



**The European Union's "2007/145-210" Project
for the WBT Region**

**Service Contract for a Monitoring system of the
implementation of Projects and Programmes of External Co-
operation financed by the European Community
Lot 6: Western Balkans & Turkey**

**Synthesis Report on
*Components of EU Funded
Regional Projects in Bosnia and
Herzegovina monitored in the
Period January to June 2010***

July 2010



This project is funded by
the European Union



A project implemented by
ICCS-NTUA Consortium
ICCS-NTUA (EPU) -INTEGRATION -ECORYS - TMS

DISCLAIMER

This report has been produced in the frame of a project funded by the European Union. The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of the Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) WBT Team and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

It is recalled that the ROM system focuses on individual projects and is solely designed to measure their individual performance, within the overall frame of the Project Cycle Management (PCM) approach. Its methodology and criteria have not been thought for (foreseen?), nor tailored to allow drawing more general findings, conclusions or recommendations on any higher or wider level, such as sectors, countries or regions.

For this reason, attention is drawn to the fact that such more general findings and conclusions, formulated in this Synthesis Report, should be considered as indicative only, without any statistical validity or reliability whatsoever.

REPORT COVER PAGE

Project Title	“Service Contract for a Monitoring system of the Implementation of Projects and Programmes of External Co-operation financed by the European Community - Lot 6: Western Balkans & Turkey”
Country	Bosnia and Herzegovina

Date of report:	08 July 2010
Authors of report:	Kyriakos Argyroudis, Regional Team Leader, Sarajevo Katerina-Maria Sourouni, KOMIS Manager
QA of report:	Athanasios Papakonstantinou, Quality Manager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. ACHIEVEMENTS	4
1.1. OVERVIEW OF OUTPUTS	4
2. ANALYSIS OF ROM RESULTS.....	5
2.1. OPERATIONAL CONCLUSIONS	5
2.2. PERFORMANCE CONCLUSIONS	9
 ANNEX I: List of Monitored Projects	

1. ACHIEVEMENTS

1.1. Overview of outputs

During the period from 01/01/2010 to 30/06/2010, the following have been achieved with regard to the monitoring of projects:

20 regional projects were monitored:

- 5 projects monitored only at the regional level (Project Coordinator)
- 15 projects monitored also in the involved countries including BA

120 project-visits were implemented in total, of which 15 in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

119 monitoring reports were submitted, on 19 regional projects. The outputs from one mission to a regional project monitored only at the regional level are at the stage of quality control and finalisation, the deadline for their submission being later than the date of issuance of the present Synthesis Report.

Projects from 15 specified sectors (at CRS level code) were monitored:

- 1 project in 14020 - Water supply and sanitation - large systems
- 3 projects in 15130 - Legal and judicial development
- 1 project in 15140 - Government administration
- 1 project in 15150 - Strengthening civil society
- 1 project in 15160 - Human Rights
- 1 project in 15200 - Conflict prevention and resolution, peace and security
- 1 project in 15210 - Security system management and reform
- 1 project in 16010 - Social welfare services
- 2 projects in 16062 - Statistical capacity building
- 1 project in 25010 - Business support services and institutions
- 1 project in 33120 - Trade facilitation
- 2 projects in 41010 - Environmental policy and administrative management
- 2 projects in 43010 - Multisector aid
- 1 project in 72030 - Aid to refugees (in recipient country)
- 1 project in 74010 - Disaster prevention and preparedness

The total budget covered was € 61,883,095.00.

The average size of the monitored projects was € 3,094,154.70.

2. ANALYSIS OF ROM RESULTS

2.1. Operational Conclusions

Best Practices

This section highlights the examples of best practices identified among the projects monitored. In order to identify candidate projects and single out best practices, the following 4-stage method was applied:

Stage 1: Draw up a "shortlist" of all "very good" projects, having a general average score above 3,00.

Stage 2: Select all projects which have at least one "A" grade.

Stage 3: Remove all projects which have "C" or "D" grade.

