Title: Final Evaluation Team Leader (international position)
Reporting to: United Nations Resident Coordinator in Serbia
Duty Station: Belgrade, Serbia
Duration: June – November 2019 (output-based consultancy)
Contract Type: Individual Contract (IC)

Background

Purpose


The Development Partnership Framework Evaluation is an external, independent exercise aimed at generating an independent assessment of results, successes, challenges and lessons learned to inform the DPF stakeholders and feed into the next DPF programming cycle. The DPF Evaluation will provide information primarily to the Government of the Republic of Serbia, the United Nations Development System and the UN Country Team in the RS, as well as to the Serbia’s civil society organizations, international institutions, donors and the Serbian public at large about the key achievements of the Development Partnership Framework between the United Nations Country Team in Serbia and the Government of the Republic of Serbia in the period 2016-2020.

According to the Development Partnership Framework 2016-2020 document “an evaluation in the penultimate year of the programme cycle will be conducted to support the formulation of the next DPF. The evaluation will assess the relevance of the DPF outcomes, the effectiveness and efficiency of implementation by partners, and their sustainability and contribution to country priorities. The evaluation will also gauge the performance of the Joint National Steering Committee and Results Groups”.2

---

1 The UN Country Team (UNCT) refers to the totality of UN development operations in Serbia by resident and non-resident agencies, funds and programmes.
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a. Objective

The final evaluation will seek to answer the fundamental results-oriented questions: what difference did the DPF intervention make in Serbia’s development? How did it make this difference, and what other factors were relevant? To provide answers, the final evaluation will assess the contribution made by the UNCT in the framework of the UNDAF to national development results using evaluation criteria based on available evidence (please refer to the attached Final DPF Evaluation TOR).

b. Composition of the Evaluation Team

Given the importance of DPF evaluation and the complexities involved in its design and implementation, it is critical that due time and effort is accorded to recruiting an external evaluation team which will meet the standards to conduct the evaluation. The evaluation team will consist of one international team leader and one additional team member (national expert).

The evaluation team leader will lead the entire evaluation process, working closely with UNCT and its partners in the Republic of Serbia. She/he will conduct the evaluation process in a timely manner and in line with the attached DPF Evaluation TOR. The national consultant will contribute to the evaluation process substantively through data collection and analysis.

The two team members will share responsibilities for conducting the initial desk review, the field phases of the evaluation and preparation of the final report.

c. Duties and responsibilities

The selected international consultant (team leader) will fully adhere to all aspects of the attached Final DPF (2016-2020) Evaluation Terms of Reference.

The final DPF evaluation team will report to the UNCT through the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator and will receive their overall guidance and support. At the technical level, the final DPF evaluation team will work closely with Evaluation Management Group (Section 10 of the attached TOR provides complete details on Management of the DPF Evaluation).

The team leader will take a lead role during the evaluation, develop a comprehensive evaluation methodology based on the Final DPF Evaluation Terms of Reference (Section 8 of the TOR), and coordinate the work of other team members (national consultant). The team leader will ensure the quality of the evaluation process, outputs, methodology and timely delivery of all products. The team leader, in close collaboration with the UNCT and the Evaluation Manager, will take the lead role in conceptualization and design of the evaluation and shaping the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report. The tasks of the team leader include:

- Develops an inception report and details the design, methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis criteria for selection of examples, required resources), and work plan of the evaluation team.
- Directs and conducts the research and analysis of all relevant documentation;
- Decides the division of labor within the evaluation team and coordinates team tasks within the framework of the TORs;
- Oversees and quality assures the preparation of the report and takes a lead in the analysis of the evaluative evidence;
- Oversees the administration, and analysis of the results of the data collection exercise;
- Drafts the evaluation report, and coordinates the inputs from team members;
• Prepares periodic inputs to the meetings (consultations and de-briefings) with JNSC, UNCT and other stakeholder to review findings, conclusions and recommendations.
• Leads the stakeholder feedback sessions on the evaluation through formal and informal sessions and finalizes the report based on feedback from the quality assurance process;
• Delivers the final evaluation report.

d. Products expected from the evaluation

The full evaluation report (minimum 35 pages excluding the Executive Summary and Annexes), covering the issues outlined in the terms of reference and inception report including evaluation findings and conclusions, lessons and recommendations.

The Final Evaluation Report should at a minimum include the following components:

• Executive summary
• Introduction
• Description of the evaluation methodology
• Analysis of the situation with regard to outcome, outputs, resources, partnerships, management and working methods and/or implementation strategy
• Key findings
• Conclusions and practical, actionable recommendations for the DPF successor document implementation
• Annexes including:
  - Evaluation ToR
  - The evaluation matrix
  - Inception report (including gap and stakeholder analysis)
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field interviews
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Online survey and/or questionnaire (if any) used and summary of results

e. Deliverables and Timeline

Tentative Evaluation schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Desk review</td>
<td>June 2019 (7 days)</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial meeting and discussions with UNCT</td>
<td>June 2019 (3 days)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>UNC, Team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full desk review including CPE Evaluation results and gap analysis</td>
<td>July 2019 (10 days)</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting/ finalizing Inception Report, outlining evaluation design, initial synthesis and detailed</td>
<td>July 2019 (14 days)</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional data collection plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Inception Report</td>
<td>By end July 2019</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country field mission and presentation of the preliminary findings</td>
<td>September (10 days)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Team members and Evaluation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dates tbc in line with the final UNDAF roadmap)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization first draft of full evaluation report (35-40 pages excluding</td>
<td>By 28 October 2019 (14 days)</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Executive summary and annexes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of second draft, following feedback from UNCT</td>
<td>By November 2019</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the Final DPF Evaluation findings and recommendations</td>
<td>Early November (2 Days)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>All Team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 working days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the financial offer the international consultant should indicate the number of working days per deliverable. The consultant will receive the payments by deliverable based on the lump sum provided in the consultant’s proposal. The indicated number of working days in the table above is reflective of the DPF Evaluation TOR timeline and should be used for orientation only.

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

- The report has to be written in professional and clear English language
- The Executive Summary (in both English and Serbian) should be a concise chapter (not exceeding five pages), highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations
- The information in the report has to be complete, well structured, concise and clearly presented
- All information in the report has to be adequately documented and supporting the findings
- The information in the report has to addresses priority or strategic information needs
- Findings and recommendations have to be evidenced, concrete and implementable
- Human rights and gender equality perspective has been taken into account

Overall, the evaluation has to be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.
f. Required skills and experience:

- Master’s Degree in a relevant discipline
- At least 10 years of working experience in evaluation of UN’s strategic documents and UN agency country programmes
- Previous experience with regional organizations and the UN system
- Experience with participatory approaches, organizational assessments partnership strategies and capacity development
- Knowledge of relevant human rights issues and ability to identify related problems in their political, ethnic, racial, gender equality and socio-economic dimensions
- Ability to evaluate and integrate information from a variety of sources and assess impact on the human rights and gender equality. Ability to incorporate gender perspectives in all aspects of the evaluation report
- Regional expertise in either Serbia or Western Balkans
- Proven experience as an evaluation team leader with ability to lead and work with other evaluation experts.
- Facilitation skills and ability to manage diversity of views in different development contexts
- Ability to produce well written reports demonstrating analytical ability and communication skills
- Excellent knowledge of written and spoken English

g. Application procedure:

Qualified and interested candidates are asked to submit their applications via the UNDP website: UNDP in Serbia no later than 10 June 2019.

Application should include:

- CV containing date of birth and contact information;
- Offeror’s Letter (only PDF format will be accepted) confirming Interest and availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment. Can be downloaded from the following link: http://www.undp.org.rs/download/ic/Confirmation.docx. The Offeror’s Letter shall include financial proposal specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement with a breakdown of costs. Offeror’s Letter must also include the following:
  - Methodology concept containing a preliminary plan of work (no more than two pages).
  - Example of an evaluation report written by the applicant (ideally UNDAF evaluation).

Methodology concept and example of an evaluation report should be merged into Offeror’s Letter and submitted as one document.

Any request for clarification must be sent by standard electronic communication to the e-mail vacancy.rs@undp.org. The procuring UNDP entity will respond by standard electronic mail and will send response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

h. Financial proposal

Lump sum contract
The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. Travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket will not be considered. The travel costs must include transfer to/from the airport in Belgrade. Travel within Belgrade will be organized and covered by the UN Resident Coordinator’s Office in Serbia.

Evaluation of the proposals

1. Cumulative analysis

The proposal will be evaluated using the weighted scoring method, the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight; 70%
* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria A</td>
<td>Desk review of the CVs and previous report examples: Proven experience in developing/implementing similar large-scale evaluations – preferably in the region</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria B</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria C</td>
<td>Quality of the Methodology concept (containing a preliminary plan of work)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria D</td>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engagement of Government Officials and Employees

- Government Officials or Employees are civil servants of UN Member States. As such, if they will be engaged by UNDP under an IC which they will be signing in their individual capacity (i.e., engagement is not done through RLA signed by their Government employer), the following conditions must be met prior to the award of contract:

  (i) A “No-objection” letter in respect of the individual is received from the Government employing him/her, and;
(ii) The individual must provide an official documentation from his/her employer formally certifying his or her status as being on “official leave without pay” for the duration of the IC.

