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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document represents the Final Evaluation Report of the Project “Enhancing the Social Protection and Inclusion Systems for Children in Bosnia and Herzegovina” (hereinafter called “the SPIS Project”).

Project description

The overall aim of the Project is to objective to improve the social protection systems at all levels of governance through strengthening the social protection and inclusion of children policy framework and capacities of social service providers, in particular to apply a needs and human rights based approach. The Project focuses special attention on on children with disabilities and children, Children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families. It planned to achieve three specific objectives: 1) Strengthening the Social Protection and Inclusion legal and policy framework and coordination mechanisms; 2) Enhancing systems and capacities to deliver quality inclusive services at the local level, with a focus on children with disabilities and children, Children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families; and 3) Raising awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue, ensuring the participation of children and young people, focusing on children with disabilities, at the local level and throughout programme and media Campaign

It’s about Ability. Project activities include capacity building and training initiatives; Advocacy and technical assistance in development of policies and legislation; Coordination, consultations; Technical and financial assistance to strengthen services; Campaigns and Production of One minute Junior movies, etc. The target groups of the Project are teachers and professionals working in education, health, social welfare and early childhood detection and intervention (ECI) services; preschool institutions; primary schools delivering preschool education; ECI resource rooms; parents; Roma leaders and mediators; policy makers. Final beneficiaries of the Project are at least 5,000 children and their parents (through increased access to inclusive and protective social services), and approximately 40,000 children and their parents and teachers (through Campaign It’s about Ability). Direct beneficiaries of the Project are relevant ministries at all levels; Decision makers; 32 local communities; and Service providers. The total budget of the Project is 616,942 EUR, out of which 500,000 EUR has been provided by the European Union Delegation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and remaining funds were covered by UNICEF. The implementation period of the Project began in November 2013 and lasted until February 2015. Following discussions with the donor, a no-cost extension until March 2015 has been granted. The Project is implemented by UNICEF BiH under the steering of a multi-stakeholder Project Management Board (PMB) and with the technical support of two working groups on ECE, respectively ECI.

Context of the Project

BiH is a transition country severely affected by the global economic crisis. The country is facing high and constantly rising unemployment and poverty. Children are disproportionally hit by poverty and deprivation: the absolute poverty rate is 30.5%1 compared to 23.4% for the overall population. Educational system in Bosnia and Herzegovina is overburdened by administrative costs. Preschool education in BiH is a major weakness of the education system, having the lowest preschool participation rate in the region: 14.2% in 2012/20132. The health system is also fragmented and does not allow for equal protection of health rights in all communities across Bosnia and Herzegovina.
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The 2006 Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) estimated that 6.5% of children from 2 to 9 years of age have some form of disability in BiH. It is estimated that 38% of children placed in residential care in BiH are children with disabilities, while the rate of children without parental care in residential care (in 1,000s) has been increasing from 1.8 in 2000 to 2.3 in 2010, while the rate of children in care of foster parents or guardians (in 1,000s) went down from 2.5 in 2000 to 1.3 in 2010.

The State of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), in its current structure defined by the 1995 Dayton Peace Agreement, has limited central power, with most government functions delegated to two entities: the Republika Srpska and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Brcko District is a third administrative unit, which has been under international administration. BiH is a potential candidate for EU membership. The Stabilization and Association Agreement has been ratified but has not yet entered into force. However, progress on EU-related reforms has been limited.

Spending on social protection is around 3.3% of GDP, however, allocations for those with very low incomes, for child benefits, and for people with non-war related disabilities are small or non-existent and vary considerably depending on where the person lives. In both entities, over 27% of the budget allocations is "captured" by the richest 20% of the population and only 5% of the poorest quintile receive some kind of cash assistance provided by the Centers for Social Work (CSW).

Major identified bottlenecks include a highly fragmented configuration comprising of thirteen almost independent systems resulting in disparities in availability, accessibility and budgetary allocations; poor targeting of social assistance; status-based cash benefits allocation (war veterans benefits) and lack of competencies and resources of the centers for social work. UNICEF is working jointly with the governments on harmonization of laws, revision of the legislation, capacity building and local level initiatives aiming to address some of the bottlenecks.

**Objective, purpose and scope of the evaluation**

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the final (end) results and achievements of the project, and capture good practices and relevant lessons learned. The evaluation covers the implementation period of November 2013 to February 2015. The Project did not include a Theory of Change (ToC), which was developed within the scope of this Evaluation by the consultant. The evaluation was carried out by independent individual evaluation expert, selected by UNICEF.

**Evaluation methodology**

The evaluation was carried out in three phases. Review of project documentation and relevant literature and reference documents was conducted in the Inception phase, resulting in the Inception report for the Evaluation. Within this phase, the evaluation framework, primary data collection methods and evaluation tools were developed. The Field Phase was organised within a very limited timeframe and limited scope, and was devoted to the collection of data from key stakeholders at state, entity, and municipality levels through semi-structured interviews, focused discussion groups and site visits to a limited number of municipalities. A beneficiary survey was conducted as well to capture the opinions of parents and children using ECD services in local communities. In the Synthesis Phase, the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability were applied to assess the achievement of planned results of the Project, against which informed conclusions and recommendations were drawn.
Main Findings and Conclusions

The Project is relevant and responds well to the recognised need for Bosnia and Herzegovina to improve the social protection systems for children at all levels of governance through strengthening the social protection and inclusion policy framework and service delivery for vulnerable families and children, in particular for children with disabilities. It addresses important gaps and challenges of the current social protection and inclusion system, and provides an opportunity to devise systems to address multidimensional needs of children, through connecting social protection, health, education, law enforcement, civil society and other sectors in strengthening response to the needs of children. The Project has been designed on the basis of extensive evidence base and lessons learned both from implementation of previous Project phases but also from assessments and studies conducted focusing on children in Bosnia and Herzegovina and corresponds to the strategic and legislative framework for social protection and inclusion in the country. The Project is highly relevant for the needs of professionals and municipalities to implement quality and inclusive social services for vulnerable children. The project is also highly relevant to the government counterparts at all levels of governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina as it provides technical assistance and advisory in development of policies and services in this sector.

As far as human rights and cross-cutting issues are concerned, the Project is highly relevant for BiH’s international commitments deriving from the ratification of CRC and its status of EU potential candidate country. It had a major contribution to the promotion and realisation of child rights through opening access to social services and early learning development to children who are left out of the system. The Project had a positive contribution to the strengthening of the capacity of a wide range of Bosnian duty-bearers to protect and fulfil the child rights. It managed to ensure an equity focus by orienting investment to vulnerable children.

The project achieved, albeit to varying degrees, all of its envisaged outputs, and made contributions to its planned outcomes. Particularly strong contributions were noted in relation to strengthening the legal frameworks for social protection and inclusion of children, which were enriched by a number of laws and bylaws developed or amended with technical assistance of the project. The Project achieved important results in the area of strengthening SPI systems at local level through enhanced capacities for service delivery, and provision of quality inclusive services (particularly to children with disabilities, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families). UNICEF supported research and analysis of the state of affairs in the social protection and inclusion sector provided strong evidence base for policies and legislation, but also further investments in the sector. The Campaign It’s about Ability and linked activities contributed to raising awareness on social inclusion and child rights among general population throughout the country.

UNICEF made successful efforts to use available project resources strategically and efficiently. Management efforts by the UNICEF project team were appropriate and contributed to the effective and efficient implementation of planned initiatives. While cooperation agreements with individual partners were modest in size, they often contributed to achieving results that have the potential to positively influence the work of the respective partner organization in the longer term. UNICEF put appropriate systems in place to monitor and report on project progress, thereby placing emphasis on capturing not only activities but also emerging results. The project logframe, while having a number of minor weaknesses, provided useful guidance in this regard. The project builds on the lessons learned and solid foundations from previous phases, and the level of effort and related budgets have been utilized in such a manner to adequately invest in strengthening the social protection and inclusion system. These investments, particularly related services show direct benefits to
children and their families, bringing about tremendous returns in the future for the individuals, communities and society generally.

Available data strongly indicate that project efforts have contributed to moving existing change processes into the desired direction, and that the policies, mechanisms and services have impacted lives of targeted groups of children positively. The project has supported the structural reform of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance with success, and particularly to the promotion of multi sectorial approach to SPI through establishment of services, local governance mechanisms, protocols of cooperation and referral mechanisms in targeted municipalities. These mechanisms, if and when implemented have positive effects of children’s lives.

Effects and outcomes of the Project are less likely sustainable. Although the current policy and legal framework governing the social protection and inclusion system in BiH is supportive for the further development and expansion of services and approaches put in place by the Project, the severe financial constraints at all levels of government (especially in cantons and municipalities) make the continuation of reform dependent on external funding. External support continues to be crucial for increasing access and coverage of vulnerable children in preschool education until solid rights-based foundations of practices and procedures are built and capacities are in place to ensure that laws and systems run effectively.

**Recommendations**

**Operational Recommendations**

- O1 (for UNICEF and partners) - Conduct Impact assessment and draw lessons learnt for the SPIS Project in its entirety to inform future policy measures and projects that will focus on children with disabilities, children without parental care, and children at risk of separation from families;
- O2 (for UNICEF and partners) - Organise a promotional campaign to promote best practices from the SPIS-municipalities and enable sharing them with underdeveloped municipalities (e.g. peer-to-peer)

**Strategic and Programming Recommendations**

- SP1 (UNICEF, government partners and EUD) - Further invest in country-wide expansion of international standards in the area of social protection and inclusion of children, particularly children without parental care, children with disabilities and children at risk of separation from their families.
- SP2 (Government, with support of UNICEF and donors) - Ensure continuation of support to IECD and other new services established by the Project, to strengthen their mechanisms for sustainability.
- SP3 (Government in partnership with municipalities, UNICEF and international donors) - Advocate for development of the framework for securing the financial sustainability on long-run of support and empowerment services developed by the Project, particularly those targeting children with disabilities, children without parental care, and children at risk of separation from families.
- SP4 (UNICEF) - Improve monitoring and reporting practices in future projects and the evaluability of impact
1. CONTEXT AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1 PROJECT CONTEXT

Social exclusion is driven by a complex interplay of demographic, economic, social and behavioural factors that are linked and mutually reinforcing. The section below provides presentation of main causes of social exclusion in Bosnia and Herzegovina, from the perspective of governance, demographic pressures, socio-economic trends and poverty.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK

The Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as an integral part of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina allowed the country to move out of instability and enter into a calmer period of development, but has also resulted in the establishment of a complex constitutional and highly fragmented system of government, with asymmetric system of governance. The state level in Bosnia and Herzegovina has a mandate to define basic principles and coordinate entity policies concerning inter alia the areas of social protection, inclusion, health, education, etc. as well as it is tasked with reporting and follow up on international treaties that Bosnia and Herzegovina is signatory to. The two entities (Republic Srpska and Federation BiH) have different composition: while Republic of Srpska is centralised, the Federation BiH is further decentralised into ten cantons, with legal and executive powers for a number of social policies and their implementation vested to them3. The Brčko District (BD) has full authority over the social inclusion and protection development within the District. There are 141 municipalities within the entities, of which 79 are in the FBiH cantons and 62 in the RS.

