project start-up in 2017

<sup>51</sup> Source: ILDP Project Team

Project Outcome	Summary of results achieved			
	Indicator	Baseline 2017	Target 2021	Result
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Local and cantonal governments effectively address needs of citizens and accelerate growth through inclusive development planning and management	% of local and cantonal governments with functional development management structures as part of a coherent system	30% (LG) 10% (Cantons)	55% (LG) 70% (Cantons)	56% (LG) 90% (Cantons)
	Average number of citizens (including percentage of women and representatives of socially excluded groups) who engage in development planning and management processes at local and cantonal levels	40	56 (40% increase)	No increase in LGs 41% in cantons (52% women)
	Average % increase of additionally attracted funds based on local strategies against average local governance budget	40%	50%	Below 40% (average for all partner LGs)
	Average % increase of additionally attracted funds based on cantonal strategies against average cantonal budget	10.8%	20%	22% <sup>52</sup>

Exhibit 5: Summary of results achieved, Outcome 2<sup>53</sup>

#### 4.3.3. Outcome 3: Citizens, civil society organisations and media take pro-active part in development management and benefit from improved services.

**Finding 8:** While the intervention strategy prioritised the engagement of citizens and civil society organisations in strategic subnational development management, there has been limited evidence of the continuous engagement of the media in this process.

The project intervention strategy has been significantly informed by the need for an inclusive participatory approach to development planning and management, including the need to engage socio-economic actors from vulnerable and/ or underrepresented groups. Given the proximity of the local and cantonal partners to the general citizenry, project activities at these levels have placed strong emphasis on the social inclusion theme. The draft ILDP (Phase III) Advocacy Plan has further identified inclusive planning practice as one of the key drivers of functional development planning and management, given its intent to ‘leave no one behind.’

In line with the project design, therefore, project implementation at the level of the local and cantonal governments included public consultations through local forums (partnership groups) to identify priority issues for intervention from a citizen perspective. In addition to the partnership groups which comprised representatives of the public; and private sectors; and civil society, specific focal groups of socially excluded persons were also identified and consulted. These groups comprised representatives of returnees (ethnic minorities); women from rural communities; associations of children with disabilities; etc. As the Project prioritised forum participation by socio-economic actors from vulnerable and/ or marginalised social groups, it ‘gave voice’ to citizens who do not usually have the opportunity to share their concerns and needs. Moreover, the prioritised concerns of citizens, including civil society organisations, were used to inform the development strategies of the local and cantonal authorities, including proposals for the implementation of local development projects. Importantly, therefore, in addition to prioritising the concerns of vulnerable and/ or marginalised social

<sup>52</sup> Based on reports formally adopted in 8 cantons (7 cantons secured valid data)

<sup>53</sup> Source: Outcome Monitoring Summary Report, 03/2017 – 03/2021; ILDP Project Team 2021

groups, ILDP Phase III also prioritised local development within underdeveloped municipalities (see Finding 3).

Through its Seed Fund Mechanism, the Project provided financial support (and technical assistance) for the implementation of local development projects from two broad categories:

- **Category I:** Priority projects of the best performing cantons and local governments; and
- **Category II:** Priority projects from the newly-adopted development strategies of underdeveloped local governments.

Although the COVID pandemic contributed toward the delayed implementation of local development projects, approximately 0.32 million BiH citizens have benefitted from the seed funding facility (see Exhibit 6) by December 2020.

To be eligible for funding under Category I, local and cantonal governments were required to have developed and adopted their development strategies, as well as established their development management systems. Assessments were conducted on partner local governments from the previous project phase; new partner local governments and all 10 cantons. The assessment criteria included, inter alia, evidence of: inter-municipal cooperation; integration of gender equality considerations; and social inclusion. Funding was allocated based on results achieved by partner local governments and cantons by the end of 2018 (Cycle I) and 2019 (Cycle II), with emphasis on the three best performing local governments, and the two best performing cantons. Approximately 0.29 citizens benefitted from Cycle II, including 26,557 persons from socially excluded groups.

As most of the 11 new partner local governments were underdeveloped, however, the Project successfully applied for additional funding in 2019 for an additional cycle of the Seed Fund. Under this additional funding cycle, the new partner local governments were to each receive and co-fund a financial allocation of USD 25,000<sup>54</sup> to implement one priority project from their newly-adopted development strategies. To increase the coverage of the competitive cycle, USD 0.1 million was also allocated for the five best performing municipalities from among the 11 new partner local governments. The Project also took steps to provide technical and financial assistance to an additional eight underdeveloped new partner local governments. Specifically, these new partner governments were to

receive support from the project to: i) conduct their participatory planning process; ii) establish their basic development management system; and iii) implement at least one priority project from their newly adopted development strategy with an allocation of USD 25,000. In light of their limited resources, the eight underdeveloped new partner local governments were not required to co-fund the financial allocation.

Given its engagement of BiH citizens in strategic planning at the local and cantonal levels, ILDP Phase III supported the prioritisation (and implementation) of local development projects that address the priority concerns of citizens. Following their implementation, therefore, these projects have contributed towards better public services to improve citizen quality of life. Interestingly, therefore, project implementation has also entailed engaging the media in the strategic development process. By incorporating results targets with an identified role for the media, the Project has, in effect, acknowledged that the media has a contribution to make to the facilitation of strategic development. Notably, the role that was envisaged by the Project involved engaging and influencing development management systems (see Exhibit 6). It is conceivable that this role further involves raising awareness about the intervention purpose; core project activities; the significance of citizen participation; expected and achieved results; etc. It is of interest, therefore, that apart from the engagement of journalists in a 2018 training on development planning and management, the extent to which the media has been consistently engaged by the Project is unclear. To illustrate, the indicator ‘Constructive reaction of local governments on demands brought forward by CSOs<sup>55</sup> or media per year’ has been used to measure the engagement of social actors, including the media in development planning (see Exhibit 6). By not differentiating between CSOs and the media, however (for example by using two separate indicators) the contribution of the media to the success of the identified development planning action is unconfirmed. Similarly, the use of the indicator, ‘# (number) of articles published which raise awareness’ has not ruled out the possibility for project partners to use their organizational website to publish the articles themselves, thereby counteracting the intended role of the media in supporting project implementation.

ILDP Phase III has contributed significantly towards citizen engagement in strategic development at the

<sup>54</sup> Co-funding amounted to at least 40% of the allocation.

<sup>55</sup> Civil society organisations

subnational level. Using the combination of a participatory process and the provision of financial and technical assistance, the Project ensured that the prioritised concerns of citizens were reflected in planning processes, including the resultant strategy documents. While the Project has acknowledged that the media has a role to play during strategic planning, however, the extent of this role has been unclear.

**Output 3.1: Relevant civil society organisations and journalists are capacitated to understand the development planning and management system and enable wider public engagement and scrutiny in its functioning.**

Notwithstanding the initial efforts of the Project to engage the media in subnational development planning and management, there is limited evidence to demonstrate consistent engagement to support an effective process. Indeed, the project implementation strategy has not put a very strong emphasis on media engagement. Further, the budget allocation for engaging the media in strategic development accounted for only three percent of the total budget allocated for the main outcome area, Outcome 3 (see Exhibit 7). Yet, in acknowledging that the role of the media is critical for the development of democratic societies,<sup>56</sup> it is equally important to note that the topic of development is not necessarily a hot topic from the perspective of the BiH media. Conceivably, there is greater media interest in news that can be sensationalised and widely disseminated for increased viewing and media ratings. Of interest, therefore, feedback from journalists who were engaged by the Project highlighted their appreciation for the opportunity they received to participate in ILDP Phase III and learn about strategic approaches to development.

Notably, project implementation in this results area has also involved engaging civil society in strategic development. Specifically, the Project has aimed to equip CSOs with knowledge and skills about development planning and management systems to allow for 'wider public engagement' in system functioning. The intended result of this process has been a capacity for CSOs to 'analyse and report to the public in the domain of development planning and management' (see Exhibit 6). Consequently, while 23 representatives of the media (15 women and eight men) gained access to capacity-strengthening in this

domain, 51 CSO representatives (23 women and 28 men) also engaged in this opportunity. In total, 74 representatives from the media and CSOs participated in the capacity-strengthening session(s), surpassing the target for this results area (50 participants). As more than 50% of the participants were women, the Project also exceeded its target from a gender perspective (see Exhibit 6).

Importantly, further to the engagement of CSO representatives in the capacity-strengthening sessions, there have been examples of local development projects that served to build the capacities of civil society to actively support strategic development. To illustrate, citizens in Zenica-Doboj Canton were given an opportunity to increase their awareness and understanding about the implementation of local development strategies. With the use of online communication channels, this local development project reached 20,000 citizens. In the RS municipality of Nevesinje, a local development project was used to engage 250 citizens in thematic sessions on proposal writing and local development management. Further, proposal writing workshops that were held in Laktaši municipality (RS) informed the development of 10 draft project proposals for five local communities.

The engagement of civil society (including CSOs) in project implementation activities for Output 3.1 does not negate the strong focus of this results area on media engagement.<sup>57</sup> There has been limited evidence, however, of the involvement of the media in associated project implementation activities. This leads to a question as to whether future similar projects should revisit the approach to media engagement, involving awareness-raising among journalists about strategic development to enlist their support for this process. Another question of relevance is whether the results target for media engagement should be removed from the project results framework in future projects and be incorporated, instead, into a media engagement plan to support project implementation (see Appendix VIII for results achieved in this output area).

**Output 3.2: Livelihoods and service for the citizens are improved through priority projects of local and cantonal governments.**

In the area of local development, ILDP Phase III has used its seed funding mechanism to provide strong support for the implementation of the priority projects of partner local and cantonal governments (see Finding 8).

<sup>56</sup> <https://www.agora-parl.org/resources/library/role-media-democracy-strategic-approach>

<sup>57</sup> See Project Document, p. 26.

As discussed, the Seed Fund has been used as an incentive mechanism, on the one hand, for the development management processes of local and cantonal governments. Seed funding has been awarded to the best performing local governments and cantons, to allow them to implement their priority projects after being assessed against set criteria. The Seed Fund has, on the other hand, been used to support the implementation of the priority local development projects of underdeveloped municipalities, by providing them with financial assistance and technical support, as applicable.

Given the additional support that has been provided for local development through the seed funding mechanism, ILDP Phase III has contributed towards opportunities for improved livelihoods and public services for BiH citizens. To illustrate, by December 2020, projects that had benefitted from the 2018 Seed Funding Cycle had been implemented in 15 municipalities and had reached 0.27 million beneficiaries.<sup>58</sup> Further, a target of 0.1 million beneficiaries was established for the 2019 Seed Funding Cycle, with the expectation that 30% of the beneficiaries would be women and 10% of all beneficiaries would have been from socially excluded groups. In December 2020, however, the Project exceeded this target, as the total number of beneficiaries for the 2019 Seed Funding Cycle was 0.27 million.<sup>59</sup> While women accounted for 46% of this aggregate, 10% of the beneficiaries were from socially excluded groups. In addition, a total of 140 citizens benefitted from jobs and income streams in 2020, as a result of the assistance that had been provided through seed funding. This result surpassed the project target of 50 beneficiaries. One project in the RS municipality of

Zvornik also generated income for 25 vulnerable households.

Of interest, at the time of the application for additional activities and budget changes (2019), a direct line of the Seed Fund Financing Mechanism was established to address the joint priority concern of six partner local governments. The focal concern was the agreed need to ‘humanly resolve the roaming dogs issue’<sup>60</sup> at the municipal level, upon the request of citizens.<sup>61</sup> As a result, each local government was scheduled to receive seed funding to implement their development strategies, and in particular, work with communities to develop and implement the associated action plans, to achieve and sustain the expected results.

In general, ILDP Phase III has used its seed funding mechanism to establish an enabling environment for strategic subnational development. Following the 2019 adjustments to the allocation criteria, seed funding has been used to encourage standardised, high quality strategic development, as well as increase the level of support that is provided for the priority projects of local and cantonal governments. In light of this approach, the Project is seen to have created increased opportunities for improved livelihoods and service for BiH citizens (see Appendix VIII for results achieved in this output area).

Project Outcome		Summary of results achieved		
Outcome 3: Citizens, civil society organisations and media take proactive part in development management and	Indicator	Baseline 2017	Target 2021	Result
	# of articles published which raise awareness or inform the public on the matters of development planning and management	Very limited	30	Local level: 116 Local and cantonal level: 25 Total: 141

<sup>58</sup> ILDP Annual Report, 2020, p. 16

<sup>59</sup> ILDP Annual Report, 2020, p.37

<sup>60</sup> ILDP 2019 Yearly Plan of Operation, Narrative Description

<sup>61</sup> The roaming dogs issue had been incorporated into local development strategies as it was seen as contributing to impaired local development.

benefit from improved services	# of citizens who benefit from improved public services beyond direct Project interventions	n/a	275,000	Seed Fund: 271,174 RS Financial Mechanism: 58,000 Total: 329, 174
	Constructive reaction of local governments on demands brought forward by CSOs or media per year	0	2 per LG	9.7 average

Exhibit 6: Summary of results achieved, Outcome 3<sup>62</sup>

#### 4.4. Efficiency

Project efficiency was measured as the extent to which ILDP Phase III has been able to deliver expected results, as articulated in the Project results framework and theory of change, in an economic and timely way. The evaluation results have shown that **the Project has created good value for money, as efforts have been made to maximise the impact of the intervention relative to the resources that were made available for project implementation. Local and cantonal governments also demonstrated a resilience to the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic based on the sense of ownership they developed during their project involvement. Through its intervention strategy, ILDP Phase III has further contributed to the nationalisation of Agenda 2030, which has led to country ownership of the SDGs.**

**Finding 9:** Insofar as project implementation has been supported by strategic and economic resource allocation, ILDP Phase III has provided good value for money, and facilitated an emergent resilience by the local and cantonal governments in their response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The initial budget for ILDP Phase III amounted to USD 5.4 million for project management and implementation over a four-year period. While 93% of this outlay was acquired through donor funding, the remaining seven percent was provided by UNDP BiH (see sub-Section 2.1). Following the approval of project funding for additional and revised project activities, including an extra cycle of seed funding to support underdeveloped local governments and cantons, and address priority local development issues, the total project budget amounted to USD 6.5 million.

In general, project implementation and results achievement remained on track, with the exception of project activities that were delayed by political instability; administrative resistance; and/ or other emergent issues, in particular, the COVID-19 pandemic. Importantly, however, project design and implementation were informed by an assessment of key risks to results achievement and the identification of effective measures for risk mitigation. To the extent that the Project has made notable efforts towards maximising the impact of the intervention with its available resources, therefore, there is evidence to show that ILDP Phase III has provided good value for money.

#### Project value for money

In assessing the extent to which ILDP Phase III has provided value for money, the point of reference has been the 3Es Framework,<sup>63</sup> to determine whether project implementation has benefitted from the principles of economy (resource purchase that has been informed by quality and suitable pricing); efficiency (how well resources have been converted into expected outputs); and effectiveness (the noted impact of project outputs). In the area of project **economy**, therefore, it is worth noting that the Project has had access to quality resources, in the form of technical expertise and experience, to support knowledge-transfer and built capacities across BiH subnational governments. As discussed throughout the report, the intention has been to facilitate public sector reform by equipping lead sector institutions at the entity level, and within BD BiH, with the technical expertise; methodologies; knowledge; and tools that are necessary during this process.

To illustrate, in addition to the technical competencies that have been available within the ILDP Project Team,

<sup>62</sup> Source: Outcome Monitoring Summary Report, 03/2017 – 03/2021

<sup>63</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/49551/DFID-approach-value-money.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/49551/DFID-approach-value-money.pdf)

the Project has included budget lines to facilitate access to required development expertise (under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2) to support the implementation process. At 16% and 56% respectively of the budget estimates for each outcome area (see Exhibit 7), the cost estimate for external development expertise has ranged from moderate to high. The issue to consider, however, is the trade-off between the institutional capacities that existed prior to ILDP Phase III and the evidence of improved technical capacities that have been emerging as a result of the intervention. Prior to ILDP Phase III, there was no technical capacity within entity-level institutions to initiate public sector reform based on vertical coordination and horizontal collaboration. Similarly, there was limited capacity at the local and cantonal levels to support the implementation of strategic development plans. Notwithstanding the costs that have been linked to the process of accessing and providing technical expertise, therefore, the results that have been generated during project implementation have, arguably, outweighed the financial investment.

Results Area	Budget USD m	Output budget as % of Outcome budget	Expenditure 2017 –2020 as % of Results Area budget
<b>Outcome 1</b>	<b>1.79</b>		<b>65</b>
<i>Output 1.1</i>	0.45	25	84
<i>Output 1.2</i>	1.05	59	51
<i>Output 1.3</i>	0.28	16	82
<b>Outcome 2</b>	<b>1.96</b>		<b>81</b>
<i>Output 2.1</i>	0.59	30	72
<i>Output 2.2</i>	0.27	14	81
<i>Output 2.3</i>	1.09	56	85
<b>Outcome 3</b>	<b>1.44</b>		<b>45</b>
<i>Output 3.1</i>	0.04	3	50
<i>Output 3.2</i>	1.40	97	44
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.20</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>66</b>

Exhibit 7: Summary statistics<sup>64</sup>

Of further interest, the highest budget allocation across all results areas was issued to activities under Output 3.2, which involved the award of seed funding for local and cantonal development projects. Indeed, as a result

of the delays to project implementation that were generated by the COVID-19 pandemic, only 44% of the budget allocation in this results area had been spent by December 2020. More importantly, however, the size of the budget allocation has underscored the commitment of the project to facilitating strategic development at the local and cantonal level to improve citizen quality of life.

In considering how well the available project resources have been converted into expected results (**efficiency**), the measures that have been used by the Project to ensure quality implementation and results achievement are to be noted. On the one hand, there has been no indication that project resources have not been adequate to address the cost of implementation and management. Staffing requirements have also been covered by the available project budget and have been supplemented by UNDP permanent staff, where required. On the other hand, project implementation has involved building on the experiences and lessons learned from the previous project phases. Indeed, this approach has contributed towards the ongoing attainment of project milestones, such as the implementation of local development projects in underdeveloped localities to address expressed social concerns and improve the quality of life of citizens. Consequently, the Project has used several tools and procedures to quality assure its intervention as indicated by the following examples:

- **UNDP Procurement Process:** The purchase of all project resources adheres to the regulations that underpin a strict procurement process, to ensure compliance with organisation policies and international standards. Any intended deviation from the written procedures must be reviewed by UNDP senior management prior to implementation, to determine whether it is in the best interest of all relevant parties, as well as whether written approval will be granted for next steps;
- **Permanent Field Office Presence:** While the Project Team includes field officers who work at the local and cantonal level by commuting to the field, some field officers are permanently based within regional offices. In addition to potential resource savings that are generated through this work modality, there is an added benefit of proximity to local development processes. In essence, project staff who are based in the field

<sup>64</sup> Source: ILDP Phase III, Financial Report, 2020

are in a position to understand local development challenges as they emerge, as well as build a productive working relationship with local development stakeholders. By default, the Project has benefited from a capacity for increasing its responsiveness to the emergent stakeholder needs at the local and cantonal levels.

- **Quality Assurance Tool:** The ILDP quality assurance tool was refined in 2018 and has been used by the partner local governments and cantons, as well as by the ILDP Project Team, to assess and monitor the functionality of development planning and management systems. The tool is applied by awarding points to specific categories based on established criteria (e.g. strategic documents; processes; institutional structures; collaboration with stakeholders, such as civil society and the private sector; etc.). A Monitoring Commission was further established to review the quality of documents based on the awarded points. The members of the Commission have included representatives from the development management structures and the cantonal Parliament. While the tool has been used independently at the local and cantonal levels, it is also used by the Project Team to ensure that self-assessment reports are based on valid evidence. Importantly, therefore, discussions between the Project Team and the relevant development management units are usually held to address significant differences in the points that are awarded by each party for the same categories that have been assessed.

These quality measures, in combination, have contributed towards process efficiency, whereby project resources are used in the best way possible to ensure quality results.

Of interest, therefore, while there has been evidence of project **effectiveness**, (see Section 4) results achievement has been challenged by several emergent factors (e.g. the COVID-19 pandemic; the reluctance of the FBiH Government to fully implement the Financing Mechanism; and a generally unstable political environment). While these challenges have disrupted the pace of results achievement, they do not negate the effects of the project on planning processes across BiH subnational governments, and the contribution of ILDP

Phase III to local development and improved livelihoods among citizens.

Given that the concept of equity, has been increasingly incorporated into the assessment of value for money, and has aligned with the revised OECD-DAC definition of effectiveness, evidence of its manifestation during ILDP Phase III is of further importance. The facilitation of equity is linked to the 'policy priority to leave no one behind.'<sup>65</sup> Significantly, therefore, the Project has been actively used to support the engagement of underrepresented social groups during strategic local development (e.g. women; elderly persons; etc.) and has prioritised the provision of seed funding to underdeveloped localities.

### Resilience to COVID-19

Of note, the COVID-19 pandemic was an unforeseen shock to the BiH socio-economy that affected strategic development planning and management process at all levels of government (see Finding 6). As a result, the Project experienced implementation delays and a reduced capacity to facilitate public participation through in-person activities. It is of interest, therefore, that key informant consultations highlighted an emergent resilience to the effects of the pandemic at the local and cantonal levels. Specifically, while the local and cantonal governments complied with mandatory regulations for reducing the spread of COVID-19, they demonstrated strong support for project continuity, using remote online platforms to reschedule; adjust; and engage in project activities, as required. By generating this capacity for resilient behaviours at the level of local development, ILDP Phase III has indirectly contributed to the ownership of anticipated project results. Importantly, a major advantage of this development has been the scope that has been created for results sustainability (see Finding 15).

**Finding 10:** From a design standpoint, the integrated approach to strategic development planning and management has contributed towards results ownership across subnational governments, given its support for vertical and horizontal coordination, through inclusive participation; financial integration; and the nationalisation and localisation of Agenda 2030.