Table 1: Short-listed success stories in selected period

#	Title	Horizontal / BA Component						Average Score	% of excellence
			Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability		
1	Social Inclusion: Regional support to marginalised communities	Horizontal	B	A	B	B	B	3.00	67 %
		BA Component	B	A	B	B	B	3.38	79 %
2	Regional programme for refugee return and provision of durable solutions for refugees and internally displaced persons (IDP) in the Western Balkans	Horizontal	B	B	C	A	B	2.85	62 %
		BA Component	B	B	A	B	B	3.31	77 %
3	Support for implementing Cross Border Institution Building (CBIB) Phase II in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo under UNSCR 1244/99	Horizontal	B	A	B	B	B	3.23	74 %
		BA Component	B	A	B	B	B	3.13	71 %

In the table above, the projects which constitute success stories in BA are presented; the respective scoring at the level of the Horizontal MR for the whole project are presented in gray, to provide the complete picture.

Stage 4: Identify the success stories in terms of design quality, sound operational set-up and expected results.

The Following table provides short profiles of the two selected projects (success stories) and presents comments on the reasons for success:

Table 2: Success Stories

Project Title	Social Inclusion: Regional support to marginalised communities
Domain	IPA
Sector	15160 - Human rights
Intervention Logic	Overall Objective: To contribute to the social inclusion of RAE and other marginalised groups and to their full enjoyment of citizenship rights in the region of the WB, as well as to the prevention and reduction of statelessness in the WB region. Project Purpose: To reduce the number of persons at risk of statelessness which particularly affects the RAE population, especially those displaced during the conflicts in the region; To provide free legal assistance for obtaining personal documents for RAE and other marginalised groups as an essential condition for enjoyment of citizenship rights as well as accessing basic socio-economic rights; To increase awareness of the RAE and other relevant stakeholders of the need for civil registration and documentation, as well as the need for removing unnecessary legal aid administrative obstacles associated with registration; To increase the availability of baseline data in the region on the scope and causes of statelessness and related risks of statelessness. Expected Results:1) Number of registered persons belonging to RAE

	<p>communities and other minorities in the region increased; 2) Number of registrations within prescribed time period increased; 3) Number of delivered personal IDs increased; 4) Number of persons at risk of statelessness reduced; 5) Access to personal documents and citizenships for persons belonging to RAE communities and other minorities in the region increased; 6) Number of individuals provided with legal aid on accessing basic social and civil rights increased; 7) Access to citizenship and basic socio-economic rights for persons belonging to RAE communities in the region increased through free legal assistance; 8) Awareness among RAE communities increased through various information dissemination activities on the civil registration process; 9) Awareness among relevant authorities, stakeholders and general public regarding civil registration, personal documents and naturalization increased; 10) Awareness and participation of RAE communities in the civil registration process increased; 11) Legal frameworks, administrative procedures and services regarding access to documents, civil registration and acquisition of citizenship improved; 12) Response and processing time of civil registration cases in the administrative and court proceedings decreased; 13) Capacity of stakeholders in particular administrative authorities in dealing with RAE communities increased; 14) Response and cooperation of authorities and other stakeholders in civil registration / naturalization processes and realization of rights for the RAE increased; 15) Availability of information on the scope and causes of remaining de facto statelessness and lack of civil registration and personal documents in the MK and HR increased; 16) Coordination and information exchange between UNHCR and implementing partners (IP) involved improved; 17) regional coordination among IPs through coordination meetings, exchange of PI materials and issuance of documents for applicants in other countries than the issuing country improved.</p>