- The above requirements are also applicable to Government-owned and controlled enterprises and well as other semi/partially or fully owned Government entities, whether or not the Government ownership is of majority or minority status.

- UNDP recognizes the possibility that there are situations when the Government entity employing the individual that UNDP wishes to engage is one that allows its employees to receive external short-term consultancy assignments (including but not limited to research institutions, state-owned colleges/universities, etc.), whereby a status of “on-leave-without-pay” is not required. Under such circumstance, the individual entering into an IC with UNDP must still provide a “No-objection” letter from the Government employing him/her. The “no objection” letter required under (i) above must also state that the employer formally certifies that their employees are allowed to receive short-term consultancy assignment from another entity without being on “leave-without-pay” status, and include any conditions and restrictions on granting such permission, if any. The said document may be obtained by, and put on record of, UNDP, in lieu of the document (ii) listed above.
Terms of Reference for the Final Development Partnership Framework 2016-2020 Evaluation

1. Introduction: Brief national context

The Republic of Serbia was granted the status of EU candidate country in 2012. In April 2013, the EU Commission recommended to the Council of the European Union that accession negotiations should be opened. Since the opening of Serbia’s accession negotiations in January 2014, 16 out of 35 chapters have been opened (as of 2019), two of which provisionally closed.

Serbia is facing many development challenges that are the consequence of past legacies, the 2008 global economic crisis, and natural disasters, especially the 2014 floods. In the aftermath of the 2008 global economic crisis, Serbia struggled with lagging economic growth, underdevelopment of rural areas and other regional disparities, relative high unemployment, low levels of investment and an increase in public debt. In 2014, the Government of Serbia initiated stringent fiscal adjustments to curb public spending, combined with structural reforms that foster fiscal stability and economic growth, which included measures to cut government spending, reduce subsidies to state-owned companies, and lower wages for public sector employees. Although measuring a modest reduction in employment, Serbia has a high risk of poverty and social exclusion according to the EU SILC methodology indicators (25.4% in 2013 and 2014).

Serbia has been facing unfavorable demographic trends: low natality rate, negative natural growth rate, slow increase in life expectancy, ageing (average age is 42.9) and increase in share of population aged 65 years and over, but also high level of internal migrations from rural to urban areas and emigration, resulting in overall negative migration balance.

According to the recent EU Serbia Progress Reports (2017 and 2018), limited progress has been made in the country in the areas of public administration reform, judicial system, fight against corruption and organized crime, also freedom of expression, functioning market economy, environment and climate change. Significant additional efforts are needed to further align with EU policies in areas such as water, waste management, air quality and protection of nature.

Despite the progress made in the establishment of the legal and political framework for the improvement of women’s rights and gender equality, gender inequalities are still underlined. Years characterized by war,

---

3 Data derived from the MAPS ToR background and MAPS full report documents
conflict and transition significantly undermined women’s rights in terms of civic participation, employment and social policy.

Serbia’s many development challenges were taken into consideration when formulating the Development Partnership Framework jointly by the UNCT and the Government of the Republic of Serbia. The Development Partnership Framework recognizes the EU integration process as the overarching priority for Serbia’s national development agenda.

2. Development Partnership Framework (2016-2020) Background and Main Characteristics

The Government of the Republic of Serbia (GoS) and the United Nations Country Team in Serbia have jointly developed a medium-term strategic planning document named Development Partnership Framework (DPF) for the period 2016-2020 that was finalized and signed on 30 May 2017. The DPF was signed by the Government of the Republic of Serbia and nineteen UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes active in the country. The framework articulates a collective vision and response of the UN development system to national development priorities and activities to be implemented in partnership with the GoS and in close cooperation with the international partners and civil society until 2020. This strategy was developed following an extensive Country Context Assessment and a comprehensive series of consultations with all relevant stakeholders. The key aspects of DPF and UNCT’s cooperation with the Government of Serbia in the current period are closely aligned with country’s EU integration agenda and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The DPF 2016-2020 process is designed to strengthen national ownership through the recognition, support and advocacy of effective public policies, as well as reliance on domestic institutions, systems and resources in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and EU Acquis chapters. It also supports the development of a strategic framework, systems for the monitoring and evaluation of achieved results, as well as promotion of partnerships and technical cooperation, including public-private partnerships to achieve the global agenda.

The joint implementation of DPF was envisioned through the establishment of the Joint National Steering Committee (JNSC) for strategic guidance and oversight and five Results Groups (RGs) tasked to prepare and implement the 2-year joint work plans to be signed between the UN Government of the Republic of Serbia counterparts. The DPF results matrix contains five main pillars with nine specific outcomes that the Results Group Chairs (Pillar Chairs) are responsible for delivering on in Serbia.

The outcomes expected from cooperation between the Government of the Republic of Serbia, the UNCT, international and civil society partners are grouped according to five strategic pillars that respond to country needs and make use of the UN’s strengths:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Governance and Rule of Law                                         | 1. By 2020, people in Serbia, especially vulnerable groups, have their human rights protected and have improved access to justice and security  
2. By 2020, governance institutions at all levels have enhanced accountability and representation to provide better quality services to people and the economy  
3. By 2020, state institutions and other relevant actors enhance gender equality and enable women and girls, especially those from vulnerable groups, to live lives free from discrimination and violence |
| II. Social and Human Resources Development                            | 4. By 2020, high quality, inclusive, equitable, gender-sensitive, and age appropriate health services that protect patient rights are available and utilized by all  
5. By 2020, an efficient education system is established that enables |
relevant, quality, inclusive and equitable education to all, particularly the most vulnerable, and increases learning and social outcomes

6. By 2020, the social welfare system is strengthened to provide timely, holistic and continued support to individuals and families at risk and enable them to live in a safe, secure, supportive family and community environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Economic Development, Growth, and Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. By 2020, there is an effective enabling environment that promotes sustainable livelihoods, economic development, focused on an inclusive labour market and decent job creation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Environment, Climate Change and Resilient Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. By 2020, there are improved capacities to combat climate change and manage natural resources and communities are more resilient to the effects of natural and man-made disasters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Culture and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. By 2020, Serbia has inclusive policies ensuring an enhanced cultural industries sector, promoting cultural diversity and managing cultural and natural heritage as a vehicle for sustainable development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each DPF Pillar and Outcome was further developed with the corresponding set of indicators containing baselines and targets, specifically designed to measure the progress toward results over the implementation period. The DPF Results Matrix (Annex I) represents an integral part of the document and a key reference point for the DPF final evaluation.

To support the achievement of the stated outcomes, the DPF has also defined a set of overarching and cross-cutting principles representing a foundation for all DPF programming activities:

a) Coherence and complementarity with EU Integration processes in Serbia

All activities in this Strategy are designed in such a way to complement and smoothen country’s efforts to align with the EU norms and standards and achieve a successful and timely completion of the EU accession process, especially in achieving the EU Acquis.

b) Post-2015 Development Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

DPF has taken into consideration the global development agenda and was designed to support Government of the Republic of Serbia in its efforts to aligning its national development policies accordingly.

c) Promotion of UNCT coherence through application of the Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering Together in a Post-2015 development world

Key elements of Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering as one, such as One Leader, One Programme, Operating as One and Communicating as One were closely reviewed by the Government of the Republic of Serbia and UNCT and have been adjusted for the Development Partnership Framework in Serbia 2016-2020. The One Fund option is not part of the DPF, however certain elements of the Common Budgetary Framework were partially applied.

d) Cross-Cutting Programming Principles

The Government of Serbia and UNCT have agreed that the DPF will strive to observe a set of common principles which should be observed in planning and implementing of all DPF outcomes, outputs and activities:

- Promoting fundamental human rights
- Ensuring gender equality

- Promoting environmental sustainability
- Strengthening entrepreneurship and competitiveness
- Advancing independence and engagement of civil society and media
- Improving the quality and availability of data

Although containing an outline of the Common Budgetary Framework the DPF financial resources are provided as estimates only. The Government of the Republic of Serbia and UNCT system agreed to jointly calculate the gaps to meet the targets set under DPF and jointly mobilize resources from various donor organizations for the DPF implementation. Therefore, the estimates included in the DPF resources table do not bear financial obligations for the Government of the Republic of Serbia counterparts involved, aside from existing agreements signed before the beginning of the financial year 2016. According to the DPF estimates out of the US$ 169,764,004 total resources required for DPF implementation, US$ 76,566,167 will be available and US$ 93,197,837 were to be mobilized during the implementation period.

3. Purpose of the DPF Evaluation

The DPF Evaluation is an external, independent exercise aimed at generating an independent assessment of results, successes, challenges and lessons learned to inform the DPF stakeholders and feed into the next DPF programming cycle. The DPF Evaluation will provide information primarily to the Government of the Republic of Serbia, the United Nations Development System and the UN Country Team in the RS, as well as to the Serbia’s civil society organizations, international institutions, donors and the Serbian public at large about the key achievements of the Development Partnership Framework between the United Nations Country Team in Serbia and the Government of the Republic of Serbia in the period 2016-2020.