A core element of ILDP Phase III has been its integrated development strategy, which has supported strategic development planning that is driven by transparent

---

<sup>65</sup> <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

cross-sectoral collaborations, as well as vertical and horizontal coordination. Notably, the Project engaged key development actors from subnational governments and civil society in development planning processes, to ensure strategic subnational development that is functional; regulated; and focused on priority issues that were identified through inclusive public consultations (see Finding 7). Further, priority development projects were integrated into strategic local and cantonal development planning, to facilitate project access to available funding from allocated budgets. Importantly, the integration process was designed to facilitate a vertical alignment with entity-level governments, based on the use of an EU-compliant financing mechanism in each entity. The aim of this approach was not only to facilitate the vertical coordination of local development efforts, but to increase the capacity of local and cantonal government funding recipients to apply for EU financial assistance. As of December 2021, the RS Financing Mechanism has been fully taken over by the RS Government and the corresponding mechanism at the level of FBiH was under consideration.<sup>66</sup> As indicated, however, it is unlikely that the mechanism will be adopted by the FBiH Government (see Finding 6).

In line with the consolidated phasing-out approach for ILDP Phase III, the inclusiveness of the intervention strategy has contributed to increasing results ownership by project stakeholders at the local and cantonal level. The determining factors have been their leading role in collaborating with citizens, to identify priority intervention issues for integration into local development plans; their responsibility for managing the intervention through allocated funding; and their strengthened position relative to their capacity to apply for external funding. It is of interest, therefore, that the intervention strategy has contributed to the nationalisation of Agenda 2030, which has led to country ownership of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including at the subnational level. Specifically, as of 2019, the Project has been collaborating closely with relevant stakeholders from the national and subnational levels to develop the BiH Framework for SDGs.<sup>67</sup> This framework defines a common position of BiH governments on Agenda 2030

and the SDGs. It has been endorsed by the State government; the entity-level governments; and the BD BiH government. The SDG Framework will be localised through the incorporation of relevant development pathways; indicators; and targets into entity-level and BD BiH development strategies. Development management systems that were established with support from the Project will further be used as infrastructure, to support subnational SDG implementation, including alignment with budgets and development financing. By default, a trickle-down effect<sup>68</sup> in the form of vertical coordination is foreseen, in the integration of SDG indicators into strategic development planning at the local and cantonal levels.

#### 4.5. Cross-cutting themes

As ILDP Phase III has been implemented through the work portfolio of UNDP BiH, the cross-cutting themes that are central to the work of the organisation, and to the Government of Switzerland, have been of equal relevance to project implementation. The evaluation has, therefore, examined the extent to which project design and implementation integrated considerations for gender equality; the application of a rights-based approach; and the facilitation of human development. Relatedly, the gender equality thematic has also been of relevance to the work of the Government of Switzerland/ SDC, through the Embassy of Switzerland in BiH.

As a measure of gender equality, the analysis was used to determine the extent to which equal rights; responsibility; and opportunities were provided to women and men.<sup>69</sup> Relatedly, to explore the extent to which the Project applied a rights-based approach, the analysis was used to identify evidence of development programming that recognised the entitlements of all human beings to civil; cultural; economic; political; and social rights. By extension, the measure for the facilitation of human development was evidence of sustainable; people-centred development. Consequently, **the results of the evaluation have shown that the cross-cutting themes are not mutually exclusive. As a result, the Project successfully contributed to the integration of gender equality**

<sup>66</sup> The FBiH Ministry of Finance has indicated that it is 'not ready to mainstream the [financing mechanism] practice' as it is 'too complex for local governments' (ILDP Annual Report, January – December 2020, p.20)

<sup>67</sup> ILDP 2019 Yearly Plan of Operations, Narrative description

<sup>68</sup> Lewis, W.A., 1954. Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour. The Manchester School, May 1954.

<sup>69</sup> While the analysis has aligned with the OECD-DAC definition of gender equality, as well as the approach to gender disaggregation that was provided through the Project, there is an equal acknowledgement that gender is non-binary (Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S., 2013. *Language and Gender*. Second Edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.).

**considerations by facilitating rights-based human development. The efforts of the Project were challenged, however, by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and the gender composition of political bodies.**

**Finding 11:** The integration of gender equality and social inclusion considerations has been strongly reflected in project design and implementation, and has intertwined with the application of a rights-based approach to human development.

The cross-cutting themes that have been central to the implementation of ILDP Phase III, as indicative of the institutional priorities of UNDP BiH and the Embassy of Switzerland, are independently definable (see Appendix IV) but have intertwined at the point of project implementation. To illustrate, while the facilitation of gender equality is based on set targets for providing equal opportunities to all genders, the integration of gender equality considerations into an intervention supports adherence to a rights-based approach to human development. Within the current context, therefore, ILDP Phase III demonstrated strong evidence of the integration of gender equality and social inclusion considerations that are consistent with a rights-based approach to human development. At the cantonal level, for example, all the strategies and action plans that were developed for 2020 reflected the needs of women and socially excluded persons. In addition, 10 new local government development strategies included at least two projects that addressed the needs of women and/ or persons from other socially excluded groups. Gender Commissions that had been established by eight cantonal Assemblies prior to ILDP Phase III (in eight of the 10 partner cantons), were also used by the Project as an additional platform to check on the integration of gender perspectives into planning processes. Further, in 2018, the implementation of 12 local government projects through the RS Financing Mechanism resulted in direct benefits for 58,000 citizens. Forty percent (40%) of these citizens were women and 6,000 citizens were from socially excluded groups (see Appendix IX for an overview of the results that were achieved in the area of gender and social inclusion).

At the level of project design, the logical framework for ILDP Phase III also included results targets (outputs; outcomes and impact) that have been anchored in the need to foster human development through a rights-based approach. The specific focus has been on an improvement in the quality of life for all BiH citizens. In support of this objective, the key performance

indicators of the framework, have addressed the need for the Project to monitor the extent to which its activities are socially inclusive. The emphasis, here, has been on the active engagement of vulnerable social groups in project activities. Included among these groups are women and other socially excluded groups. Further, as an advancement over its previous phases, ILDP Phase III has been informed by an action plan for reinforcing social inclusion and gender equality into project design and implementation.

Importantly, project activities have built on these requirements. Consultations with key informants from across all categories of project stakeholders, supported by document review, have indicated that measures were established to facilitate the integration of the key cross-cutting themes into project activities. As an example, proposals that were submitted for local development funding were awarded additional points for demonstrating evidence of the integration of social inclusion considerations. Overall, the integration of the cross-cutting themes into the Project have aligned significantly with the inclusive participatory approach that has been advocated by the intervention strategy.

Of note, however, the restrictions that were implemented in response to the COVID-19 pandemic challenged the capacity of the Project to ensure consistent participation by underrepresented and/ or socially excluded groups in project activities (see Finding 7). As an additional challenge to the integration of gender, in particular, the Project was unable to facilitate increased gender balance within cantonal development councils. In essence, each development council is a cantonal government body that reflects the gender distribution of the cantonal governments and local government mayors, which are male-dominated (see Finding 7).

#### **4.6. Impact**

In order to measure the impact of ILDP Phase III, the focus of the analysis was on the extent to which the Project generated significant higher-level effects, whether positive or negative, as well as whether they were intentionally generated or unforeseen. The evaluation results have indicated that **the Project contributed to the establishment of a new, regulated system for subnational development planning and management in BiH. As its main function, the system uses an integrated and inclusive methodology to incorporate legitimate development priorities into strategic institutional planning, including budget planning. As the local and cantonal governments have**

**been at different stages in developing and implementing their strategic plans, however, they have differed in the extent of their contribution towards improved citizen quality of life.**

**Finding 12:** While there is significant evidence of the contribution of ILDP Phase III to functional subnational development, the project has varied in the extent of its contribution towards improvements in the quality of life of citizens.

ILDP Phase III has made significant contributions towards the establishment of functional development planning and management at the subnational level in BiH (see Section 4). To illustrate, a critical achievement of the Project has been the facilitation of a system in which legitimate development priorities are transformed into institutional work plans and subsequently, into programming budgets. These development priorities have been defined in development strategies that were each prepared through an inclusive participatory process, which engaged socio-economic actors from all levels of government; civil society; and the private sector. As the new system is regulated by a legal framework, compliance with its core requirements is mandatory. The system was further designed to improve transparency; accountability; and effective resource usage. Overall, the approach to strategic development that has been advocated by the system is new to BiH, but FBIH entity has been a pioneer in this area. Specifically, subsequent to the adoption of the 2017 FBIH Law on Development Planning and Management and the preparation of its associated by-laws, other countries in the West Balkans region took steps to apply the same approach (see Finding 2).

As the expected impact of ILDP Phase III has included an improvement in the quality of life of BiH citizens, it is of importance that several measures have been established by the Project to facilitate this objective. Notably, citizens were engaged in public consultations to support the development of local development strategic plans, which have been informed by the expressed needs of citizens. Results monitoring for the Project has further shown that approximately 0.3 million citizens, including persons from socially excluded groups, benefitted from improved public services as of March 2021.<sup>70</sup> Progress reporting has also provided examples of citizen engagement in awareness-raising sessions. As a result of delays to the implementation of local and cantonal strategic plans,

however, local development projects have been at different stages of implementation. While these delays have been compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic, they were also influenced by changes in elected officials following the local elections, and different capacities across local and cantonal governments for implementing strategic plans (see Finding 6). On the one hand, all 10 cantonal governments have developed their new 2021-2027 development strategies. On the other hand, not all local governments have produced development strategies to align with the new legal framework, including adjusting existing strategies or taking steps to launch their planning process, as applicable. Specifically, at the level of the FBIH entity, all partner local governments have adjusted their development strategies or have produced new ones that align with cantonal strategies and the new legal framework. Yet, as the RS Law on Strategic Planning and Development and the by-law for designing strategic documents were only adopted in July and September 2021, respectively, the process of producing the new strategies is still in its early stages within this entity. Five local partner governments within the RS entity are also currently receiving support from the Project to develop their new strategies in line with the new law.

The issue that has emerged, in consequence, is two-fold. First, it is undeniable that there have been improvements in service delivery to BiH citizens at the local and cantonal levels, given the prioritisation of citizen concerns during strategic planning and the subsequent implementation of citizen-informed local development projects. By facilitating this approach, ILDP Phase III has created scope for improvements in citizen quality of life. Second, the establishment of the entity-level strategic planning and development management systems has been relatively recent. It is too early, therefore, to document their impact in terms of benefits to citizens. Indeed, this is not a shortcoming of the Project, but an acknowledgement that the realisation of tangible results further to an intervention takes time, and in particular, within a post-conflict environment.

**Finding 13:** Based on its direct investment in an increased capacity for local and cantonal governments to access external financial assistance, including from the EU, ILDP Phase III indirectly contributed to the creation of a platform for the country-wide adoption of Agenda 2030.

---

<sup>70</sup> Outcome Monitoring Summary Report, 03/2017 – 03/2021

In line with the results framework for the Project, the expected impact of ILDP Phase III has included contributing to the integration of BiH into the European Union (EU). The Project took measures to facilitate this objective by incorporating EU standards into its activities. As an example, the RS Financial Mechanism was informed by EU standards for transparent financial management. The Project also developed a manual that was aligned with EU financial principles, to guide practitioners during the designing of public grant schemes. Capacity strengthening sessions at the local and cantonal levels also advocated local strategic plans that are based on EU standards. Further, the Project facilitated trainings on the EU Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) programming, the focus of which has been to engage local and cantonal governments in the defining priorities of the IPA, as well as the BiH Directorate for European Integration.

Overall, the incorporation of EU standards into project activities has been aimed at increasing the capacity of local and cantonal governments to apply for EU financial assistance. ILDP Phase III has contributed to these efforts by introducing EU standards; principles; partnership structures; and methodological approaches into project activities. This approach has been informed by Chapter 22: Regional Policy and Coordination of Structural Instruments, to identify and implement the EU priorities for BiH. Further, the application of EU standards to project implementation activities has contributed to: i) the endorsement (and implementation) of EU-compliant financing mechanisms at the level of the two entities and BD BiH; and ii) country ownership of the SDGs based on the nationalisation and localisation of Agenda 2030 through the SDG Framework in BiH (see Findings 6 and 10).<sup>71</sup>

The SDG Framework in BiH has been informed by a contextual assessment of country-level development, including the BiH EU Accession Agenda. It was further developed based on extensive stakeholder consultations in BiH, which were conducted over the period 2018 – 2019. The Framework has recognised three development pathways within the BiH context: i) Good governance and public sector management; ii) Smart growth; and iii) Society of equal opportunities. It has also incorporated two horizontal themes, namely, Human capital for the future; and the ‘Leave no one behind’ principle. Given the combined relevance of the development pathways and the horizontal themes for strategic development in BiH, and in particular the

management systems that have been established through ILDP Phase III, it is of importance that the SDG Framework was endorsed across all subnational governments, and has also informed new 2021 – 2027 development strategies and at the level of the entity governments, as well as the local and cantonal governments (see Finding 4)<sup>72</sup>.

It follows that ILDP Phase III has provided a platform for the country-wide implementation of the SDG Framework in BiH. Although this was not a target result for the Project, it has been an emergent result at the impact level that has the potential to further enhance strategic development processes at the subnational level.

#### 4.7. Sustainability

The sustainability criterion was measured as the likelihood for the continuation of the net benefits of ILDP Phase III beyond the project end date. In this respect, the results of the evaluation have shown that **the Project has demonstrated a strong potential for results sustainability based on the combined workings of its exit and intervention strategies. Lead planning institutions at the entity level and within BD BiH have gained access to capacities and frameworks (legal; methodological; financial; and institutional) to independently steer a new system for development planning and management. By supporting strategic planning that has prioritised local development needs using an inclusive approach, the intervention strategy has further contributed to a sense of results ownership among project stakeholders at the local and cantonal levels.**

**Finding 14:** By combining its inclusive and integrated strategy with a consolidated phasing out approach, ILDP Phase III has contributed towards the readiness of stakeholders across government levels to assume ownership for the sustainability of project results.

Following the initial launch of ILDP in BiH 2008, Phase III is the culmination of approximately 13 years of intervention activity. To support a continuation of the momentum that was created, the project design included a consolidated phasing out strategy. The intention has been to gradually hand over the main project components to the institutional partners that will become responsible for sustaining achieved results. Invariably, they will also be responsible for facilitating the achievement of expected results, given the delays

<sup>71</sup> The focus of Finding 13 will be on Agenda 2030, as opposed to the project financing mechanisms.

<sup>72</sup> The development strategy for BD BiH was a work in progress as of December 2021

to project implementation that have resulted from the COVID-19 pandemic. Of note, therefore, the ILDP Phase III Exit Strategy has identified the main institutional partners of the project at the entity-level, and has delegated responsibility for the core project components to each institution. As an example, responsibility for facilitating the practitioners' networks after the Project ends has been delegated to the FBIH Development Planning Institute and the RS Strategic Planning Unit. Each institution will manage the functioning and financing of the networks in their respective jurisdictions.

Importantly, project implementation has also been informed by a sustainability principle and has been contributing to an emergent ownership of project results among the key project stakeholders (see Finding 10). To illustrate, in building on the public consultations that were largely conducted during Phase II of the Project at the local and cantonal levels, the priority concerns of citizens have been incorporated into strategic development plans. Further, the allocation of funding through the entity-level Financing Mechanism has contributed increased resources for the implementation of local development projects. As the allocation criteria has included, *inter alia*, the prioritisation of project implementation in underdeveloped municipalities, it has allowed local governments to become better equipped to address the development needs of their citizens. This has contributed to a sense of ownership at the local level for the results of each local development project.

Similarly, the ILDP Project Team has committed to continue to work closely with the lead planning institutions at the entity level and within BD BiH during the phasing out period.<sup>73</sup> This has created the opportunity for the effective handover of the core project components, to ensure that these institutions are well-equipped to steer strategic development using the integrated intervention methodology (see Finding 15). In support of this process the Project has also contributed to policy dialogue and informal collaborations for informational exchanges and the sharing of experience. The contribution of the AMCs has been important, here, to advocate for vertical coordination and horizontal cooperation, as well as cross-governmental collaboration. Specifically, project activities during ILDP Phase III have involved the establishment of collaborative working groups, as well as functional networks, to support strategic planning

for development management. Policy dialogue has been central to this process. As an example, the process for preparing the 2017 FBIH Law on Development Planning and Management and its associated by-laws was very broad (consultative) and, thereby, beneficial. In addition to engaging stakeholders across all subnational governments, the lessons learned during this process informed the development of the 2021-2027 FBIH Development Strategy, as well as the 2021 RS Law on Development Planning and Management. Consequently, in addition to the cross-sectoral working group that collaborated on the draft RS Law on Strategic Planning and Development Management (see Finding 5), an important development during the Project has been the establishment of development practitioners networks at the local and cantonal levels.

The practitioners networks have been platforms for policy dialogue and the facilitation of systemic change, as well as advocacy mechanisms for the promotion of good practices and approaches. They have also been especially active in facilitating policy dialogue to address resistance to systemic change at the local and cantonal levels. While the identified collaborations, including the increase in policy dialogue, emerged as a result of the Project, it is of interest that the formation of the practitioners networks emerged as an unintended project result. Moreover, given the contribution of the networks to advocacy, they are examples of good practice that can be used to further advance the development planning and management mandate at the local and cantonal levels.

Overall, the combined intervention and exit strategy of the Project has created a strong potential for the ownership of project results by the subnational governments. As a result, there is an increased likelihood for the results of the project to be sustained beyond the project end date.

**Finding 15:** As the Project has invested significantly in building institutional capacities for systemic; functional; and inclusive subnational development, it has created strong potential for the sustainability of its emergent results.

Given its intention to facilitate functional development planning and management at the subnational level, ILDP Phase III has contributed towards increased capacities for strategic development across subnational institutions. As a result of the Project, subnational governments gained access to opportunities to: i) build

---

<sup>73</sup> As a continuation of the efforts to mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on results achievement, the phasing out period will be extended to the end of February 2022 (ILDP Project Team).

their institutional capacities; ii) engage in cross-governmental collaboration; iii) facilitate policy dialogue; and iv) engage in networking. To illustrate, the Project Exit Strategy was used to engage entity-level institutions in trainings, to address their need for increased technical expertise on implementing strategic plans and managing the development process. These trainings were further designed to support vertical coordination, by ensuring that the existing entity-level Training Systems are equipped with the resources and capacities that are required to deliver similar trainings and support at the local, cantonal and entity levels.

In the interest of using this approach to sustain the results of the project, the training programmes that were designed through the Project, including the trainers who participated in the ToT programme, were integrated into the training systems of the two entities. At the level of the FBiH entity, the training programme was integrated into the FBiH Training System under the Civil Service Agency. Similarly, at the level of the RS entity, the training programme was integrated into the RS Training System, as managed by the RS Civil Service Agency and the RS Ministry for Administration and Local Self-Governance. Importantly, the Project has provided each institution with the training materials and tools that are required for future training delivery.

At the level of BD BiH, the Project has been offering technical assistance to relevant institutional partners, to enhance institutional capacities for the efficient long-term functioning of the new system. In support of this process, the Project will also share the training material and experiences of the two entities with BD BiH, as a

contribution towards future cross-governmental collaboration.

The establishment of development councils at the cantonal level was also used to encourage policy dialogue through cross-governmental networking and exchanges between local and cantonal governments (see Finding 7). Notably, collaborative activities at the local level have also engaged socio-economic actors from the wider society, to ensure that the expressed needs of the general public, including persons from socially excluded groups, are incorporated into strategic local development plans. As these strategic plans are informed by an inclusive participatory process, they reflect actual societal needs. In consequence, the local development plans have an increased potential to inform development interventions that address the lived realities of citizens and generate significant impact. These interventions can, therefore, be used to contribute towards enhanced services that address the needs of citizens and support a visible improvement in the quality of their lives.

Of additional interest, the implementation of the local strategic planning voucher scheme in five of the 10 ten cantons (see Finding 7) allowed them to identify cantonal agencies with the capacity to support the development of local development strategies. By default, these agencies can be approached by cantonal authorities in the future, to provide a similar level of support beyond the project cycle. The voucher scheme has, therefore, contributed to the sustainability of the approach that has been used by cantons to facilitate strategic development.

# 5. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

---

## 5.1. Conclusions

In the effort to build on the results of its previous two phases, ILDP Phase III has engaged Project partners and target beneficiaries alike, in a unique development intervention for establishing a system for functional subnational development in BiH. The main objective of the Project has involved facilitating a system for the intensified planning and implementation of development priorities, as identified by citizens, as a contribution towards an improvement in their quality of life. Indeed, Phase III of the Project has been challenged by the complex socio-political environment of BiH and the unanticipated emergent effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Yet, there has been evidence of the achievement of expected project results and the attainment of milestones. Moreover, the Project has provided examples of good practice that can be used to enhance future project phases or the implementation of future similar development interventions.

The main findings of the evaluation are summarised below, and have been organised under the main evaluation criteria.

### 5.1.1. Relevance

ILDP Phase III has been relevant at the country-wide level. It has, however, specifically responded to the need for increased technical capacities across subnational governments, to initiate public sector reform for the benefit of citizens. The Project has, therefore, addressed subnational policy reform needs and the necessity of improved public service delivery. By aligning with the international development agenda, the Project has been of further relevance for contributing to BiH international development priorities **(Related to Finding #1; #2; #3 and #4)**.

### 5.1.2. Coherence

The Project has been compatible with other development interventions at the country level, in the broad thematic areas of inclusive development; built institutional capacities; and improved standards of living. As the ILDP intervention strategy has been uniquely based on systematic; inclusive; subnational

development that has been informed by multi-stakeholder collaboration, it has complemented rather duplicated other BiH development projects **(Related to Finding #5)**.

### 5.1.3. Effectiveness

In spite of an unstable socio-political environment and the COVID-19 pandemic, both of which have challenged anticipated accelerated growth, ILDP Phase III has successfully addressed the variation in capacities across subnational governments. The Project has facilitated a harmonised approach to strategic subnational development through vertical and horizontal coordination. Project achievements have included: functional development planning and management systems at the entity level that have been equipped with: regulatory and operational frameworks; institutional structures and capacities; strategic documents; partnerships; vertical and horizontal coherence; and accountability mechanisms. The Project has also facilitated Seed Funding that has contributed towards development management processes at the local and cantonal level, and priority local development projects, including within underdeveloped municipalities, that have led to improved livelihoods and services for 0.27 million citizens. The Project has also contributed towards increased awareness among civil society organisations and the media about strategic development to enable them to support development planning and management. There has been limited evidence, however, of the engagement of the media **(Related to Finding #6; #7 and #8)**.

### 5.1.4. Efficiency

ILDP Phase III has created good value for money by maximising the impact of the intervention relative to available project resources. In response to the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, local and cantonal governments developed resilience in the form of an emergent sense of results ownership. Based on the ILDP intervention strategy, the Project has further contributed to the nationalisation of Agenda 2030, which has led to country ownership of the SDGs **(Related to Finding #9 and #10)**.