Horizontal Key issues	<p>The project is relevant to the needs of the WB region and has been implemented efficiently in the participating countries, achieving already visible results. It can be considered as quite useful as it provides a key service to vulnerable beneficiaries and its progress is considerable. The UNHCR and the Implementing Partners (IPs) are well experienced, competent and committed to the project's success. A 3rd phase was recommended by the assistant programme officer of UNHCR, in order to allow governments to address changes in the legal and administrative framework. Such a follow up is needed to ensure project sustainability and support RAE in obtaining the status of aliens with permanent residence in the beneficiary countries. The Monitors suggested to the EC and the UNHCR to discuss the possibility for the continuation of the project in the first SC meeting in Brussels in April 2010, and to the UNCHR Office in Brussels to: 1) develop a phase out strategy, in case the project is not continued; 2) prepare comprehensive Progress Reports that will include detailed provision of inputs; 3) further elaborate the LF in order to define quantified indicators at the level of PP. The Contractor was recommended to strengthen the exchange of information with the EC Task Manager in Brussels on the project related issues.</p>
BA Key issues	<p>Overall progress of the project could be considered as very good. The Contractor was only recommended to strengthen the exchange with the EUD in Bosnia and Herzegovina on the project related issues, especially in the field of advocacy and a new legislation lobbying related activities. Awareness-raising among Roma should be conducted on a regular basis, and the issue should be closely followed at the local level.</p>
Project Title	Regional programme for refugee return and provision of durable solutions for refugees and internally displaced persons (IDP) in the Western Balkans
Domain	IPA
Sector	72030 - Aid to refugees (in recipient country)
Intervention Logic	<p>Overall Objective: 1) Foster and enhance durable solutions across the region [...] for remaining persons in displacement in BA, HR, ME, RS and KOS. 2) In coordination with EC and OSCE support and monitor the implementation of the political process initiated with the Sarajevo Declaration in 2005 aiming at settlement of outstanding issues pertaining to displacement in the region. Project Purpose: 1) Promote and support the safe and dignified voluntary repatriation to place of origin of refugees in BA, HR, ME and RS through logistic support, public information dissemination, and legal advice, information and assistance, as well as through technical support to the countries to complete their national Road Maps. 2) Support the Governments of the 3 countries with local integration of refugees and IDPs and HR with reintegration of returnees. 3) Promote safe and dignified voluntary repatriation of IDPs from RS to KOS through public information dissemination. 4) Increase capacity of local NGO partners to enable them to improve the quality of their performance and standardise the approach in provision of legal assistance and other assistance related to achieving durable solutions for persons of UNHCR concern in the region. Expected Results: 1) Persons of concern to UNHCR empowered and able to get on with their lives where security and political conditions permit. 2) Returnees and refugees provided with information and legal advice,</p>