According to The Development Partnership Framework document “an evaluation in the penultimate year of the programme cycle will be conducted to support the formulation of the next DPF. The evaluation will assess the relevance of the DPF outcomes, the effectiveness and efficiency of implementation by partners, and their sustainability and contribution to country priorities. The evaluation will also gauge the performance of the Joint National Steering Committee and Results Groups”. In specific terms the Final DPF Evaluation will:

- Assess the extent to which DPF results have been successful in contribution to national capacities for achievement of the national development goals, EU integration agenda and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
- Assess the DPF strategic intent, principle and spirit the DPF has been taken forward by UN agencies and identify the factors that have affected the UN agencies working together in the context of the ONE Programme.
- Generate evidence and lessons learnt based on the assessment of the current performance of the DPF outcomes and outputs. Provide a set of actionable recommendations based on credible findings, to be used for organizational learning.
- Inform the planning and decision-making for the next UNCT programming, UNDAF, cycle and for improving United Nations coordination at the country level through promoting Delivering as One Operating principle and in line with the ongoing UN Reform processes, namely following provisions from the Monitoring and Accountability Framework from March 2019
- Support greater accountability of the UNCT to the DPF stakeholders.

---
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4. Main Objectives of the DPF Evaluation:

In terms of the precise objectives, the final evaluation will seek to answer the fundamental results-oriented questions: what difference did the DPF intervention make in Serbia’s development? How did it make this difference, and what other factors were relevant? To provide answers, the final evaluation will assess the contribution made by the UNCT in the framework of the UNDAF to national development results using evaluation criteria based on available evidence (accountability):

- Provide information on the overall relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the programming and results of the current DPF 2016-2020, across its five Pillars and nine Outcomes.
- Identify the factors that have affected the UNCT’s implementation and contribution, assessing the performance and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks, with special attention to Delivering as One and ONE Programme operating principles.
- Evaluate the results of the cross-cutting programming and “leave no one behind” principles in the current DPF: assess the differential progress on vulnerable groups (women, children, persons with disabilities, Roma community, youth, older persons, low income families, LGBTI community).
- Assess the extent to which the DPF and coordination mechanisms have contributed to advance and streamline Results-based Management, Gender Equality and Human Rights Based Approach in UN agencies’ programming.
- Advise on the suitability of indicators and other verification tools used to measure progress towards outcomes and outputs.
- Reach conclusions concerning the UN’s contribution across the DPF Results Framework. To extent possible also provide conclusions which results could be attributable to the UN interventions in cooperation with the national counterparts.
- Provide actionable recommendations for improving the UNCT’s contribution, especially for incorporation into the new UNDAF.

5. Scope of the Evaluation

The scope covered by the evaluation will include the overall results framework of the DPF 2016-2020 and its implementation instruments, specifically the Joint Work Plans 2016-2018 and 2019-2020. The evaluation will pay special attention to the mainstreaming and application of the UNDAF programming principles in DPF design and implementation: human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development. The DPF will be evaluated against its contribution to the national development results defined in the DPF results framework (contribution to the EU accession and Agenda 2030 implementation).

The evaluation will review the progress and impact on UN coherence achieved through the implementation of Delivering as One operating principle, with particular focus one ONE Programme element. Associated with this, the DPF evaluation will look at other aspects of DaO, namely Communicating as One and Operating as One. The latter will involve a degree of complementary with the evaluation of the Business Operating Strategy (BOS) that will be commissioned simultaneously.

6. Evaluation Criteria and Questions
The intended evaluation approach including the main evaluation criteria and questions must comply with the United Nations Evaluation Group ‘Norms and Standards for Evaluation’. With assured appreciation of the UNEG norms, the evaluation will use the standard OECD development evaluation criteria (the DAC Evaluation Criteria adapted to the new development landscape and the 2030 Agenda):

Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of the Development Partnership Framework are consistent with the needs and interests of the Serbian people, the needs and priorities of Serbia and its international obligations, Serbia’s EU integration agenda, the Sustainable Development Goals and the policies and priorities of the principal donors in Serbia.

1. Is the identification of the main development challenges, with their respective causes, clear in the DPF? Does the DPF address key development issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified by the DPF stakeholders?

2. What has been DPF’s relevance in contributing to the national development goals (National Priorities for International Assistance NAD, EU Accession strategies)? To what extent was DPF a relevant strategic framework in terms of Serbia’s efforts toward achievement of the SDGs?

3. To what extent have the Serbia’s national, local authorities and civil society been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the DPF?

4. Have the DPF outcomes been relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and commitments, norms and standards to guide the work of UN agencies? (The SDGs, UN human rights treaties, and resolutions, CRC, CEDAW, UNFCCC, etc.)

5. Does the DPF cover and reach its intended beneficiaries? Does it take into account the particularities and specific interests of the vulnerable groups (women, children, people with disabilities, Roma community, youth, elderly, low income families, LGBTI community)?

6. To what extent was the DPF results matrix designed as a results-oriented, coherent, and focused framework? Was it properly operationalized through the output and activity structure?

7. Are the DPF indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the DPF? Did the design of the UNDAF results framework allow for easy monitoring and reporting against the stated outcomes?

Effectiveness: Assessment of the performance of DPF support to Serbia’s development in terms of achieved of results. The evaluation will assess the extent to which DPF’s contribution has strengthened national capacities and contributed to real progress in the planned areas of agreed intervention.

1. Is the DPF likely progressing towards the attainment of the established outcomes, goals and targets as set in the DPF results matrix? Have the outputs been achieved, and to what extent they contribute to the DPF Outcomes (in comparison to other stakeholder interventions)? Can DPF outputs and activities be credibly linked to the achievement of the DPF Pillars and Outcomes?

2. What is the level of UNCT interagency programmatic cohesion at the output and activity levels (assessment using the Joint Work Plan structure as a reference)?

3. Have the DPF results responded to the needs and priorities of the target populations? To what extent did the DPF interventions reached the vulnerable groups – (women, children, persons with disabilities, Roma communities, youth, older persons, low income families, LGBTI community)

4. What are the main factors that contributed to the realization or non-realization of the DPF outputs and outcomes? Has the DPF been used by UN agencies as a common programming tool for planning their activities and setting goals?

5. Has the DPF promoted effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the main DPF Pillars and Outcomes (with and within the Government of Serbia, with national partners and civil society, donors and other external support agencies)?

6. To what extent have human rights principles and gender equality been effectively streamlined in the implementation of the DPF? Have the human rights approach and the DPF cross-cutting principles been reflected as methods for effective implementation of the DPF interventions?

7. To what extent and in what ways has the DPF contributed to setting national priorities and implementing the Sustainable Development Goals at national and local levels?

8. How were risks and assumptions addressed during the implementation of DPF outputs and activities? How well did the UNCT and DPF stakeholders respond to unplanned situations (such as natural or manmade disasters) and what were the effects on DPF implementation?

Efficiency: The extent to which the DPF established and implemented clear procedures to provide coordinated support and the relationship of inputs (financial and staff) to the achieved results. Assessment of the DPF operational and financial management procedures to establish if they helped or hindered efficiency, implementation of the cross-cutting principles and the achievement of planned results.

1. The what extent have the DPF Outcomes been achieved with the planned amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.)?

2. Were the DPF priorities sufficiently defined to maximize efficiency? Was the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different DPF stakeholders, partners and UN Agencies well defined to manifest efficient implementation of the DPF?

3. How has the UN system mobilized and used its resources (human, technical and financial) and inter-agency synergies to achieve the planned DPF results? Compare efficiency achieved under joint programming and joint programmes models. To what extent have national and donor resources been mobilized to contribute to the DPF’s outcomes and produce results and impacts?

4. The extent to which resource allocation took into account or prioritised most marginalised groups including women and girls. To what extent were adequate resources provided for integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in the DPF? Assess appropriateness of UNCT joint programmes in addressing cross sectoral issues.

5. To what extent did the DPF promote the UN transparency and accountability to beneficiaries of the implemented activities, including through clear mechanisms for accountability?

6. What were the elements that contributed to progress or delay in the timeline of the DPF implementation process and the attainment of results? What mechanisms were used by the UN agencies to adjust joint programming and DPF resources to unforeseen circumstances?
Sustainability: The evaluation will examine the sustainability of the DPF results and benefits and explore whether DPF outputs and activities develop/strengthen mechanisms to promote scaling up and replication of successful results.

1. What are the main development changes achieved by DPF that are likely to last? Which outcomes can be permanently sustained without further interventions? Did the beneficiaries and their organizations gain significant new capacities in order pursuit of their own development objectives?

2. Does the DPF include strategies to ensure sustainability? What are the opportunities and risks to the sustainability of DPF? How has DPF contributed to sustainability of results of Country Programmes and projects of individual UN agencies?

3. Has DPF enabled innovative approaches embedded in institutional learning for national capacity development (government, civil society and NGOs) to enable these actors to continue achieving positive results without the UN/development partners’ support?

4. To what extent did the DPF contribute to developing an enabling environment (including capacities of rights holders and duty bearers) and institutional changes to advance Human Rights and Gender Equality issues? Did DPF manage to create sufficient technical expertise, financial independence and mechanisms through which rights-holders may participate in and assert the fulfilment of their rights?

Impact: The impact criteria will be used to assess the socio-economic and environmental changes that have occurred in Serbia through the DPF implementation: it will provide an assessment of the overall DPF stakeholder contributions to the well-being of vulnerable groups, individuals, households and communities that could be credited to the DPF implementation.