### 5.1.5. Cross-cutting themes

Efforts to integrate the cross-cutting themes that are of relevance to the Project, have shown that gender equality; the use of a rights-based approach; and the facilitation of human development are not necessarily mutually exclusive. The Project contributed, therefore, to the integration of gender equality considerations by facilitating rights-based human development. Project efforts in this area were challenged, however, by the COVID-19 pandemic and the gender composition of political bodies (**Related to Finding #11**).

### 5.1.6. Impact

The Project has facilitated a new, regulated system for subnational development planning and management in BiH. The system uses an integrated and inclusive methodology to incorporate legitimate development priorities into strategic institutional planning, including budget planning. As the local and cantonal governments have been at different stages in developing and implementing their strategic plans, however, they have differed in the extent to which they have contributed towards an improvement in the quality of life of citizens (**Related to Finding #12 and #13**).

### 5.1.7. Sustainability

Based on the combination of its exit and intervention strategies, the Project has demonstrated a strong potential for results sustainability. Lead planning institutions at the entity level and within BD BiH have gained access to legal; methodological; financial; and institutional capacities and frameworks to enable them to independently steer a new system for development planning and management. By supporting strategic planning that has prioritised local development needs using an inclusive approach, the intervention strategy has contributed towards results ownership at the local and cantonal levels (**Related to Finding #14 and #15**).

## 5.2. Recommendations

This sub-Section presents a set of strategic and operational recommendations that have been informed by the emergent results of the evaluation. As the Project will end in February 2022, they are presented as options that can be used to guide the next steps for programming and/ or policy design. They do not, therefore, specify a timeframe for implementation. As the ILDP Project Team will also cease to exist after the project end date, the recommended actions have not identified an individual lead implementer but

delegates institutional responsibility for next steps, as applicable.

### Strategic

**Recommendation 1:** It is recommended that UNDP BiH, in collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, should work with working with the public audit offices at the entity level in the future, so that they include a performance audit of the development planning and management systems in their work (**Related to all Findings; High priority**).

The ILDP project is ending after 14 years of intervention activity at the subnational level to support the establishment of a consolidated approach to strategic development planning and management in BiH. Phase III of the Project has specifically built on the results of the previous two project phases, and has successfully established a legally regulated system for strategic development at the level of subnational governance. The Project has made a significant contribution to subnational development in BiH through: i) a systemic, integrated, inclusive methodology; ii) legal frameworks; iii) enhanced institutional capacities; iv) strategic, citizen-informed plans; and v) programme-based budgeting, to ensure the transparency and accountability of development processes and the sustainability of generated results.

Notwithstanding the advancements that have been made over pre-project conditions at the subnational level, there is a conceivable risk to the sustainability of the results that have been achieved. These risks are particularly linked to the volatile socio-political environment of BiH. It is recommended, therefore, that an auditing facility should be established to quality assure the development management system. The emphasis should be on facilitating system efficiency and effectiveness, with emphasis on transparency and accountability for results achievement. Further the auditing facility should be anchored within the public audit offices to ensure its functioning and sustainability.

The deliberations that are required to establish the audit facility should be led by UNDP BiH and the Embassy of Switzerland. To further support the readiness of the institutional partners for the first annual audit, and in the interest of results sustainability, it would be practical for UNDP BiH and the Embassy of Switzerland to allocate resources for results monitoring over a scheduled time-frame beyond the project end date. The monitoring process can be supported by the quality assurance tools that were established during ILDP Phase III.

**Recommendation 2:** UNDP BiH should, in collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, explore the potential for enhancing development planning and management in future similar interventions through increased collaborations and partnerships that further support the localisation of the BiH Framework for SDGs **(Related to all Findings; Moderate priority)**.

The integrated approach to strategic planning and development management has been used to facilitate results-based planning and frameworks for development management through an integrated and inclusive process. In light of the progress that has been made by the Project during its third phase, including achieved results and milestones that have been attained, the methodological approach has been generally effective. While the Project has been challenged by situations that have been beyond its control, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, arguably, other emergent challenges have been within its area of influence. One such challenge has been the resistance of the FBiH Government to fully implement the Financing Mechanism. On the one hand, the FBiH Government (through the Ministry of Finance) maintained its position in spite of high-level interventions by senior officials from UNDP BiH and the Embassy of Switzerland, as well as the FBiH Prime Minister. On the other hand there is a question of whether a refinement of the Financing Mechanism to address the specific concerns of the Ministry would have contributed to a greater openness towards full implementation. Specifically, as the Ministry indicated that the underlying approach of the Financing Mechanism was ‘too complex,’ it would be worth considering which measures should have been applied, from the perspective of the Ministry, to reduce the perceived level of complexity and produce a ‘more acceptable’ financing option. This approach would require further discussions with senior officials of the Ministry.

In light of the successful introduction of new legal and methodological frameworks during ILDP Phase III, and the perceived need for the entire system to remain contextually applicable, it is recommended that UNDP BiH and the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH should explore the potential for diversification in the implementation of new development strategies. The emphasis will be on incorporating more innovative approaches into the implementation process, such as increased collaboration with the private sector, to mobilise additional funding; the introduction of innovative approaches to service delivery (e.g. through partnerships, outsourcing, digitalisation; etc.); inter-

municipal collaborations; etc. It is anticipated that greater innovation during strategic development planning and management will not only address the ongoing need for contextual applicability, but will contribute towards sustainable approaches and results. As the incorporation of innovative approaches into strategic development processes will enhance development planning and management, it will further support the localisation of the BiH Framework for SDGs. Given that a central element of the overall process involves integrating SDG indicators into strategic development planning, there is also scope for country-level contributions towards the achievement of the SDGs.

**Recommendation 3:** In collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, UNDP BiH should further explore the contribution of post-Project activities to the EU Accession Agenda and the SDG Framework in BiH, to address existing gaps and facilitate increased capacities at the subnational level to apply for external funding **(Related to all Findings; High priority)**.

Although unexpected, one of the emergent results of ILDP Phase III has been the country-level adoption of the SDG Framework for BiH. As project implementation has further aligned with the BiH EU Accession Agenda, there have been active efforts to ensure compliance between project activities and EU standards, to support the realisation of the EU Priorities for BiH. Pending the end of the Project in early 2022, however, it will be the direct responsibility of the lead planning institutions at the entity-level, as well as within BD BiH, and the local and cantonal governments to facilitate the ongoing implementation of development projects. Notably, project activities at the local and cantonal levels, in particular, have included efforts to increase the capacity of each jurisdiction to access EU funding.

Given the commitment of BiH to contribute towards the achievement of the SDGs, it would be worthwhile for post-Project activities to support this effort. In the interest of strategic national development, support for SDG achievement would underscore the importance of the SDG Framework in BiH for strategic country-wide development. Based on the objective of ILDP Phase III, to contribute towards country integration into the EU, efforts to sustain the results of the project should further include support for the BiH EU Accession Agenda.

It is recommended, therefore, that UNDP BiH should collaborate with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH to identify existing gaps in the efforts of BiH to contribute towards Agenda 2030 and the EU Accession

Agenda, with emphasis on the efforts that are being made at the subnational level. On the one hand, efforts to address contribution gaps, where they exist, will strengthen the capacity of BiH to contribute towards both agenda. On the other hand, a better alignment between international development agenda and BiH strategic development allow for increased access to opportunities for financial assistance to support strategic development. By extension, there is potential for an improvement in the quality of life citizens through the implementation of citizen-prioritised local development projects.

### Operational

**Recommendation 4:** UNDP BiH, under the direction of the ILDP Project Manager, should continue to work closely with the lead planning institutions and the relevant EU project during the phasing out period, to ensure that programme-based budgeting is fully integrated into strategic development processes at all levels of subnational government **(Related to all Findings; High priority)**.

ILDP Phase III has contributed to the scaling-up of development efforts across all levels of subnational government, by building on the results that were achieved during the previous two phases of project implementation. On the one hand, the Project has supported the enhancement of technical capacities for the design and implementation of strategic plans, through trainings and technical assistance at the local and cantonal level, as well as at the entity-level, and within BD BiH. On the other hand, the Project has facilitated vertical coordination through funding that is allocated using the Financing Mechanism, which has become fully operational in Republika Srpska. A central requirement for the effective functioning of this process has been the need to link strategic planning with the emerging programme-based budgeting, which facilitates horizontal coordination by ensuring that strategic development is anchored in a process of accountability for development results. Further, the development of by-laws that support the operationalisation of strategic planning regulations is dependent on programme-based budgeting, which is endorsed by the EU. It is recommended, therefore, that UNDP BiH continues to cooperate with the EU to incorporate a programme-based budgeting approach into strategic development processes. The aim would be to ensure that vertical linkages are established and maintained between entity-level institutions, and local and cantonal governments, as well as with BD BiH, to better coordinate development efforts.

**Recommendation 5:** UNDP BiH, under the direction of the ILDP Project Manager and in collaboration with the lead planning institutions at the entity-level and within BD BiH, should continue to implement the Project Exit Strategy during the remaining project timeframe to ensure effective handover of responsibilities and the scaling up of the good practices for strategic development that emerged during the Project **(Related to all Findings; High priority)**.

The ILDP Exit Strategy has provided a detailed and comprehensive overview of the steps that need to be taken to facilitate the consolidated transfer of project responsibilities to domestic institutions, notably at the entity level, by project completion. It is in the interest of results sustainability, including continued progress towards project milestones that have not yet been attained, to ensure that the responsibility for results achievement is completely and effectively handed over by the project end date (circa February 28, 2022). It would be equally important to ensure that the lead planning institutions at the entity level and within BD BiH receive scheduled guidance to: i) continue to build on results achieved; ii) ensure the proper functioning of the frameworks and processes that were established during the Project; and iii) support future system scale up to other local and cantonal governments, with emphasis on emergent good practices for strategic development.

As an example of next steps, the practitioners networks emerged at the local and cantonal levels as platforms that have developed capacities for facilitating policy dialogue and systemic change. Given that the role of the Project Team is being phased out to support ownership of strategic development by domestic institutions, further investment by UNDP BiH in post-Project follow-up activities will be dependent on resource availability. To mitigate the limitation of resources, therefore, it would be worthwhile for the Project Team, under the guidance of the ILDP Project Manager, to collaborate with the practitioners networks before the project end date, to support the continuity and/ or adoption of good practices for strategic development at the local and cantonal levels. Notably, the scaling up of the practitioners network to local and cantonal governments that were not involved in the Project has been completed. Encouragement from the Project for the engagement of local forums in these areas, would serve to replicate results achieved under ILDP Phase III. The forums can further be used to facilitate gender equality and social inclusion during development planning and management. It would also be opportune to explore the engagement of the media during

strategic planning, to support awareness-raising of development efforts, thereby building on the capacity of the media to contribute towards the local development agenda.

**Recommendation 6:** UNDP BiH should explore the possibility of scaling up the results of the Project to allow for harmonised development planning and management at the state level, given the potential for Project results to contribute towards the achievement of the nationalised SDGs (**Related to all Findings; Moderate priority**).

Further to the alignment of the Project with Agenda 2030, BiH has taken steps towards the nationalisation of the SDGs through the development of the SDG Framework in BiH. Notably, the Framework defines a common position across all levels of government, as regards the contribution of BiH towards the achievement of the SDGs. Given the potential contribution of the Project in this area, it would be worthwhile for the results of the Project to be scaled up to the State level, to allow for BiH ownership of results sustainability. The intention, here, would be to not only ensure that Project results are sustained, but support the establishment of a consolidated national system for planning and development management, which is one of the requirements of the EU. Further, State ownership of the Project results would also facilitate vertical and horizontal coordination of the national development effort.

### 5.3. Lessons learned

The main lessons that have emerged from the Project are summarised below:

1. **In a post-conflict setting that is characterised by decentralised governance, the socio-political climate can continue to influence efforts to facilitate strategic development, even within a regulated context.** Notwithstanding the efforts that have been made by the Project to establish a system for strategic development using an integrated, inclusive methodology and regulatory frameworks, results achievement has been continuously challenged by a volatile political environment. In addition to the possible effects of decentralised governance on the willingness of authorities to adopt new development procedures and mechanisms, implementation progress has been significantly challenged by the frequent changes in subnational authorities, as well as unprecedented delays in the appointment of governments at various levels. A commitment by governments to the development process through an evident political will has been foreseen as being necessary to take the development process forward. In its absence there is a high likelihood for a slow pace of development and the implication of delayed results achievement, as well as the possibility that results will be of low quality.
2. **While there can be an emergent willingness by stakeholder institutions across BiH governments to take ownership of strategic development processes to support the achievement of anticipated results, there is a learning curve that needs to be addressed through built technical capacities at all levels of government to steer development efforts.** It is critical for this requirement to be supported by the recognition that strategic development and the associated policy implementation process, as applicable, is time-intensive and not time-sensitive, particularly within a post-conflict environment. In addition to creating opportunities for capacity-strengthening, therefore, development efforts need to be responsive to contextual needs to ensure that recommended approaches are understood and endorsed by development partners and align with existing bureaucratic and/ or legislative procedures. This approach is further required to ensure transparency; accountability; coordination; and collaboration.
3. **The possibility for the sudden emergence of challenging circumstances that are beyond the control of development interventions signifies the need for contingency planning, as well as the exploration of alternative and/ or innovative approaches to project implementation.** Although the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the pace of project implementation and challenged the process of results achievement, the Project has been able to make good progress towards the achievement of its key milestones. The determining factor during this process has been the resilience of the project stakeholders, as reflected in their willingness to adjust working modalities and implementation plans, to ensure that project implementation got back on track.
4. **In the interest of maximising the effectiveness of interventions for strategic development, it is important to take stock of similar interventions that are being implemented by other development partners in the project locality.** The aim is to minimise the possibility for duplicated efforts to build on the work that is being done,

thereby increasing the potential for effectiveness and expected impact.

5. **Although there is an assumption that the topic of strategic development does not hold significant appeal to members of the media, there is a conceivable role for media houses to play in supporting development efforts at the subnational level.** In addition to contributing to awareness-raising across civil society, media houses can be educated on the rationale that underlies strategic planning and development management, and incentivised to better support future initiatives on this subject.
6. **Policy making processes, regulatory changes and effective cross-governmental consultations take**

**time. They require careful planning, management and the engagement of all relevant stakeholders, as well as flexibility in solution finding.** Pre-defined solutions will not work in a country like BIH. In such processes, stakeholders need to be presented with evidence-based analytics, exposed to best practices and supported, through facilitation, to define best options that are informed by the complex administrative processes and frameworks of the country.

# Appendix I: Terms of Reference

---

## Terms of Reference for ICs and RLAs through /GPN ExpRes

- Services/Work Description: Final Project Evaluation
- Project/Programme Title: Integrated Local development Project (ILDP) Phase III
- Consultancy Title: International Consultant for the Final Project Evaluation
- Duty Station: Bosnia and Herzegovina (remote)
- Duration: September-October 2021 (up to 27 expert days)
- Expected start date: 1 September 2021

## I. BACKGROUND

Together with Brčko District, there are 145 local governments<sup>74</sup> in Bosnia and Herzegovina, of which 80 are in the entity of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and 64 in the entity of Republika Srpska. Local governments vary substantially in terms of size of their population, territory and development status, while at the same time having the same responsibilities. Local governments tend to be more responsive and present a good entry point for effort to strengthen the social contract between citizen and their governments.

The local governance legal framework lies at the entity level and also at the cantonal level within the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The framework laws are the Law on Local Self-Government of Republika Srpska and the Law on the Principles of Local Self Government of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Other general provisions are given in the Constitutions and relevant legal framework of the cantons. For that matter, local government legal frameworks and fiscal arrangements vary between the two entities and between the subordinate ten cantons in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Implementation of the local governance legal framework is complex, characterised by unclear apportionment of functional responsibilities across government levels, ultimately leading to inefficient service delivery at the local level.

Regarding the institutional framework, the Ministry of Administration and Local Self-Government is the main institution in charge of local governance affairs in Republika Srpska. However, no equivalent institution exists in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina Ministry of Justice has oversight over the implementation of the local governance legal framework, while the actual responsibility for local government matters rests with the cantons.

Local governments are the key providers of essential public services at the local level. These services include local roads, water-supply and sewage, waste collection, disposal and management, heating, sports, culture, housing, etc. However, inadequate policy and legal frameworks, and limited financial resources often lead to under-provision of these vital public services to the citizens.

### Development planning and management system in the country: state of play, challenges and needs

Bosnia and Herzegovina does not have a consolidated country-wide development planning and management system in place, which would enable result-oriented prioritisation and delivery of policies and services for the citizens across all government levels. Similarly, the country has not had a development strategy since 2007. However, in April 2021 the BIH Council of Ministers adopted the 2030 Framework for Sustainable Development Goals (SDG Framework in BIH), preceded by its adoption by the governments of the two entities and Brčko District BIH. The SDG Framework in BIH provides long-term development pathways for the country, along with development accelerators and drivers.

---

<sup>74</sup> Local governments are municipalities or cities.

Considering the multi-tier governance structure of BiH, further operationalisation of the Framework is being ensured through its mainstreaming into national and subnational development strategies.

**At the state level**, there are numerous sectoral strategies; however, there is no single overarching country strategy, to set the country development directions. The country also lacks credible country-wide sectoral strategies in line with EU requirements and serving as basis for absorption of funds from the EU Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) II, as well as for implementation of necessary reforms. The state level strategies are rarely, if at all, connected with development strategies of lower government levels. The SDG Framework in BiH is currently being mainstreamed into the 2030 Strategic Framework for state-level institutions.

**Within the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina**, significant progress has been made since 2013 towards improvement of the regulatory framework related to development planning and management. The Law on Development Planning and Management and a number of by-laws operationalising the Law in practice have set in place a system where development strategies are implemented through institutional mid-term and annual planning, monitoring and reporting. This legal framework defines all aspects of the planning system in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, including timeframe, methodological and institutional frameworks, type of strategic and operational documents to be designed by governments at all levels in the entity and its linkages with financial planning.<sup>75</sup> Key institutional holder of the development planning and management system in FBiH is the FBiH Development Programming Institute. In line with the aforementioned legal framework, a new FBiH Development Strategy 2021-2027 has been designed and is currently undergoing parliamentary adoption procedure. Importantly, the Strategy is fully aligned with the SDG Framework in BiH.

Similar system is in place in **Brčko District BiH**.

**At the level of the Republika Srpska**, the system has been developing with a somewhat slower pace; however, a new Law on Strategic Planning and Management was adopted in 2021, while preparation of key by-laws is underway. The new system in the RS is similar to the one in the FBiH, which ensures coherence in development management at subnational levels in the country. Moreover, the RS Government created the Strategic Planning and Policy Coordination Unit within the Secretariat General of Republika Srpska Government, that is responsible for coordinating strategic planning and development management efforts. Republika Srpska does not have its integrated development strategy in place and steers development through a number of sectoral strategies; however, as the new Law on Strategic Planning and Development Management has been adopted, the Government plans to launch the preparation of the new development strategy in late 2021, aligned with the SDG Framework in BiH.

Since 2013, **cantons in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina have** a harmonised development planning methodology in place, which guided the development of integrated strategies in all 10 cantons. In line with the new FBiH Law on Development Planning and Management, all cantons have prepared their new 2021-2027 development strategies, aligned with the FBiH Development Strategy. Most cantons have also established their development management units responsible for strategic planning and coordination of strategies' implementation, monitoring and reporting. Moreover, significant progress has been achieved in ensuring vertical integration and communication in strategic planning between cantons and the FBiH Development Planning Institute.

**Local government level** planning and development management is most advanced and functional. It is based on the following main features: i) institutionalised and standardised local planning methodology; ii) over 80% of local governments country-wide have local development strategies; iii) local strategies are increasingly linked with municipal budgets; iv) some 40 % of local governments apply a local development management model, which helps translating strategies into development results. However, considering the new legal frameworks at the entity level, local strategies are now to be fully aligned with the new methodologies.

---

<sup>75</sup> The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP) provided support in the design of the Law and relevant by-laws.

## About the Project

<b>Project title</b>	Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP), phase III
<b>Atlas ID</b>	00091324
<b>Corporate outcome and output</b>	UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021, Outcome 2, Output 1.2.1
<b>Country</b>	Bosnia and Herzegovina
<b>Date Project document signed</b>	09 March 2017
<b>Project dates</b>	01 March 2017 31 December 2021
<b>Project budget</b>	USD 6,517,653
<b>Project expenditure at the time of evaluation</b>	5,915,039.95
<b>Funding source</b>	Government of Switzerland/SDC, UNDP, Government of BIH, IFAW
<b>Implementing party</b>	UNDP

**The Integrated Local Development Project, Phase III** is supported by the Government of Switzerland and implemented by UNDP in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is the Project's third, consolidation phase, which works to scale up and consolidate knowledge and systems whose creation has been initiated back in 2008, with the launch of the Project. To that end, the Project provides assistance to a wide range of domestic partners to affirm a functional development planning and management subnational system, which reinforces effective delivery of public policies – including those related to integration to the European Union – and thus contributes to better development results. The entity public financing mechanisms are strengthened to reinforce the efforts of the system, ensuring vertical connectivity between higher government levels' public funds and local priorities, contributing to improved local services, livelihoods and quality of life.

**The Overall objective** of the Project is “Functional development planning and management system at subnational levels contribute to better quality of life for the citizens and integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the EU”.

**The Outcomes of the Project** are:

- **Outcome 1: Lead planning structures at entity level steer the development planning and management systems characterized by vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards the citizens.**  
Expected achievements under this Outcome relate to the consolidation of the development planning and management systems in both entities, as well as replication of its principles and frameworks in Brčko District. As a result, relevant entity structures are capacitated and able to independently lead the future functioning of the subnational systems without external assistance, equipped with regulatory frameworks and methodological tools. Vertical and horizontal policy dialogue within the subnational systems are more structured, thus contributing to coordinated development planning and management, and EU integration processes. Knowledge and tools are handed over to relevant stakeholders and the rich Project knowledge heritage is sustained within the work routine of institutional partners.
- **Outcome 2: Local and cantonal governments effectively address needs of citizens and accelerate growth through inclusive development planning and management.**  
Effective cantonal and local governance and development planning and management frameworks enable better outreach and anchoring of entity and national development policies and strategies. Therefore, results under this Outcome will ensure that local and cantonal governments are effectively addressing the needs of citizens and business, as well as accelerate growth through inclusive development planning and management systems. As a result of the Project support, local and cantonal development planning and management frameworks and practices will be sustained and scaled up as part of a harmonized and accountable subnational system.