	<p>assistance and counseling. 3) Refugees assisted with return and voluntary repatriation. 4) Operational legal framework for local integration in HR and assistance with local integration of refugees in all beneficiary countries. 5) Refugees and IDPs in RS and beyond informed on their rights and related issues. 6) Increased capacities of local partner NGOs to provide legal aid and enhance their sustainability. 7) Enhanced regional coordination, collaboration and visibility in the area of repatriation and the 3x4 process.</p>
<p>Horizontal Key issues</p>	<p>The Monitors' suggestions were: EU: 1) Drop insistence on a political consensus and focus on practical steps towards achieving durable solutions. 2) Take the lead in launching a true "regional" programme that can coordinate and integrate both regional and national programmes targeting the achievement of "alternative solutions" for the remaining refugees and IDPs in the WB. 3) Consider applying the multi donor regional "facility" concept in the area of refugees and IDPs. 4) Support the initiative taken by BiH and supported by Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia for a regional cooperation project aimed at closing all remaining collective centres. EU, UNHCR, OSCE and CoE: 1) Embark on a coordinated programme assisting the partner governments in following up on the Conference. EC and EUDs: 1) Improve coordination. EC: 1) Support the implementation, for instance through a robust regional programme, of the outstanding issues identified in the Joint Discussion Paper including: a) establishing a joint statistical framework, b) civil status, c) OTR with emphasis on establishing a "fair settlement mechanisms", d) convalidation, e) property reconstruction, f) repossession of land, g) re-opening of the deadline of HCP in Croatia and improvement of its application, h) housing and local integration for those who do not wish to return, i) access to and exercise of economic and social rights in particular through combating discrimination, and j) prosecution for war crimes. 2) Enhance pro-activity and activate existing joint mechanisms such as the Western Balkans Investment Framework (WBIF) and the EU-funded facilities IPF 1 and IPF 2 in assisting beneficiary countries in preparing projects in the field of a) closure of the collective centres; b) reconstruction of remaining properties; c) social housing for refugees and IDPs, d) electrification, water supply, sanitation and transport infrastructure for refugee and IDP settlements. 3) Support further institution building at the regional, national and local (municipalities) level in the area of refugees and IDPs. 4) Assess the UNCHR Participatory Assessment tool and, if relevant, promote its application by other EU-funded interventions in the area of migration and asylum in general and refugees and IDPs in particular. EC and UNHCR: 1) Ensure integration of both logframes and enhance them once more in line with specific ROM recommendations. 2) Ensure a stronger role of beneficiary countries in future programming and project design in the area of refugees and IDPs. 3) Strengthen the regional dimension in the Programme. 4) Agree on an extension of the Programme with 1 year and with a budget of 1 MEUR. 5) Enhance and highlight mainstreaming of crosscutting issues such as gender and the environment. 6) Establish a "regional" SC involving representatives from the EC, UNHCR, OSCE, CoE, the four beneficiary countries, regional bodies, the IPs and other stakeholders, ensure at least two SC meetings per year, and consider establishing specific national SCs for each beneficiary country. 7) Ensure reporting compliance with the agreed EC / UN minimum requirements and formalize the quarter PLUS two weeks reporting schedule for the quarterly report and the inclusion of a monthly list of "bullet points" to be submitted at the end of the month PLUS two weeks. 8) Assess and agree a feasible and final number of outputs for all activities the progress of which has been adversely affected by internal or external conditions. 9) Improve communication. 10) Consult regional environmental stakeholders such as the Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC) on how mainstreaming of the environment in regional and national projects targeting durables solutions can be ensured and enhanced. 11) Ensure that UNHCR remains in charge of the recruitment and selection process of beneficiaries of donor-funded interventions targeting refugees and IDPs. EC, UNHCR and IPs: assess the feasibility of a regional network of Non State Actors and Local Authorities that are active in the area of durable solutions.</p>
<p>BA Key issues</p>	<p>The Monitors' suggestions for the project in BA were: EU: 1) Drop insistence on a political consensus and focus on practical steps towards achieving durable solutions. 2) Stand firm with UNHCR, OSCE and CoE in the quest for an instant solution for refugees and IDPs who wish to remain in their place of displacement. 3) Increase pressure on HR to move towards a "fair settlement mechanism". EC: 1) Ensure multi-annual funding for UNHCR in terms of governance, management, monitoring and evaluation in the area of durable solutions. 2) Ensure multi-annual funding for the IPs to ensure continuation of service delivery to the target groups. 3) EC to take a rapid decision as to the immediate extension of this Programme until July 2011. 4) Consider financing a comprehensive multi-annual regional programme focused on durable solutions that can coordinate and integration regional and national programmes across the four states. 5) Support the initiative taken by BiH and supported by Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia to close all remaining collective centers. 6) Support implementation of the outstanding issues identified in the Joint Discussion Paper including: a) establishing a joint statistical framework; b) civil status, c) OTR, d) convalidation, e) property reconstruction with emphasis on remaining needs and the needs of those whose request for reconstruction assistance was denied, f) repossession of land by pre-conflict bona fide landowners who</p>