Administrative role and functions of the State of BiH in a number of social sectors are not foreseen in the Dayton Constitution. The Ministry of Civil Affairs at the state level is tasked with defining coordination and harmonisation of social policies, while the BiH Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees has a task to implement international human rights documents, and report on their implementation. Social protection is the competence of the entity government as stipulated by the BIH Constitution, so the state level government does not have any relevant legislation dealing with these issues. Mandates for relevant subsectors within social protection and inclusions at entity and cantonal levels lay within relevant Ministries. Structural composition of Ministries differs between Republic of Srpska and Federation BiH. In RS, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health and Social Welfare lead the work in these areas. In the Federation BiH and in the ten cantons, Ministries of Health, Ministries of Education and Science and Ministries of Labour and Social Policy deal with social protection and inclusion.

Performance of service providers at the local level, as first instance for provision of social protection and inclusion, is affected by significant challenges in terms of human, financial and technical capacities. Services, particularly for marginalised and vulnerable children (those coming from minority, rural areas and children with disability) are scarce and where they exist, they are often provided with limited time and resources, affecting the quality and accessibility of services to all. Particularly visible are weaknesses of targeting of social assistance with lack of competencies and resources of the centers for social work to respond to the needs of children and their families. As a consequence, children often fall through the

3 There are ten cantons in the FBiH: Una-Sana, Posavina, Tuzla, Zenica-Doboj, Bosnia-Podrinje, Central-Bosnia, Herzegovina-Neretva, Western-Herzegovina, Sarajevo, Canton 10.
cracks of existing safety nets, even in situations where the skills and capacities to address these issues exist.

Spending on social protection is around 3.3% of GDP, however, allocations for those with very low incomes, for child benefits, and for people with non-war related disabilities are small or non-existent and vary considerably depending on where the person lives. In both entities, over 27% of the budget allocations is “captured” by the richest 20% of the population and only 5% of the poorest quintile receive some kind of cash assistance provided by the Centers for Social Work (CSW).

The country composition and highly fragmented configuration comprising of thirteen almost independent systems resulting in disparities are main bottlenecks for successful supply of rights-based social protection and inclusion policies.

SOCIAL EXCLUSION

The first post-war census was conducted in Bosnia and Herzegovina in autumn 2013, and its preliminary data indicate that the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina is 3,791,622 people, out of which 2,371,603 persons in the FBiH; 1,326,991 persons in the RS, and 93,028 persons in BD. UNICEF’s working paper “Situation Analysis of Children’s and Women’s Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina” reports that the proportion of children aged 0-14 in the total population is almost two times higher than the proportion of persons aged 65 and above (19% vs. 11%), which indicates a relatively young population.

Due to global economic crisis and slow post-war rehabilitation and development, Bosnia and Herzegovina faces difficult economic challenges due to the continuing crisis and return to recession conditions. High level of public expenditures on one side and weak industrial output on the other side are most important challenges, which are further exacerbated by the global economic crisis. At the end of 2013, BiH recorded a public debt of around 10,423 billion BAM, out of which 71.04% was external and 28.96% was internal debt. The crisis had a severe negative impact on the Bosnian economy, which has still not recovered to the GDP level attained in 2008, while real GDP fell further in 2012 by about three quarters of one per cent. The terms set up for the Stand-by Agreement with the IMF, aiming to reduce the overall general government deficit to two per cent of GDP, and to reduce the structural fiscal deficit to three quarters of one per cent of GDP in order to reduce public debt (IMF 2012a, 2012b), provide additional burden on the expenditure on social protection.

The country is facing high and constantly rising unemployment and subsequently increased risk of poverty with recorded 24.3% poverty rate among unemployed population and 13.9% of so-called working poverty. Children are disproportionally hit by poverty and deprivation: the absolute poverty rate is 30.5% compared to 23.4% for the overall population. Social exclusion, inequality, poverty and unemployment remain significant challenge for BiH, where among the most vulnerable are children, persons with disabilities, displaced persons, Roma, families with two or more children, the elderly, unemployed and unskilled. People in rural areas are at greater risk of social exclusion and denied equal access to services.

---

A&template_id=140&pageIndex=1, accessed 22.09.2014
Public spending on education is in line with comparable countries (4% of GDP for Republika Srpska - RS and Brčko District and 5% for the Federation of BiH -FBiH). However, due to complex education administration and finance system in FBiH leads to cost duplication and inefficiencies with 77.7% of the budget going to education wages. Preschool education in BiH is a major weakness of the education system, having the lowest preschool participation rate in the region: 14.2% in 2012/2013. The worst situation was registered in Brčko District (6.6% compared to 14.4% in the Federation of BiH and in rural areas (7.9% compared to 22.8% in urban areas).

BiH expenditure on health is 9.5% of GDP, which is similar to neighbouring countries. Only 18.5% of children under six months are exclusively breastfed and malnutrition remains a concern (moderate and severe stunting: 8.9% for mainstream and 21.1% for Roma; underweight: 1.9% for mainstream and 8.8% for Roma; overweight: 17.4% for mainstream). Under-5 and infant mortality rates have decreased to 813, while they are still very high for the Roma population at 25 and 28 respectively.

The rate of children of children without parental care in residential care (in 1,000s) has been decreasing from 1.8 in 2000 to 2.3 in 2010, while the rate of children in care of foster parents or guardians (in 1,000s) went down from 2.5 in 2000 to 1.3 in 2010.

Persons with disabilities constitute one of the most vulnerable groups in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). The country has ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and its Optional Protocol but many of the rights set out in the Convention are not applied in practice. The 2006 Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) estimated that 6.5% of children from 2 to 9 years of age have some form of disability in BiH. Children with disabilities are not given access to basic education in mainstream educational institutions due to several factors: a lack of or limited basic facilities required to ensure their accessibility to kindergartens and schools; teaching staff that are not prepared to work with them; school curricula that are not flexible and adapted to these children’s special educational needs. As a result, many children are placed in residential institutions. It is estimated that 38% of children placed in residential care in BiH are children with disabilities, a number which has been steadily growing during the last decade and is the highest in the region (Transmonee 2014).

A survey on Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices, conducted in May/June 2013 revealed that 40% of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina would not allow a child with socio-emotional disabilities to attend the same class as their own child. The same survey also stated that almost 60% of the population would not allow their child to marry a person with physical disability and over 40% of people thought that children with disabilities should attend special educational institutions, while only 20% saw the positive developmental impact of inclusion.

---

8 World Bank, Education Report for BiH, 2006
9 TransMonEE 2014
10 MICS 2011/12
11 WHO: Health Expenditure, 2009
12 8.2%, in Croatia and Serbia
13 UN Child Mortality Report 2011
14 The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability identifies persons with disabilities as those who suffer from “long-term physical, mental, intellectual, or sensory impairments, which, in interaction with various barriers, may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others”.
1.2 PROJECT TO BE EVALUATED

The Project for Enhancing the Social Protection and Inclusion Systems for Children in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been initiated as a joint project of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina and UNICEF Country Office in BiH. Since its inception in 2008, it has been funded by the European Union, the Government of the United Kingdom – Department for International Development (DFID), the Government of Norway and UNICEF. Implemented since January 2009 over the course of four years, it has been implemented in partnership with the governments at all levels in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 21 locations, from both Entities: FBiH and RS, as well as in Brcko District. The Project has been implemented in three phases, mostly related to donor funding cycles. In the first two phases the project was implemented in the ‘pilot’ 10 municipalities in FBiH and RS, while in the third phase it is being implemented in additional 11 locations in FBiH, RS and Brcko District. The so-called SPIS IV Project builds on these three previous phases of the SPIS Project. The SPIS project has been developed in close cooperation with the relevant government counterparts at all levels of governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina and UNICEF with the overall objective to improve the social protection systems at all levels of governance through strengthening the social protection and inclusion of children policy framework and capacities of social service providers, in particular to apply a needs and human rights based approach.

The specific objectives of the SPIS IV Project have been the following:

Specific objective 1 Strengthening the Social Protection and Inclusion legal and policy framework and coordination mechanisms;

Specific objective 2 Enhancing systems and capacities to deliver quality inclusive services at the local level, with a focus on children with disabilities and children, Children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families;

Specific objective 3 Raising awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue, ensuring the participation of children and young people, focusing on children with disabilities, at the local level and throughout programme and media Campaign It’s about Ability.

BENEFICIARIES

The direct beneficiaries of the Project are relevant ministries at all levels; Decision makers; 32 local communities; and Service providers. The final beneficiaries are at least 5,000 children and their parents (through increased access to inclusive and protective social services), and approximately 40,000 children and their parents and teachers (through increased awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building, inter-cultural education/dialogue and “It’s about ability” campaign).

In order to implement the Project, the following expected results are envisaged:

EXPECTED RESULT 1

---

15 Although the agreement with the donors was signed by end of 2008, the programme was officially implemented from January 2009. As per SPIS 1st Annual Report 1st January 2009 – 31st March 2010
16 At the beginning of the programme, in 2009-2010, pilot municipal models were not planned for Brcko District. Only establishment of working groups was planned. In the subsequent phases of the programme, one municipal model was also established in BD.
Institutions mandated to develop laws and policies have developed by-laws, standards and protocols strengthening the service delivery for children with disabilities, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families, including through strengthened coordination of Social protection and inclusion in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

EXPECTED RESULT 2

SPI systems strengthened on the local level through enhanced capacities for service delivery, and quality inclusive services provided, particularly to children with disabilities, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families.

EXPECTED RESULT 3

Children, young people, community members and Municipal authorities have participated in Campaign “It’s About Ability”, and increased their knowledge of social inclusion, child rights, peace building, and inclusive education/intergenerational dialogue focusing on disabilities.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES

For the achievement of Project outputs and expected outcomes, a rich set of activities has been implemented, including, but not limited to Advocacy and awareness raising through promotional activities, campaigns, workshops, trainings, public and media presentations; technical and financial assistance to partners in development of legislation, services and mechanisms; Coordination and consultation; Mapping of existing services for children, forging partnerships and new initiatives, etc.