1. What were the most significant changes in the well-being of citizens of Serbia (individuals, households and communities) that could be linked to the DPF? The evaluation should identify the changes that have occurred and provide the assessment of the UN contribution versus the Government of Serbia and other stakeholder interventions, given the realistic evaluation limitations due to its composition-based approach.

2. To what extent are the observed social, economic and environmental changes results of the DPF joint stakeholder interventions rather than other factors, especially other international aid modalities, donors, and government programmes and/or policies?

3. What unintended results – positive or negative – did the DPF implementation produce? What would have happened in the absence of the DPF intervention, compared to the current development trends in Serbia?

The evaluation matrix should also incorporate the following cross-cutting questions related to the internal UN coordination and application of the UNDAF programming principles in the implementation of the DPF:

UN Coordination. Did UN coordination reduce transaction costs and increase the efficiency of DPF implementation? To what extent did the UNDAF create actual synergies among agencies and involve concerted efforts to optimise results and avoid duplication?

To what extent and in what way have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context specifically in relation to other development partners active in the
country (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the special mandates of UN agencies)?

**Delivering as One.** To what extent the UNCT applied UNEG Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering as One (DaO) Approach to ensure greater effectiveness and better delivery of results under such approach?

- In the context of DaO, what is the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the One Programme and its contribution and results, including any impacts on the realization of shared results with particular attention to the human rights for the poor and people in vulnerable situations?

- What is the extent of integration and mainstreaming of the United Nations programming principles and other relevant crosscutting issues in the One Programme, including its contributions to equitable, inclusive, transparent, participatory and accountable development processes?

- What is the degree of coherence of the United Nations system in addressing national priorities, and contributions to informed decision making and knowledge generation?

**Five UNDAF Programming Principles.** To what extent have the UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) been considered and mainstreamed in the UNDAF chain of results? Were any shortcomings due to a failure to take account of UNDAF programming principles during implementation?

- To what extent did the DPF make use of and promote human rights and gender equality standards and principles (e.g. participation, non-discrimination, accountability, etc.) to achieve its goal?  

- To what extent did DPF strengthen the capacities for data collection and analysis to ensure disaggregated data on the basis of race, color, sex, geographic location, etc. and did those subjects to discrimination and disadvantage benefited from priority attention?

- Did the DPF effectively use the principles of environmental sustainability to strengthen its contribution to national development results?

- Did the DPF adequately use RBM to ensure a logical chain of results and establish a monitoring and evaluation framework?

- Did the DPF adequately invest in, and focus on, national capacity development? To what extent and in what ways did DPF contribute to capacity development of government, NGOs and civil society institutions?

8. Methodology

The evaluation methodology will be based on a composition approach: the three resident UN agencies (UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA) are using substantial resources to perform summative evaluations of their country programmes in 2019, and the UNCT realized an opportunity to benefit from these processes in order to reduce transaction costs and avoid the duplication of evaluation activities. Although using a modified methodology, the UNCT Serbia approach will ensure compliance with the with the overall UNEG Guidance for

---

10 The UNCT Serbia has recently completed a SWAP-Scorecard (United Nations Country team System Wide Action Plan - Gender Scorecard) in January 2019. SWAP is a globally standardized rapid assessment of UN country level gender mainstreaming practices. The framework is designed to foster adherence to minimum standards for gender equality processes within UN Country Teams (UNCTs) and their activities related to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).
UNDAF Evaluations as well as UNDG and UNEG UNDAF evaluation principles and the new UNDAF preparation guidelines.

The DPF evaluation team will use the results of the three evaluations for the respective DPF Outcomes covered by the agency Country Programme Evaluations (CPEs):

- **UNICEF Country Programme Document (CPD) 2016-2020**
  - will fully cover DPF Outcome 5 (education system) while significantly contributing to Outcome 4 (health services) and Outcome 6 (social welfare) while partially contributing to Outcome 1 (human rights), Outcome 3 (gender) and Outcome 7 (environment, DRR) – **Final report due in May 2019**.

- **UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2016-2020**
  - will fully cover DPF Outcome 8 (environment and resilient communities), significantly contributing to Outcome 1 (human rights), Outcome 2 (governance), Outcome 7 (economic development) and partially contributing to Outcome 3 (gender) – **First draft due in August 2019, Final report not expected before October 2019**.

- **UNFPA Cluster Evaluation North Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Kosovo (SCR 1244)**
  - will cover aspects of the UNFP country programme contributing to Outcome 3 (gender), Outcome 4 (health services) and Outcome 6 (population policies) – **Final report expected in June 2019**.

The UNCT Members with full country offices not performing programme evaluations in 2019: UNHCR, WHO, IOM, UNOPS. For these organizations the partial synthesis approach will be developed and use as reference the evaluation of these organizations programmes implemented in the period 2016-2019.

The UNCT Members with project-based offices not performing programme evaluations in 2019: UN Women, UNODC, FAO, OHCHR, ILO, UNEP. The partial synthesis approach will use the same approach as with the above group of organizations.

The UNCT Members without country presence but participating with certain DPF activities: IAEA, UNCTAD, UNECE, UNESCO, UNIDO, UNWTO. A more detailed partial synthesis approach through consultation with these UN entities and their partners may be undertaken to obtain necessary data.

The Final DPF evaluation in Serbia will follow 3 distinct phases:

1. Preparation and gap analysis - review of the Terms of Reference, preliminary desk review of the existing evaluations, meetings with the UNCT and support the process to produce an Inception Report;
2. Conduct of the evaluation – Field mission including meeting with donors and relevant stakeholders.
3. Follow up – Production of the Final DPF Evaluation Report, and coordination with UNCT to finalize the overall report.

The Final DPF evaluation methodology must meet the gender-related UNEG Norms and Standards and demonstrate effective use of the UNEG Guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality during all phases of the evaluation using the norms of the United Nations System Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP)\(^\text{11}\).

### 8.1 Document review and gap analysis

Unlike the standard evaluations the desk review phase of the DPF evaluation will be crucial for successful accomplishment of its main objectives. The evaluation team should make full use of existing evaluative

evidence to plan the answers to the evaluation questions (including but not limited to the 3 CPEs already underway by UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA). A mapping of all evaluations commissioned by UN agencies in Serbia during the DPF period (2016-2020) has previously been conducted by the UNCT and annexed to the TOR (Annex 2). In this way the primary data gathering of the DPF evaluation team will be focused on filling critical evidence gaps e.g. answering evaluation questions not already answered by existing evaluations.

Due to the broad scope of DPF’s implementation a very large number of documents and reports (published and unpublished) are available for review (a full list of reference documents which will have to be expanded with other relevant sources upon the initial desk review will be provided to the evaluation team). Some may be subject to only a general review while others will require detailed scrutiny. Key sources of information will include joint work plans, results frameworks, annual reports, evaluations and documents related to relevant work of other organizations. UNCT will create an online repository for these documents so that the evaluation team can access all the relevant data before the evaluation mission.

8.2 Stakeholder analysis

Based on the desk review and professional knowledge of the issues, the evaluation team will conduct a stakeholder analysis which will be carried out to identify which stakeholders have not been addressed by the Country Programme Evaluations. With the support of the UNCT, this analysis should be used to ascertain which individuals and organizations need to be included as part of the consultation process during the evaluation mission.

8.3 Production of the Inception Report

Based on the desk review, the consultants will produce an Inception Report (minimum 10 pages excluding annexes) for the overall evaluation. The inception report should outline at a minimum the following issues:

- A clear purpose and scope of the evaluation, which includes a clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and an outline of the main issues to be examined.

- An outline of the evaluation criteria and questions that the evaluation will use to assess performance.

- The evaluation methodology, including the gap analysis and methods used for collecting data and their sources (must include the covered by CPE’s as well as the additional data required, including a rationale for their selection). Data collection tools with an explanation of their reliability and validity. The methodology will take into consideration country-level data limitations.

- An evaluation matrix (in annex to the report) which identifies the key evaluation questions, and an indication of how the team expects these questions to be answered.

- Evaluation Work Plan outlining tasks, a revised schedule of the evaluation milestones and responsibility of the evaluation team members.

8.4 Conduct of the Evaluation

It is imperative that the evaluation method ensures that the perspectives of different stakeholders are captured, and recommendations are validated through the prism of nationally-owned priorities observing UNEG Evaluation Report Standards.

The evaluation team will proceed to structure the data gathering phase with close attention to the gap and stakeholder analysis. Data collection methods must be linked to the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions that are included within the evaluation matrix. The precise data collection methods should be identified following the gap analysis of existing evaluative evidence and administrative data.
The additional data will be gathered using structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews and consultations. In some cases, focus group discussions may be held to capture the dynamic of information sharing and debate, and to enrich the findings. The consultations will involve a range of development stakeholders (including government officials, UNCT members, RCO, donors, NGO, INGOs, and groups of beneficiaries) required to answer the evaluation questions.

Following the field phase a final report will be prepared with the key evaluation outputs include:

Power Point presentation for DPF, the government counterparts and other stakeholders on the preliminary findings, lessons learned, and recommendations

**Draft full report (minimum 35 pages excluding the Executive Summary and Annexes),** covering the issues outlined in the terms of reference and inception report including evaluation findings and conclusions, lessons and recommendations.