	<p>never registered their entitlements in the land registries, g) re-opening of the deadline of HCP in Croatia and improvement of its application, h) housing and local integration for those who do not wish to return would like to stay in BiH, Montenegro and Serbia, i) access to and exercise of economic and social rights in particular through combating discrimination, and j) prosecution for war crimes. EC and UNHCR: 1) Ensure integration of both logframes and enhance them once more in line with specific ROM recommendations. 2) Collect lessons learnt from the joint EC / UNHCR management of this action and ensure their integration in project design for future multi donor actions. 3) Enhance participation of other stakeholders in the overall SC, ensure two SC meetings per year and establish a specific BiH SC for all interventions targeting durable solutions for refugees and IDPs. 4) Ensure follow up with IPF 1 and IPF 2 and engage them in the identification of large-scale sectoral infrastructure projects benefiting returnees and the remaining refugees and IDPs in displacement in BiH (and elsewhere in the WB). UNHCR: 1) Ensure appropriate mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues, including the environment, and highlight this mainstreaming in progress reporting. IPs: 1) Carry out a feasibility study into the relevance and feasibility of a regional NGO network in the area of durable solutions vis-à-vis alternative solutions.</p>
Project Title	Support for implementing Cross Border Institution Building (CBIB) Phase II in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo under UNSCR 1244/99
Domain	IPA
Sector	15150 - Democratic participation and civil society
Intervention Logic	<p>Overall Objective: Strengthen the capacities of the relevant management structures (operating structures, joint monitoring committees, both assisted by the joint technical secretariats) to program and implement IPA CBC programmes at borders between candidate / potential candidate countries, and strengthen the capacity of stakeholders within the eligible areas to prepare and implement joint cross border cooperation projects within the framework of IPA CBC Programmes and to enhance prosperity and good neighbourly relations through improved cooperation in the border regions of the beneficiary countries. Project Purpose: At the Institutional, Management and Implementation level, provide assistance to the Operating Structures (OS) and to newly established Joint Management Structures (Joint Monitoring Committee, Joint Steering Committee assisted by the Joint Technical Secretariat) to ensure an efficient operation in line with EC standards; provide assistance to Joint Management Structures in launching, implementation and monitoring of the Calls for proposals (CfPs) relating to IPA CBC. At the Project Preparation and Project development level, Build upon experience gained under previous funding instruments (CARDS, Interreg, Phare CBC) of cross-border cooperation to improve capacity in project preparation and project implementation; raise awareness of stakeholders in the eligible areas about the possibility offered by the IPA CBC; train and assist to potential applicants concerning the development of joint cross-border cooperation projects to be submitted to the IPA CBC. Expected Results: 1. Capacities of Programme Structures strengthened; 2. Management and Control Mechanisms in place; 3. Cross-border Cooperation increased; 4. Capacities for Project Preparation and Implementation enhanced.</p>
Horizontal Key issues	<p>The project has made very good progress across the region, which should be further built upon during the extension phase. There were no specific areas of notable weakness during this phase; nevertheless, the Contractor was advised to: 1) Consult with the key beneficiaries in all countries as soon as possible in the planning of the extension phase activities. 2) Further refine the indicators of achievement (OVI) through revision of the LFs for the next phase, based on the ongoing knowledge and the results of the 1st round CfPs. 3) Ensure sufficient and continuous liaison with other related projects in the region (e.g. the national TA in BA) regarding the planning of future activities and those related to the increasing implementation of the Decentralised Implementation System (DIS). 4) Update the project website with regard to KOS. 5) Further elaborate a work plan for the associated part-time expert in Pristina. The EC Task Manager was advised, in liaison with the EUDs, to: 1) Lobby the respective Governments to provide more human resources for the CBC area in future, not least in view of the forthcoming 2nd round CfPs. 2) Consider supporting an increase of JTS personnel, given the expected increase of IPA CBC related tasks / responsibilities later in the year; and also that of the Antenna Offices where necessary, if the eligible regions are sizeable, and in view of time required for future monitoring of the projects. 3) Request that Heads of EUD/ECLC Contracting and Finance Units attend appropriate regional events to help facilitate future EU procedural/contracting areas of the projects. 4) In cooperation with CBIB II, the Serbian Ministry of Finance and the EUD, consider possibilities for an appropriate interface between the proposed MIS and their existing system. 5) Consider the possibility of creating a regional CBIB body in the next project phase that could suitably coordinate the current regional and national support, thereby providing a unified and integrated approach to the future</p>