FINANCING, DURATION AND IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

The budget of the Project is 616,942 EUR, out of which 500,000 EUR has been provided by the European Union Delegation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The difference was covered by UNICEF. The implementation of the Project focus of this Evaluation began in November 2013 and lasted until February 2015. As discussed, this Project is a part of larger investment of UNICEF and government partners since 2009 in strengthening capacities of government and its partners in the area of social protection and inclusion of children in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

IMPLEMENTATION PARTNERS

The project is being implemented by UNICEF BiH under the steering of the Project Management Board chaired by the Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Project implementing partners invest their resources, expertise and policy leverage to the achievement of project results. Project partners are: Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ministry of Health and Social Welfare of the Republika Srpska, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Policy; Federal Ministry of Health, Directorate for Economic Planning BiH, Brcko District Government; Faculties of Political Sciences/Departments for Social Work in Banja Luka and Sarajevo; Specialised NGOs: Duga, Edus, Centre for Children, Youth and Family Laktasi, GENESIS and Project Hope.
1.3 THE SPIS IV THEORY OF CHANGE

The Project does not have the Theory of Change in its programming documentation. The following is the reconstruction of the Theory of change developed by the consultant and based on the review of the SPIS documentation.

Children with disabilities, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families lack adequate social protection and face barriers to inclusion in BiH society. Creating an environment that fosters the healthy development of these vulnerable families and children requires targeted action at both the national and local levels. The SPIS Program focuses on 3 main Domains of Change: 1) strengthened governance through legal and policy frameworks surrounding social protection and inclusion of children, 2) developed local capacity to deliver quality services to these children, and 3) public awareness to reduce stigma and increase opportunity and social mobility. These elements individually contribute to improved social protection systems for children and also reinforce each other.

To make progress in any of the Domains of Change, SPIS enacts Change Processes through targeted activities. Governance is strengthened through advocacy, technical assistance, coordination and consultation at the state and entity/canton levels. Local capacity is strengthened through training and technical and financial assistance for service providers and advocacy for such trainings. Public awareness is built through social networks, media, inter-cultural dialogue, institutional linkages and the media campaign “It’s About Ability.”
The Domains of Change are the key elements essential for children to enjoy quality services, social protection and inclusion. Strong local capacity creates the foundation for quality service provision for children to support their healthy development. Responsible governance in the form of Social Protection and Inclusion legal and policy frameworks, as well as coordination mechanisms, ensure children receive the resources and protections they require. A public knowledgeable about social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inclusive education reduces discrimination and improves social mobility for these children.

All three elements work together to improve the services children receive. Quality service delivery is more sustainable and impactful when supported by strong national legal and policy frameworks and a public that is knowledgeable about the importance of social inclusion and child rights. As governance is strengthened, local services supported by by-laws, curriculum development, documented best practices/lessons learned and social innovation are able to flourish. Similarly, quality services for children are better supported by the community and able to grow when the public is made more aware of social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inclusive education. Through the strengthening of governance, local capacity and public awareness the SPIS Program is dedicated to ensuring that children enjoy quality service delivery and improved social protection and inclusion.
2. EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

2.1 PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

In January 2015, UNICEF contracted an independent consultant, Ms Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic to conduct the final evaluation of the project. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the final (end) results and achievements of the project, and capture good practices and relevant lessons learned. The evaluation is intended both as an accountability tool, as well as a learning opportunity. As such, it needs to focus on the targeted groups by the Project and not provide ‘general only’ recommendations, but specific for the each group: children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families.

Scope of the evaluation

Specifically, as per its TOR, the evaluation is expected to:

1. Provide feedback to UNICEF BiH office and its national counterparts on the soundness (defined as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability) and impact of the Project approach in strengthening the social protection and inclusion policy framework and service delivery for vulnerable families and children, in particular for children with disabilities, with the aim to:

   - Reveal good practices and its implementation modalities in with particular focus on local levels of governments
   - Identify systemic gaps in application of SPI approaches at entity and local levels
   - Evaluate Project Impact following Description of the Action and Logical Framework

2. Extract lessons learned and recommendations aimed at further enhancement of the Social Protection and Inclusion system in BiH at local and policy level based on the experiences from the Project implementation.

The intended primary users of the evaluation are UNICEF; government counterparts, current and potential donors, as well as project stakeholders and partner organizations in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Geographical coverage

While the evaluation looked at the SPIS IV Project as a whole from the perspective of the desk review and analytical work; the fieldwork focused only on a limited number of municipalities and beneficiaries to be included, due to the time and resource limitations for the evaluation. As per guidance by UNICEF, the following municipalities were subject to field observation and interviews:

- Derventa and Velika Kladusa related to the implementation of the SPIS activities at local level
- Sarajevo and Banja Luka related to the overall assessment of policy, services and overall capacity building of governments and CSO partners
Beneficiaries of ECD services in six communities across Bosnia and Herzegovina participated in the beneficiary survey.

### 2.2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

#### OVERALL APPROACH AND DESIGN

According to the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-DAC) Evaluation Quality Standards, selection and application of adequate evaluation methodology is crucial to produce reliable data that allow for valid evaluative judgments that are useful for learning and making decisions.

The evaluation applied a non-experimental design in the absence of realistic comparators or counterfactuals, and in view of the available evaluation time and resources. The overall approach to the evaluation was utilization-focused, gender and human rights responsive, and follow a mixed method approach.

**Utilization-focused**: The evaluation methodology was based on the evaluator's inception phase findings as regards the actual interests and needs of the intended users of the evaluation, in particular those of UNICEF. As the evaluation advances, the evaluator involved potential users to review evaluation progress and draft deliverables, and support the development of evaluation recommendations.

The Evaluation applied “mixed methods” to optimise the potential of the analysis and to reach sound evaluation, including qualitative and quantitative methods and instruments, such as survey, focus groups and interviews, as well as document review, and meetings with project partners and beneficiaries. The methodology was designed to allow for triangulation of the findings and thus maximising the quality of recommendations with an aim to provide useful information for UNICEF and its partners.

The evaluation used three main sources of data: People; documents and files (including databases); and observations during the site visits. It included both primary and secondary data types.

All individual and group interviews followed agreed upon interview guides tailored to the respective stakeholder group and aligned with the overall evaluation framework. An exemplary interview guide is included in Annex 3. Initial interview questions were intentionally open ended, thus allowing consulted stakeholders to focus on and highlight the specific issues they consider to be most relevant in relation to the broader question. During the interview process, the Evaluator provided a number of thematic prompts to elicit additional information on specific topics addressed in the evaluation framework.

The fieldwork agenda was established with guidance from UNICEF, and included a range of stakeholders from government, civil society, public institutions, and final beneficiaries (families with children using services established within the Project).

The second data source included relevant documents, files, and other types of written information (e.g. websites) that informed the desk review part of the evaluation.

The third source of data were observations made during the visits to local communities. The focus of these visits was on eliciting information about contributions to results; as well as on stakeholder perspectives on the usefulness of interventions and their overall satisfaction with the project.
The evaluation was carried out in following phases:

**A desk research** phase including the detailed outlining of evaluation process, elaboration of the evaluation questions into evaluation matrix, and desk review of available project documentation.

**A field study** including:

- *Individual and group interviews* (face-to-face, Skype and/or phone) with implementing partners and key stakeholders:
- *Mini-Survey for parents and children, users of social services in 6 target communities of the SPIS project*- The survey is an important tool to complement narrative data collected during the field visit and the follow-up interviews. It was carefully designed in order to allow respondents to provide information, share views and opinions while remaining anonymous.
- *Field research* in Derventa and Velika Kladusa related to the implementation of the SPIS activities at local level.

The drafting phase of the **Final Report**.

**METHODOLOGIES APPLIED WITHIN DIFFERENT STAGES OF THE FINAL EVALUATION**

**Desk Review**

Desk review included:

- The Project documentation: Description of Action (narrative, log-frame, budget), reports, monitoring reports;
- UNICEF Gender Policy Guidelines;
- Situational analyses, studies, reports and other relevant material focusing on social protection and inclusion in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as other relevant processes in the country that influence developments in the sector.

The document review and the analysis of the project intervention were used for the development of the Evaluation matrix and design of the research methods to be applied in the main assessment stage. This process also clarified the approach and the sample of project partners and beneficiaries to be visited within the fieldwork, as well as the sample of those to be included in the mini survey.

**FIELD RESEARCH PHASE**

The purpose of field research phase for this Evaluation was to systematically collect the information required to support the formulation of conclusions and answers to the evaluation questions. The fieldwork, thus, included coordination with the UNICEF team, contacts with project partners and beneficiaries, and applying data collection methods. The main elements of field research phase were the interviews, field visits and the mini survey.

**Field visits**: the Evaluator visited two local communities (Derventa and Velika Kladusa) and related SPIS Commissions and social service providers in order to observe from first-hand and learn about expected project impact at the given stage.

The field research activities included:
Face-to-face individual interviews with the following actors:

- UNICEF (management and staff);
- BiH Ministry of Civil Affairs;
- Federal Ministry of Health
- Pedagogical Institute Zenica Doboj Canton
- Social Protection and Inclusion Commission in Derventa
- Day Care Center Derventa
- Ministry of Health and Social Welfare of Republika Srpska,
- Social Protection and Inclusion Commission in Velika Kladusa
- ECD Center Velika Kladusa
- Ministry of Education of Una-Sana Canton
- Centre for Social Welfare Novi Travnik
- Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
- Federal Ministry of Education
- NGOs: Genesis Project; Center for Children and Youth Laktasi; Duga and Step by Step

Site visits to Derventa and Velika Kladusa to visit the SPIS Commissions, Day Care and ECD services/centres and meeting of the beneficiary children and their families;

Three discussion groups: two with SPIS Commissions, including representatives of Local Self-Governments targeted by the project (also on the occasion of the site visits to Derventa and Velika Kladusa respectively) and a group discussion with project beneficiaries, parents, during the site visit to Velika Kladusa. The discussion groups provided the Evaluator with important findings about the impact of the implemented projects. Additionally, the beneficiaries provided first hand experiences and recommendations for future activities.

Mini survey. The survey was used as an important tool to complement narrative data collected during the field visit and the follow-up interviews. It was carefully designed in order to allow respondents to provide information, share views and opinions while remaining anonymous. The mini-survey reached out to a parents and children who use social services provided in the six target communities, with a view to understanding the range of perspectives that beneficiaries may have on the utility of the services, and the results and challenges related to support offered by the project.