Final evaluation report, which should at a minimum include the following components:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- Analysis of the situation with regard to outcome, outputs, resources, partnerships, management and working methods and/or implementation strategy
- Key findings
- Conclusions and practical, actionable recommendations for the DPF successor document implementation
- Annexes including:
  - Evaluation ToR
  - The evaluation matrix
  - Inception report (including gap and stakeholder analysis)
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field interviews
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Online survey and/or questionnaire (if any) used and summary of results
  - Any other relevant material that supports evaluation findings and recommendations

### 8.5 Follow-up and validation

The findings of the evaluation report will be reviewed jointly by Evaluation Steering Committee, (ESC), comprising UNCT and national stakeholders to ensure that the key recommendations are validated and incorporated into the design of new strategic framework. The UNCT will draft a management response outlining how the evaluation findings will be applied, including a timeframe and responsibilities for follow up.

Lessons learned from the evaluation will be extracted and disseminated by the UNCT in order to contribute to strategic planning, learning, advocacy and decision-making at all levels, including for the formulation of the DPF successor document. The full evaluation report will be made public through the UNCT internet platform and shared in the form of electronic and hard copies to the key national stakeholders. The UN Serbia Communication staff will develop suitable visibility materials to communicate the most important DPF evaluation findings to wider audiences.

### 9. Evaluation limitations and challenges

The partial composition/synthesis approach of the final evaluation is an obvious challenge for the effective implementation of the DPF evaluation. The overall success of the DPF evaluation will be dependent in large extend to the quality and timely delivery of the full or preliminary results of the agency Country Programme
Evaluations (CPEs). Unimpeded communication between the Final DPF Evaluation team and the Country Programme Evaluations (CPEs) consultants will be of great significance for the successful conduct of the evaluation but may be beyond the UNCT Serbia influence as the CPE team leaders are also responsible to individual UN agency headquarters.

The Final DPF Evaluation methodology was designed to incorporate the CPE findings to the best possible extent, focusing on the resulting gaps (gap analysis) and paying attention to the UNCT members and DPF stakeholders which were not covered by the programmatic evaluations. Nevertheless, the final DPF evaluation will face a challenge in overcoming the individual agency perspectives and extracting a broader view necessary for the DPF assessment. In that respect the evaluation team may face obstacles in distinguishing the data relevant for the overall DPF assessment from the individual CPE datasets focusing on agency results and supplementing them with the additional relevant sources of information.

Additional challenges will mostly be reflected in providing an overall assessment of UNCT’s contribution versus the attribution of development results, especially in terms of DPF’s sustainability and impact assessment. These issues may be partially overcome by the careful analysis of the UNCT Joint Work Plan achievements (containing detailed output results directly linked to the UN and domestic partner interventions) in comparison to the overall DPF Outcome results structure (Annex 1).

10. Management of the DPF Evaluation

As per UNEG norms and standards, UNDAF evaluations should involve all key stakeholders from the start, in order to bolster ownership and, consequently, use of evaluation findings. The UNDAF TOR guidelines ideally call for creation of the three-tiered evaluation management structure:

The Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC) - the decision-making organ for the UNDAF Evaluation bringing together representatives of the Evaluation Commissioners (UNCT and national counterparts) and possibly other key stakeholders such as national civil society organizations and donor representatives. The ESC supports the management of the evaluation and approves the evaluation deliverables (Interim Report, Draft and Final Reports).

UNDAF Evaluation Management Group (EMG): composed by a staff member of the Resident Coordinator’s Office, two or three monitoring & evaluation officers/focal points from selected resident UN agencies and 1 representative from the national counterparts (the management group should be limited to 5 members max).

In the specific implementation circumstances in the Republic of Serbia, the following arrangements will be considered: The role of the Evaluation Steering Committee will be performed by the DPF/UNDAF JNSC due to adequacy of its composition. The DPF Steering Committee will undertake the oversight of the final evaluation as one of its regular activities per the DPF document.

The role of the UNDAF Evaluation Management group will be undertaken by the UNCT Monitoring and Evaluation group, with optional participation of the government counterpart as/if appropriate.

The Evaluation Reference Group: the reference group will serve as a key advisory entity for the DPF Evaluation. It will be composed of key Govt counterparts, UNCT members, civil society partners etc. The Evaluation Reference Groups will review and comment on inception report, participate in the presentation of preliminary findings, review and comment on the draft evaluation report. Additionally, the Reference Group may enable access to key informants during the evaluation process as necessary.

Evaluation Manager: The UNCT has designated an Evaluation Manager (Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst, UN resident Coordinator’s Office) who will assume the day-to-day responsibilities for managing the evaluation process and serve as the focal point for ensuring the evaluation runs smoothly. Overall, the DPF evaluation will follow a standard process that is established for organizing a major evaluation.
11. Quality Assurance

The **Evaluation Steering Committee** will provide oversight of the evaluation process, exercising quality assurance. The **Evaluation Management Group** will play an important role in providing strategic, methodological and substantive advice into the evaluation process as well as a peer review for the key outputs including the main report. Meetings of the EMG will be specified in the evaluation work plan.

The DPF Evaluation ToR, Evaluation Inception Report and Final Report will be submitted to an independent quality control institution for review and improvement/revision suggestions. The cost of the independent quality control mechanism will be covered by UNCT.

Additionally, the evaluation methodology will be monitored and advised by the UNICEF Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor and UN Women Regional Evaluation Specialist, a member of UN Evaluation Group in consultation with the MEG Serbia team and in consultation with the RCO in Serbia.

The selected consultants will be required to clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches to the DPF evaluation, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process in their proposal.

12. Composition of the Evaluation Team

Given the importance of DPF evaluation and the complexities involved in its design and implementation, it is critical that due time and effort is accorded to recruiting an external evaluation team which will meet the standards to conduct the evaluation. The evaluation team will consist of one team leader and one additional team member (national expert).

The evaluation team leader will lead the entire evaluation process, working closely with UNCT. He/she will conduct the evaluation process in a timely manner and communicate with the EMG on a regular basis and highlight progress made/challenges encountered. The team leader will be responsible for producing high quality inception report and the draft and final evaluation reports in standard English (both the Evaluation Brief and Executive Summary of the Evaluation Report will need to be translated in Serbian at the cost of UNCT). The national consultant will contribute to the evaluation process substantively through data collection and analysis. Team members will share responsibilities for conducting the initial desk review and the field phases of the evaluation.

13. Indicative Time-frame of the Evaluation

The final implementation plan for the evaluation will be outlined in the inception report, but it is expected that the final Evaluation Report should be delivered by ....

**Tentative Evaluation schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Desk review</td>
<td>June 2019 (7 days)</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial meeting and discussions with UNCT</td>
<td>June 2019 (3 days)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>UNC, Team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full desk review including CPE Evaluation results and gap analysis</td>
<td>July 2019 (10 days)</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting/ finalizing</td>
<td>July 2019 (14 days)</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report, outlining evaluation design, initial synthesis and detailed</td>
<td>By end July 2019</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional data collection plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Inception Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country field mission and presentation of the preliminary findings</td>
<td>September (10 days)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Team members and Evaluation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of First draft of full evaluation report (35-40 pages excluding</td>
<td>By 28 October 2019 (14</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Executive summary and annexes)</td>
<td>days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of second draft, following feedback from UNCT</td>
<td>By November 2019</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the Final DPF Evaluation findings and recommendations</td>
<td>Early November (2 Days)</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>All Team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 working days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. 1 Evaluation Budget

The approximate available budget for the evaluation is USD 60,000. The overall budget may increase considering the circumstances related to the current reform of the UN Development Coordination System with further clarification of the procedures for individual agency in-kind and other contributions to the joint UN efforts. A detailed budget breakdown for the individual consultants and operational costs will be developed upon the UNCT adoption of the Final DPF Evaluation TOR.

13.2 Evaluation Team Qualifications

A. Team Leader (International, external)

The team leader will take a lead role during the evaluation and coordinate the work of other team members. The team leader will ensure the quality of the evaluation process, outputs, methodology and timely delivery of all products. The team leader, in close collaboration with the UNCT and the Evaluation Manager, will take the lead role in conceptualization and design of the evaluation and shaping the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report. The tasks of the team leader include:

- Develops an inception report and details the design, methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis criteria for selection of projects, required resources), and work plan of the evaluation team.
• Directs and conducts the research and analysis of all relevant documentation;
• Decides the division of labour within the evaluation team and coordinates team tasks within the framework of the TORs;
• Oversees and quality assures the preparation of the report and takes a lead in the analysis of the evaluative evidence;
• Oversees the administration, and analysis of the results of the data collection exercise;
• Drafts the evaluation report, and coordinates the inputs from team members;
• Prepares for meetings with JNSC, UNCT and other stakeholder to review findings, conclusions and recommendations.
• Leads the stakeholder feedback sessions, briefs JNSC and UNCT on the evaluation through informal sessions and finalizes the report based on feedback from the quality assurance process;
• Delivers the final evaluation report.