- **Outcome 3: Citizens, civil society organizations and media take pro-active part in development management and benefit from improved services.** Through this Outcome, the Project will ensure citizens' scrutiny over public performance.

The Outputs of the Project are:

- **Output 1.1:** Lead planning structures at entity level and Brčko District capacitated and equipped with policy and regulatory frameworks and instruments.
- **Output 1.2:** Public financing mechanisms sustainably reinforce the development planning and management systems, resulting in improved livelihoods and service delivery for the citizens.
- **Output 2.1:** Local development planning and management frameworks and capacities are sustained and scaled up as part of a harmonized system, in line with EU requirements.
- **Output 2.2:** Core development planning and management frameworks and capacities at cantonal level further advanced and sustained as an integral part of a harmonized public system and EU integration processes.
- **Output 3.1:** Relevant civil society organizations and journalists capacitated to understand the development planning and management system and enable wider public engagement and scrutiny in its functioning.
- **Output 3.2:** Livelihoods and services for the citizens are improved through priority Projects of local and cantonal governments.

Detailed outline of the Project Result Framework *is available in Annex 1.*

## Partnerships

This Project is funded by the Government of Switzerland and implemented by UNDP, in partnership with relevant institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina, including: the BiH Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees, the FBiH Ministry of Justice, the RS Ministry of Administration and Local Self-Government and both Associations of Municipalities and Cities. Other partners include the FBiH Development Programming Institute, General Secretariat of the RS Government and Brčko District BiH as well as the entity ministries of finance, the RS Ministry for European Integration and International Cooperation, the RS Investment and Development Bank and the Civil Service Agencies at the entity level.

*Overview of key stakeholders and partners and their roles in evaluation is provided in Annex 2.*

## Target groups and beneficiaries

- Local Governments and cantons. The Project works with partner local governments across the country, Brčko District BiH and the ten cantons in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Republika Srpska, helping them increase their capacities for planning and managing their development.
- FBiH Development Programming Institute and the Strategic Planning Department within the General Secretariat of the RS Government. These institutions are key beneficiaries of Project's assistance in establishing coherent planning systems at subnational level in BiH.

## Main achievements

- Full regulatory and methodological frameworks designed to support effective functioning of development planning and management systems in the FBiH and Brčko District BiH. Institutional capacities significantly strengthened as well as vertical coordination among different government levels (relevant for FBiH entity).
- Regulatory framework for future strategic planning and development management system designed, preparation of methodological framework is underway. Institutional capacities significantly improved.
- Coherent development planning and management systems at the cantonal level established.
- Significant level of harmonization of strategic planning and development management at the local level.

- Capacity development tools and training programmes on new legal and methodological frameworks designed and anchored within the existing training systems (entity Civil Service Agencies) for future replication.
- Functional practitioners' networks in the area of development planning and management established, enabling exchange of knowledge and practices among planners at cantonal and local level.
- Functional financing mechanism for local development priorities in Republika Srpska.
- Improved service delivery for over 250,000 citizens (communal services, healthcare, education, etc.)

## **2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK**

### **a) Purpose**

The purpose of this Final Project Evaluation (the Evaluation) is to provide an impartial review of the Project Integrated Local Development Project, phase III, in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, overall performance, management, and achievements. The information, findings, lessons learned and recommendations generated by the evaluation will be used by the Project Board, UNDP, Government of Switzerland and other relevant stakeholders to strengthen the remaining Project implementation and inform future programming.

### **b) Objective**

The Evaluation objective is to examine the overall performance of the Project, if its inputs and activities led to expected outputs, and if and how the delivered outputs contributed to improved performance by Project's target groups and institutional beneficiaries enabling functional development planning and management system at subnational levels and better quality of life for the citizens in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In a substantive analysis of the effectiveness of the Project approach and feedback from beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders, the evaluation should assess cause and effect relations within the Project, identifying the extent to which the observed changes can be attributed to the Project.

In addition, this Evaluation aims to provide forward-looking recommendations to the Government of Switzerland and UNDP on the sustainability of the Project results and the Project's scaling up potentials.

### **c) Scope**

The Evaluation will assess the extent to which the planned Project outcomes and outputs have been achieved since the beginning of the Project on 1 March 2017 and likelihood for their full achievement by the end of the Project on 31 August 2021 (based on the Project Document and its results framework). The Evaluation will investigate the overall Project performance and results (reviewing the set of activities implemented and their contribution to the set outputs and outcomes), capturing the changes triggered by the Project in the area of development planning and management at subnational levels in the country.

To the extent possible, the Evaluation will also consider the results of the Project's contribution to address the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Evaluation will look into the Project's processes, innovations, strategic partnerships and linkages in the specific country's context that proved critical in producing the intended outputs and the factors that facilitated and/or hindered the progress in achieving the outputs, both in terms of the external environment and risks, crisis caused by the pandemic, as well as internal, including weaknesses in programme design, management and implementation, human resource skills, and resources.

Evaluation criteria and key questions

The Evaluation of the Project Integrated Local Development Project, phase III will address the following questions, so as to determine the Project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, including lessons learned and forward-looking recommendations:

## Relevance

Were the Project objectives relevant to the needs of the country and the beneficiaries, having in mind political, social, legal and institutional context of the country?

Have the Projects' objectives been consistent with the country's priorities, including the EU accession agenda, Agenda 2030 and other effective strategic frameworks?

To what extent is gender equality and social inclusion mainstreamed within the Project? Has this mainstreaming been relevant to the needs of socially excluded groups and both women and men?

Were adequate steps taken by the Project to adjust its implementation strategy to the new circumstances and needs imposed by COVID-19 pandemic relevant?

To what extent has the Project been successful in ensuring complementarity, harmonisation and coordination with other relevant interventions of the governments in BiH and other donors, avoiding duplication of efforts and adding value?

## Effectiveness

To what extent have the intended results been achieved? What are the main Project accomplishments? Overview of the Project progress against the result framework indicators is to be provided in an Annex of the Evaluation Report.

To what extent and how effectively have the Project specific approach and actions contributed to its outputs and outcomes? If so, why? If not, why not?

To what extent has the Project managed to encourage policy dialogue on the relevant topic among policy-makers and instigate policy changes?

To what extent has the Project supported effective nationalisation of Agenda 2030 in the country?

To what extent has the Project outreached marginalized groups (i.e. youth, persons with disabilities, returnees, internally displaced, minorities...)? Have the Projects been implemented in accordance with a civic and human rights perspective: i.e. have target groups been participating in planning, implementation and follow up? Has anyone been discriminated by the Projects through the implementation? Have the Projects been implemented in a transparent fashion? What accountability mechanisms have been applied in the Projects?

## Efficiency

Have resources (financial, human, technical) been allocated strategically and economically to achieve the Project results? Were the Project activities implemented as scheduled and with the planned financial resources? Is the relationship between Project inputs and results achieved appropriate and justifiable?

To what extent has the Project strengthened and promoted local ownership and leadership? To what extent have the target groups and other stakeholders taken an active role in implementing the Project? SUSTAINABILITY What modes of participation have taken place? How efficient have partner institutions been in supporting the Project's implementation?

Has the communication and outreach of the Project been satisfactory?

## Impact

What is the Project impact in qualitative as well as quantitative terms from a broader development and system building perspective? What would the development have been like without the Project interventions in the area of concern?

What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the Project's interventions?

To what extent are key stakeholders/final beneficiaries satisfied with the implementation and results of the Project, specifically in terms of the partnership support and what are specific remaining issues in the area of concern?

To what extent has the Project elevated cooperation between relevant institutions?

How have cross-cutting issues, such as gender equality and reaching the most vulnerable, been effectively taken up?

What real differences have the Project interventions made to the beneficiaries? How many people have been affected? Have women and men equally benefited from the Project?

## Sustainability

To what extent are the achieved outcomes and outputs sustainable? Will the outputs lead to benefits beyond the lifespan of the Project? How could Project's results be further sustainably Projected and expanded, having in mind the remaining needs? And by which institutions?

To what extent has the Project approach triggered the behavioural and policy change among the target institutional beneficiaries in relation to system development planning and management?

To what extent has the Project approach (intervention strategy) managed to create ownership of the key institutional stakeholders?

To what extent have the capacities of relevant government institutions been strengthened to sustain the results of the Projects? Which are, in this regard, challenges to overcome or potentials to be unlocked in the future?

What are the elements that do not deliver sustainable results?

What are the innovations/ best practices that need to be further build upon?

Future-looking concept and recommendations

What are, if relevant, after-Project possible priority interventions and general recommendations, which could further ensure sustainability of Project's achievements and contribute to accelerated development in Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly in the context of Agenda 2030?

What could be possible after-Project priority interventions and general recommendations for the Government of Switzerland and UNDP related to policy influencing, which could further ensure sustainability and scaling up of Project's achievements?

The evaluation needs to assess the degree to which the Project's supported or promoted gender equality, a rights-based approach, and human development. In this regard, [United Nations Evaluation Group's guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation should be consulted.](#)

Based on the [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, UNEG Norms and Stand for Evaluations](#) and in consultations with UNDP Country Office, the Evaluation will be participatory, involving relevant stakeholders.

The Evaluation will be conducted by the International Evaluation Consultant (the Evaluator) who will propose an adjusted evaluative methodology that may be needed to implement the evaluation effectively in the COVID – 19 pandemics circumstances, applying safety guidance and remote data collecting methods such as extended desk reviews, virtual stakeholder meetings and interviews by Evaluators<sup>76</sup>. A detailed plan for the Evaluation process will be proposed by the Evaluator and agreed as a part of the Evaluation Inception Report.

The proposed methodology should employ relevant quantitative, qualitative or combined methods to conduct the Evaluation, with focus on gender sensitive data collection and analytical methods and tools applicable in the concrete case. The Evaluator is expected to combine the standard and other evaluation tools and techniques to ensure maximum reliability of data and validity of the evaluation findings.

Limitations to the chosen approach/methodology and methods shall be made explicit by the Evaluator and the consequences of these limitations discussed in the proposed methodology. The Evaluator shall, to the extent possible, present mitigation measures to address these limitations.

The Evaluator is expected to carry out the evaluation process with careful consideration of these Terms of References. In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluation, the Evaluator should ensure an

---

<sup>76</sup> UNDP Evaluation Guidelines: Evaluation During COVID-19.

evaluation design that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk during the data collection phase or the dissemination phase.

Standard UNDP evaluation methodology would suggest the following data collecting methods:

- **Desk review:** The Evaluator will conduct a detailed review of the Project materials and deliverables including but not limited to the Project Document and Addendums, theory of change and results framework, monitoring and Project quality assurance reports, annual workplans, consolidated progress reports etc. *An extensive list of documents for desk review is provided in Annex 3.*
- **Key informant interviews:** Using virtual technological solutions, the Evaluator will remotely interview representatives of UNDP, Government of Switzerland, Ministry for Administration and Local Self Governance, Development Programming Institute of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Strategic Planning Department of Republika Srpska, Ministry for European Integration and International Cooperation of Republika Srpska, Investment and Development Bank of Republika Srpska, entity Civil Service Agencies, Association of Municipalities and Cities, and representatives of partner cantons and local governments.
- Detailed list of main stakeholders that may be considered for meetings is provided in Annex 2.
- **Other methodologies,** as appropriate, such as case studies, statistical analysis, social network analysis, etc. online interviews, mobile questionnaires, online surveys, and collaboration platforms (slack or yammer) are recommended to be used to gather data. Stakeholders that are dealing with existing emergencies should be given advance notice.
- **Field visits/selected spot checks** to collect relevant evidence on the Project's results will be conducted exceptionally, depending on the epidemiological situation related to the COVID-19 pandemic and in compliance with all epidemiological measures effective in the country.

As an integral part of the evaluation report and specifically under the impact criteria, the Evaluator will review the Project' effects and impact on the target groups. In this context and using the online tools, the consultancy is expected to gain insights from both the partners and the beneficiaries.

Stakeholders involvement: During the evaluation process, the Evaluator is expected to talk with the senior representatives of the UNDP, Embassy of Switzerland, Project Board members and the representatives of local governments/institutions included in the Project implementation.

The expected duration of the assignment is up to 27 work-days in the period September- October 2021.

### 3. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

Following the initial briefing and a detailed desk review, the Evaluator will be responsible for delivering the following products and tasks:

- **Inception Report (10-15 pages)** will be presented before the evaluation starts, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by proposing methods, sources of data and data collection procedures. The Inception Report should elaborate an **evaluation matrix** (*provided in Annex 4*) for the Project and propose a schedule of tasks, activities and evaluation deliverables. The Evaluation Inception Report should follow the structure proposed in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, p. 22-23.
- **Evaluation and data collection:** Upon the approval of the Inception Report and the evaluation work plan by the UNDP, the Evaluator is expected to carry out the Evaluation. **Data collecting methodology presented in the Evaluation Inception Report should limit the exposure of any consultant, Project team member, beneficiary or stakeholder to the pandemic,** therefore, strongly recommended is use of remote and virtual methodologies. Field visits and physical spot checks can be undertaken exceptionally, depending on the epidemiological situation and in compliance with epidemiological measures effective in the country.
- **Draft Evaluation Report:** Based on the findings generated through desk review and data collection process, the Evaluator will prepare and submit the Draft Evaluation Report to the UNDP team and key stakeholders for review. **Following the implementation arrangements of the Project, the Evaluation findings, lessons**

**learned and specific recommendations for the Project will be separately presented in distinct sections of the Evaluation Report.** *Structure of the Report is outlined in Annex 5.*

- **Evaluation review process** (and eventual dispute settlement): Comments, questions, suggestions and requests for clarification on the evaluation draft will be submitted to the Evaluator and addressed in the agreed timeframe. The Evaluator should reply to the comments through the **evaluation audit trail document**<sup>77</sup>. If there is disagreement in findings, these should be documented through the evaluation audit trail, while effort should be made to come to an agreement.
- **Evaluation debriefing:** will be held with UNDP, Embassy of Switzerland, Project Board representatives and other key stakeholders to present main findings and recommendations in an online form (i.e. Skype/Zoom/Microsoft Teams briefing). In addition, short briefings on immediate findings with UNDP senior management will be considered after completion of the initial assessment.
- **Evaluation Report** (maximum 40 pages of the main body) should be logically structured (structure of the Evaluation Report is outlined in Annex 5 of the Terms of Reference), contain data and evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations, and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. Finally, based on the evaluation findings and in a distinct report section, the Evaluator will provide a **forward-looking actionable recommendations for the Project**, outlining key strategic priorities to be addressed after completion of the Project in terms of policy dialogue and policy influencing by UNDP and the Government of Switzerland and UNDP and follow-up activities by the governments and public institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

#### **4. Institutional arrangements/reporting lines**

The evaluation will be conducted by the International Evaluation Consultant who will design and implement the evaluation process in line with these Terms of References.

The Evaluator is expected to provide an independent and substantiated review of the Project achievements; capture underperformance; assess partnership strategy; capture feedback from beneficiaries of assistance provided by the Project, produce the Evaluation Report in light of development results; and provide strategic forward-looking recommendations, outlining pathways for the period beyond this Project phase.

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The Evaluator shall safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The Evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners. The Evaluator must be free from any conflict of interest related to this evaluation.

**UNDP Evaluation Guidelines Note:** *As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account, conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.*

*If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.*

---

<sup>77</sup> Template available at

[http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP\\_Evaluation\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf), p. 25

*If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national Evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. **No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm and the safety is the key priority. stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule.***

## **5. Experience and qualifications**

- I. Academic Qualifications: Advanced university degree in social sciences, political sciences, public administration or related field
- II. Years of experience:
  - At least 5 years of extensive Project/programme evaluation expertise and experience in the area of sustainable development and system-building interventions;
  - Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
  - Previous experience in remote evaluation is an asset;
  - Understanding and knowledge of the political and administrative context in Bosnia and Herzegovina is an asset.
- III. Language:
  - Fluency in English language; knowledge of local languages of BIH is an advantage.
- IV. Competencies:

### **Core values**

- Demonstrates integrity and fairness by modelling UN values and ethical standards;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

### **Core competencies**

- Demonstrates professional competence to meet responsibilities and post requirements and is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results;
- Results-Orientation: Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals, generates innovative, practical solutions to challenging situations;
- Communication: Excellent communication skills, including the ability to convey complex concepts and recommendations, both orally and in writing, in a clear and persuasive style tailored to match different audiences;
- Team work: Ability to interact, establish and maintain effective working relations with a culturally diverse team;
- Client orientation: Ability to establish and maintain productive partnerships with national partners and stakeholders and pro-activeness in identifying of beneficiaries and partners' needs and matching them to appropriate solutions.

## **6. Payment Modality**

Payment to the individual contractor will be made based on the actual number of days worked, deliverables accepted and upon certification of satisfactory completion by the manager.

# Appendix II: Approved Methodology

---

## Technical Approach

The technical approach to the evaluation of Phase III of the Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP) was theory-based and was conducted using a client-approved evaluation matrix. It was further supported by an inclusive participatory approach; utilisation-focused principles; mixed-methods; and purposive sampling. The rationale that underlies the technical approach is described in the sub-sections that follow.

## Theory-based Evaluations and the Evaluation Matrix

The theory-based approach to evaluation involves structuring the evaluation around the theory of change/ logical framework of the development intervention that is being evaluated.<sup>78</sup> This approach is used to test the theory of change, to better identify the contextual factors that have contributed to emergent results, whether these results were anticipated or unforeseen, and are positive or negative. The applicability of the theory-based approach to the current evaluation is noted especially by the emphasis of the ToR on using ‘the overall performance of the Project’ as a basis to ‘inform future programming.’<sup>79</sup> ToR specifications further emphasised the need for the evaluation to specifically determine ‘the extent to which observed changes could be attributed to the Project,’ and identify the contextual factors that have been ‘critical in producing the intended outputs’ and those that have ‘hindered progress’ in this area.<sup>80</sup>

To support this line of analysis, an evaluation matrix was informed by the Project theory of change and logical framework. The evaluation matrix was used to conceptualise the evaluation under the five OECD-DAC criteria that were outlined within the ToR, namely, relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact and sustainability. Three cross-cutting themes, gender equality; a rights-based approach; and human development, were further incorporated into the evaluation matrix to address ToR requirements.<sup>81</sup> In response to the indicative evaluation questions of the ToR, coherence was added as a final criterion. The exploration of the identified criteria (see Appendix III for the definition of each criterion) was used to conduct the summative component of the evaluation. In order to allow the end users of the evaluation to learn from the emergent results, the evaluation matrix also incorporated a lesson learned criterion. A recommendations criterion was further used to facilitate the formative component of the evaluation and inform future Project programming. The client-approved evaluation matrix was used, therefore, to establish a logic of enquiry to guide data generation and analysis and produce the results of the evaluation. This logic of enquiry comprised the key evaluation questions and sub-questions; data sources; and the means of verification (The evaluation matrix is presented in Appendix IV).

## Inclusive Participatory Approach

As Project implementation was supported by partnerships with multiple stakeholder organisations, the use of an inclusive participatory approach was appropriate. On the one hand, the inclusive participatory approach allows for a pragmatic evaluation, as all categories of relevant Project stakeholders are provided with the opportunity to contribute towards evaluation design and implementation. The approach draws on the knowledge and experience of the Project stakeholders as the key informants of the Project experience, with emphasis on Project design; implementation; and impact. On the other hand, as the Project stakeholders/ key informants have a right to be involved in decision-making that affects them,<sup>82</sup> an inclusive participatory approach is ethical. The overall advantage

---

<sup>78</sup> Rogers, P., 2007. Theory-based Evaluations: Reflections ten years on. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 114, p.63.

<sup>79</sup> ToR, Section 2b

<sup>80</sup> ToR, Section 2c

<sup>81</sup> ToR, p.9

<sup>82</sup> United Nations Evaluations Group, 2011. *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation: Towards UNEG Guidance*. Paris: UNEG.

of this approach, therefore, is the avenue it creates for generating better-quality data, to inform reliable results and appropriate recommendations, thereby increasing the potential for policy uptake of the evaluation results.<sup>83</sup>

### Utilisation-focused Principles

As the evaluation will be used to guide future ILDP programming, it has been critical for the exercise to meet the expressed needs of the end-users. This approach supports their ownership of the emergent evaluation results, including the uptake of recommendations and lessons learned during strategic planning and follow-on programming. The application of utilisation-focused evaluation principles further supports this objective by addressing the need for an evaluation that is useful to its end-users. As a contribution to this process, the evaluation engaged all categories of stakeholders who were involved in the Project, from design through to implementation. Based on the understanding that the end-users are key informants of ‘the Project story’, the use of utilisation-focused principles complements the inclusive participatory approach by facilitating an evaluation that is conducted for and by its end-users. As the evaluation was conducted by an external evaluator, however, the results that were generated were impartial, given that the evaluator was responsible for final data analysis and results synthesis.

### Mixed Methods

The ToR implied that this evaluation would have generated qualitative and quantitative data. Mixed methods were used where applicable, therefore, to align emergent results with the type of data that was to be generated. The use of mixed methods has the advantage of supporting data triangulation across multiple sources, which creates the potential for increased data accuracy and credibility to inform the reliability of the evaluation results.

### Purposive Sampling

Purposive sampling was used to achieve the level of rigour that is required for a robust evaluation. The process responded to the existing diversity across Project documentation and stakeholder groups, and was conducted using a sequential approach. Purposive sampling that is based on a sequential approach is structured around the main evaluation criteria and questions to increase results accuracy. The rationale for this approach is its capacity to mitigate one of the main limitations of an evaluation, namely, resource scarcity. In essence, the purposive approach to sampling is used to identify the key informants who are best suited to provide detailed responses to the evaluation questions, to accurately reflect given elements of the Project experience. When purposive sampling is supported by a sequential approach, it further allows for additional data generation at any stage of the evaluation, to facilitate results reliability and completeness.

The criteria for the selection of stakeholders and Project documentation during this evaluation was informed by the start-up discussion of the inception phase, as well as a preliminary review of relevant Project documents (see Appendix IV for a document map of the available documents). Consequently, all documents that were of relevance to the Project were selected for in-depth review. To further ensure that the evaluation engaged a wide range of Project stakeholders, and to mitigate the possibility of non-response to requests for consultation, stakeholder selection followed the purposive sampling approach. Purposive sampling was also used to increase the potential for response accuracy and data reliability. The evaluation, therefore, engaged key informants from the main categories of stakeholders that facilitated the Project (see Table A1, primary data sources).