The survey instrument was first developed in English for approval by UNICEF, before being translated into local language and distributed by Project Hope (See Survey Questionnaire in Annex 4). Survey questions had closed responses in most cases. Mini survey was conducted within limited time frame and corresponded with the level of technical resources in local communities. Total of 78 questionnaires have been collected. Survey respondents are children and parents who use Day Care Centres’ services between 1 and four months (namely, 18.1% have been using services between 1-2 months, and 66.7% between 2-4 months). They have joined the service by invitation (16.7%), volunteered for it (26.9%) or were referred to it by the Centre for Social Work (45%). Small percentage of them were referred to service by the hospital (5.1%) or learned about it through media (6.4%). Survey respondents use observation and creation of individual child development or speech therapist service (42.1%) or speech and special education services (39.5%) Half of respondents stated that similar services did not exist in their communities before, while 31% did not know whether such service existed before, while 18.2% stated that there were similar services before.

During data collection, the Evaluator ensured that the evaluation process is ethical and that participants in the process can openly express their opinions, protecting the confidentiality of
their answers. The Field Phase ended with a debriefing of UNICEF concerning the preliminary findings. It took place on February 6, 2015.

ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

The review and analysis of the information and formulation of conclusions and recommendations was based on collected documentation and its review, responses to the survey, site visits, discussions and interviews with a broad range of stakeholders. The ToR and the OECD/DAC Principles were the foundation and framework for the analysis.

The following methods of data analysis were employed:

**Descriptive analysis** was used to understand the relevant contexts that had influenced project implementation, and to describe project objectives and interventions. Descriptive analysis was used as a first step, before moving on to more interpretative approaches.

**Content analysis** constituted the core of the qualitative analysis. Documents and stakeholder consultation notes were analysed to identify common trends, themes, and patterns in relation to the evaluation questions. Content analysis was also used to flag diverging views and opposite trends. In these cases, further data collection may be needed. Emerging issues and trends constituted the raw material for crafting preliminary observations that were subsequently refined to feed into the draft and final evaluation reports.

**Quantitative/Statistical analysis** was used to interpret quantitative data, e.g. as regards the allocation and use of project funds.

To ensure validity of data, and as part of the process of synthesizing information derived from different data sources and through different means of data collection, the following methods were used.

**Triangulation** – i.e. comparing data generated from different data sources to identify trends and/or variations;

**Complementarity** – i.e. using data generated through one method of data collection to elaborate on information generated through another, e.g. use stakeholder consultations to explore reasons for strengths or shortcoming indicated in existing documents.

The standard evaluation criteria were approached as follows:

**Relevance**: The assessment of the project relevance was based on the analysis of the national and local context, the challenges of the social protection and inclusion reform and the needs and priorities of various stakeholders and beneficiaries (e.g. social service provision, access and quality, capacity building, etc.).

**Effectiveness**: Using the project’s Log frame, the evaluator analysed the extent to which the results obtained following the implementation of activities have contributed to the attainment of the planned objectives. Using evidence collected during the first two phases of the evaluation, the report explained the factors that contributed or hampered the achievement of results in terms of mobilisation and capacity building of selected state, entity and local level institutions for improvement of social protection and inclusion of children in Bosnia and Herzegovina, expansion of physical and human resources capacities for provision of social services in the target municipalities, development of models of diversified alternative social services, increase of access for the most vulnerable children and influence of parents on the development of new services or further expansion of existing ones.
Analysis of coordination and synergy between activities at different governance levels was also done. The report also discusses the additional/indirect effects (positive or negative) of the project.

**Efficiency:** The report analysed how well UNICEF organized itself in delivering its work with regard to managerial and budget efficiency. Analysis of efficiency was based on the assessment of outputs/activities in relation to project inputs, costs and planned timelines. The report also incorporates discussion of issues related to the assessment of the extent to which co-ordination was ensured with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps.

**Impact:** In the case of impact assessment, the key task of the evaluation was to examine to what extent the project increased local capacities to ensure that more children from vulnerable groups benefit from social protection and inclusion policies and services in a way which contributes to the overall improvement of the social protection and inclusion systems for children in BiH. The Evaluator also assessed if the project has accelerated the pace of change and if it gave direction to reforms in the area of social protection and inclusion, social services and early childhood development and care generally.

**Sustainability:** The evaluation report reviewed sustainability factors in terms of project design, process, implementation and national context. Sustainability was analysed from various perspectives: legal, institutional, capacity building, financial. The report highlights the factors that facilitated or decreased the sustainability prospects of the results of the project (legislation, synergy with similar initiatives, engagement and ownership by local stakeholders, etc.).

**Safeguarding of ethical issues**

The Evaluator applied a Child-Rights Based Approach to the evaluation, guided by five core principles: normativity, participation, non-discrimination, accountability and transparency, and by the Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation and Programming, approved by the United Nations Development Group in 2003:

- All programmes of development cooperation, policies and technical assistance should further the realization of human rights as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments.
- Human rights standards contained in, and principles derived from, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments guide all development cooperation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process.
- Development cooperation contributes to the development of the capacities of “duty bearers” to meet their obligations and/or of “rights holders” to claim their rights.
- The evaluation culminated in the draft and final evaluation report, which synthesizes evaluation findings and formulate recommendations.
- Throughout the process, the evaluation was in compliance with the United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards.

During data collection, the evaluator ensured that the evaluation process is ethical and that participants in the process can openly express their opinions, protecting the confidentiality of their answers. All interviewed people were informed in advance about the purpose and the themes of the interviews, and discussion groups, as the case. Special attention was given during the focus groups with parents of vulnerable children to ensure that the questions were
well understood and that the evaluation team is sensitive to beliefs, emotions and customs of participants.

**Involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process**

UNICEF took on the lead in recruitment of stakeholders from different institutional levels, following the agreed methodology and list of stakeholders of relevance to the evaluation developed by the consultant. Participation in the evaluation was voluntary and opinions were presented in the report in an anonymous manner.

Selection of parents and children for the focus group in Velika Kladusa was done in cooperation with the project coordinators and service providers (ECD centre). Parents were informed about the scope of the focus group and its main discussion topic and asked to confirm their consent. Children were informed that they can withdraw anytime during the focus group without any obligation to explain the reasons.

The evaluation process engaged stakeholders at three levels: **information, participation and consultation**, depending on the nature of each stakeholder and engagement in the Project A number of survey and interview and focus group discussion respondents answered qualitative questions on elements that could be improved or that they otherwise considered satisfactory by actually phrasing their responses as recommendations, which complied with way in which the qualitative data were coded, analyzed, and interpreted for these particular questions. Thematic analysis involved: Viewing all data available several times; categorizing the data into one (or more, as relevant) of the evaluation questions; identifying emerging patterns and themes across all data within each evaluation question; reorganizing the data according to thematic categories; and synthesizing the information contained in the thematic categories. Opinions, experiences and reflections shared during the interviews, focus group discussions and survey were valuable not only as insights and inputs for evaluation findings, but also for checking the perceived priorities for the continuation of reforms in social protection and inclusion of children in BiH by the key stakeholders.

This was very useful for informing the recommendations of the evaluation based on an open and participatory process initiated during the Field Phase and which will continue with the presentation of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations through the report.

**EVALUATION MATRIX**

The evaluation matrix (Annex 2) operationalizes the 27 evaluation questions by aligning the specific questions with data sources and methods of data collection. The matrix guided the development of data collection instruments and the data collection process.

**LIMITATIONS AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES**

Main limitation of the Evaluation was the scope of the fieldwork and allotted time and resources for this exercise. Due to short timeframe for the fieldwork of the evaluation, it was decided that only two municipalities will be visited for field observation, interviews and focus group discussions. While this has not affected the evaluation as a whole, it was presented a missed opportunity to gather voices of a more representative sample of municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some stakeholders were not available for interviews during the site visits</td>
<td>UNICEF informed stakeholders as early as possible of the upcoming visit and ask for their collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cases where stakeholders were unavailable for face-to-face consultations, the Evaluator followed up with the respective individuals at a later time via telephone or Skype.</td>
<td>UNICEF and local partners informed beneficiaries about the survey purpose and utilisation and asked for their collaboration. Additional time allocated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The SPIS Project includes a comprehensive set of interventions ensuring holistic approach working towards enhancing the system of social protection and inclusion. The Project is implemented in a complex socio-economic and political context and includes a range of partners from the state, entity, cantonal and local governments and CSOs. This Chapter examines the SPIS Project’s performance and analyses its work in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability prospects. The consideration of these criteria is based on a set of evaluation questions and related evaluation criteria and indicators as detailed in the Terms of Reference and the Evaluation matrix, provided in Annexes 1 and 2. For easier reference, relevant Evaluation Question is highlighted together with overall finding for it to guide the analysis.

3.1 RELEVANCE: TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE PROJECT RESPONDING TO THE NEEDS OF STAKEHOLDERS AND BENEFICIARIES?

The following is the analysis of the Project’s relevance from the perspective of the demands for reforms of social protection and inclusion system and response to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries, particularly children from vulnerable and excluded groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Project design and its objectives are aligned and respond to needs and priorities of beneficiaries and to the demands for reforms of systems for social protection and inclusion of children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Evaluation Question 1. Extent to which the Project addresses underlying causes of exclusion and respond to the needs of the most vulnerable target groups**

The Project design, its strategies for achievement of set objectives, address the underlying causes of exclusion and needs of most vulnerable groups, particularly children with developmental delays and disabilities and of children from families facing poverty and exclusion.