Required skills and experience:

• Master’s Degree in a relevant discipline
• At least 10 years of working experience in evaluation of UN’s strategic documents and UN agency country programmes
• Previous experience with regional organizations and the UN system
• Experience with participatory approaches, organizational assessments partnership strategies and capacity development
• Knowledge of relevant human rights issues and ability to identify related problems in their political, ethnic, racial, gender equality and socio-economic dimensions
• Ability to evaluate and integrate information from a variety of sources and assess impact on the human rights and gender equality. Ability to incorporate gender perspectives in all aspects of the evaluation report
• Regional expertise in either Serbia or Western Balkans
• Proven experience as an evaluation team leader with ability to lead and work with other evaluation experts.
• Facilitation skills and ability to manage diversity of views in different development contexts
• Ability to produce well written reports demonstrating analytical ability and communication skills
• Fluent in English

B. Evaluation specialist (National expert, external)

The Evaluation Specialist will provide the expertise in the local development issues with sound understanding of the Serbian social and economic context. The evaluation specialist is expected to Perform the following tasks:

• Review relevant documents
• Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology ad provide inputs o the inception report
• Conduct an analysis of the outcomes, outputs, Join Work Plans and
• Carry out fieldwork and data collection as per the inception report and Terms of Reference
• Draft related parts of the evaluation report as agreed on the division of labor with the team leader
• Assist the Team Leader in finalizing the evaluation final report including incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.
Required skills and experience:

- At least a master’s degree in a relevant field
- Excellent knowledge of Serbia’s development contact and at least seven years work experience in the field of socio-economic analysis in Serbia
- At least 5 years of experience in development evaluation
- Knowledge of relevant human rights issues in Serbia and ability to identify related problems in their political, ethnic, racial, gender equality and socio-economic dimensions
- Ability to evaluate and integrate information from a variety of sources related to the the human rights and gender equality
- Expertise in statistics (Serbia’s context) would be an advantage
- Proven experience in results-based management systems
- Strong quantitative and qualitative research skills
- Good analytical ability and drafting skills
- Excellent coordination and team working skills
- Citizenship of the Republic of Serbia
- Fluent in English
### UNDAF Evaluation Agenda 2019

#### Evaluation Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>W4</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>W4</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase**
- **Initial phase**
  - Design and evaluation team selection
  - Synthesis of available evaluations and desk review
  - Data collection, initial findings
  - Finalization

**Preparation for the UNDAF evaluation**
- Preliminary discussion within NEG
- Recommendations made to the UNCT
- Compile a preliminary list of documentation
- Mapping of Stakeholders
- Integration of UNDAF Guidelines

**Inception phase**
- Finalization of evaluation questions
- Finalization Methodology for Data collection and analysis
- Identification of interviewees, selection and contracts
- Detailed Schedule (detailed workplan for data collection)
- Presentation of methodology and inception report
- Initial review of the CPD evaluation findings
- Desk review, integration of CPD findings

**Field work**
- Interviews, group discussions, data collection
- Debriefing meeting, comments and feedback from key stakeholders

**Report drafting**
- Report drafting
- Draft Report (1st and 2nd version)
- Commenting, Validation workshop
- Final report

**Dissemination and use of and follow up of the evaluation results**
- Develop management response to address evaluation recommendations and follow up with the implementation
- Dissemination (if requested)
### ANNEX 1 - Serbia-UN Results Matrix

#### Serbia-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar I Governance and Rule of Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Priorities For International Assistance**:
B1 Justice Sector, B2 Home Affairs Sector, B3 Public Administration Reform Sector, B12 Civil Society Organizations Thematic Area

**EU Integration**: Copenhagen criteria (Political), Judiciary and Fundamental Rights (23); Justice, Freedom and Security (24);

**SDGs**: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (16); Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls (5); Reduce inequality within and among countries (10)

---

#### Outcome 1.
**By 2020, people in Serbia, especially vulnerable groups, have their human rights protected and have improved access to justice and security**

1.1 Percentage of successfully implemented recommendations of human rights mechanisms of the United Nations

Baseline: TBD for UPR and each Convention
Target: 80% implementation of recommendations

1.2 Percentage of implemented recommendations made by the independent oversight bodies to state administration bodies

Baseline: 368 recommendations (2013), an unknown quantum of which implemented
Target: 90% rate of implementation

1.3 Percentage of complaints addressed to the Ombudsman related to the violation of rights of vulnerable or stigmatized groups (gender equality, rights of persons deprived of their liberty, rights of persons with disabilities, children's rights and minority rights), which are acted upon by these institutions, out of the total number of complaints submitted

Baseline: In the course of 2014 the Ombudsman office received a total of

---

1.1 Review of Government of the Republic of Serbia reports to human rights mechanisms

1.1 UN treaty body’s reports covering the progress for the provided recommendations

1.2 Report of the Government of the Republic of Serbia to the National Assembly stating the number of implemented and non-implemented recommendations of the independent state oversight institutions

- Annual Report of the Ombudsman
- Annual Report of the Commissioner for Protection of Equality
- Annual Report of the Commissioner for Information of Public Importance and Personal Data Protection
- Annual Report of the Anti-Corruption Agency

---

**Assumptions**:
- Sustained commitment to governance reforms and ratified human rights commitments
- State budget allocations
- The newly established
- Council for the monitoring of implementation of recommendations of the UN human rights treaty bodies is fully functional and fulfils its mandate

---


14 Implementation of UPR recommendations to be understood as substantively elaborated by Special Procedures, Treaty Body recommendations and other relevant information arising from the international human rights system.

15 CRC and CEDAW - the baseline of “% implemented in 2014” the information will be available when the Council for monitoring of implementation of recommendations of the UN HR mechanisms (established in December 2014) starts working
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Number of civil society organizations or entities engaging international human rights review machinery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 31 Serbian civil society organizations providing or joining inputs to 2nd Serbia Universal Periodic Review <strong>Target:</strong> 34 Serbian civil society organizations are engaged with the international human rights review machinery, with a particular focus on local and/or vulnerable or stigmatized groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Official track record of organized crime preventive measures and regulations established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> Actionable data on preventive measures and regulations collection currently based on individual projects <strong>Target:</strong> Official track record of regulations and preventive measures at national level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Percentage of cases lasting over 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) When criminal offender is a juvenile (14-17 years of age) <strong>Baseline:</strong> 44% of cases last over 1 year in 2013 <strong>Target:</strong> less than 20% of cases last over 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) When the victim of the crime is a child: <strong>Baseline:</strong> 43.3% of cases last over 1 year in 2013 <strong>Target:</strong> Less than 20% of cases last over 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) when criminal offender is an adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 These targets will be defined in the Biannual Work Plan, approved by the Joint National Steering Committee
## Serbia-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</strong></td>
<td><strong>Means of Verification</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risks and Assumptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. % of applied diversionary schemes in relation to total number of criminal charges against juvenile offenders:</td>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 5.3% in 2013 <strong>Target:</strong> 20% in 2020</td>
<td><strong>1.7. Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assumptions:</strong> Sustained commitment to public administration reform and e-Government development coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. The number of asylum applications processed and number of quality, merits-based decisions, rendered by the competent authorities</td>
<td><strong># of application processed: baseline: 17 in 2014, target: 2000</strong> <strong># of quality, merits-based decisions: baseline: 6 in 2014, target: 2000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8 UNHCR reporting in cooperation with MoI, Commissariat for Refugees and Migrations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong> Incorrect data and lack of database updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Number of final judgments on corruption of all cases with elements of corruption</td>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> <strong>Target:</strong> TBD for 2014 Annual increase of final judgements up to 20%</td>
<td><strong>1.9 NAD and Serbia’s Supreme Court of Cassation Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong> Lack of clear legal framework for work with electronic documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>By 2020, governance institutions at all levels have enhanced accountability and representation to provide better quality services to people and the economy</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1 Open Budget Index</strong> <strong>Baseline:</strong> 39 (2012), 41 (2014); <strong>Target:</strong> (2020): 55</td>
<td><strong>Assumptions:</strong> State budget allocations Human resource allocation Inter-ministerial coordination and cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 %Change in governance Indicators for Serbia</td>
<td><strong>a) WB Governance Effectiveness Index</strong> <strong>Baseline:</strong> 2013: -0.10 <strong>Target:</strong> 0.4</td>
<td><strong>2.1 Ministry of Finance reports, International Budget Partnership (every two years)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong> Incorrect data and lack of database updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Progress of implementation of Public Administration Reform Action Plan and Open Government Action Plan</td>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 0 <strong>Target (2020):</strong> 100% implemented(^{17})</td>
<td><strong>2.3 Ministry in charge of public administration (annual)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong> Lack of clear legal framework for work with electronic documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 % of eGovernment Strategy implemented</td>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 0</td>
<td><strong>2.4 Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self Government, Directorate for eGovernment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) Target will be adjusted in the context of the Biannual Work Plan, approved by the Joint National Steering Committee
### Serbia-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;By 2020, state institutions and other relevant actors enhance gender equality and enable women and girls, especially those from vulnerable groups, to live lives free from discrimination and violence</td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> At least 25% of the strategy measures implemented by end 2017; 75% implemented by 2019 &lt;br&gt;2.5% of citizens declaring trust in the Parliament &lt;br&gt;Baseline (2013): 24% &lt;br&gt;Target (2020): 45% &lt;br&gt;2.6 Corruption Perception Index &lt;br&gt;Baseline: 41 (78/175); Target: increase in the index by 2020 to 50 percentage points &lt;br&gt;2.7 % of SDG indicators on which government institutions collect data that are disaggregated by at least 2 potential markers of disparity &lt;br&gt;Baseline: TBD &lt;br&gt;Target: TBD &lt;br&gt;3.1 Number of recommendations by the UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) to Government of the Republic of Serbia substantively acted upon &lt;br&gt;Baseline: 36 numbered recommendations in most recent CEDAW review of Serbia &lt;br&gt;Target: All recommendations effectively and substantively implemented</td>
<td><strong>Means of Verification:</strong> Report (annual) &lt;br&gt;2.5 UNDP Public opinion poll, every two years &lt;br&gt;2.6 Transparency International, annual &lt;br&gt;2.7 Web-based Government of the Republic of Serbia SDG reporting platform &lt;br&gt;- Reports of respective State Agency/Ministry</td>
<td><strong>Risks and Assumptions:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Absence of mechanisms which would oblige the public administration to provide services through the E-government portal&lt;br&gt;- Commitment of the Government and the Coordination Body for Gender Equality to gender equality and gender mainstreaming across sectors&lt;br&gt;- Inter-sectoral coordination and cooperation&lt;br&gt;- Government bodies do not have sufficient human resources to complete the tasks&lt;br&gt;- Inadequate state budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 These targets will be defined in the Biannual Work Plan, approved by the Joint National Steering Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Baseline:** since 2006 to 2013 the progressive increase of registered cases (3441 cases registered in 2006; 9877 cases in 2013)  
**Target:** 50% increase of registered cases of domestic violence by social protection system | **Baseline:** TBD 2015  
**Target:** Increase by 40% | 3.3 Government of the Republic of Serbia Reports  
3.4 Ministerial and Secretariats’ budget reports  
Ministry of Finance/Secretariat of Finance reports | allocations for GE priorities |
| 3.3 Existence of consolidated and functional institutional gender mechanisms at the national and sub-national levels (Y/N) | 3.5 Number of Romani women and women with disabilities who are Members of Parliament.  
**Baseline:** 0 Romani women and women with disabilities Members of Parliament  
**Target:** Number of Romani women and women with disabilities Members of Parliament reflective of percentage representation in public-at-large | 3.5 National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia-gender structure | |