**Table A1: Key Sources of Primary and Secondary Data**

Data Sources	Description
<b>Primary sources</b>	Relevant Project stakeholders from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina Country Office</li> <li>• ILDP Project Team</li> <li>• Embassy of Switzerland</li> <li>• Entity of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Cantons</li> <li>– Ministry of Justice</li> <li>– Project partner institutions within Municipalities and cities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>83</sup> Guijit, I, 2014. *Participatory Approaches*. Florence: UNICEF.

Data Sources	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entity of the Republic of Srpska (RS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Ministry of Administration and Local Self-government</li> <li>– Project partner institutions within Municipalities and cities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Brčko District</li> <li>• Development planning and management institutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– FBIH Development Programming Institute</li> <li>– RS Secretariat General, Strategic Planning and Policy Coordination Unit</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other relevant stakeholders, as applicable</li> </ul>
<b>Secondary sources</b>	<p>Relevant Project documents and literature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conceptual documents (Project Theory of Change; logical framework; Project documents; etc.)</li> <li>• Project management reports (Project work plans; progress reports; financial reports; results monitoring reports; etc.)</li> <li>• Strategic reports (strategic plans; policy documents; etc)</li> <li>• Evaluation/ Assessment reports</li> <li>• Other relevant documents, as applicable</li> </ul>

Given existing differences across local governments and institutions, simplified criteria was further used, where applicable, to increase the diversity of the evaluation sample. The criteria were applied to the cantonal authorities, which differ in terms of size (small; mid-size; large); and capacity for development management (limited; growing; advanced capacity). Key informants for the Republic of Srpska and the Federation of BiH, were also selected randomly as they were more numerous for these subnational governments, and each had similar levels of Project engagement. Key informants who were not selected for the initial sample were placed in a reserve group and were approached for consultation to address non-response within the main sample.

## Methods

The evaluation was executed over five distinct, but overlapping phases: Phase 1: Inception; Phase 2: Data generation; Phase 3: Data analysis and results synthesis; Phase 4: Reporting and validation; and Phase 5: Assignment management. A description of each phase of activity is presented in the sub-Sections that follow.

### Inception

Further to contract signature, the evaluator and the evaluation focal points at UNDP-BiH Country Office participated in a remote start-up meeting to better understanding pertinent key issues to inform evaluation start-up, including the needs and expectations of both parties; and the evaluation objectives and context.

Following the Start-Up meeting, the evaluator produced the first draft of the main deliverable of Phase 1, the draft inception report, which outlined the evaluation methodology; work plan and implementation schedule. The draft inception report was submitted to the UNDP BiH Country Office through the evaluation focal points, to facilitate internal review. Feedback received was used to inform finalisation, and the final inception report served as the client-approved evaluation guide.

### Data generation

Data generation was based on two methods, an in-depth review of relevant documents and the literature; and key informant consultations. In line with ToR requirements, data generation by key informant consultation was conducted remotely using a virtual platform (Zoom).

The selection of potential sources of data, key informants and documents inclusive, was based on purposive sampling using a sequential approach. This approach facilitated follow-up data generation from additional sources, as required, throughout the evaluation.

### Desk review:

An in-depth desk review of relevant programme documents and the literature was guided by the key questions and sub-questions of the client-approved evaluation matrix. All available Project documents that were relevant to the

evaluation were included in the evaluation sample. Where necessary, the evaluator requested additional documents for in-depth review

### **Key informant consultations:**

Key informant consultations were facilitated as individual and/ or small group interviews. Each consultation was guided by data generation tools that were tailored to each category of key informant.

### **Data analysis and results synthesis**

In order to purposefully influence analysis through cross-validation, to produce credible evaluation findings, the following methods of analysis were used:

- **Descriptive analysis** : A descriptive analysis of the Project was used to understand and describe its main components, including related activities; partnerships; modalities of delivery; etc. Descriptive analysis preceded more interpretative approaches during the evaluation;
- **Content analysis**: A content analysis of relevant documents, the literature and the notes from key informant consultations, was conducted to identify common trends and themes, and patterns for each of the key evaluation issues (as the main units of analysis). Content analysis was also used to flag diverging views and opposite trends, and determine whether there was need for additional data generation. Emerging issues and trends were synthesised to inform each stage of the reporting process (validation; draft and final evaluation reports);
- **Quantitative analysis**: A quantitative analysis of data was conducted of resource use during Project design and implementation. Simplified analyses were conducted on all quantitative datasets using spreadsheet software (e.g. Excel), where applicable, to generate summary statistics. The statistics that were generated were used to develop emergent findings and inform a comparative analysis.
- **Counterfactual analysis**: Within the context of Project effectiveness, the analysis of impact comprised a qualitative and a quantitative component entailing the establishment of the Project counterfactual using both types of data. Quantitative values, as measured at Project baseline, constituted the estimates of the quantitative targets that would have been attained without the Project intervention. These baseline values were compared with endline values, as available, to gauge the extent of quantitative Project impact. Similarly, perception data generated during key informant consultations were used to estimate the situation that would have been realised, from the perspectives of the key informants, if the Project had not been implemented. The results of the counterfactual analysis were also used to inform the comparative analysis of emergent evaluation results;
- **Contribution analysis**: In alignment with the Project theory of change and/or logical framework, contribution analysis was used to determine the extent to which Project results could have been attributed to the Project. As the Project was implemented in parallel with other Projects and was affected by context-specific factors, the aim of the analysis did not centre on identifying the Project as the single reason for observable results. Rather, the intention was to validate the assumptions of the theory of change, to affirm the contribution of the Project intervention to the contextual emergence of results.
- **Comparative analysis**: A comparative analysis was used to examine findings across emerging themes, and to identify good practice and innovative approaches, where applicable, and lessons learnt. Information was organised according to the hypotheses that emerged. The main evaluation findings were generated through this process. Case study vignettes were also developed, as applicable, to document examples of Project impact; lessons learned; and/or examples of good practice from Project design and implementation. Case study vignettes are short, descriptive, summary examples of the effects and workings of programming.<sup>84</sup> They vary in length and detail according to the specific example provided and the availability of data. While they are not indicative of the overall Project impact, they can provide rich contextual data on a given intervention.

---

<sup>84</sup> Patton, M. 2001. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. California: Sage Publications.

## **Reporting and validation**

In line with the use of utilisation-focused principles, the initial findings from data generation were shared with UNDP BiH, following data generation and analysis, and initial results synthesis, in the interest of validation. The initial findings were presented as a summary document, the purpose of which was to initiate further data generation, where required, and inform the draft evaluation report.

Using the client-approved report guidelines, as informed by the ToR and incorporated into the inception report, the consultant submitted the draft report to UNDP BiH for dissemination and review by the Project team. Consolidated feedback on the draft evaluation report was used to inform the finalised version. The consultant then facilitated an online session to present the main results of the evaluation to the Project team.

## **Assignment management**

In the interest of quality assurance and evaluation ethics, the evaluation complied with the international standards of UNDP; OECD-DAC; and the United Nations Evaluation Group. The evaluator also provided regular progress updates to the evaluation focal points at UNDP BiH throughout the evaluation. Any emergent incidents that could have implicated the evaluation was reported to the focal points without delay. As the evaluation is the property of UNDP BiH, the evaluator also refrained from reproducing the evaluation data or products for personal purposes.

## **Limitations and mitigation measures**

The evaluation was challenged by four limitations: i) the COVID-19 travel restrictions; ii) resource limitations; iii) the unavailability of some stakeholders for consultations; and iv) language.

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, it was not possible for the evaluator to travel to the Project country to facilitate in-person consultations with the key Project informants. Given that this limitation was foreseen by the evaluation commissioner, the ToR specified the need to adjust the evaluation methodology to effectively address this limitation. To mitigate the emergent circumstances of the pandemic, therefore, the evaluator used remote consultations to engage key informants across distance. The process was made possible through the Zoom platform.

A common limitation to evaluations is the inadequacy of the resources that are available to facilitate the exercise, in particular a restricted evaluation timeframe and limited human resource. To successfully mitigate the resource limitations to the evaluation, the evaluator collaborated closely with the UNDP BiH Country Office, through the Project team, to schedule consultations with key informants. Purposive sampling was further used to identify the key informants who were most suitable for providing detailed information on Project design; implementation; and results generation.

The evaluation was also challenged by the unavailability of some key informants for consultations, as a result of other commitments. In order to mitigate this challenges, purposive sampling approach was used to select alternative key informants, as applicable, for engagement by the evaluator.

As the evaluator was not versed in the local languages of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the difference in language was an additional challenge to the evaluation. With the support of the UNDP BiH Country Office, however, the evaluator gained access to independent translation support, which was used to facilitate the remote consultations with key Project informants, as required.

# Appendix III: Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria		Definition
1.	Relevance	The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change
2.	Coherence	The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country; sector or institution
3.	Effectiveness	The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups
4.	Efficiency	The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way
5.	Impact	The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects
6.	Cross-cutting themes:	
	6.1 Gender equality	The equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men, and girls and boys as a central component for the realisation of all human rights
	6.2. Rights-based approach	Development programming that is informed by the recognition that all human beings are entitled to civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights regardless of nationality, place of residence, sex, sexual orientation, national or ethnic origin, colour, disability, religion, language etc.
	6.3 Human development	Sustainable people-centred development for the realisation of all human rights. Developing the capacities of duty-bearers to meet their obligations during human rights-based programming, and of right-holders to claim their rights
7.	Sustainability	The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue
8.	Lessons learned	Generalisations based on evaluation experiences with Projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations; frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact
9.	Recommendations	Proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a development intervention; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources

Source:

- OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2019. Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use, #1 - #5; #7
- UNEG 2011, Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation: Towards UNEG Guidance, #6.1 - #6.3
- OECD DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-based Management, #8 - #9

# Appendix IV: Evaluation Matrix

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
1.0 Relevance	1.1 To what extent have the Project objectives been relevant to the needs of the country and the beneficiaries, given the political, social, legal and institutional context of Bosnia and Herzegovina?	1.1.1 What evidence is there to indicate that ILDP Phase 3 has been relevant for country-wide development planning and management?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from :               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> <li>– Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of alignment between Project objectives and country strategies/ policies/ priorities</li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
1.0 Relevance		1.1.2 In what way has the Project been relevant for establishing functional development planning and management at the subnational level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of context-specific gaps at subnational level</li> <li>Alignment between Project objectives and built capacities for subnational development planning and management</li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
1.0 Relevance	1.2 To what extent have the objectives of ILDP Phase III been consistent with country priorities/ strategic frameworks?	1.2.1 What evidence is there of the alignment between the ILDP Phase 3 and the commitment of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the international development agenda?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– alignment between Project objectives and international development frameworks (e.g. EU Accession Agenda; Agenda 2030; etc.)</li> <li>– Project-related nationalisation of international development strategies; frameworks; etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
1.0 Relevance	1.3 What is the relevance of the Project to the donor agency?	1.3.1 In what way has the Project been responsive to the strategic priorities of the Government of Switzerland?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of alignment between Phase 1 Project objectives and donor priorities</li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
<b>2.0 Coherence</b>	2.1 To what extent has ILDP Phase III ensured complementarity, harmonisation and coordination with other relevant interventions of the governments in BiH and other donors?	2.1.1 In what way has ILDP Phase III complemented or duplicated other government-level interventions in BiH?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP BiH</li> <li>Entities and district</li> <li>Local government</li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of internal coherence/ lack of internal coherence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project activities build on (add value to) existing/ previous/ planned government-level interventions</li> <li>Project activities duplicate existing/ previous/ planned government-level interventions</li> </ul> </li> <li>Evidence of external coherence/ lack of external coherence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project activities build on (add value to) existing/ previous/ planned government-level interventions</li> <li>Project activities duplicate existing/ previous/ planned government-level interventions</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
2.0 Coherence		2.1.2 In what way has ILDP Phase III complemented or duplicated development interventions by other donor agencies in BiH?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from :               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP BiH</li> <li>Entities and district</li> <li>Local government</li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of internal coherence/ lack of internal coherence:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project activities build on (add value to) existing/ previous/ planned interventions by other donors</li> <li>Project activities duplicate existing/ previous/ planned interventions by other donors</li> </ul> </li> <li>Evidence of external coherence/ lack of external coherence:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project activities build on (add value to) existing/ previous/ planned interventions by other donors</li> <li>Project activities duplicate existing/ previous/ planned interventions by other donors</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
3.0 Effectiveness	3.1 To what extent have the intended results of ILDP Phase III been achieved and what are the main Project accomplishments?	3.1.1 How successful was the Project in leading planning structures at entity level, to steer development planning and management systems characterised by vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards the citizens? (Outcome 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from :               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP BiH</li> <li>Entities and district</li> <li>Local government</li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of functionality of the subnational development planning and management systems:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of regulatory and operational framework; institutional structures and capacities; strategic documents; partnerships; vertical and horizontal coherence; and accountability in place</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
3.0 Effectiveness		3.1.2 What evidence is there to show that local and cantonal governments have effectively addressed the needs of citizens and accelerated growth through inclusive development planning and management? (Outcome 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from :               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> <li>– Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>55% of local and 70 % of cantonal governments with functional development management structures as part of a coherent system</li> <li>30% of women and 10 % of representatives of socially excluded groups engage in development planning and management processes at local and cantonal levels</li> <li>50 % increase of additionally attracted funds based on local strategies against average local governance budget</li> <li>20 % increase of additionally attracted funds based on cantonal strategies against average cantonal budget</li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
3.0 Effectiveness		3.1.3 In what way have citizens, civil society organisations and the media taken pro-active part in development management and benefited from improved services? Outcome 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from :               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Media and relevant civil society organisations engage and influence development management systems</li> <li>275,000 citizens (30% of women + 10% of socially excluded groups) in target localities benefit from improved public services beyond direct Project interventions</li> <li>At least 2 constructive reactions of local governments on demands brought forward by civil society organisations or media</li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
4.0 Efficiency	4.1 To what extent has ILDP Phase III been managed efficiently?	4.1.1 What evidence is there of efficient resource allocation during Project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations/ financial reports</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP BiH</li> <li>Entities and district</li> <li>Local government</li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate Project resources (human; time; financial; etc.)</li> <li>Timely dissemination of required Project resources</li> <li>Use of internationally approved procedures for Project management, including financial management; results monitoring; troubleshooting; etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
4.0 Efficiency		4.1.2 Has there been satisfactory communication and outreach during Project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented satisfaction with Project communication and outreach</li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
4.0 Efficiency		4.1.3 How efficient have partner institutions been in supporting Project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP BiH</li> <li>Entities and district</li> <li>Local government</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost-effective modes of participation by partner institutions</li> <li>Project ownership by partner institutions</li> <li>Etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
4.0 Efficiency		4.1.4 What evidence is there to indicate that ILDP Phase 3 has provided value for money?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from :               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of indicators to monitor delivery of value for money</li> <li>Evidence of production of intended outputs</li> <li>Evidence of outcome achievement</li> <li>Cost of inputs/ resources relative to outputs</li> <li>Capacity to produce quality outputs at least cost</li> <li>Capacity to produce quality outputs on time and within budget</li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
4.0 Efficiency		4.1.5 How successful was the Project in adjusting its implementation strategy to the COVID-19 pandemic?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from :               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Timely revisions to Project strategy</li> <li>– Continuity of Project activities</li> <li>– Continued progress towards results achievement</li> <li>– Stakeholder satisfaction with Project revisions</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
5.0 Impact	5.1 What has been the Project contribution to functional development planning and management systems at the subnational levels, for a better quality of life for citizens and the integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina into the European Union (EU)?	5.1.1 In what way has the Project contributed to a functional development planning and management system at the subnational level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>• Project document</li> <li>• Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>• Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>• Project Board reports</li> <li>• Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– UNDP BiH</li> <li>– Entities and district</li> <li>– Local government</li> <li>– Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>• Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Continuous growth of value of development index at cantonal and local government levels</li> <li>– Citizen reports of better quality of life as a result of Project implementation</li> <li>– Progress towards EU integration</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Descriptive analysis</li> <li>– Content analysis</li> <li>– Quantitative analysis</li> <li>– Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>– Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
6.0 Cross-cutting theme: Gender	6.1 To what extent has ILDP Phase 3 been gender responsive?	6.1.1 How has gender equality been integrated into Project activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from :               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP BiH</li> <li>Entities and district</li> <li>Local government</li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the integration of transparent gender equality considerations and practices into Project design and/ or implementation e.g.:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporating a gender analysis into Project design</li> <li>Facilitating equal opportunities for Project participation at all Project stages</li> <li>Identifying and eliminating barriers to access/ opportunities for individual participation</li> <li>Project design and implementation, including target results, are informed by the needs of all target beneficiaries</li> <li>Transparent accountability procedures</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

6.2 To what extent did the Project apply a rights-based approach?

6.2.1 What evidence is there to show that Project activities were implemented using rights-based principles to facilitate social inclusion?

- Country development strategies and policy documents
- Project document
- Project logical framework/ Theory of change
- Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations
- Project Board reports
- Consultations with stakeholders from :
  - UNDP BiH
  - Entities and district
  - Local government
  - Development management and planning institutions
- Review of relevant documents and Project website
- Consultations with key informants:
  - Interviews (individual; small group)
- Evidence of the integration of rights-based principles into Project design and/ or implementation e.g.
  - Incorporating rights-based considerations into Project design
  - Facilitating equal opportunities for Project participation at all Project stages, including for persons from vulnerable/ marginalised social groups
  - Identifying and eliminating barriers to access/ opportunities for individual participation
  - Project design and implementation, including target results, are informed by the needs of all target beneficiaries
  - Transparent accountability procedures
- Key informant perceptions
- Desk review, including:
  - Descriptive analysis
  - Content analysis
  - Quantitative analysis
  - Counterfactual analysis
  - Comparative analysis
- Key informant consultations

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
6.0 Cross-cutting theme: Human development	6.3 To what extent were human development considerations incorporated into Project design and implementation?	6.3.1 What evidence is there to indicate that the Project was informed by human development considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP BiH</li> <li>Entities and district</li> <li>Local government</li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the integration of human development considerations into Project design and/ or implementation e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporating human development considerations into Project design</li> <li>Facilitating individual access to opportunities to develop personal abilities and use them freely</li> <li>Providing opportunities for political freedom</li> <li>Facilitating human security</li> <li>Facilitating decent standards of living</li> <li>Reducing gender disparities</li> <li>Eliminating discrimination</li> <li>Transparent accountability procedures</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
7.0 Sustainability	7.1 What is the likelihood for results sustainability beyond the Project end date?	7.1.1 What evidence is there of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ownership of the intervention strategy by key institutional stakeholders/ partner Project institutions?</li> <li>- behavioural and policy change among the target institutional beneficiaries in relation to system development planning and management?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>• Project document</li> <li>• Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>• Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>• Project Board reports</li> <li>• Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNDP BiH</li> <li>- Entities and district</li> <li>- Local government</li> <li>- Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>• Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project ownership, including the intervention strategy and expected results achievement, by partner Project institutions</li> <li>- Behavioural and policy change among target beneficiary institutions for system development planning and management</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Descriptive analysis</li> <li>- Content analysis</li> <li>- Quantitative analysis</li> <li>- Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>- Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
7.0 Sustainability		7.1.2 In what way has the Project strengthened the internal capacities of government institutions to support results sustainability beyond Project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country development strategies and policy documents</li> <li>Project document</li> <li>Project logical framework/ Theory of change</li> <li>Project monitoring/ progress reports/ evaluations</li> <li>Project Board reports</li> <li>Consultations with stakeholders from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP BiH</li> <li>Entities and district</li> <li>Local government</li> <li>Development management and planning institutions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of relevant documents and Project website</li> <li>Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews (individual; small group)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of enhanced governmental capacities for Project continuity; results achievement; and results sustainability, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy dialogues</li> <li>Policy uptake</li> <li>Networking and collaboration across different levels of government for enhanced service delivery</li> <li>Etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>
8.0 Lessons learned	8.1 What are the main lessons that have emerged from ILDP Phase 3?	8.1.1 What are the elements of the Project that worked well during?	Main evaluation findings	Synthesis of results of data analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Best practices</li> <li>Innovation</li> <li>Success stories by target Project beneficiaries</li> <li>Major factors positively influencing results achievement</li> <li>Etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/ Tools	Indicators/ Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
8.0 Lessons learned		8.1.2 Which aspects of the Project require strengthening in future similar Projects?	Main evaluation findings	Synthesis of results of data analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas for improvement</li> <li>Major factors impeding results achievement</li> <li>Partnerships in need of improvement</li> <li>Etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant perceptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive analysis</li> <li>Content analysis</li> <li>Quantitative analysis</li> <li>Counterfactual analysis</li> <li>Comparative analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>Key informant consultations</li> </ul>
9.0 Recommendations	9.1 What are the emergent recommendations of the Project, with emphasis on policy influence; results sustainability; and Project scale-up?	9.1.1 What are the emergent recommendations for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- policy influence;</li> <li>- results sustainability; and</li> <li>- future Project scale-up?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Main evaluation findings and lessons learned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Synthesis of results of data analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emergent recommendations from evaluation findings and lessons learned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results synthesis</li> </ul>