The Project builds on previous phases of implementation of comprehensive support to improvement of the social protection and inclusion systems in Bosnia and Herzegovina, through which efforts have been directed to improve social protection and inclusion services and support to children from vulnerable groups. The Project strategies are relevant to the needs of these children, particularly of children with developmental delays and disabilities and of children facing socio-economic challenges. The Project has been designed on the basis of extensive evidence base and lessons learned both from implementation of previous Project phases but also from assessments and studies conducted focusing on children in Bosnia and Herzegovina (MICS 2011-2012, Situation analysis of socially excluded children in BiH, Analysis of needs in the area of social welfare and health of families and children in FBiH and BD, Gap Analysis in the Area of Social Protection and Inclusion Policies in BiH/Study on compliance of BiH with EU policies and standards, etc.). These studies show that main challenges that children in Bosnia and Herzegovina face are those linked to equal access to social protection and inclusion services. The Project, through its efforts to strengthen the system for social protection and inclusion, addresses the challenges of children affected by the economic crisis and poverty, which is closely and consistently associated with poorer physical health, impaired cognitive development, underachievement in school and social risks. The data collected through SPIS conducted studies mentioned above show that there is a 38 per cent increase in the number of children registered in socially vulnerable families between 2002 and 2010. The project addresses the needs of children with disability, by giving them opportunities to access the social services, particularly those linked to early childhood development and inclusion in the educational system. The 2006 Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) estimated that 6.5 % of children from 2 to 9
years of age have some form of disability in BiH. The project strengthens the educational systems, addressing the challenge that children with disabilities face in access to basic education in mainstream educational institutions, including lack of or limited basic facilities required to ensure their accessibility to kindergartens and schools; preparing teaching staff to work with them; improving school curricula to be more flexible and adapted to these children’s special educational needs.

The project also provides an opportunity to devise systems to address multidimensional needs of children, through connecting social protection, health, education, law enforcement, civil society and other sectors in strengthening response to the needs of children.

The Project has not specifically targeted the children living in rural areas. Still, through supporting local Commisions for Social Protection and inclusion in developing evidence base on children in their communities, more comprehensive data on children, their needs and status have been developed, assisting the local governments to create informed policies on outreach to these children. Further, local social services established and supported by the project reached out to the vulnerable children from rural areas (as evidenced by field observation conducted within the Evaluation, whereby parents with children from rural areas in and around Velika Kladusa come to the ECD Center and use its services). The challenge with reaching out to rural children in need is ongoing poor financial situation in the communities included in the project. As far as age is concerned, various Project components targeted children of different age. The ECD component focuses on children aged 0-6; while advocacy component reached out and is relevant to children above 6 years old in various activities and workshops. Components for strengthening legislation, systems and service provision also have their relevance to children and adolescents.

**Evaluation question 2. Extent to which the Project design is relevant in regard to the overall Project goal and the achievement of its objectives in the given period of time**

UNICEF deliberately shaped the project to simultaneously address the issue of the gaps in the social protection and social inclusion systems for vulnerable families and children, in particular for children with disabilities at all levels of governance, with and through multiple stakeholders, and from different angles. The project applied broad approach, which was appropriate given the existing knowledge of and data on the issues at project onset, and in view of experiences gained from previous project phases. While being one of several strengths characterizing the design of the project, it also posed the challenge of spreading available resources too thin.

The overall design of the project and the strategies that it utilized at different levels were appropriate given its results framework, and given the types of changes that it was trying to contribute to. To guide the work of the project, UNICEF – in consultation with various state, entity, cantonal and local level partners in the country – defined ambitious, but not unrealistic overall objectives. These reflected the decision to simultaneously address the issue of strengthening social protection and inclusion systems from different angles, and by trying to involve all key stakeholders – both duty bearers and rights holders - at state as well as decentralized levels.

Data obtained through document review and interviews with stakeholders indicated that the process of designing the overall project as well as its various components was evidence based, building on lessons learned from previous project phases and in consultation with and integrating suggestions from various partners, including both duty bearers and rights holders.

The project was able to build on existing trust and partnerships between UNICEF and various stakeholders at all levels of governance. This allowed for continuity and a longer-term perspective of efforts aimed at strengthening the capacity of these actors despite
working within the setting of a time-bound project. At the same time; the project aimed at deepening the partnership and support to UNICEF partners beyond so-called traditional partners (such as local governments and civil society organizations) to include actors such as CSOs (EDUS, Project Hope) with whom UNICEF had not had interactions within previous projects as well as existing partners, such as Duga.

The (justified) decision to take a broad, systemic approach inevitably held the danger of fragmentation and of spreading available resources too thin. For the most part UNICEF was, however, able to successfully mitigate this risk. While the total financial resources available for individual activities and partnerships were limited, they were invested in realistically scaled and meaningful interventions, many of which led to tangible results (supported local actions and services; supported policy making interventions, etc.) relevant for the ongoing work of the respective actors. The resulting satisfaction over the partnership was confirmed in interviews with UNICEF partners throughout the evaluation process.

**Evaluation question 3. Extent to which the Project design and its objectives are relevant in regard to national policies and strategies**

The project has been relevant in view of government priorities and strategies at different levels in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Project in focus of this evaluation capitalises on achievements of preceding phases of the Project, particularly in the area of supporting further development of legislative and policy framework for social protection and inclusion (of children). The Project of focus of this evaluation was requested by the SPIS Management Board to the EUD, to extend services particularly to children with disabilities. It was has been designed to comply and contribute to adequate implementation of the legislation and policies in place before and those supported by previous Project phases, in all their elements, including the coordination and management structures. In this respect, the Project’s Management Board is composed of representatives of relevant competent authorities with the mandate to guide and ensure coordinated actions within their administrative unit (state, entity, canton, district) for achieving the goal of the Project in a concerted manner.

The Project addresses documented needs of the BiH institutions for strengthening Social Protection and Inclusion systems through: coordination and governance structures at all levels, including the establishment of permanent municipal SPI Commissions; identification of vulnerable groups of children using the Human Rights Based Approach to Programming; development of action plans and signature of protocols of cooperation between social sector service providers in target communities and Brcko district; programmes to promote the rights and address the needs of children with disabilities and Roma children; developing by-laws, multisectoral working groups and training curriculums on early childhood interventions (ECI) and scaling up social services for children and families, especially for children with disabilities.

Also, the Project addresses the important gap in implementation of many rights as set out in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and its Optional Protocol Persons which was ratified by Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), but never really applied in practice.

**Evaluation question 4. The extent to which the Project is designed according to international norms and agreements on Human Rights (HR) and Gender Equality (GE) and in line with national strategies to advance HR & GE**
The project has been designed and corresponds to international norms and agreements on human rights. Gender equality principle has not been at the forefront of the project’s strategy, still there has been a good gender balance among the beneficiary children and professionals.

The Project’s core has been the application of the human rights-based approach (HRBAP), with a particular emphasis on non-discrimination and participation principles. Through application of HRBAP, the project has been helping the authorities at all levels, including in selected municipalities, to address the actual needs of children and families, and to develop models and best practices to be expanded in the future. The Project also applies child rights indicators as tools to measure the obligations of the country – specifically, the progressive obligation to protect, promote and fulfil children’s rights - all of which relate to international treaty body obligations and the development agenda as specified by the EU inclusion policies.

With regards to gender equality norms and principles, the assessment of project documentation shows mixed situation with regards to data on target groups, final beneficiaries and progress as per indicators. Progress reports for this and previous Project phases show mixed approach to reporting on gender disaggregated data, whereby some gender disaggregated data is present (mainly with regards to children using established/supported local social services), but there is no specific discussion on any possible gender issues raised during the implementation of the Project. Gender disaggregated data regarding the professionals who benefitted from targeted interventions (workshops, trainings, working group meetings, etc.) does not exist, even though interviews and anecdotal data show that majority of participants are women. Nevertheless, this is accidental and reflection of the fact that the social protection and inclusion are female-dominated sectors and not the result of a gender-sensitive strategy employed by the Project.
3.2 EFFECTIVENESS: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE PROJECT MEET THE OUTCOMES AS DEFINED BY THE DOA AND LF?

Effectiveness is a criterion that measures the extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Effectiveness is a qualitative measure of immediate and observable change as a direct result of project activities and the delivery of outputs. This section is organised in such a manner to provide responses to EQs relating to OECD DAC Effectiveness criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation findings as regards contribution to envisaged results are positive, overall. The project achieved, albeit to varying degrees, all of its envisaged outputs, and made contributions to planned outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The project helped strengthen the legal frameworks for social protection and inclusion of children to a great extent. Key tools to achieving this end were targeted studies that explored different aspects of the issue (such as the Gap Analysis conducted, Situational analyses, etc.); as well as extensive efforts to facilitate dialogue among key actors at national and decentralized levels. The efforts resulted in one (1) by-law relating to continued professional education in early detection, diagnosis, intervention and monitoring for developmental and other disorders that affect child growth and development. The by-law was approved by Federal Ministry of Health. Additionally, scales for the development assessment of children ages from birth through 6 years old; draft curriculum on parent education for ECI educators was drafted as well as training curriculum and draft syllabi for the Training Modules for professional education of the existing professional staff for early detection, diagnostic and intervention have been developed (Basic Program for early detection of deviations from typical development (from 0 to 18 years of age), Advanced A program for early detection, diagnostic and intervention for child developmental disorders (from conception up to 6 years of age with focus on children up to 3 years of age) and Advanced B Program for detection, support and monitoring for preschool and school-aged children with deviations from typical development (ages 3 to 18 years)). Also, within the scope of SPIS IV, the Protocols strengthening the service delivery for children with disabilities, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families were revised wherever needed to reflect new legal solutions that came to force or as per recognised need to adapt them to local realities in 13 target communities, while coordination of Social protection and inclusion was strengthened at local level. However, cooperation and coordination at higher level of governance varies in depth, extent and inclusion of actors, mainly due to factors beyond control of the Project. Data derived from document review and stakeholder interviews indicate that the various research studies and related publications commissioned and supported by the project throughout its implementation were (and continue to be) relevant tools in facilitating the adoption or amendment of existing legal and policy frameworks.

The Project achieved important results in the area of strengthening SPI systems at local level through enhanced capacities for service delivery, and provision of quality inclusive services (particularly to children with disabilities, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families). The foundation for the work in this field was completing Mapping of the available services and gaps for children with disabilities in 32 municipalities (all municipalities included in different phases of the project since its initiation).

The Project reached out to 345 service providers from SPIS and non-SPIS locations who gained new knowledge on ECD and ECI through workshops, seminars, trainings and mutual exchanges of best practices and lessons learned. The capacity building was accompanied by small grant support to municipalities whereby six (6) new or improved services were established and/or supported reaching out to at least 134 children with disabilities. The work with educational institutions reached out to 118 teachers trained in inclusive education approaches to work with children with disabilities. Specifically, the Project efforts lead to issuing official instruction to all schools for establishment of school inclusion teams in the...
Una-Sana Canton. The interviews held within the scope of this evaluation showed that services are apparently better utilised in the small municipalities where no such services were existent before but the evaluation does not have sufficient evidence in this regard. Also, the interviewees agree that the knowledge and skills acquired were essential in producing better quality work with children (particularly those with disabilities or at risk of exclusion). In support to these finding, the survey responses show that the motivation of parents to become service users are all features of the service (particularly innovativeness of services and their quality) (See Graph 1 below). The most beneficial services for survey respondents are day care; individual treatment; speech therapy and special education; socializing with other children as stated in the open ended question within the survey (See Annex 5 for all responses).