---

**In Serbia, GEMs are still not consolidated and functional institutional mechanisms. The changes occurred in course of 2014 showed that these recently established gender equality mechanisms can be easily downgraded and even closed. Thus, having consolidated and functional institutions with clear mandate for work in gender equality is to be considered in case of Serbia as an outcome level result i.e institutional change.**
### Serbia-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar II Social and Human Resources Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Priorities For International Assistance</strong>&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;: B8 Human Resources and Social Development Sector, B3 Public Administration Reform Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EU Integration</strong>: Social Policy and Employment (19) and Consumer and health protection (28), and Environment (27); Education and Culture (26); Justice and Fundamental Rights (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDGs</strong>&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;: End poverty in all its forms everywhere (1); Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages (3); Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all (4); Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls (5); Reduce inequality within and among countries (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome 4.
By 2020, high quality, inclusive, equitable, gender-sensitive, and age appropriate health services that protect patient rights are available and utilized by all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1 Full immunization coverage&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt; for children aged 24-35 months from the general population (GP) and children from Roma settlements</th>
<th>4.2 Prevalence of modern contraceptive methods among women (15-49) who are married or in union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>Target</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma settlements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>Target</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>Target</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assumption:
- Sustained political and budget support to expand quality and coverage of health services, especially for vulnerable groups and underserved areas

<sup>20</sup> National Priorities For International Assistance (NAD) 2014-2017 with Projections Until 2020 and National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis Communautaire 2014-2018, Serbia-EU Accession Plan


<sup>22</sup>Percent of children receiving full immunization (as recommended by the national vaccination calendar)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.3 Private households’ out-of-pocket payments on health as % of total health expenditure (disaggregated by male headed and female headed households) | **Baseline:** 37.1 (2012)  
**Target:** 35 | 4.3 Institute of Public Health of Serbia report /NHA(National Health Account) | |
| 4.4 National Public Health Strategy addressing the reduction of health inequities and other aspects of the right to the highest attainable standards of physical and mental health developed and under implementation | **Baseline:** NPHS to be developed  
**Target:** Strategy adopted and implementation started | 4.4 Government of the Republic of Serbia (Government of the Republic of Serbia) Official Gazette and Program monitoring reports | |
| 4.5 Age standardized premature mortality rate for CVD (cardiovascular diseases), cancer and injuries | **Baseline:**  
Total 84.7 (2012)  
Male 122.8  
Female 48.9  
**Target:**  
Total 75  
Male 105  
Female 40  
**a.** SDR (standardized death rate), diseases of circulatory system, 0-64 per 100 000  
**Baseline:**  
Total 103.2 (2012)  
Male 120.9  
Female 105  
**Target:**  
Total 90  
Male 105  
Female | 4.5 WHO Health for All Data Base  
4.5 Institute of Public Health of Serbia report | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.6 Ministry of Health and Institute of Public Health of Serbia, National health survey Serbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Percentage of population:</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 Ministry of Health and Institute of Public Health of Serbia, National health survey Serbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. With daily smoking habits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline:</td>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.9 (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline:</td>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.7 (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. With daily consumption of alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline:</td>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Percentage of overweight and obese population according to their BMI (body mass index)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline:</td>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight BMI&gt;25 kg/m2)</td>
<td>22.5 (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese obesity (BMI&gt;30 kg/m2)</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Life time prevalence of illicit drugs among the general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Ministry of Health and Institute of Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Outcomes</td>
<td>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
<td>Risks and Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2020, an efficient education system is established that enables relevant, quality, inclusive and equitable education to all, particularly the most vulnerable, and increases learning and social outcomes</td>
<td>5.1 % Children 3 to 4 years enrolled in pre-school education</td>
<td>4.8. Institute of Public Health – administrative data</td>
<td>- Continued commitment of the Government of the Republic of Serbia to obligations stemming from ratified international conventions, i.e. CRC, CEDAW, CRPD, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (2014): Total 50.2%</td>
<td>Total (2019): 75%</td>
<td>- State allocates more funds to enhance quality education and human capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 51.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>- State policy focused on alignment with international standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 48.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roma 5.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poorest 9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline: Total (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 % of pupils 15 yrs old with low competencies (bellow level 2 on PISA test scale 2012) in literacy, mathematics science and problem solving</td>
<td>5.2. PISA report (2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline: Total (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Means of Verification:**
- Health of Serbia, National health survey Serbia

**Risks and Assumptions:**
- Continued commitment of the Government of the Republic of Serbia to obligations stemming from ratified international conventions, i.e. CRC, CEDAW, CRPD, etc.
- State allocates more funds to enhance quality education and human capital
- State policy focused on alignment with international standards
## Serbia-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MoEd enforces policies and provides adequate supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading 33.2%  
- <25%  
- Mathematical 38.9%  
- Scientific 35%  
- Problem solving 28.5%  
- <25%

### 5.3 % of schools achieving quality standards on the level 3 and 4
- Baseline: 40 (2012)  
- Target: 70 (2020)

### 5.4 % Participation of vulnerable groups in each level of education
- Baseline: 5.3 Ministry of Education reports
- Target (2020):
  - a) Primary school completion rate
    - Total: 93.4  
    - Female: 97.9  
    - Male: 90.4  
    - Roma: 64.0 (2014)  
    - Target: 98  
    - Female: 98  
    - Male: 98  
  - b) Secondary school attendance rate
    - Total: 89.1  
    - Female: 93.0  
    - Male: 86.0  
    - Poorest: 74  
    - Roma: 21.6  
    - Male: 35

### 5.4.a)
- SORS  
- Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS)

### 5.4.b)
- SORS  
- Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 % Women and % men (25-64) covered by adult education and lifelong learning programmes</td>
<td>Baseline: 3.6 (2012)</td>
<td>Target: 7.0 (2020)</td>
<td>5.5. SORS, Adult Education Survey in the Republic of Serbia, LFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 % households from the poorest quintile receiving financial social assistance</td>
<td>Baseline: 10.7% (2014)</td>
<td>Target: 30%</td>
<td>6.1. - Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) - SILC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 No. of municipalities that offer community services, in compliance with social welfare law, particularly for vulnerable groups: a) Children with disabilities, b) older persons</td>
<td>Baseline: 94</td>
<td>Target: 130</td>
<td>6.2. -Republic Institute of Social Protection -Municipal reports - Programme reports - Periodic qualitative review with partners – Mapping of community based services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Number of children with disability in institutional care</td>
<td>Baseline: 534</td>
<td>Target: 374 (30% reduction)</td>
<td>6.3. Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veterans and Social Affairs' information system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Number of municipalities that implement local protocols for protection of children from violence, abuse and neglect</td>
<td>Baseline: Children</td>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>6.4. Assessment of the implementation of the local protocols 6.4 Program reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 6. By 2020, the social welfare system is strengthened to provide timely, holistic and continued support to individuals and families at risk and enable them to live in a safe, secure, supportive family and community environment
### Serbia-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.5 Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Affairs, Ministry of Health Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5 Percentage of newly developed population policies that are evidence based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
<td>Target: 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Serbian-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

### Pillar III Economic Development, Growth, and Employment

**National Priorities For International Assistance (NAD)**: B4 Competitiveness Sector, B9 Agriculture and Rural Development Sector