# Appendix V: List of Documents Reviewed

---

1. Action Plan for Reinforcing Social Inclusion and Gender Equality within the Integrated Local Development Project
2. Annexes, Integrated Local Development Project Mid-term Review Report, February 2020
3. Annual Report 2019, Democratic Governance, Municipal Services
4. Country Programme Document for Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015-2020
5. Design of Public Grant Schemes: A Functional Manual for Practitioners
6. Integrated Local Development Project - Third Consolidation Phase, Project Budget, Final Financial Report
7. Integrated Local Development Project - Third Consolidation Phase, Project Budget, Financial Report for 2018
8. Integrated Local Development Project Mid-term Review Report, February 2020
9. Integrated Local Development Project Phase 3, Annual Progress Report, March 2018 – February 2019
10. Integrated Local Development Project Phase 3, Annual Progress Report, March 2018 – February 2018
11. Integrated Local Development Project Phase 3, Annual Progress Report, January – December 2019
12. Integrated Local Development Project Phase 3, Annual Progress Report, January – December 2020
13. Integrated Local Development Project Phase 3, Progress Report, July – November 2018
14. Integrated Local Development Project, (Phase 3: March 2017 – February 2021) Project Document, February 2017
15. Integrated Local Development Project, Plan of Yearly Operations, 1 March – 31 December 2017
16. Integrated Local Development Project, 2019 Plan of Yearly Operation, Narrative Description
17. Integrated Local Development Project, Plan of Yearly Operations, 1 January – 1 December 2018
18. Integrated Local Development Project, Draft Advocacy Plan for 2020 – 2021
19. Integrated Local Development Project, Exit Strategy, Revised Version, April 2021
20. Integrated Local Development Project, Request for Phase Additional Activities and Budget Changes, February 2019
21. OMS for the Project: ILDP, Reporting Period 03/2017 – 03/2021
22. OMS for the Project: ILDP, Reporting Period 03/2017 – 03/2019
23. OMS for the Project: ILDP, Reporting Period 03/2017 – 09/2020
24. OMS for the Project: ILDP, Reporting Period 03/2017 – 07/2019
25. OMS for the Project: ILDP, Reporting Period 09/2017 – 09/2018
26. OMS for the Project: ILDP, Reporting Period 09/2017 – 03/2018
27. OMS for the Project: ILDP, Reporting Period 09/2017 – 09/2018, Shortened
28. OMS, Integrated Local Development Project, Reporting Period 0/2017 – 09/2017
29. Overview of Progress Towards Attainment of Outcomes, Annual Report 2019
30. Project Logical Framework and Theory of Change
31. UNDAF for Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015-2020

# Appendix VI: Key Informants Consulted

## Bosnia and Herzegovina, Directorate for Economic Planning

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
LUCIC, Tanja	Head, BiH Department for Planning	Female	Email exchange

## Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH)

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
ALJOVIC, Alija	Assistant Minister – FBiH Ministry of Finance	Male	Individual interview (Remote)
AVDUKIC, Nijaz	Assistant Director – FBiH Development and Planning Institute	Male	Individual interview (Remote)
HASIC, Sejla	Senior Associate – FBiH Association of Municipalities and Cities/ Project Board member	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
LJUICA, Samra	Assistant Director – FBiH Civil Service Agency	Female	Individual interview (Remote)

## Cantons

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex
JERKOVIC, Damir	Adviser to the Minister – Hercegovina Neretva Canton	Male
JURILJ, Ivan	Director – Office for European Integration of the Government West-Herzegovina Canton	Male
MISKOVIC, Ivana	Head of the Development Unit – Canton 10	Female
OVCINA, Senad	Office of the Prime Minister – Tuzla Canton	Male
SIJERCIC, Emir	Secretary of Government – Bosnia Podrinje Canton	Male
SOFTIC, Muhamed	Head of the Office – Office for European Integration, Funds, Public Relations and Quality to International Standards, Central Bosnia Canton	Male
ZIVKOVIC, Marijana	Associate, Government Office for Development and EU Integration	Female

## Republic of Srpska

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex
BOSNJAK, Mirko	Sector Director – Investment and Development Bank	Male
KOVACEVIC, Nemanja	Assistant Minister – Ministry for European Integration and International Cooperation	Male
MILOJEVIC, Dusko	Senior Associate – Ministry of Administration and Local-Self-Government	Male
PANTIC, Aco	Secretary – Associations of Municipalities and Cities	Male
VOJNOVIC, Sanja	Head of the Strategic Planning Department - Department for Strategic Planning, General Secretariat of the RS Government	Female

## Brčko District

<b>SURNAME, First name</b>	<b>Title - Affiliation</b>	<b>Sex</b>
ABADZIC, Amra	Head of Economy Development Unit – Department for Economy Development, Sports and Culture	Female
GUSIC, Oliver	Chairman of the Development Committee Brcko – Secretariat of the Government of Brcko District of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sector for General Affairs and Strategic Planning	Male

## Municipalities and Cities, Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina

<b>SURNAME, First name</b>	<b>Title - Affiliation</b>	<b>Sex</b>
DERVISEVIC, Eldina	Coordinator – Breza	Female
KRUPIC, Senad	Coordinator – Buzim	Male
MULAHASANOVIĆ, Dženan	Coordinator – Jablanica	Male
OMEROVIĆ KRLIČEVIĆ, Umihana	Coordinator – Doboj Jug	Female
TAHIROVIC, Sena	Coordinator – Lukavac	Female
TIPCERA-DERVISIĆ, Nermina	Strategic Planning and Management Unit	Female

## Municipalities and Cities, Republic of Srpska

<b>SURNAME, First name</b>	<b>Title - Affiliation</b>	<b>Sex</b>
ASONJA, Slavica	Han Pijesak	Female
DAMJANOVIC, Zeljko	Head of Development Department/ Coordinator – Vlasenica	Male
KUZMANOVIC SALIPUR, Jelena	Coordinator – Rudo	Female
LJUBOJA, Dalibor	Coordinator – Oštra Luka	Male
MIHOLJČIĆ, Marko	Coordinator – Srbac	Male
MILIC, Biljana	Coordinator – Zvornik	Female
REPOVIĆ, Velimir	Coordinator – Nevesinje	Male
SKARAMUCA, Ružica	Coordinator – Ravno	Female
TEPIĆ, Vidosava	Coordinator – Kotor Varoš	Female
TUPESA, Njegos	Cajnice	Male
VOJČIĆ, Vitomir	Coordinator – Ljubinje	Male

## UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina

<b>SURNAME, First name</b>	<b>Title - Affiliation</b>	<b>Sex</b>
ALIBEGOVIĆ, Nermina	Field Officer, ILDP – UNDP Country Office	Female
DIMOVA, Marina	Chief Technical Advisor – UNDP Country Office	Female
KOBASLIJA, Alma	Policy Specialist, ILDP – UNDP Country Office	Female
LAKOVIC- HOSO, Aida	Project manager, ILDP – UNDP Country Office	Female
MIHAJLOVIC, Tanja	Field Officer, ILDP – UNDP Country Office	Female
NALIĆ, Nasir	Development Management Specialist, ILDP – UNDP Country Office	Male
NEDERA, Steliana	Resident Representative – UNDP Country Office	Female
OBARČANIN, Muamer	Capacity Development Specialist, ILDP – UNDP Country Office	Male

<b>SURNAME, First name</b>	<b>Title - Affiliation</b>	<b>Sex</b>
<b>POZDER CENGIC, Adela</b>	Sector Leader, Good Governance Sector – UNDP Country Office	Female
<b>SLIJEPČEVIĆ, Saša</b>	Field Officer, ILDP – UNDP Country Office	Male
<b>SUTON-WILLIAMS, Mirela</b>	Field Officer, ILDP – UNDP Country Office	Female

#### **Embassy of Switzerland, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

<b>SURNAME, First name</b>	<b>Title - Affiliation</b>	<b>Sex</b>
<b>KANOSTRAVAC CVIJETIC, Snezana</b>	Governance Officer – Embassy of Switzerland	Female
<b>ZARIĆ, Maja</b>	Head of Local Governance and Municipal Services Portfolio – Embassy of Switzerland	Female
<b>ZUKORLIC, Alma</b>	Former Governance Officer – Embassy of Switzerland	Female

# Appendix VII: Interview Protocols

---

## Interview Protocol: UNDP BiH/ Project Board

### Introduction:

The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP) Phase III has been designed to support the establishment of a functional development planning and management system at the subnational level in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). With financial assistance from the Government of Switzerland, in the amount of USD \$8.5 million, ILDP Phase III has been implemented by UNDP BiH Country Office over the four-year period March 1, 2017 – December 31, 2021. The target beneficiaries of the Project have been: entities; local governments and cantons; development agencies and civil society organisations; citizens; and the media. As its overall objective, the Project has aimed to facilitate a better quality of life for the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and country integration into the European Union.

Pending the end of Project activities in December 2021, UNDP BiH has engaged an external evaluation consultant, to conduct the final evaluation of ILDP Phase III. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine overall Project performance; management; and achievements, to inform future phases of Project activity. Consequently, this evaluation will examine: Project relevance; coherence; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability; and three cross-cutting themes (gender equality; a right-based approach; and human development). The evaluation will further be used to identify lessons learned and generate recommendations for enhanced programming.

To increase the accuracy of the evaluation results, all categories of Project stakeholders are being provided with the opportunity to share their views on their individual Project experience. All discussions conducted during the evaluation will be kept strictly confidential. As the evaluator will only share generalised findings and anonymous comments, you will not be identified in any material that is produced. You are therefore encouraged to speak openly and honestly. Participation in this evaluation is voluntary and the decision to participate will not be remunerated. There are also no foreseen risks to participation. An individual is free to opt out of participating or withdraw their participation at any time without penalty, and will not be asked to provide a reason for this decision. Data generation during the evaluation complies with the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

This discussion will last for a maximum of 45 minutes. For further information about the evaluation please contact the evaluator, Dr Halcyon Louis, at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com). Alternatively, please contact the ILDP Project Manager, Ms Aida Lakovic Hoso at [aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org).

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. Before we begin, do you have any general questions?

### Consent Form:

I have read the participation information sheet and I have had the opportunity to ask the evaluator to clarify any issues that were unclear to me. I understand that my participation in this evaluation is voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time without penalty. I further understand that my responses will be anonymized and will be used by UNDP BiH to inform its forward-planning for future similar Projects. I, therefore, consent for the information I provide to be used during this process.

If I have any further questions about the evaluation I can contact the evaluator at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com).

If I have any concerns about the way the evaluation has been conducted I can contact Ms Aida Lakovic Hoso at [aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org).

By signing below I consent to: *Please tick as appropriate*

- Participate in the evaluation
- The analysis and anonymization of my responses by the evaluator
- The use of my responses to develop the evaluation report for further use by UNDP BiH

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Day/month/year

## Background:

- What is your job title? How long have you been in this position?
- What are your current responsibilities?
- Please describe your involvement in ILDP Phase III, including the frequency of team meetings.

## Main Questions:

### Relevance

- How has ILDP Phase III has been relevant for country-wide development planning and management?
- In your opinion, how has the Project been relevant for functional development planning and management at the subnational level?
- What is the alignment between the objectives of the Project and the commitment of Bosnia and Herzegovina to international development goals?
- Has the Project aligned with the strategic priorities of the Government of Switzerland? Please provide examples to explain your response.

### Coherence

- In your opinion, has ILDP complemented or duplicated other interventions at the government-level in BiH? By other donor agencies? Please explain your response.

### Effectiveness

- What success has the Project had in establishing development planning and management systems for vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards citizens?
- In your opinion have the local governments and cantons facilitated inclusive development planning and management to address citizen needs and accelerate growth? Please explain your response.
- Have civil society organisations and the media actively participated in development management and benefited from improved services? Please provide examples to support your response.
- How has the Project design specifically contributed towards results achievement?
- In your opinion, has the Project design contributed towards policy dialogue and change? Please provide examples to support your response.
- Did the Project produce any unintended results, whether negative or positive? Please provide examples to support your response.

### Efficiency

- What has been the value added the Project? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- What were the main resource needs of the Project? Were resources allocated and managed efficiently? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion has Project communication and outreach been satisfactory? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- What examples are there to show whether the partner institutions have provided efficient support for Project implementation?
- In your opinion, has the Project provided value for money? Please explain your response.
- How successful was the Project in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic? Please provide examples to explain your response.

## **Impact**

- In your opinion, how has the Project contributed to functional development planning and management at the subnational level?

## **Cross-cutting theme: Gender**

- How, if at all, has gender equality been integrated into the Project?
- What effect did the integration of gender considerations have on the Project?
- How can the integration of gender be improved in future Project phases?

## **Cross-cutting theme: Rights-based approach**

- Was the Project implemented using rights-based principles? Please provide examples to support your response.
- *If yes*, What effect did the use of a rights-based approach have on the Project?
- How can the application of a rights-based approach be improved in future Project phases?

## **Cross-cutting theme: Human development**

- Were human development considerations integrated into the Project? Please explain your response.
- *If yes*, What effect did the integration of human development considerations have on the Project?
- How can the integration of human development considerations be improved in future Project phases?

## **Sustainability**

- What is the likelihood for results sustainability beyond the Project end date? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion, what are the main risks to results sustainability and how can they be addressed?
- Is there any evidence of ownership of the intervention strategy by Project partners? Please provide examples to support your response.
- Is there any evidence of behavioural and policy change in relation to system development planning and management? Please provide examples to support your response
- How, if at all, has the Project strengthened the internal capacities of government institutions to support results sustainability beyond Project implementation?

## **Lessons learned**

- What, in your opinion, are the main aspects of the Project that have worked well? Please explain your response.
- Which areas of the Project need to be strengthened in future phases of Project activity and how can this be done?

## **Recommendations**

- What are the emergent recommendations from the Project for influencing policy? For future Project scale-up?
- Are there any general recommendations for the achievement of expected Project results?

## **Close**

- Are there any further comments or suggestions you wish to make?

**Thank you for your time and participation.**

## Interview Protocol: Government of Switzerland

### Introduction:

The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP) Phase III has been designed to support the establishment of a functional development planning and management system at the subnational level in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). With financial assistance from the Government of Switzerland, in the amount of USD \$8.5 million, ILDP Phase III has been implemented by UNDP BiH Country Office over the four-year period March 1, 2017 – December 31, 2021. The target beneficiaries of the Project have been: entities; local governments and cantons; development agencies and civil society organisations; citizens; and the media. As its overall objective, the Project has aimed to facilitate a better quality of life for the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and country integration into the European Union.

Pending the end of Project activities in December 2021, UNDP BiH has engaged an external evaluation consultant, to conduct the final evaluation of ILDP Phase III. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine overall Project performance; management; and achievements, to inform future phases of Project activity. Consequently, this evaluation will examine: Project relevance; coherence; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability; and three cross-cutting themes (gender equality; a right-based approach; and human development). The evaluation will further be used to identify lessons learned and generate recommendations for enhanced programming.

To increase the accuracy of the evaluation results, all categories of Project stakeholders are being provided with the opportunity to share their views on their individual Project experience. All discussions conducted during the evaluation will be kept strictly confidential. As the evaluator will only share generalised findings and anonymous comments, you will not be identified in any material that is produced. You are therefore encouraged to speak openly and honestly. Participation in this evaluation is voluntary and the decision to participate will not be remunerated. There are also no foreseen risks to participation. An individual is free to opt out of participating or withdraw their participation at any time without penalty, and will not be asked to provide a reason for this decision. Data generation during the evaluation complies with the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

This discussion will last for a maximum of 45 minutes. For further information about the evaluation please contact the evaluator, Dr Halcyon Louis, at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com). Alternatively, please contact the ILDP Project Manager, Ms Aida Lakovic Hosu at [aida.lakovic-hosu@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hosu@undp.org).

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. Before we begin, do you have any general questions?

### Consent Form:

I have read the participation information sheet and I have had the opportunity to ask the evaluator to clarify any issues that were unclear to me. I understand that my participation in this evaluation is voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time without penalty. I further understand that my responses will be anonymized and will be used by UNDP BiH to inform its forward-planning for future similar Projects. I, therefore, consent for the information I provide to be used during this process.

If I have any further questions about the evaluation I can contact the evaluator at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com).

If I have any concerns about the way the evaluation has been conducted I can contact Ms Aida Lakovic Hoso at [aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org).

By signing below I consent to: *Please tick as appropriate*

- Participate in the evaluation
- The analysis and anonymization of my responses by the evaluator
- The use of my responses to develop the evaluation report for further use by UNDP BiH

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Day/month/year

## Background:

- What is your job title? How long have you been in this position?
- What are your current responsibilities?
- Please describe your involvement in ILDP Phase III.

## Main Questions:

### Relevance

- How has the Project aligned with the strategic priorities of the Government of Switzerland? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- In your opinion, what is the alignment between the objectives of the Project and the commitment of Bosnia and Herzegovina to international development goals?

### Coherence

- Has ILDP complemented or duplicated interventions by other donor agencies in BiH? Please explain your response.

### Effectiveness

- In your opinion, what are the main accomplishments of the Project?
- Has the Project design contributed towards policy dialogue and change? Please provide examples to support your response.

### Efficiency

- In your opinion, has the Project been managed efficiently? Please explain your response.
- What has been the value added the Project? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- How successful was the Project in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- In your opinion, has the Project provided value for money? Please explain your response.

### Impact

- How, if at all, has the Project contributed to functional development planning and management at the subnational level?

### Cross-cutting theme: Gender

- In your opinion was gender equality integrated into the Project? Please provide examples to support your response
- How can the integration of gender be improved in future Project phases?

### Cross-cutting theme: Rights-based approach

- In your opinion has the Project been implemented using rights-based principles? Please provide examples to support your response.
- How can the application of a rights-based approach be improved in future Project phases?

### Cross-cutting theme: Human development

- Were human development considerations integrated into the Project? Please explain your response.
- How can the integration of human development considerations be improved in future Project phases?

### Sustainability

- What is the likelihood for results sustainability beyond the Project end date? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion, what are the main risks to results sustainability and how can they be addressed?

**Lessons learned**

- What, in your opinion, are the main aspects of the Project that have worked well? Please explain your response.
- Which areas of the Project need to be strengthened in future phases of Project activity and how can this be done?

**Recommendations**

- What are the emergent recommendations from the Project for influencing policy? For future Project scale-up?
- Are there any general recommendations for the achievement of expected Project results?

**Close**

- Are there any further comments or suggestions you wish to make?

**Thank you for your time and participation.**

## Interview Protocol: UNDP BiH/ Project Board

### Introduction:

The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP) Phase III has been designed to support the establishment of a functional development planning and management system at the subnational level in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). With financial assistance from the Government of Switzerland, in the amount of USD \$8.5 million, ILDP Phase III has been implemented by UNDP BiH Country Office over the four-year period March 1, 2017 – December 31, 2021. The target beneficiaries of the Project have been: entities; local governments and cantons; development agencies and civil society organisations; citizens; and the media. As its overall objective, the Project has aimed to facilitate a better quality of life for the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and country integration into the European Union.

Pending the end of Project activities in December 2021, UNDP BiH has engaged an external evaluation consultant, to conduct the final evaluation of ILDP Phase III. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine overall Project performance; management; and achievements, to inform future phases of Project activity. Consequently, this evaluation will examine: Project relevance; coherence; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability; and three cross-cutting themes (gender equality; a right-based approach; and human development). The evaluation will further be used to identify lessons learned and generate recommendations for enhanced programming.

To increase the accuracy of the evaluation results, all categories of Project stakeholders are being provided with the opportunity to share their views on their individual Project experience. All discussions conducted during the evaluation will be kept strictly confidential. As the evaluator will only share generalised findings and anonymous comments, you will not be identified in any material that is produced. You are therefore encouraged to speak openly and honestly. Participation in this evaluation is voluntary and the decision to participate will not be remunerated. There are also no foreseen risks to participation. An individual is free to opt out of participating or withdraw their participation at any time without penalty, and will not be asked to provide a reason for this decision. Data generation during the evaluation complies with the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

This discussion will last for a maximum of 45 minutes. For further information about the evaluation please contact the evaluator, Dr Halcyon Louis, at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com). Alternatively, please contact the ILDP Project Manager, Ms Aida Lakovic Hosu at [aida.lakovic-hosu@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hosu@undp.org).

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. Before we begin, do you have any general questions?

### Consent Form:

I have read the participation information sheet and I have had the opportunity to ask the evaluator to clarify any issues that were unclear to me. I understand that my participation in this evaluation is voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time without penalty. I further understand that my responses will be anonymized and will be used by UNDP BiH to inform its forward-planning for future similar Projects. I, therefore, consent for the information I provide to be used during this process.

If I have any further questions about the evaluation I can contact the evaluator at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com).

If I have any concerns about the way the evaluation has been conducted I can contact Ms Aida Lakovic Hoso at [aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org).

By signing below I consent to: *Please tick as appropriate*

- Participate in the evaluation
- The analysis and anonymization of my responses by the evaluator
- The use of my responses to develop the evaluation report for further use by UNDP BiH

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Day/month/year

## Background:

- What is your job title? How long have you been in this position?
- What are your current responsibilities?
- Please describe your involvement in ILDP Phase III, including the frequency of team meetings.

## Main Questions:

### Relevance

- How has ILDP Phase III has been relevant for country-wide development planning and management?
- In your opinion, how has the Project been relevant for functional development planning and management at the subnational level?
- What is the alignment between the objectives of the Project and the commitment of Bosnia and Herzegovina to international development goals?
- Has the Project aligned with the strategic priorities of the Government of Switzerland? Please provide examples to explain your response.

### Coherence

- In your opinion, has ILDP complemented or duplicated other interventions at the government-level in BiH? By other donor agencies? Please explain your response.

### Effectiveness

- What success has the Project had in establishing development planning and management systems for vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards citizens?
- In your opinion have the local governments and cantons facilitated inclusive development planning and management to address citizen needs and accelerate growth? Please explain your response.
- Have civil society organisations and the media actively participated in development management and benefited from improved services? Please provide examples to support your response.
- How has the Project design specifically contributed towards results achievement?
- In your opinion, has the Project design contributed towards policy dialogue and change? Please provide examples to support your response.
- Did the Project produce any unintended results, whether negative or positive? Please provide examples to support your response.

### Efficiency

- What has been the value added the Project? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- What were the main resource needs of the Project? Were resources allocated and managed efficiently? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion has Project communication and outreach been satisfactory? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- What examples are there to show whether the partner institutions have provided efficient support for Project implementation?
- In your opinion, has the Project provided value for money? Please explain your response.
- How successful was the Project in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic? Please provide examples to explain your response.

## **Impact**

- In your opinion, how has the Project contributed to functional development planning and management at the subnational level?

## **Cross-cutting theme: Gender**

- How, if at all, has gender equality been integrated into the Project?
- What effect did the integration of gender considerations have on the Project?
- How can the integration of gender be improved in future Project phases?

## **Cross-cutting theme: Rights-based approach**

- Was the Project implemented using rights-based principles? Please provide examples to support your response.
- *If yes*, What effect did the use of a rights-based approach have on the Project?
- How can the application of a rights-based approach be improved in future Project phases?

## **Cross-cutting theme: Human development**

- Were human development considerations integrated into the Project? Please explain your response.
- *If yes*, What effect did the integration of human development considerations have on the Project?
- How can the integration of human development considerations be improved in future Project phases?