![Graph 1. What motivated you to become service user?](image)

The Campaign It’s About Ability was an important and rather successful intervention for increasing awareness and knowledge of social inclusion, child rights, peace building, and inclusive education/intergenerational dialogue focusing on disabilities. Through various tools (such as media reporting, workshops, events, TV programmes, social media, opportunity for children to produce One minute junior movies, featuring and some of them produced by children with disabilities), the Project succeeding in reaching out to at least 1000 children with disabilities, who directly benefited from the Campaign, through direct participation in related events, and over 10,000 general children population. The TV programmes produced within the Campaign reached over 500,000 citizens, and social media reached at least 50,000 people. The initiative to produce One-minute junior movies included 138 children and resulted in 105 OMJM movies produced. The campaign was supported by all SPIS municipalities, and in 30 % of them, participation of representatives of Student’s Councils and children with disabilities in the SPI Commissions was ensured. All interviewed stakeholders agree that the Campaign and overall work of the Project on raising awareness and knowledge on inclusive education and children with disabilities has been important asset of the project and brought positive changes in schools and among children.

**Evaluation question 6. Extent and way in which the project contributed to the strengthening the Social Protection and Inclusion legal and policy framework, and coordination mechanisms**

The project has contributed to a great extent to the strengthening of the Social Protection and Inclusion legal and policy framework. The Project contributed to improved coordination mechanisms, with most visible effects at local level.
Review of available SPIS documentation and government legislation in the area of social protection and inclusion of children shows impressive results of UNICEF and partners’ efforts in strengthening the legislative and policy framework invested throughout the lifetime of the Project. While the measures taken at the onset of the SPIS Project to conduct extensive institutional and situational analyses in different areas of concern for children were widely discussed in terms of their added value, they provided strong evidence base for stakeholders to advocate and put pressure on government to take steps towards improvements of the system to better fit the children needs and rights. The real changes in the legislative and policy frameworks took place in the period since 2013, when most of the new legislation was adopted/revised or enriched by by-laws or protocols.

Review of data shows that, with contribution of the SPIS project since 2012, the following legislations/policies were adopted/revised/enriched. At the entity level, under the new RS Law on Social Protection (adopted April 2012), additional by-laws were adopted: By-law on needs assessment and targeting children and youth with disabilities (Official Gazette of the Republika Srpska, No. 117/2012); By-law on conditions for the establishment of social protection institutions (Official Gazette of the Republika Srpska, No. 24/2013); By-law on the implementation of the right to a day-care (Official Gazette of the Republika Srpska No.2/13) and By-law on foster care (Official Gazette of the Republika Srpska No. 4/14). In FBiH, in close coordination with federal and cantonal representatives, the Programme supported revision of two laws defining social protection in FBiH: a) Law on Basics of Social Protection; b) Law on Protection of Families with Children. In the area of ECD, BiH Framework Policy on ECD developed and adopted in March 2012. FBiH and RS ECD Policies also developed and adopted (March 2011 in RS and May 2011 in FBiH). Draft Strategic Plan for Improving ECD for FBiH for the period 2013-2017 was developed and approved by the federal government in March 2013. Protocol on cooperation for improvement of ECD in FBiH was adopted and signed by three sectoral ministers from FBiH in April 2012. Similar protocols on cooperation on the cantonal level were signed in Tuzla Canton in July 2012, in Una-Sana Canton in June 2013 and in Herzegovina–Neretva Canton in December 2013.

Within the SPIS IV framework, the By-law on continued professional education in early detection, diagnosis, intervention and monitoring for developmental and other disorders that affect child growth and development was developed and adopted by the Federal Ministry of Health in October 2013 (Official Gazette of FBiH 82/2013). Also, Guidelines for establishment of Day Care centres in FBiH adopted.

With regards to coordination mechanisms, the review of project documentation and interviews with UNICEF and partners show that the SPIS Project has adopted the principle of encouraging and supporting coordination both vertically (among different levels of governance) and horizontally (among partners and sectors) as a guiding principle of the Project. The argument for encouraging the cooperation is that cooperation between sectors in the area of social protection and inclusion creates positive environment and impact on the well being of children. Coordination and multisectoral cooperation builds the system of service delivery that is better able to identify children at risk of exclusion and provide harmonised, coherent protection services for these children and their families. This is especially important given the fact that child vulnerabilities and forms of exclusion are multi-faceted; therefore, the combination of skills of all relevant duty bearers in assessing and addressing the status, the needs of children and response to these needs are crucial.

The vertical coordination and that of sectors and actors at higher levels of governance seems to have lagged behind during the entire project cycle, as confirmed by analysis of documentation and interviews. This, however, is beyond the control of the Project: the slow pace of building cooperation and coordination at entity, inter-entity and particularly at state level is the result of the complexities of the governance and political systems in the country and cannot be affected or changed by a project. Still, examples of positive practice of cooperation has been seen in the Federation BiH, within efforts to build stronger response to...
early childhood development, Review of documentation and interviews shows that different sectors (Health, Education, Social protection) have joined into a Working group together with representatives of civil society working on development of guidelines for ECD. Besides this group established through the project, Federal Ministry of Health has initiated intersectoral group for healthy growth and development. This group includes representatives from education, health, social policy sectors and also the Federal Institute for planning. The group has served as forum for discussion on common issues but also issues of relevance for the Project. The group is still active.

There is evidence that, at local level, cooperation, coordination and networking between different sectors and local institutions (health, education, social welfare, justice, police, civil society, etc.) has worked much better and the results of such cooperation are more visible. Project data shows that Protocols are functional in 60 % of SPIS Municipalities (19 out of 32). The Commissions for social protection and inclusion have been established in all target municipalities, and the project data indicates that they are functional in 80 % of SPIS Municipalities. Visited municipalities confirm that they have both mechanisms in place and that they are using them. This is a good achievement, having in mind the fact that the project applied a model that was new to local level, particularly that all institutions dealing with any area of social protection and inclusion applied individual approach, without much efforts put in connecting in others who might contribute to betterment of the overall situation of a child or a group in question. However, due to the limited timeframe of this evaluation, it was not possible to get more extensive evidence of their functionality through field observations.

**Evaluation question 7. Extent and way in which the project contributed to the enhancement of systems and capacities to deliver inclusive services at the local level, with a focus on children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families**

The project has contributed significantly to the enhancement of systems and capacities to deliver inclusive services at local level, with a focus on children with disabilities, while also children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families were included through Child protection and foster care initiative.

Evidence collected within the evaluation process shows important new mechanisms taking root thanks to investment in capacity building of professionals in public and CSO institutions to deliver inclusive services for children, particularly children with disabilities. The foundation for improvement of services was laid down in previous phases of the Project, whereby Situation Analyses in target municipalities were created as comprehensive baseline documents about social protection and inclusion. The document includes aggregated data on different aspects of the needs of children and their wellbeing, and also provides for identification of vulnerable children in the municipalities. Based on this document, municipalities were able to develop local Action plans and new targeted services for children with disabilities, as well as to evidence gaps in capacities and resources. Throughout this phase, trainings for service providers were continued together with technical assistance and expertise in setting up services as well as procurement of supplies (e.g. didactic materials) for selected locations. As a result, the services are considered as accessible and good, while parents find them easily available with positive attitude of the service teams (See Survey for complete results). Overall, parents are satisfied with services used as per findings of the survey.

As already mentioned, the project reached out to service providers and educational professionals through various trainings and workshops. Interviews and review of documents confirm that these trainings were extremely important for professionals in different sectors to acquire knowledge and raise awareness and sensitise to the issues of vulnerable children (particularly children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of
separation from their families). Importantly, UNICEF applied an approach whereby an existing IECD Centre (Laktasi) would provide peer support to new ones through mentoring and training. This approach was very well received and proved to be valuable to new centres established. Specialist trainings and mentorship by EDUS were also praised as excellent investment and measure, which assisted improving skills of not only the Centres but also of professionals in different institutions and public servants in the government.

The Project also supported establishment of ECI services in 6 locations: Gacko, Tesanj, Stolac, Livno, Neum, and Kupres, while also continuing support to existing mechanisms at local level in old and non-SPIS communities. The efforts for institutionalisation of IECD and ECI services were based on modelling integrated services through the social protection and inclusion systems in selected locations, and finding possible solutions for institutionalisation of such services within the existing public institutions. The Project sought and tested various models of institutionalisation, including organising IECD and ECI services within kindergartens, as CSO or within the Dom zdravlja (Municipal Health Canter). Each of these models has its advantages, but also important disadvantages as confirmed by interviews with various stakeholders. If an IECD is organised as a CSO, it may fundraise from different sources but it can struggle to get the recognition and become part of the referral mechanism in the community, due to its non-institution nature. Placing it within the Health Centre gives it the precondition of health and not the multidimensionality it actually epitomises. On the other hand, such model provides an opportunity for early detection and immediate start of treatment and care. On a negative side, this model does not open the space for external fundraising, which brings constraints for long-term running of such institutional set up.

The Project advocated for integration of ECD services and models in both entities and at the state level, resulting in relevant policies adopted (See EQ 6 above). However, the relevant ministry in the RS did not continue investing in the ECD, as there was no interest for this area as confirmed in the interviews with relevant ministry representatives. In the FBiH though, more support and focus on ECD was placed resulting in signing ECD Protocols in four cantons (HNC, C10, BPC, WHC) and also protocols signed in three (3) non-SPIS municipalities: Mostar, Visoko, Cazin, which makes total of 6 cantons with signed ECD Protocols in FBiH.

Technical assistance to institutionalize teacher-training programme for inclusion was provided to Zenica-Doboj Canton and Republika Srpska. Staff from Pedagogical Institutes from these two administrative units is providing training for primary and secondary school teachers. As part of broader intervention in the area of inclusive education (not just SPIS), currently the efforts are being made to start with the training programme for preschool teachers. As a result of the advocacy to and cooperation with educational authorities at cantonal level, the Ministry of Education of the Una-Sana Canton issued official instruction to all schools for establishment of school inclusion teams.

**Evaluation question 8. Extent to which the Project contributed to raising awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue**

The project has significantly contributed to raising awareness on social inclusion and child rights among general population throughout the country. Important investments in peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue were also made in target municipalities, albeit on limited number of children exposed to and participating in the trainings and actions.