	implementation of such Programmes.
BA Key issues	It was suggested to the Contractor to: 1) Speed up discussion and identification of monitoring modalities, and the associated costs and funding needs particularly for the BA-ME Programme; 2) Ensure that future DIS activities are well coordinated with any national TA.

Problem cases

This section highlights the problematic cases identified among the projects monitored. In order to single out the problematic cases, the following four-stage method was applied:

Stage 1: Draw up a “shortlist” of all projects with “serious deficiencies, having a general average score below 2,00.

Stage 2: Select all projects which have at least one "D" grade.

Stage 3: Identify the problematic cases in terms of design quality, sound operational set-up and expected results.

The application of the method confirmed that there were no regional projects experiencing major difficulties either at regional level or at BA level in the reference period of this Synthesis Report.

2.2. Performance Conclusions

Overall performance

The frequencies or % of A, B, C, and D occurrence are presented, based on the grades of the Monitoring Reports, in order to illustrate the number of A and B (very good or good performance) over the total number of grades in the ROM outputs, i.e. a percentage of 50% demonstrates that in the respective category there are more A or B than C or D. The following table illustrates the performance of the 59 projects monitored, along with the average score.

Table 3: Average DAC criterion scores for main criteria

#	Criterion	Horizontal		BA Component	
		Good (A or B)	Average Score	Good (A or B)	Average Score
1	Relevance/Quality of design	84%	2.86	73%	2.83
2	Efficiency	74%	2.83	60%	2.72
3	Effectiveness	58%	2.76	47%	2.70
4	Impact	74%	2.89	67%	2.72
5	Sustainability	79%	2.83	67%	2.75
Average		74%	2.83	73%	2.74

In general, the projects monitored in the period from 01/01/2010 to 30/06/2010, for which the ROM outputs have been submitted already, performed well (average “B” grade) with regard to all five criteria.

Overall, Impact appears to be the strongest aspect of the monitored regional projects in the first half of 2010, while also the Relevance and Quality of Design of the projects prove to be good. At regional (horizontal) level, the average effectiveness of the regional projects (the contribution of the projects’ results to the achievement of their project purpose) seems to be the relatively weaker aspect, which could be attributed, among other, to the fact that not all regional projects have “physical presence” in all addressed countries, which could have affected the accessibility of the projects’ work and results by

their beneficiaries. It is observed that in average the performance of the regional projects in BA is slightly lower than the one at the regional (horizontal) level. This could be due on one hand to better performance of some projects in other countries (e.g. HR, RS), and on the other hand to the particularly complex institutional frame in BA.

The distribution of grades along the 5 ROM criteria is illustrated in the table below. The samples of projects and reports were: 26 MRs on 26 national BA projects.

Table 4: Overview of performance by DAC criterion of MRs for ongoing projects (% of frequency of ratings)

#	Criterion	Very good (A)		Good (B)		Problems (C)		Serious deficiencies (D)		TOTAL
		WBT	BA	WBT	BA	WBT	BA	WBT	BA	
1	Relevance/ Quality of design	11%	0%	74%	73%	16%	27%	0%	0%	100%
2	Efficiency	16%	13%	58%	47%	26%	40%	0%	0%	100%
3	Effectiveness	11%	7%	47%	40%	42%	53%	0%	0%	100%
4	Impact	16%	0%	58%	67%	26%	33%	0%	0%	100%
5	Sustainability	0%	0%	79%	67%	21%	33%	0%	0%	100%
BCS TOTAL Score		11%	0%	63%	73%	26%	27%	0%	0%	100%

In general, the majority of the monitored regional projects (85%) have been assessed to be performing well (B score), while also 11% of the monitored projects were assessed to have very good performance in relation to some aspects of their implementation. The strongest aspect of this good performance is related to Impact prospects, indicating thus that the various parameters rendering the results of the projects sustainable are on the way to be secured. Efficiency of implementation and Effectiveness seem to be overall the weaker aspects of the regional projects' implementation. In the BA, the picture is overall the same, i.e. 73% of the projects perform well though none performs very well. In the case of BA, the projects' relevance and design quality seem to be the stronger aspect, and effectiveness the relatively weaker one, for reasons commented above.

There are no projects identified to be experiencing overall serious deficiencies. However, 27% of the monitored regional projects seem to be facing problems (C scores), mainly in the area of Effectiveness (accessibility of results by the beneficiaries, problems in ensuring that achieved results will lead to achievement of the Project Purpose), and less so in the area of Efficiency of implementation.

The following table illustrates the performance of the projects as per the performance categories set by the ROM Development and Coordination Unit (AIDCO/E5) for the annual synthesis of ROM results.