## **Sustainability**

- What is the likelihood for results sustainability beyond the Project end date? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion, what are the main risks to results sustainability and how can they be addressed?
- Is there any evidence of ownership of the intervention strategy by Project partners? Please provide examples to support your response.
- Is there any evidence of behavioural and policy change in relation to system development planning and management? Please provide examples to support your response
- How, if at all, has the Project strengthened the internal capacities of government institutions to support results sustainability beyond Project implementation?

## **Lessons learned**

- What, in your opinion, are the main aspects of the Project that have worked well? Please explain your response.
- Which areas of the Project need to be strengthened in future phases of Project activity and how can this be done?

## **Recommendations**

- What are the emergent recommendations from the Project for influencing policy? For future Project scale-up?
- Are there any general recommendations for the achievement of expected Project results?

## **Close**

- Are there any further comments or suggestions you wish to make?

**Thank you for your time and participation.**

## **Interview Protocol: Bosnia and Herzegovina (Directorate for EU Integration/ Directorate for Economic Planning)**

### **Introduction:**

The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP) Phase III has been designed to support the establishment of a functional development planning and management system at the subnational level in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). With financial assistance from the Government of Switzerland, in the amount of USD \$8.5 million, ILDP Phase III has been implemented by UNDP BiH Country Office over the four-year period March 1, 2017 – December 31, 2021. The target beneficiaries of the Project have been: entities; local governments and cantons; development agencies and civil society organisations; citizens; and the media. As its overall objective, the Project has aimed to facilitate a better quality of life for the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and country integration into the European Union.

Pending the end of Project activities in December 2021, UNDP BiH has engaged an external evaluation consultant, to conduct the final evaluation of ILDP Phase III. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine overall Project performance; management; and achievements, to inform future phases of Project activity. Consequently, this evaluation will examine: Project relevance; coherence; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability; and three cross-cutting themes (gender equality; a right-based approach; and human development). The evaluation will further be used to identify lessons learned and generate recommendations for enhanced programming.

To increase the accuracy of the evaluation results, all categories of Project stakeholders are being provided with the opportunity to share their views on their individual Project experience. All discussions conducted during the evaluation will be kept strictly confidential. As the evaluator will only share generalised findings and anonymous comments, you will not be identified in any material that is produced. You are therefore encouraged to speak openly and honestly. Participation in this evaluation is voluntary and the decision to participate will not be remunerated. There are also no foreseen risks to participation. An individual is free to opt out of participating or withdraw their participation at any time without penalty, and will not be asked to provide a reason for this decision. Data generation during the evaluation complies with the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

This discussion will last for a maximum of 45 minutes. For further information about the evaluation please contact the evaluator, Dr Halcyon Louis, at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com). Alternatively, please contact the ILDP Project Manager, Ms Aida Lakovic Hosu at [aida.lakovic-hosu@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hosu@undp.org).

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. Before we begin, do you have any general questions?

### Consent Form:

I have read the participation information sheet and I have had the opportunity to ask the evaluator to clarify any issues that were unclear to me. I understand that my participation in this evaluation is voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time without penalty. I further understand that my responses will be anonymized and will be used by UNDP BiH to inform its forward-planning for future similar Projects. I, therefore, consent for the information I provide to be used during this process.

If I have any further questions about the evaluation I can contact the evaluator at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com).

If I have any concerns about the way the evaluation has been conducted I can contact Ms Aida Lakovic Hoso at [aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org).

By signing below I consent to: *Please tick as appropriate*

- Participate in the evaluation
- The analysis and anonymization of my responses by the evaluator
- The use of my responses to develop the evaluation report for further use by UNDP BiH

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Day/month/year

## Background:

- What is your job title? How long have you been in this position?
- What are your current responsibilities?
- Please describe your knowledge of ILDP Phase III.

## Main Questions:

### Relevance

- How has ILDP Phase III been relevant for country-wide development planning and management?
- In your opinion, how has the Project been relevant for functional development planning and management at the subnational level?
- What is the alignment between the objectives of the Project and the commitment of Bosnia and Herzegovina to international development goals?

### Coherence

- Has ILDP complemented or duplicated other interventions at the government-level in BiH? By other donor agencies? Please explain your response.

### Effectiveness

- In your opinion, what are the main accomplishments of the Project?
- Has the Project design contributed towards policy dialogue and change? Please provide examples to support your response.

### Efficiency

- In your opinion, has the Project provided value for money? Please explain your response.
- What has been the value added the Project? Please provide examples to explain your response.

### Impact

- How has the Project contributed to functional development planning and management at the subnational level?

### Cross-cutting theme: Gender

- How, if at all, has gender equality been integrated into the Project?
- How can the integration of gender be improved in future Project phases?

### Cross-cutting theme: Rights-based approach

- Was the Project implemented using rights-based principles? Please provide examples to support your response.
- How can the application of a rights-based approach be improved in future Project phases?

### Cross-cutting theme: Human development

- Were human development considerations integrated into the Project? Please explain your response.
- How can the integration of human development considerations be improved in future Project phases?

### Sustainability

- What is the likelihood for results sustainability beyond the Project end date? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion, what are the main risks to results sustainability and how can they be addressed?

### Lessons learned

- What, in your opinion, are the main aspects of the Project that have worked well? Please explain your response.
- Which areas of the Project need to be strengthened in future phases of Project activity and how can this be done?

**Recommendations**

- What are your recommendations for the uptake of the Project results by policy? For future Project scale-up?
- Are there any general recommendations for the achievement of expected Project results?

**Close**

- Are there any further comments or suggestions you wish to make?

**Thank you for your time and participation.**

## Interview Protocol: BiH Federation/ Republic of Srpska /Brčko government

### Introduction:

The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP) Phase III has been designed to support the establishment of a functional development planning and management system at the subnational level in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). With financial assistance from the Government of Switzerland, in the amount of USD \$8.5 million, ILDP Phase III has been implemented by UNDP BiH Country Office over the four-year period March 1, 2017 – December 31, 2021. The target beneficiaries of the Project have been: entities; local governments and cantons; development agencies and civil society organisations; citizens; and the media. As its overall objective, the Project has aimed to facilitate a better quality of life for the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and country integration into the European Union.

Pending the end of Project activities in December 2021, UNDP BiH has engaged an external evaluation consultant, to conduct the final evaluation of ILDP Phase III. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine overall Project performance; management; and achievements, to inform future phases of Project activity. Consequently, this evaluation will examine: Project relevance; coherence; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability; and three cross-cutting themes (gender equality; a right-based approach; and human development). The evaluation will further be used to identify lessons learned and generate recommendations for enhanced programming.

To increase the accuracy of the evaluation results, all categories of Project stakeholders are being provided with the opportunity to share their views on their individual Project experience. All discussions conducted during the evaluation will be kept strictly confidential. As the evaluator will only share generalised findings and anonymous comments, you will not be identified in any material that is produced. You are therefore encouraged to speak openly and honestly. Participation in this evaluation is voluntary and the decision to participate will not be remunerated. There are also no foreseen risks to participation. An individual is free to opt out of participating or withdraw their participation at any time without penalty, and will not be asked to provide a reason for this decision. Data generation during the evaluation complies with the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

This discussion will last for a maximum of 45 minutes. For further information about the evaluation please contact the evaluator, Dr Halcyon Louis, at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com). Alternatively, please contact the ILDP Project Manager, Ms Aida Lakovic Hosu at [aida.lakovic-hosu@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hosu@undp.org).

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. Before we begin, do you have any general questions?

### Consent Form:

I have read the participation information sheet and I have had the opportunity to ask the evaluator to clarify any issues that were unclear to me. I understand that my participation in this evaluation is voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time without penalty. I further understand that my responses will be anonymized and will be used by UNDP BiH to inform its forward-planning for future similar Projects. I, therefore, consent for the information I provide to be used during this process.

If I have any further questions about the evaluation I can contact the evaluator at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com).

If I have any concerns about the way the evaluation has been conducted I can contact Ms Aida Lakovic Hoso at [aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org).

By signing below I consent to: *Please tick as appropriate*

- Participate in the evaluation
- The analysis and anonymization of my responses by the evaluator
- The use of my responses to develop the evaluation report for further use by UNDP BiH

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Day/month/year

## Background:

- What is your job title? How long have you been in this position?
- What are your current responsibilities?
- Please describe your involvement in ILDP Phase III.

## Main Questions:

### Relevance

- How has ILDP Phase III has been relevant for country-wide development planning and management?
- In your opinion, how has the Project been relevant for functional development planning and management at the subnational level?
- What is the alignment between the objectives of the Project and the commitment of Bosnia and Herzegovina to international development goals?

### Coherence

- In your opinion, has ILDP complemented or duplicated other interventions at the government-level in BiH? By other donor agencies? Please explain your response.

### Effectiveness

- What success has the Project had in establishing development planning and management systems for vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards citizens?
- In your opinion have the local governments and cantons facilitated inclusive development planning and management to address citizen needs and accelerate growth? Please explain your response.
- Have civil society organisations and the media actively participated in development management and benefited from improved services? Please provide examples to support your response.
- How has the Project design specifically contributed towards results achievement?
- In your opinion, has the Project design contributed towards policy dialogue and change? Please provide examples to support your response.
- Did the Project produce any unintended results, whether negative or positive? Please provide examples to support your response.

### Efficiency

- What were the main resource needs of the Project? Were resources allocated and managed efficiently? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion has Project communication and outreach been satisfactory? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- What examples are there to show whether the partner institutions have provided efficient support for Project implementation?
- In your opinion, has the Project provided value for money? Please explain your response.
- How successful was the Project in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- What has been the value added the Project? Please provide examples to explain your response.

### Impact

- In your opinion, how has the Project contributed to functional development planning and management at the subnational level?

**Cross-cutting theme: Gender**

- How, if at all, has gender equality been integrated into the Project?
- What effect did the integration of gender considerations have on the Project?
- How can the integration of gender be improved in future Project phases?

**Cross-cutting theme: Rights-based approach**

- Was the Project implemented using rights-based principles? Please provide examples to support your response.
- *If yes*, What effect did the use of a rights-based approach have on the Project?
- How can the application of a rights-based approach be improved in future Project phases?

**Cross-cutting theme: Human development**

- Were human development considerations integrated into the Project? Please explain your response.
- *If yes*, What effect did the integration of human development considerations have on the Project?
- How can the integration of human development considerations be improved in future Project phases?

**Sustainability**

- What is the likelihood for results sustainability beyond the Project end date? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion, what are the main risks to results sustainability and how can they be addressed?
- Is there any evidence of ownership of the intervention strategy by Project partners? Please provide examples to support your response.
- Is there any evidence of behavioural and policy change in relation to system development planning and management? Please provide examples to support your response
- How, if at all, has the Project strengthened the internal capacities of government institutions to support results sustainability beyond Project implementation?

**Lessons learned**

- What, in your opinion, are the main aspects of the Project that have worked well? Please explain your response.
- Which areas of the Project need to be strengthened in future phases of Project activity and how can this be done?

**Recommendations**

- What are the emergent recommendations from the Project for influencing policy? For future Project scale-up?
- Are there any general recommendations for the achievement of expected Project results?

**Close**

- Are there any further comments or suggestions you wish to make?

**Thank you for your time and participation.**

## Interview Protocol: Cantons / Local governments

### Introduction:

The Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP) Phase III has been designed to support the establishment of a functional development planning and management system at the subnational level in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). With financial assistance from the Government of Switzerland, in the amount of USD \$8.5 million, ILDP Phase III has been implemented by UNDP BiH Country Office over the four-year period March 1, 2017 – December 31, 2021. The target beneficiaries of the Project have been: entities; local governments and cantons; development agencies and civil society organisations; citizens; and the media. As its overall objective, the Project has aimed to facilitate a better quality of life for the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and country integration into the European Union.

Pending the end of Project activities in December 2021, UNDP BiH has engaged an external evaluation consultant, to conduct the final evaluation of ILDP Phase III. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine overall Project performance; management; and achievements, to inform future phases of Project activity. Consequently, this evaluation will examine: Project relevance; coherence; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability; and three cross-cutting themes (gender equality; a rights-based approach; and human development). The evaluation will further be used to identify lessons learned and generate recommendations for enhanced programming.

To increase the accuracy of the evaluation results, all categories of Project stakeholders are being provided with the opportunity to share their views on their individual Project experience. All discussions conducted during the evaluation will be kept strictly confidential. As the evaluator will only share generalised findings and anonymous comments, you will not be identified in any material that is produced. You are therefore encouraged to speak openly and honestly. Participation in this evaluation is voluntary and the decision to participate will not be remunerated. There are also no foreseen risks to participation. An individual is free to opt out of participating or withdraw their participation at any time without penalty, and will not be asked to provide a reason for this decision. Data generation during the evaluation complies with the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

This discussion will last for a maximum of 45 minutes. For further information about the evaluation please contact the evaluator, Dr Halcyon Louis, at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com). Alternatively, please contact the ILDP Project Manager, Ms Aida Lakovic Hosoi at [aida.lakovic-hosoi@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hosoi@undp.org).

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. Before we begin, do you have any general questions?

### Consent Form:

I have read the participation information sheet and I have had the opportunity to ask the evaluator to clarify any issues that were unclear to me. I understand that my participation in this evaluation is voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time without penalty. I further understand that my responses will be anonymized and will be used by UNDP BiH to inform its forward-planning for future similar Projects. I, therefore, consent for the information I provide to be used during this process.

If I have any further questions about the evaluation I can contact the evaluator at [halcyon.louis@gmail.com](mailto:halcyon.louis@gmail.com).

If I have any concerns about the way the evaluation has been conducted I can contact Ms Aida Lakovic Hoso at [aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org](mailto:aida.lakovic-hoso@undp.org).

By signing below I consent to: *Please tick as appropriate*

- Participate in the evaluation
- The analysis and anonymization of my responses by the evaluator
- The use of my responses to develop the evaluation report for further use by UNDP BiH

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Day/month/year

## Background:

- What is your job title? How long have you been in this position?
- What are your current responsibilities?
- Please describe your involvement in ILDP Phase III.

## Main Questions:

### Relevance

- How has ILDP Phase III has been relevant for country-wide development planning and management?
- In your opinion, how has the Project been relevant for functional development planning and management at the subnational level?

### Coherence

- In your opinion, has ILDP complemented or duplicated other interventions at the government-level in BiH? By other donor agencies? Please explain your response.

### Effectiveness

- What success has the Project had in establishing development planning and management systems for vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards citizens?
- In your opinion have the local governments and cantons facilitated inclusive development planning and management to address citizen needs and accelerate growth? Please explain your response.
- Have civil society organisations and the media actively participated in development management and benefited from improved services? Please provide examples to support your response.
- How has the Project design specifically contributed towards results achievement?
- In your opinion, has the Project design contributed towards policy dialogue and change? Please provide examples to support your response.
- Did the Project produce any unintended results, whether negative or positive? Please provide examples to support your response.

### Efficiency

- What were the main resource needs of the Project? Were resources allocated and managed efficiently? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion has Project communication and outreach been satisfactory? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- What examples are there to show whether the partner institutions have provided efficient support for Project implementation?
- In your opinion, has the Project provided value for money? Please explain your response.
- How successful was the Project in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic? Please provide examples to explain your response.
- What has been the value added the Project? Please provide examples to explain your response.

### Impact

- In your opinion, how has the Project contributed to functional development planning and management at the subnational level?

### Cross-cutting theme: Gender

- How, if at all, has gender equality been integrated into the Project?

- What effect did the integration of gender considerations have on the Project?
- How can the integration of gender be improved in future Project phases?

**Cross-cutting theme: Rights-based approach**

- Was the Project implemented using rights-based principles? Please provide examples to support your response.
- *If yes*, What effect did the use of a rights-based approach have on the Project?
- How can the application of a rights-based approach be improved in future Project phases?

**Cross-cutting theme: Human development**

- Were human development considerations integrated into the Project? Please explain your response.
- *If yes*, What effect did the integration of human development considerations have on the Project?
- How can the integration of human development considerations be improved in future Project phases?

**Sustainability**

- What is the likelihood for results sustainability beyond the Project end date? Please explain your response.
- In your opinion, what are the main risks to results sustainability and how can they be addressed?
- Is there any evidence of ownership of the intervention strategy by Project partners? Please provide examples to support your response.
- Is there any evidence of behavioural and policy change in relation to system development planning and management? Please provide examples to support your response
- How, if at all, has the Project strengthened the internal capacities of government institutions to support results sustainability beyond Project implementation?

**Lessons learned**

- What, in your opinion, are the main aspects of the Project that have worked well? Please explain your response.
- Which areas of the Project need to be strengthened in future phases of Project activity and how can this be done?

**Recommendations**

- What are the emergent recommendations from the Project for influencing policy? For future Project scale-up?
- Are there any general recommendations for the achievement of expected Project results?

**Close**

- Are there any further comments or suggestions you wish to make?

**Thank you for your time and participation.**

# Appendix VIII: Overview of Project Achievements

Project Outcome	Summary of results achieved			
	Indicator	Baseline 2017	Target 2021	Result <sup>85</sup>
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Lead planning structures at entity level steer the development planning and management systems characterized by vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards the citizens	Level of functionality of the subnational development planning and management systems	Partially functional system in FBiH, non-existent functional systems in the RS and Brčko District (BD)	Advanced functionality of all subnational development planning and management system	All elements of the planning system are in place FBiH and in BD BIH. The system design process in the RS is underway
	# of public mechanisms engaging government authorities at different levels for improved vertical cooperation and concerted action in development planning and management	1	10	9+1
	# of institutions that apply the EU approach to public grant scheme management	2	4	3
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Lead planning structures at entity level and Brčko District capacitated and equipped with policy and regulatory frameworks and instruments	Number of entity/Brčko District planning structures capable to manage the sub-national planning systems	1 partially capacitated structure (the FBiH Development Planning Institute) and no capacities in the recently established RS Strategic Planning Unit and in the Brčko District (2016)	3 planning structures, respectively at the FBiH, RS and Brčko District levels capacitated to steer sub-national development planning and management systems (2021).	1 fully capacitated planning structures (FBiH Development Planning Institute)  1 partially capacitated (RS Strategic Planning Department)  1 fully capacitated BD BIH Department for Strategic Planning in BD BIH Government Secretariat
	Extent to which regulatory and methodological framework is formalised to enable harmonised and effective functioning	Partially (2016)	Fully, including principal and by-law methodological	Partially

<sup>85</sup> ILDP Phase III Annual Report, January – December 2020

Project Outcome	Summary of results achieved			
	of development planning and management systems		and regulatory frameworks (2021)	
	# of institutions that apply the EU approach to public grant scheme management	2 (2016 – Ministry of Development, Entrepreneurship and Crafts FBIH; RS Development Bank)	4 (2021 – including Sector Ministries)	3
<b>Output 1.2:</b> Public financing mechanisms sustainably reinforce the development planning and management systems, resulting in improved livelihoods and service delivery for the citizens	% increase of public resources allocated through the financing mechanisms for implementation of local priorities.	10% (2016)	40% (2021)	48% for the RS Local Development Financing Mechanism (2018)
	# of citizens who directly benefit from improved public services as a result from the assistance provided through the financing mechanisms (including women and socially excluded groups)	103,000 citizens (2016)	250,000 citizens, 30% of women + 10% of socially excluded groups (2021)	58,000, including 6,000 from socially excluded groups within the RS Financing Mechanism for Local Development (2018)
	# of new jobs <sup>86</sup> created with the support of the financing mechanisms (including women and socially excluded groups)	529 (2016)	700, 30% of women + 10% of socially excluded groups (2021)	..
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Local and cantonal governments effectively address needs of citizens and accelerate growth through inclusive development planning and management	% of local and cantonal governments with functional development management structures as part of a coherent system	30% (LG) 10% (Cantons)	55% (LG) 70% (Cantons)	39.5% (LG) 90% (Cantons)
	Average number of citizens (including percentage of women and representatives of socially excluded groups) who engage in development planning and management processes at local and cantonal levels	40	56 (40% increase)	No increase in LGs 41% in cantons (52% women)
	Average % increase of additionally attracted funds based on local strategies against average local governance budget	40%	50%	Below 40% (average for all partner LGs)

<sup>86</sup> Includes jobs and income streams

Project Outcome		Summary of results achieved		
	Average % increase of additionally attracted funds based on cantonal strategies against average cantonal budget	10.8%	20%	22% <sup>87</sup>
<b>Output 2.1:</b> Local development planning and management frameworks and capacities are sustained and scaled up as part of a harmonised system, in line with EU requirements	# of local governments with integrated development strategies as part of the coherent planning system	45 % (65) of local governments (2016)	85% (123) of local governments (2021)	88% (128) of LGs <sup>88</sup>
	% of local governments with institutionalised operational framework regulating development planning and management responsibilities	28% (40) of local governments (2016)	40% (58) of local governments (2021)	56.5% (82) of LGs
	average % of implementation of strategies' annual implementation plans (against planned financial resources)	40 % (2015)	55 % (2021)	75 % <sup>89</sup>
<b>Output 2.2:</b> Core development planning and management frameworks and capacities at cantonal level further advanced and sustained as an integral part of a harmonised public system and EU integration processes	% of cantons with institutionalised operational framework regulating development planning and management responsibilities as a whole-of-government approach	10% (2016)	70% (2021)	90%
	Average level of cantonal development planning and management index	38% (2015)	60% (2021)	73 % <sup>90</sup>
	average % of implementation of strategies' annual implementation plans (against planned financial resources)	0 % (2016).	50 % (2021)	58 % <sup>91</sup>

<sup>87</sup> Based on reports formally adopted in 8 cantons (7 cantons secured valid data)

<sup>88</sup> Based on data from AMC survey and other projects (MEG, EU LID)

<sup>89</sup> Partner LGs from the previous project phase reported the average percentage of realization as 95 %. The average percentage for LGs that joined the project in 2017 is at 79 %. The combined score is at 87 %. This information is based upon LGs' preliminary reports on implementation of strategy for 2020.

<sup>90</sup> Based on 2019 performance assessments.

<sup>91</sup> Based on officially adopted reports in 8 cantons.