**EU Integration**: Taxation (16), Economic and monetary policy (17), Social policy and employment (19); Financial services (9), Enterprise and Industrial policy (20), Science and Research (25)

**SDGs**: End Poverty in all forms, everywhere (1); Promote inclusive, sustainable, economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all (8); Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster Innovation (9); Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns (12)

**Outcome 7**

By 2020, there is an effective enabling environment that promotes sustainable livelihoods and economic development, focused on an inclusive labour market and decent job creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.1 Employment rate, disaggregated by sex, age, rural/urban, vulnerable groups</th>
<th>7.1 Statistical Office RS - LFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline: Employment rate National (15-64) 50.4 (2014)</td>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: TBD</td>
<td>- State budget allocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


## Serbia-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women (15-64)</strong></td>
<td>43.6 (2014) TBD(^{26})</td>
<td>7.2 Labour Force Survey, Statistical Office of the RS</td>
<td>- Worsening recession in major EU markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young people (15-24) 14.9(2014) TBD(^{27})</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact of natural disasters (floods; droughts etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 % Young people who are not employed and not in education or training (NEET) Baseline: 18-24 yrs 26.5 (2014) Target: 15% (2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Even if Serbia improves its business environment that does not mean automatically an improvement in the Doing Business ranking since other countries might be improving as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Share of value-added products in total value of Agriculture and Food exports Baseline: 22.3% (2013) Target: 25% (2020)</td>
<td>7.3 Ministry of Agriculture and Environment reports</td>
<td>- There is a time-lag between legislative changes that matter for the good business environment and actual outcomes (as defined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4 Share of unemployed persons from the National Employment Service in the ALMP measures compared to the total number of the unemployed persons registered in the National Employment Service at the annual level. Baseline: (2014) 14.6% Target: TBD(^{28})</td>
<td>7.4 Reports on National Employment Action Plan implementation - Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs.</td>
<td>- Political commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 Change in Serbia’s Ease of Doing Business ranking Baseline: 93 [2014] Target: TBD(^{29})</td>
<td>7.5 Ease of Doing Business Index (World Bank)</td>
<td>- Availability of national and local financing resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6 Quality of the Research and Development base to pursue economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Administrative capacities at national and local level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{25}\) These targets will be defined in the Biannual Work Plan, approved by the Joint National Steering Committee  
\(^{26}\) These targets will be defined in the Biannual Work Plan, approved by the Joint National Steering Committee  
\(^{27}\) These targets will be defined in the Biannual Work Plan, approved by the Joint National Steering Committee  
\(^{28}\) These targets will be defined in the Biannual Work Plan, approved by the Joint National Steering Committee  
\(^{29}\) These targets will be defined in the Biannual Work Plan, approved by the Joint National Steering Committee
### Serbia-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Quality of scientific research institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baseline: 3.7/69  
Target: 4.3/38 | 7.6 a) Global Competitiveness Index (12.02) |  |
| b) University-industry collaboration in R&D |  
Baseline: 3.2/95  
Target: 3.7/59 | 7.6 b) Global Competitiveness Index (12.04) |  |

### Pillar IV Environment, Climate Change and Resilient Communities

**National Priorities For International Assistance (NAD)** 30: 86 Environment and Climate Change Sector, 85 Energy Sector, 88 Human Resources and Social Development Sector  
**EU Integration:** Energy (15); Environment (27); Foreign, Security, and Defence Policy (31)  
**SDGs** 31: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (7); Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable (11); Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (13); Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss (15)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outcome 8. By 2020, there are improved capacities to combat climate change and manage natural resources and communities are more resilient to the effects of natural and man-made disasters** | 8.1 N° Sector policies, strategies and regulations that integrate climate change adaptation and disaster risk management in agriculture, water, forestry, tourism and health sectors  
Baseline: 0  
Target: 5  
| 8.1 Reports of the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment  
- Programme reports | **Assumptions:**  
- Continued emphasis on energy efficiency agenda and GhG reductions  
- Investments in GHG emission reduction and adaptation to climate change  
- State budget allocations for national and municipal DRR investments  
- State budget allocations, esp. for municipal pilots  
Continued commitment to increase in use of energy from renewable sources  
Government is willing to pursue risk re-education oriented national disaster management system; | **Risks:**  
- Economic downturn  
Lack of awareness and - policy commitment and support to tackling climate change |
| 8.2 Number of actions implemented under the (1) national climate change strategy and (2) national environmental protection programme  
Baseline: 0  
Target: 5  
| 8.2 Programme reports  
- Periodic qualitative review with partners |  | **Assumptions:**  
- State budget allocations  
Policy commitment and support |
| 8.3 Share of renewable energy in GFEC (Gross Final Energy Consumption)  
Baseline: 21.2% (2009)  
Target: 27%  
| 8.3 Report of the Ministry of Mining and Energy |  |  |
| 8.4 % Primary and Secondary schools that offer educational program on risk reduction, and safety in disasters and emergencies  
Baseline: 0  
Target: 70%  
| 8.4 Ministry of Education |  |  |
| 8.5 National disaster early warning management system operational and tested routinely  
Baseline: No  
Target: Yes  
| 8.5 Ministry of Interior reports |  |  |
| 8.6 % of municipalities that conduct gender-sensitive risk assessments, prepare and conduct local gender-sensitive DRM plans  
Baseline: 2% (2014)  
Target: 60%  
| 8.6 Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia and local official gazettes  
EU Progress Reports |  |  |
| 8.7 Number of cadastres of environmental hotspots in the country  
Baseline: 0  
Target: 2  
| 8.7 Reports from MoF, MoERD, MoME, MoAEP,... |  |  |
### 8.8 Reduction in final energy consumption in comparison to 2008

**Baseline (2010-2013):** 2.587%

**Target (2010-2018):** 9%

### 8.9 Average annual concentration of particulate matter <10µm (PM 10) in the capital, µg/m³

**Baseline:** 50.9 (2011)

**Target:** 45

### 8.10 Number of initiatives contributed to improving the road safety that addresses road safety management system

**Baseline:** 0

**Target:** 2

- **Means of Verification:**
  - 8.8 Energy Efficiency Action Plan of Republic of Serbia
  - 8.9 WHO Health for All Database

- **Risks and Assumptions:**
  - Regulatory system established
  - Secured investment funding
  - National Environmental Protection Programme Action Plan created and adopted

---

### Pillar V Culture and Development
## Serbia-UN Results Matrix [2016-2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators, Baselines, Targets</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Priorities For International Assistance (NAD)</strong>&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;: B10 Culture Thematic Area, B2 Home Affairs Sector, B4 Competitiveness Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EU Integration</strong>: Education and Culture (26); Information Society and Media (10), Free movement of goods (1); Customs union (29), Entrepreneurship and industry policy (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDGs</strong>&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all (8), make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable (11), Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome 9

**By 2020, Serbia has inclusive policies ensuring an enhanced cultural industries sector, promoting cultural diversity and managing cultural and natural heritage as a vehicle for sustainable development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.1 % of the measures of the action plan the cultural strategy effectively implemented</th>
<th>9.1 Ministry of Culture and Information Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.2 No. Government of the Republic of Serbia initiatives to promote cultural diversity, and investment in cultural industries, including the management of cultural heritage sites</th>
<th>9.2 EU Progress report; Periodic qualitative review with partners, regular quadrennial reports on implementation of 2005 Convention, submitted until 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.3 % of total annual budget that is allocated to the cultural sector</th>
<th>9.3 Ministry of Finance reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> TBD 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.4 No. New enterprises offering services to tourists at cultural sites</th>
<th>9.4 The Serbian Business Registers Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 5,000 (estimation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 5,250 (5% increase of baseline)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.5 No of measures implemented to improve the systems to identify, investigate, and fight the illicit trafficking of cultural property</th>
<th>9.5 Ministry of Interior reports Periodic review against legal/ policy framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 5 measures implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Annex 2: List of additional evaluations conducted by the UNCT agencies in the current UNDAF/DPF (2016-2020) period.

**Evaluations Conducted by the UNICEF Serbia Country Office 2014-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td><strong>Summative Evaluation of Child Care Reform in Serbia</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluations Conducted by UN Women Serbia and UN Issue based Coalition for gender Equality for Europe and Central Asia 2014-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>Desk Review of 18 UNDAFs in Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Desk Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluations Conducted by the UNDP Serbia 2014-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Environment, Climate Change and Resilient Communities</td>
<td>Analysis and assessment of the results of the project “Capacity Building and Strategic Partnerships for Chemicals Safety in the Republic of Serbia”</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Environment, Climate Change and Resilient Communities</td>
<td>Analysis and assessment of the results of the project “Capacity Building and Strategic Partnerships for Chemicals Safety in the Republic of Serbia”</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Environment, Climate Change and Resilient Communities</td>
<td>Increased Resilience to Respond to Emergency Situations Project</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Environment, Climate Change and Resilient Communities</td>
<td>Reducing Barriers to Accelerate the Development of Biomass Markets in Serbia</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Governance and Rule of Law</td>
<td>FINAL REPORT of the National Strategy for Preventing and Combating Violence against Women in Family and in Intimate Partner Relations</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Environment, Climate Change and Resilient</td>
<td>Removing Barriers to Promote and Support Energy Management Systems in Municipalities throughout Serbia</td>
<td>Mid-term Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Support to Local Response to Refugee Crisis</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>