Table 5: Performance of ongoing projects per Category (I, II, III, and IV)

Category	Performance	Projects		%	
		WBT	BA	WBT	BA
Category I	<i>Very good performance (minimum 3 a, no c, no d)</i>	2	0	11%	0%
Category II	<i>Good performance (a, b, maximum 2 c, no d)</i>	13	10	68%	67%
Category III	<i>Performing with problems (a, b, minimum 3 c, no d)</i>	4	5	21%	33%
Category IV	<i>Not performing, or having major difficulty (minimum 1 d)</i>	0	0	0%	0%
TOTAL		19	15	100%	100%

The table above confirms the positive picture formed through the assessment by frequency of grades: the vast majority of the monitored projects fall into Category II (good performance), there are no projects performing very well in BA, there are 5 projects facing problems in BA.

Performance by ODA sector

In this section, performance statistics are presented in relation to the Official Development Assistance (ODA) Sectors:

ODA 1: Social Infrastructure and Services

ODA 2: Economic infrastructure and services

ODA 3: Production sectors

ODA 4: Multi-sector/Crosscutting

ODA 5: Commodity aid and general programme assistance

ODA 6: Action related to debt

ODA 7: Humanitarian Aid

ODA 9: Other

The 28 monitored projects cover in total 4 ODA sectors. The percentage of projects with A or B grading per ODA sector is illustrated in the table below:

Table 6: Overview of good performance per ODA sector % of frequency of ratings

ODA	1		2		3		4		5		7		9		Total	
Description	Social Infrastructure and Services		Economic infrastructure and services		Production sectors		Multisector/ Crosscutting		Commodity aid and general programme assistance		Humanitarian Aid		Other			
	WB	BA	WB	BA	WB	BA	WB	BA	WB	BA	WB	BA	WB	BA	WB	BA
Operations monitored	12	9	1	1	1	1	4	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	20	15
Reports produced	75	9	8	1	9	1	15	2	0	0	12	2	0	0	119	15
Million € covered	20.6	16	1	1	2	2	36	16	0	0	2	2	0	0	61.9	37
Relevance / Quality of design	92%	78%	0%	0%	100%	100%	67%	50%	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%	0%	90%	82%
Efficiency	83%	78%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	78%	76%
Effectiveness	75%	56%	0%	0%	100%	100%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	69%	69%
Impact	83%	67%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%	0%	0%	78%	79%
Sustainability	75%	78%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%	0%	0%	85%	93%
Average	75%	89%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%	0%	0%	81%	96%

The biggest share of the projects (63 %) is under the ODA sector “Social Infrastructure Services” with higher concentration in the CRS sector 15130: Legal and judicial development (3 projects).

The samples per ODA sector are rather small to allow any concrete assessment of performance per sector or any identification of systematic best practices or problem areas. The 33% of success stories identified in the previous section of the present report are under “Social Infrastructure and Services”. The rest 66% of success stories is under the ODA sector “Production sectors”. The table above can only provide indications of issues to be looked at. For example, the relatively low performance of projects in the Production Sectors and the Humanitarian Aid in terms of efficiency and effectiveness could trigger a search as to whether there are systematic issues or problems to be solved in these areas.

Performance over Time

The provision of reliable comparisons regarding the performance of the portfolios of EC external cooperation which are monitored from year to year in a Region or country is always fairly difficult, for a

number of reasons (e.g. size and representativity of samples of projects, different stages of projects monitored and re-monitored, no assurance that the projects have been monitored in all reference years etc.). Consequently, the assessment of the performance over time is based only on re-monitored projects, i.e. those that have been monitored twice or more.