Project Outcome		Summary of results achieved		
	Number of cantonal partnership structures bringing local and cantonal governments together established and functioning	1 (2016)	at least 8 (2021)	10
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Citizens, civil society organisations and media take proactive part in development management and benefit from improved services	# of articles published which raise awareness or inform the public on the matters of development planning and management	Very limited	30	Local level: 116 Local and cantonal level: 25 Total: 141
	# of citizens who benefit from improved public services beyond direct Project interventions	n/a	275,000	Seed Fund: 271,174 RS Financial Mechanism: 58,000 Total: 329, 174
	Constructive reaction of local governments on demands brought forward by CSOs or media per year	0	2 per LG	9.7 average
<b>Output 3.1:</b> Relevant civil society organisations and journalists capacitated to understand the development planning and management system and enable wider public engagement and scrutiny in its functioning	# of civil society organisation representatives and journalists capacitated to analyse and report to the public in the domain of development planning and management.	0 (2016)	50 (at least 30% women) (2021)	23 representatives of media (8 M; 15 F) and 51 representatives of CSOs (28 M; 23 F)
	# of articles published which raise awareness or inform the public on the matters of development planning and management in Bosnia and Herzegovina.	Very limited, if any (2016)	30 (2021)	141 <sup>92</sup>
	Constructive reaction of local governments on demands brought forward by civil society organisations or media.	n/a	At least 2 reactions per local government per year	..
<b>Output 3.2:</b> Livelihoods and service for the citizens are improved through priority	# of citizens (male and female) who directly benefit from improved public services as a result from the assistance provided through seed funding	n/a (2016)	123,000 (among whom at least 30% women and 10% socially excluded <sup>93</sup> ) (2021)	271, 174

<sup>92</sup> 116 articles for local level and 25 for local and cantonal level in 2020.

<sup>93</sup> Socially excluded population groups are: Roma, returnees, Internally Displaced Persons, persons with disabilities, poor families, elderly.

Project Outcome	Summary of results achieved			
projects of local and cantonal governments	# of new citizens benefiting from jobs and income streams as a result of the assistance provided by the seed funding	n/a (2016)	55 (among whom at least 30% women and 10% socially excluded) (2021)	140
	# of new citizens benefiting from improved services and better security via systematic approach to resolving stray dog issue )	n/a (2016)	126,400 (total population in 6 municipalities).	

# Appendix IX: Overview of Achievements – Gender and Social Inclusion

Expected Results	Indicators	Achievements
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Lead planning structures at entity level steer the development planning and management systems characterized by vertical and horizontal coordination and greater accountability towards the citizens		
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Lead planning structures at entity level and Brčko District capacitated and equipped with policy and regulatory frameworks and instruments		
1.1.1. Public discussions conducted, and recommendations reviewed and incorporated when relevant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 40% of less represented gender participating in public discussions and consultations</li> <li>- Draft regulatory framework shared with at least 10 civil society organisations active in gender and social inclusion areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Achieved balanced gender representation across policy processes supported by the ILDP (49% women; 51% men)</li> <li>- Legal and methodological frameworks in FBiH and BD BiH reflect the gender equality principle and as well as the principle of equal opportunities for all, following consultative processes. Draft legal framework in the RS also reflects these principles while the RS Gender Center is part of the working group on development planning and management</li> </ul>
1.1.2. Regulatory framework on development planning and management mainstreams mainstream gender equality and equal opportunities/social inclusion as horizontal principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prior to submission for formal adoption, regulatory framework reviewed and positively assessed by the Gender Centers</li> </ul>	No information
1.1.3. Practical tools helping planner in mainstreaming gender equality and social inclusion in planning processes are provided within the wider manual for development planning and management (including gender performance and social inclusion indicators)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tools developed and integrated in manuals</li> </ul>	The manual on strategic planning in line with the new methodology has been prepared for governments in FBiH entity, while the manual for the RS institutions will be prepared in 2021, after adoption of the new legislation on development planning and management

Expected Results	Indicators	Achievements
		In addition to elaborating the principles of gender equality and equal opportunities, these aspects are further reinforced by mainstreaming Agenda 2030 into planning processes, particularly in the context of the “Leave No One Behind” principle
<b>Output 1.2:</b> Public financing mechanisms sustainably reinforce the development planning and management systems, resulting in improved livelihoods and service delivery for the citizens		
1.2.1. Financing mechanisms encourage projects that create benefits for women and socially excluded groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 public financing mechanisms that encourage gender equality and social inclusion</li> <li>- 40% of women (100.000) are direct/indirect beneficiaries of implemented projects</li> <li>- 10% (25.000) direct/indirect beneficiaries of implemented projects belong to socially excluded groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementation of 12 local governments' projects, within 2018 annual cycle of the RS Financing Mechanism, resulted in direct benefits for 58,000 citizens (40% women; 6,000 from socially excluded population groups)</li> <li>- Expected number of beneficiaries in ongoing two cycles of the RS financing mechanism is 137,891 (47% women; 32,000 from socially excluded population). Expected number of beneficiaries within FBiH Grant scheme is 200,396 (53% women, 75,000 socially excluded)</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Local and cantonal governments effectively address needs of citizens and accelerate growth through inclusive development planning and management		
<b>Output 2.1. Local development planning and management frameworks and capacities are sustained and scaled up as part of a harmonised system, in line with EU requirements</b>		
2.1.1. Core planning and consultative bodies aware and proactive with respect to ensuring gender equality and identifying and addressing needs of socially excluded groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revised training programme on development planning and management and incorporated into formal training systems</li> <li>- At least 40% of less represented gender in planning and consultative bodies</li> <li>- At least 1 additional focus group with socially excluded population categories per local government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training programme for FBiH local governments designed and delivered in 2020. Training delivery for RS local governments planned in 2021, after adoption of the new legal framework on development planning and management</li> </ul>

Expected Results	Indicators	Achievements
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft development strategies reviewed by gender commissions before being submitted for formal adoption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 40% women participated in local planning and consultative processes</li> <li>- Additional focus groups were held in 11 new partner local governments (105 participants; 59 females and 46 males (children / elderly with disabilities, returnees, Roma, unemployed) to enable identification of specific issues of these groups and possible actions that could be taken within the emerging strategies</li> <li>- 15 focus groups were held during strategy revision process (189 people; 80 females and 109 males)</li> <li>- 10 new local government development strategies reviewed by municipal gender commissions</li> <li>- Additional focus groups were held in 9 underdeveloped partner local governments (83 people; 41 females and 42 males (children / elderly with disabilities, returnees, Roma, unemployed) to enable identification of specific issues of these groups and possible actions that could be taken within the emerging strategies</li> <li>- Additional focus groups held in “old” municipalities, which launched new planning cycle (38 people; 17 females and 21 males)</li> </ul>
QASDYUITO7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development strategies supported under ILDP reflect needs and priorities of women and socially excluded groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10 new local government development strategies include at least two projects which address needs of socially excluded groups and/or women</li> </ul>

Expected Results	Indicators	Achievements
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 9 underdeveloped local government development strategies include at least two projects which address needs of socially excluded groups and/or women</li> </ul>
<p>2.1.3. Specific gender and social inclusion issues and priorities included in annual plans and reports of municipalities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 80% of partner LGs have designed annual plans and reports that reflect the needs and priorities of women and the socially excluded</li> <li>- Annual plans and reports reviewed by relevant institutional structures for gender equality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10 new local government development strategies include at least two projects which address needs of socially excluded groups and/or women</li> <li>- 9 underdeveloped local government development strategies include at least two projects which address needs of socially excluded groups and/or women</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 2.2. Core development planning and management frameworks and capacities at cantonal level further advanced and sustained as an integral part of a harmonised public system and EU integration processes</b></p>		
<p>2.2.1. Core planning and consultative bodies aware and proactive with respect to ensuring gender equality and identifying and addressing needs of socially excluded groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revised training programme on development planning and management and incorporated in formal training systems</li> <li>- At least 40% of less represented gender in planning and consultative bodies</li> <li>- At least 1 additional focus group with representatives of socially excluded population categories per canton</li> <li>- Draft development strategies reviewed by gender commissions before being submitted for formal adoption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training programmes, organised during 2020, addressed the gender equality and socially excluded groups. Overall awareness has been raised as the members of social and gender commissions participated in cantonal assembly training with the topics of strategic planning</li> <li>- On average 49% women and 51% men participated in cantonal planning and consultative processes</li> <li>- Participation in planning processes was negatively affected due to the COVID-19 outbreak. Still, representatives of the organisations which work with socially excluded groups and/or women were actively included in planning processes, contributing to shaping documents to address the needs of their target groups</li> </ul>

Expected Results	Indicators	Achievements
2.2.2. Gender specific information integrated in the socio-economic analysis and subsequently addressed within the development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development strategies supported under ILDP reflect needs and priorities of women and socially excluded groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Due to COVID 19 pandemic, planning processes were delayed and 2 cantons completed their strategies in 2020. In addition, 8 out of 10 cantonal assemblies have established gender commissions. Priorities and needs of women and socially excluded groups are now part of strategic priorities. Mainstreaming the SDGs into development strategies has additionally reinforced these efforts</li> </ul>
2.1.3. Specific gender and social inclusion issues, information and priorities included in annual plans and reports of cantons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 70% of partner cantons have designed annual plans and reports that reflect the needs and priorities of women and the socially excluded</li> <li>- Annual plans and reports reviewed by gender responsible commissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All developed strategy action plans for 2020 reflect needs of women and socially excluded</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 3: Citizens, civil society organisations and media take proactive part in development management and benefit from improved services</b>		
3.2.1. Better public services for both genders and socially excluded groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 40 % of women among targeted journalists</li> <li>- At least of 40% of gender and/or social inclusion proactive CSOs involved in training</li> <li>- At least 30% increase of training participants' understanding on mechanisms to strengthen gender equality and participation of socially included groups in development management processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 58% women participated in training for journalists and CSOs</li> <li>- 14 % of gender and/or social inclusion proactive CSOs involved in training</li> <li>- 30% increase of training participants' understanding on mechanisms to strengthen gender equality and participation of socially included groups in development management processes based on training reports</li> </ul>
3.2.2. Citizens, both women and men and socially excluded groups benefit from jobs and income streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 30% selected stories that address gender equality and social inclusion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3 awarded journalists' articles, selected based on public call for journalist, address problems of socially excluded populations in their communities</li> </ul>

Source: ILDP Phase III Annual Report, January – December 2020

# Appendix X: Map of Findings and Recommendations

Evaluation Criteria	Findings	Recommendations
Relevance	<b>Finding 1:</b> From a conceptual perspective, ILDP Phase III has been contextually relevant to BiH, given its responsiveness to the need for increased technical capacities across subnational governments, to facilitate public sector reform for enhanced public service delivery.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Relevance	<b>Finding 2:</b> At the level of project implementation, the core project activities addressed the policy reform needs of the institutional project beneficiaries.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Relevance	<b>Finding 3:</b> By facilitating improvements in public service delivery, ILDP Phase III has been of direct relevance to the priority development needs of BiH citizens.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Relevance	<b>Finding 4:</b> Project implementation has aligned directly with emergent ILDP development frameworks for subnational reform in the area of public administration and country-level priorities for the international development agenda.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Coherence	<b>Finding 5:</b> As it has presented a distinct approach to functional subnational development, ILDP Phase III has complemented the intervention efforts of key development actors in BiH.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Effectiveness	<b>Finding 6:</b> Although the Project has been challenged by political dynamics and the COVID-19 pandemic, it has contributed to strategic planning and management systems through legal and methodological frameworks and capacity development. As there is some variation in capacities across lead planning institutions, however, system implementation has been a work in progress.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Effectiveness	<b>Finding 7:</b> While there is evidence of inclusive development planning at the local and cantonal levels, to enable local authorities to better meet the needs of their citizens, there has been limited capacity to facilitate accelerated growth as a result of the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic and the social; economic; and political environment of BiH.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Effectiveness	<b>Finding 8:</b> While the intervention strategy prioritised the engagement of citizens and civil society organisations in strategic subnational development management, there has been limited evidence of the continuous engagement of the media in this process.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6

Evaluation Criteria	Findings	Recommendations
Efficiency	<b>Finding 9:</b> Insofar as project implementation has been supported by strategic and economic resource allocation, ILDP Phase III has provided good value for money, and facilitated an emergent resilience by the local and cantonal governments in their response to the COVID-19 pandemic.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Efficiency	<b>Finding 10:</b> From a design standpoint, the integrated approach to strategic development planning and management has contributed towards results ownership across subnational governments, given its support for vertical and horizontal coordination, through inclusive participation; financial integration; and the nationalisation and localisation of Agenda 2030.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
<b>Cross-cutting themes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender equality</li> <li>• Rights-based approach</li> <li>• Human development</li> </ul>	<b>Finding 11:</b> The integration of gender equality and social inclusion considerations has been strongly reflected in project design and implementation, and has intertwined with the application of a rights-based approach to human development.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Impact	<b>Finding 12:</b> While there is significant evidence of the contribution of ILDP Phase III to functional subnational development, the project has varied in the extent of its contribution towards improvements in the quality of life of citizens.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Impact	<b>Finding 13:</b> Based on its direct investment in an increased capacity for local and cantonal governments to access external financial assistance, including from the EU, ILDP Phase III indirectly contributed to the creation of a platform for the country-wide adoption of Agenda 2030.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Sustainability	<b>Finding 14:</b> By combining its inclusive and integrated strategy with a consolidated phasing out approach, ILDP Phase III has contributed towards the readiness of stakeholders across government levels to assume ownership for the sustainability of project results.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6
Sustainability	<b>Finding 15:</b> As the Project has invested significantly in building institutional capacities for systemic; functional; and inclusive subnational development, it has created strong potential for the sustainability of its emergent results.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; #3; #4; #5 and #6

## Note

---

Date: 07.02.2022  
Prepared by: Embassy of Switzerland in BiH - KANSN, ZARMA, MESSO  
UNDP BiH – Aida Lakovic Hosu, Adela Pozder Cengic

---

### **Management response to the External Evaluation Report of the project “Integrated Local Development Project”, Phase 3 (01.03.2017-28.02.2022), 7F-04369.04**

#### 1. Introduction

The Management Response was prepared jointly by the SDC, represented by the Embassy of Switzerland in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the United Nations Development Programme Bosnia and Herzegovina Country Office (UNDP BiH), co-donor and implementing agency. The Management Response states the position of Switzerland and UNDP on the recommendations of the external evaluation of the Integrated Local Development Project (ILDP). It provides a basis for strategic decision-making in future SDC and UNDP interventions.

#### 2. Background Information

The evaluated Integrated Local Development Project, Phase 3, is the last phase of a joint initiative of the Government of Switzerland and UNDP BiH, implemented by UNDP BiH. ILDP was launched in 2008 to harmonise integrated and inclusive strategic planning at the subnational level in BiH. The current project phase, which is the subject of the external evaluation, presents the consolidation phase of the project and covers the period 01.03.2017 to 28.02.2022.

ILDP is a system-building project that was developed to support the establishment of regulatory; operational; and institutional frameworks at the subnational level, to facilitate functional development planning and management. The overall goal of this project was to contribute to functional development planning and management system at sub-national levels and thus improve quality of life for the citizens and integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the EU. The project's Theory of Change suggested that in order to achieve the impact and outcomes, the functional development planning needed to be fully institutionalized, engaging governments from entity down to local level.

#### 3. Assessment of the evaluation

The evaluation was conducted by an external evaluation consultant, Halcyon Louis PhD, over the period October 2021 – January 2022, following contract signature on 11 October 2021 with UNDP BiH. The evaluation was performed in accordance with the international standards<sup>1</sup>. Due to COVID/19 pandemic, the evaluation was done remotely. However, it was well managed and SDC was closely involved.

---

<sup>1</sup> The evaluation adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The evaluation further complied with the international standards of UNDP and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) to ensure quality.

The main objective of this evaluation has been to provide an impartial review of ILDP Phase III based on five OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability), to determine overall project performance, management, and achievements.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, the results of the evaluation will be used to inform future UNDP BiH and SDC programming. SDC and UNDP appreciate the comprehensiveness of the evaluation report and the sound analysis of key elements of ILDP performance.

#### 4. Main findings

The evaluation established that ILDP Phase III has been relevant at the country-wide level and has responded to the need for increased technical capacities within subnational governments to inform public sector reform. By aligning with the international development agenda, ILDP has further contributed to the attainment of country-level development priorities. It has been effective in spite of the challenges of an unstable socio-political environment and the COVID-19 pandemic, contributing towards a harmonised approach to strategic subnational development. Project achievements have also included functional development planning and management systems at the entity level that have been equipped with: regulatory and operational frameworks; institutional structures and capacities; strategic documents; partnerships; vertical and horizontal coherence; and accountability mechanisms.

Out of the 6 recommendations, 4 are ‘fully agreed’ (green) and 2 are ‘partially agreed’ (orange) – see table below. The SDC and UNDP agree to seize this opportunity to improve their results by taking specific measures in line with the recommendations.

1.	It is recommended that UNDP BiH, in collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, should work with the public audit offices at the entity level in the future, so that they include a performance audit of the development planning and management systems in their work.	Orange
2.	UNDP BiH should, in collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, explore the potential for enhancing development planning and management in future similar interventions through increased collaborations and partnerships that further support the localisation of the BiH Framework for SDGs.	Green
3.	In collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, UNDP BiH should further explore the contribution of post-Project activities to the EU Accession Agenda and the SDG Framework in BiH, to address existing gaps and facilitate increased capacities at the subnational level to apply for external funding.	Green
4.	UNDP BiH, under the direction of the ILDP Project Manager, should continue to work closely with the lead planning institutions and the relevant EU project during the phasing out period, to ensure that programme-based budgeting is fully integrated into strategic development processes at all levels of subnational government.	Green
5.	UNDP BiH, under the direction of the ILDP Project Manager and in collaboration with the lead planning institutions at the entity-level and within BD BiH, should continue to implement the Project Exit Strategy during the remaining project timeframe to ensure effective handover of responsibilities and the scaling up of the good practices for strategic development that emerged during the Project.	Green
6.	UNDP BiH should explore the possibility of scaling up the results of the Project to allow for harmonised development planning and management at the state level, given the potential for Project results to contribute towards the achievement of the nationalised SDGs.	Orange
Fully agree		Partially agree
		Disagree

<sup>2</sup> ToR, Section 2a

#### 4.1. Overview of recommendations, management response and measures

Recommendation 1		
It is recommended that UNDP BiH, in collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, should work with the public audit offices at the entity level in the future, so that they include a performance audit of the development planning and management systems in their work.		
Management response		
Fully agree	<b>Partially agree</b>	Disagree
Action will depend on availability of funding. However, the action is particularly important from the perspective of future independent functioning of the development planning and management system and systemic implementation of the SDG Framework in BiH.		
Measures	Responsibility	Timing
Depending on available funding, UNDP will explore the possibility of engaging with public audit offices towards raising their awareness and increasing their capacities for future regular audits of the planning and development management system.	<u>UNDP BiH</u>	<u>June 2023</u>

Recommendation 2		
UNDP BiH should, in collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, explore the potential for enhancing development planning and management in future similar interventions through increased collaborations and partnerships that further support the localisation of the BiH Framework for SDGs.		
Management response		
<b>Fully agree</b>	Partially agree	Disagree
Recommendation would be important from the perspective of optimization of financial and human resources at the local level.		
Measures	Responsibility	Timing
UNDP will seek to engage into new partnerships for implementation of SDGs-aligned development strategies at the local level and support concrete localization of the SDGs. However, this will depend on availability of funding. Both UNDP and SDC will seek to support SDG localization through existing projects, or with its internal resources in the case of UNDP, while at the same time exploring more innovative service delivery mechanisms within existing and future projects to contribute to accelerating the SDG achievements. These may include digitalization of local services, upscaling products within existing projects to a larger number of local governments (e.g. e-citizen application), outsourcing of services in cooperation with private sector and CSOs), inter-municipal cooperation, exchange of good practices, etc.	<u>SDC and UNDP</u>	<u>Ongoing</u>

Recommendation 3		
In collaboration with the Embassy of Switzerland/ SDC in BiH, UNDP BiH should further explore the contribution of post-Project activities to the EU Accession Agenda and the SDG Framework in BiH, to address existing gaps and facilitate increased capacities at the subnational level to apply for external funding.		
Management response		
<b>Fully agree</b>	Partially agree	Disagree
In initial stage, UNDP will cover 8 local governments in the country to increase their capacities for SDG-based programming. This is planned under new project proposal with Sweden. However, it would be needed to scale up this intervention to include a larger number of local governments.		
Measures	Responsibility	Timing

<p>SDC will actively support and advocate for these processes with its target LGs, aiming at integrating SDG Framework into local development plans.</p> <p>All activities implemented by UNDP are designed to contribute to the EU Accession Agenda and the SDG Framework in BiH. With respect to capacity development for sub-national governments to apply for external funding, UNDP will seek to address this recommendation within a new project that is still pending adoption or possibly with its own resources.</p>	<p><u>UNDP BiH and SDC</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
---	--------------------------------	----------------

<b>Recommendation 4</b>		
<p>UNDP BiH, under the direction of the ILDP Project Manager, should continue to work closely with the lead planning institutions and the relevant EU project during the phasing out period, to ensure that programme-based budgeting is fully integrated into strategic development processes at all levels of subnational government.</p>		
<b>Management response</b>		
<b>Fully agree</b>	Partially agree	Disagree
This is envisaged within the remaining implementation period of the ILDP.		
<b>Measures</b>	Responsibility	Timing
Coordination with the lead planning institutions and relevant EU projects	<u>UNDP BiH</u>	28 Feb 2022

<b>Recommendation 5</b>		
<p>UNDP BiH, under the direction of the ILDP Project Manager and in collaboration with the lead planning institutions at the entity-level and within BD BiH, should continue to implement the Project Exit Strategy during the remaining project timeframe to ensure effective handover of responsibilities and the scaling up of the good practices for strategic development that emerged during the Project.</p>		
<b>Management response</b>		
<b>Fully agree</b>	Partially agree	Disagree
This is envisaged within the remaining implementation period of the ILDP		
<b>Measures</b>	Responsibility	Timing
Implementation of the Exit Strategy	<u>UNDP BiH</u>	Feb 2022

<b>Recommendation 6</b>		
<p>UNDP BiH should explore the possibility of scaling up the results of the Project to allow for harmonized development planning and management at the state level, given the potential for Project results to contribute towards the achievement of the nationalized SDGs.</p>		
<b>Management response</b>		
Fully agree	<b>Partially agree</b>	Disagree
This recommendation is very important, however, its feasibility is unlikely given the current political situation in the country and lack of political will for any reforms at the state level.		
<b>Measures</b>	Responsibility	Timing
Switzerland and UNDP consider it more realistic to move forward with the SDG localisation on the basis of the SDG framework which was agreed in a non-politicised and bottom-up manner among the State and its entities.	<u>UNDP BiH / SDC</u>	Dec 2024