As discussed on the Section on Contextual Analysis of this Report, the data from the KAP conducted in 2013, revealed extreme social distance of mainstream population towards persons/children with disability. UNICEF tackled this important issue through the countrywide campaign It’s about Ability, which aimed at raising awareness and creating positive attitudes on the needs and inclusion of children with disabilities. The Campaign has been spreading key messages through events to mobilize civil society, service providers and policy makers,
through billboards, TV, the media and press events in order to raise awareness and change attitudes amongst the general public towards children with disabilities. Also, UNICEF created space for children with and without disability acquire knowledge on use of video editing resources in order to advocate for Child Rights with a focus on the abilities and rights of children with disabilities. Besides raising awareness and sensitising the public on issues of disability, advocacy efforts were pursued to support the establishment of day care centres for children with disabilities in more municipalities and to ensure all necessary assistance for children in schools as well as to ensure physical access for children/persons with disabilities to all social sector institutions. The campaign achieved important outputs (short films, joint actions and projects in local communities, etc.) but importantly, it also achieved to shift the attitudes and perceptions of disability as evidenced by the end-line KAP survey, conducted in November 2014. This KAP survey revealed the increase in self-assessed knowledge about children for about 10%. Almost 50% of the randomized sample population was exposed to the Campaign, mostly through the TV programme. Upon the direct exposure to the Campaign visuals, 90% of respondents said they would allow their child to be a best friend of the child with disability, no matter of which kind. This is an important evidence of how such efforts may bring lasting shifts in behaviours and attitudes, which can impact lives of children with disability.

The CSO Genesis Project lead the component targeting different groups of beneficiaries and enabling them to initiate, develop and support “school and community based” responses to child rights in general and focusing on social inclusion, violence prevention and peace building.

Genesis Project activities carried out within this project give a special focus to child participation, particularly of children with disabilities and emphasis was put on the capacity building and development of skills amongst the primary school children and their teachers to initiate, develop and support school and community based responses to child rights focusing on social inclusion, violence prevention and peace building.

Genesis Project team along with representatives from targeted primary schools and local communities actively worked on the establishment of formal links between schools and municipalities to ensure participation of children from the Student's Councils, including children with disabilities, in the work of the Municipal SPIS Committees and facilitating dialogue among local actors and children. Implemented project activities have created solid baseline and capacity to be used for future practice in involving children with disabilities and their parents in the decision-making processes at the municipality level on matters that concern them and could affect them and their lives.

Feedback from Genesis Project shows evidence of moving things in a positive direction with regard to participation of children and youth, including children with disabilities in decisions affecting their lives at municipality level. Due to limited scope of the evaluation, the Evaluator did not conduct any interviews or focus groups with participants/beneficiaries of this component of the Project, so the feedback received could not be triangulated and confirmed from other sources.

*Evaluation question 9. Extent to which the Project contributed to strengthening capacities of service providers to provide quality assistance to the most vulnerable groups in line with national and international standards*

The project has contributed to strengthening capacities of service providers to provide quality assistance to most vulnerable groups in line with national and international standards.

As discussed in the response to the EQ 7 above, the project has closely worked with service providers both on public institutions and CSO side. Throughout the SPIS IV, 345 service
providers from SPIS and non SPIS locations were trained in different areas of early detection of developmental delays and disabilities, and interventions; while more than 200 professionals attended various events where good practice models were shared and lessons learned were discussed. The capacity building comes timely for professionals as there is increasing demand and emphasis placed on bringing more adequate focus on children from vulnerable groups and their active inclusion. Also, building professional skills goes in line and responds to new needs and initiatives of local communities, which started to develop local Action Plans and become more actively engaged in Commissions for SPI at local level. Interviews show that the trainings bring new values and methodologies for work with children, particularly those with disabilities. However, the service providers who acquire new knowledge feel frustrated that this knowledge is going to be wasted due to lack of systematic support for innovative services by the local governments and higher levels of governance in the country. There is also a very ambivalent approach to retaining specialist knowledge built through the SPIS project by relevant Ministries. For example, one Ministry representative stated that if new professionals active as volunteers at one ECD centre want to remain volunteering, it will be good; however there is no funds to retain them and if they leave, they will find new volunteers. However, the ministry has no measures for education of newcomers, and the systems for training and capacity building are project based and have not become part of the system.

**Evaluation question 10. Major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the Project objectives to date**

The major drivers of project success have been the dedication and professional skills of involved project partners at different governance levels but also in CSOs, and the flexible approach adopted by UNICEF for supporting these actors. Also, important positive factor has been the integration of lessons learned and achievements of preceding phases of the Project, which assisted capitalizing on the achievements. However, a number of contextual influences limited results achievement. These include a challenging overall socio-economic situation, as well as persistent beliefs and attitudes towards vulnerable families and children, in particular for children with disabilities as well as slow pace of reforms of the social protection and inclusion system in general, and for children and families in particular. Also important challenge is the political stalemate in the country that affects decision-making and reformist processes in the country.

**DRIVERS OF THE PROJECT SUCCESS**

UNICEF bases the project on the established framework for strengthening social protection and inclusion system that was modelled throughout the year of implementation of the SPIS Project since its initiation (and also projects in the field preceding the SPIS). The framework is founded on three pillars: strengthening systems, strengthening services and creating enabling environment to strengthen children’s self-esteem, their awareness of rights and improved capacities through direct work with beneficiaries, strengthening partner organisations and support to the local capacity building. The intervention is building the social capital in terms of relationships (relations) among partners within governments, public institutions and sectors. This is done through individual exchanges, facilitation of dialogue and exchanges, partnerships and joint efforts. The Project invests in structures, i.e. empowering right holders to enhance their participation in social sphere through joint initiatives and/or supporting partners to organise their interventions to address the need for more active engagement of families and children with disabilities and promotion of the role, needs and priorities for inclusion.

Data derived from document and literature review, stakeholder consultations, survey and observations during the site visits provided evidence on strong interest, dedication and commitment of project partners and UNICEF. General agreement among stakeholders participating in interviews and in group discussions is that the Project has been valuable and
positive experience to all parties (except in case of one sector within the RS Ministry of Health and Social Welfare). There is strong ownership over project’s results by local Commissions, established services and CSO partners, particularly those that are also small grant recipients.

HINDERING FACTORS

Bosnia and Herzegovina was hit hard by the economic crisis and suffers from high unemployment rates and low levels of income. The situation of vulnerable groups, such as families with children, particularly those with disability and in rural areas, is particularly tense – and further compounded by discrimination and social exclusion, which limits access to services and protection systems.

Children with disabilities face discrimination and exclusion and the social distance is very high. Even though the notion of empowerment of children with disability and inclusion is not new in the country, many duty bearers as well as the general public still have no or only a very limited understanding of the needs, priorities and values of enhancing social inclusion of children with disabilities. The survey provides further support to these: the respondents state that the major challenges for the services provided are “dishonest local authority, lack of money, limited financial resources, insensibility and insincere support local authorities, lack of sincere will of local authorities to develop services, lack of inventiveness local authorities” (Survey Question 14). For the project this meant that in many cases efforts had to focus on first of all helping actors understand and acknowledge that issues worth addressing existed, before being able to tackle the ‘how’ of addressing them. That is why, UNICEF and partners invested in trying to influence general attitudes of actors and general public, together with helping them develop relevant skills.

Finally and importantly, political challenges and general complexity of governance and decision making in Bosnia and Herzegovina have been serious hindrance to the project's efforts to enhance SPI systems and provided obstacles to achievement of results set jointly with the government.

**Evaluation question 11. Additional (not directly planned by the Project) significant contribution/outcomes towards development of services and social inclusion of most vulnerable and excluded children, with a focus on children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families**

The project has had a strong multiplier effect at local level, whereby non-SPIS municipalities took initiative to learn from UNICEF and SPIS municipalities about approaches, lessons learned and models applied.

Interviews with UNICEF team, Commissions for Social Protection and Inclusion and CSO partners conducted within this Evaluation process raised the point of interest of the so-called non-SPIS municipalities to learn from the SPIS ones about the models, approaches, lessons learned. UNICEF seized the opportunity and shared the SPIS experiences also with other municipalities included in other UNICEF projects (e.g. Zavidovici, Olovo). UNICEF also organized multi sectorial workshops for both SPIS and non-SPIS target municipalities aiming to promote integrative approach to social protection at countrywide level. Through this process, over 300 duty bearers from social, health, education and civil sectors have been sharing the best solutions from integrative approach to enhance life quality of children with disability. In order to ensure the sustainability component, the workshops were based on strong local ownership and organized in close partnership with line ministries.

As a direct result of this approach, informal expert government group was established aiming to support local communities in implementation of identified approach relevant for their local
community, versus a generic approach. This methodology led to further promotion and implementation of integrative approach with strong focus on children with disabilities. Added value is in the created networks of duty bearers as there is a gap in harmonized service provision at the levels of local communities and the policy makers. All of the recommendations from the workshops have been used to inform policy makers on the actual needs of children with disability in present time, considering the effects of economic crises and natural disasters.
3.3 EFFICIENCY: TO WHAT EXTENT DID THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PROJECT ENSURE TIMELINES AND EFFICIENT UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES

Efficiency is a measurement of project management performance with regard to achieving the goals by using available resources. This evaluation could not conduct the cost analysis due to overall lack of consistent data on similar programmes, interventions or standards. The analysis is structured as per EQs relevant for this section.

The UNICEF team used the project funds strategically and efficiently, ensuring timeliness and effective utilisation of resources.

UNICEF applied appropriate management structures and approaches that accompanied technical competence and personal dedication of the project team, contributing to the efficient implementation of the project. The Project was founded on lessons learned and project experiences from preceding phases showing informed organizational learning and improvement of measures and focus on what realistically can be done in the given time, resources and contextual framework in the country.

The evaluation has found evidence through desk research and field phase that UNICEF reviewed and incorporated lessons learned from past experiences not only in the overall project design (better elaborated logical framework), but also in view of how to focus the Project interventions on what can realistically be achieved within the given limitations (time, resources, political and socio-economic factors).

Consulted project partners recognize the positive role played by the UNICEF and their subject matter expertise, knowledge of the complexity of the country and choice of approaches to tackle gaps and needs, as well as their personal dedication. The team was praised for its flexibility, which allowed project partners to adapt plans according to changing context or evolving insights.