Fourteen (14) projects of the total of 20 reference projects were re-monitored in 2009 and 2010:

- The Regional School for Public Administration (ReSPA) (CRIS No C_171798)
- Establishment of International Law Enforcement Co-ordination Units (ILECUs) (CRIS No C_160506)
- IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary statistical cooperation programme (CRIS No C_18979)
- Infrastructure Projects Facility in Western Balkans (CRIS No C_157799)
- Disaster Risk Reduction in South East Europe - Activity 2: Regional Cooperation in South East Europe (CRIS No C_199922)
- Defining and Strengthening Sector Specific Sources of competitiveness in the Western Balkans Region (CRIS No C_131329)
- Regional programme on industrial and intellectual property rights in the Western Balkans and in Turkey (CRIS No C_154662)
- Support for implementing Cross Border Institution Building (CBIB) Phase II in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo under UNSCR 1244/99 (CRIS No C_169395)
- Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey (CRIS No C_200021)
- Support to the "Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Network for Accession" (ECENA) (CRIS No C_131659)
- Support for preparation of water related investment projects under the DABLAS Task Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia (CRIS No C_19285)
- Regional Programme for Social Security Coordination and Social Security Reforms in South East Europe (CRIS No C_153292)
- Support to the Prosecutors' Network (CRIS No C_153650)
- Development of monitoring instruments for judicial and law enforcement institutions in the Western Balkans (CRIS No C_171394)

The performance of these projects in 2009 and in 2010, by frequency of occurrence of grades, is presented in the following table.

Table 7: Overview of performance of projects remonitored in 2009 and 2010

Year	WBT				BA			
	2009		2010		2009		2010	
N° operations monitored	14				10			
N° reports produced	14		14		10		10	
Million € covered	35.60				30.10			
Relevance / Quality of design	78%	2.81	78%	2.79	80%	2.79	70%	2.74
Efficiency	57%	2.62	64%	2.68	60%	2.53	50%	2.56
Effectiveness	64%	2.71	50%	2.61	40%	2.55	30%	2.50
Impact	78%	2.81	64%	2.70	60%	2.60	60%	2.64
Sustainability	71%	2.91	71%	2.74	30%	2.42	60%	2.62
Average	71%	2.77	64%	2.70	54%	2.58	54%	2.61

The performance of the 10 regional projects in BA has slightly dropped in average, but this seems to have been the case also at the horizontal level. The drop in relation to relevance and quality of design indicate potentially changes in the external conditions / problems of the projects to adapt to changing

needs. The drop in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and potential sustainability might indicate problems in the contractors' performance, in the accessibility of results by the beneficiaries and in terms of ownership and/or not enough policy support. However, the sample of projects is rather small to allow generalisation of these qualitative conclusions.

ANNEX I

List of Monitored Projects

The Regional School for Public Administration (ReSPA) (CRIS No C_171798)

Regional programme for refugee return and provision of durable solutions for refugees and internally displaced persons (IDP) in the Western Balkans (CRIS No C_214055)

Establishment of International Law Enforcement Co-ordination Units (ILECUs) (CRIS No C_160506)

IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary statistical cooperation programme (CRIS No C_18979)

Infrastructure Projects Facility in Western Balkans (CRIS No C_157799)

Strengthening Regional News Exchange from the International Criminal tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC). (CRIS No C_163264)

Disaster Risk Reduction in South East Europe - Activity 2: Regional Cooperation in South East Europe (CRIS No C_199922)

Social Inclusion: Regional support to marginalised communities (CRIS No C_216438)

Defining and Strengthening Sector Specific Sources of competitiveness in the Western Balkans Region (CRIS No C_131329)

Multibeneficiary Financing Proposal 2a for projects NOT requiring a financing agreement Part I (CRIS No C_20320)

Regional programme on industrial and intellectual property rights in the Western Balkans and in Turkey (CRIS No C_154662)

Support for implementing Cross Border Institution Building (CBIB) Phase II in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo under UNSCR 1244/99 (CRIS No C_169395)

Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey (CRIS No C_200021)

Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window (CRIS No C_224490)

Support to the "Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Network for Accession" (ECENA) (CRIS No C_131659)

Support for preparation of water related investment projects under the DABLAS Task Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia (CRIS No C_19285)

Regional Programme for Social Security Coordination and Social Security Reforms in South East Europe (CRIS No C_153292)

Support to the Prosecutors' Network (CRIS No C_153650)

Development of monitoring instruments for judicial and law enforcement institutions in the Western Balkans (CRIS No C_171394)

Programme for supporting participation of the eligible candidate and potential candidate countries in the Union for the Mediterranean - Horizon 2020 (CRIS No C_220191)