One key characteristic of UNICEF’s approach to managing partnerships was its willingness to work with any actor willing and interested to engage with them, as well as its ability to facilitate exchange and collaboration among these partners. This is an important feature of the Project, given the complexity of the country’s political and administrative set up and challenges stemming from the two. At the same time, UNICEF also made decisions to reducing collaboration if the respective partner did not indicate interest or commitment (e.g. in case of the Sector for Health in Republic of Srpska). This approach was appropriate given the finite time and resources available to the project, in view of its broad, system-oriented approach; and in light of the fact that other actors were both willing and able to use resources to achieve actual results.

The monitoring mechanism for the project has also been improved significantly in this phase of the Project implementation (in comparison to the findings of the Joint Evaluation of the SPIS conducted in 2012 that recommended improvement of monitoring systems). Monitoring of project in view of tracking and keeping records of the use of financial resources has always been appropriate and good, as confirmed by the findings of the Court of Auditors’ assessment of the Project commissioned by EUD. Monitoring in relation to progress towards envisaged results made by different partners and the project as a whole has also been improved, mainly through better tracking of progress through achievement of indicators. Key tool in monitoring process is tracking progress against indicators as set out in the project logframe. Also, written progress reports are required and received from implementing partners on a regular basis as well as through ongoing, informal exchange with these partners using email, telephone, or in face to face visits.
UNICEF used the available project funds strategically and efficiently. Despite having made the deliberate choice to work with a multitude of different partners and addressing the issue of social protection and inclusion from different angles simultaneously, UNICEF was, for the most part, able to avoid spreading available resources too thin.

The original project budget is 616,942 EUR. The budget committed by the European Union was 500,000 EUR. This was complemented by UNICEF’s own funds with additional 116,942 EUR. The Project lasted for 15 months, and despite the fact that the time and resource allocation was limited, the project succeeded to complete originally planned activities, bringing the expansion of existing mechanisms and services established from the successes of the previous phases of the intervention.

UNICEF has engaged its staff to review and comment on various policy and strategic drafts, which ensured cost-effectiveness of human resources as this part was done without any additional costs for the Project. Local experts and trainers were hired whenever possible instead of international consultants, leading to important cost savings for fees and translation costs. Government partners also played an important role in contributing to the project through ensuring advocacy initiatives are better heard within their vertical and horizontal peer groups. CSOs, besides implementing their agreed activities, also undertook the advocacy role as well as reviewing and commenting on various policy and strategic drafts (e.g. EDUS), which complemented UNICEF efforts.

Additional efficiency features of the Project consisted of the use of available premises in hospitals (Dom zdravlja) and kindergartens for the delivery of IECD services in order to minimise the costs and ensure as far as possible coordinated implementation schedules at local level. The procurement process was transparent and guided by the value-for-money principle.

UNICEF’s mission within SPIS Project goes in line with the statement of a renowned scholar, James J. Heckman, Nobel Prize laureate, who said that “the highest rate of return in early childhood development comes from investing as early as possible, from birth through age five, in disadvantaged families.” 17 Analysis of the investments in strengthening the social protection and inclusion system, and particularly related services shows direct benefits to children and their families, bringing about tremendous returns in the future for the individuals, communities and society generally. The utilised funds have brought about positive results, particularly in the area of understanding the needs and how to respond to these needs through cross-sectoral cooperation, provision of services and strengthening legislation. Project investment in rehabilitation of premises of service providers, development of trainings and education of professionals in the area of social protection and inclusion of children can be quickly recovered in the coming years as more and more children will be covered through the support schemes, become integrated and benefit of child-centred, quality programmes. In other words, investment in early development and support returns in the future will pay for initial investment. From this perspective, efficiency of the Project may be perceived as high.

The Project builds on achievements of previous SPIS projects and overall developments in this sector. Its achievements become more efficient also as partnerships, policy environment, formal coordination mechanisms and knowledge gained from already supported through previous phases of SPIS, but also other related projects of

UNICEF, resulting in coherent and mutually reinforcing approaches and methodologies. It also built on the experience of UNICEF in assisting the countries globally to strengthen protection of child rights, thereby ensuring coherence, complementarity and cost-effective use of resources.

**Evaluation question 14. Extent to which the project ensured co-ordination with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps**

The project has ensured coordination with other partners to encourage synergies and avoid overlaps.

UNICEF and Save the Children are traditional agencies that support promotion and protection of child rights. Both organisations focus on empowerment of children, particularly those with disability, and strengthening systems for their protection. During the SPIS project implementation, there have been no overlaps between the two organisations’ work. In cases where similar trainings were conducted (e.g. in case of trainings for teachers on inclusive education), good coordination between the organisations and the relevant Ministries ensured no overlaps of training participants, but ensuring multiplication of knowledge. Such example may be found in organization of such trainings for teachers in Una Sana Canton. The interview with the respective cantonal Ministry of Education revealed that the two Agencies and their partners and in close coordination with the Ministry ensured that there is no overlap but also that there are synergies and similar approaches to the training. This is a good example of how well established relationships with government counterparts may contribute to more coordinated approaches and efforts of donors/implementers.

The Campaign “It’s about ability” is another example of synergies between EUD, USAID and UNICEF. The campaign started off as an activity independent of SPIS Project, but was then integrated into the SPIS project as an important component of awareness raising and empowerment of children with disability. As such it fits well with other components and adds value to ongoing efforts on strengthening systems for social protection and inclusion.

Throughout the Campaign “It’s About Ability”, the partnerships were established with the BiH Football Association, BiH Youth Sports Games and BiH Special Olympics. The project established media partnerships with television channels within the Public Broadcasting System: with one national and two entity television channels. Formal and informal partnerships with more than 50 non-governmental organisations and Associations were established. In addition, UNICEF has mobilized celebrities and public figures in Bosnia and Herzegovina, all of whom used their social image and media space to share the common messages on abilities.

Another initiative worth noting is the new Project implemented by UNICEF jointly with several UN Agencies (UNHCR, UNDP and IOM) under the title “Annex VII: Support to durable solutions of Revised Annex VII DPA Implementation Strategy” Project. This project is aims to enable national actors to address the remaining obstacles to solutions for displaced persons and returnees in accordance with the Revised Annex VII DPA Implementation Strategy goals. UNICEF supports 10 target locations in the establishment of the Social Protection and Inclusion community model, through strengthening the local social protection and inclusion policy framework and service delivery for vulnerable families and children, with a focus on internally displaced persons and returnees. The Project is a good example of synergies and joint work of UN Agencies but also shows the attention to extending the SPIS model to other localities around the country. The same approach has been utilized within the Birac regional cooperation and development project, funded by the Government of Netherlands.

**Evaluation question 15. Flexibility of the Project design in adapting to the changing environment (impact of the recent flood, etc.)**
The project has been flexible to adapt to the changing environment to a great extent.

The Project has been sufficiently flexible to adapt to the changing environment and context within which the SPI is organised. For example, the Project continuously sought ways/systems within which the ECD centres would be allowed to sustain without UNICEF’s support but within institutional set up in the two entities (and cantons). Continuous dialogue with the government and in-depth understanding of the limitations within which different levels of governments and institutions are facing, enabled UNICEF to achieve realistically possible results, while maintaining generally positive attitudes and support to the issue of strengthening the SPI systems, as confirmed by the interviewed government stakeholders (except representative of the Health sector in the RS government). Positioning of the so-called SPIS Consultants within the relevant Ministries at entity and state level helped the Project understand the (changing) needs and adapting the Project interventions to address them. The Project also took proactive steps to explore and potentially address needs of the Centres for Social Work in the municipalities affected by floods (even non-SPIS communities). Centres for Social Work in Celinac and Brcko were supported within these efforts, with funds raised from other sources than SPIS.

**Evaluation question 16. Extent to which are HR & GE a priority in the overall Project budget and implementation**

The project’s underlying principle and approach in all interventions is the human rights based approach, so the budget, while not explicitly stating this, covers human rights. However, gender equality has not been the priority of the Project.

As elaborated in the Relevance section of this Report (EQ 4), the human rights based approach is the underlying principle and foundation of the project. It is not explicit in the budget, but it goes without saying that the human rights and HRBAp is the priority of the Project, as the SPI methodology is fully aligned with the human rights principles of programming. The gender equality is not the explicit priority of the project and as such is not reflected either in the budget or in the DoA or the project implementation and monitoring systems. However; in the course of project monitoring, some of the important gender issues have been noted and the future actions will take into consideration this evidence. Also, the SPIS case study conducted within the framework of the Project, included references to gender.
3.4 IMPACT: TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE PROJECT IMPROVED THE SOCIAL PROTECTION AND INCLUSION SYSTEMS FOR CHILDREN IN BIH?

Formally, impact (and sustainability) can only be fully assessed after the end of the project since, as a development measure, it tries to give a judgement on the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, either directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Impact measures the effect of the project in meeting the overall objective. A positive impact results if the project purpose is achieved, thereby contributing to the realisation of the overall objective.

The Project has contributed significantly to the improvement of social protection and inclusion systems, primarily by lying down the foundations for systemic change, rather than focusing on isolated individual actors alone.

The project contributed to a great extent to the promotion of multi-sectorial approach to SPI through establishment of protocols of cooperation and referral mechanisms in targeted municipalities.

Analysis of available data from various Situational/Institutional/Gap Analyses conducted by the Project and external sources shows that prior to the Project, the cooperation among different public institutions and service providers in charge of addressing needs of children (and particularly children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families) has been scarce and almost non-existent. The response to needs, particularly in cases where coordinated multi-sectoral response was required, was rather ad-hoc and hectic. The project, with its facilitation of dialogue and collaboration of partners from different sectors, has brought about the change in the way complex issues and cases where children are involved to a new level. This was particularly visible in communities where the signed Protocols (and established Commissions) have started being applied in practice. Interviews with stakeholders and review of documentation point to positive changes in understanding, awareness of and application of holistic approach to tackling needs of children, and cooperation between sectors in this process.

Evaluation question 18. Level of success of the project in supporting a structural reform of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance

The project has supported the structural reform of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance with success, albeit the outcomes of support are less visible and sustainable at state level.

The project has contributed to the structural reform of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance significantly through both strengthening the evidence base and also through supporting new policies and legislation in the area of social protection and inclusion. The evidence base building (Situational, institutional, functional and gap analyses at all levels), was a highly disputed component of all previous phases of the Project (as evidenced by evaluations and feedback from interviews) but it brought about better understanding of the current context, gaps and current approaches to addressing the needs of children. The evidence base further supported building new legislation and policies which now make up strong foundation for more systematic and more adequate response to the needs of children (particularly children with disabilities). However, the level of success in supporting the structural reform is low at state level, and this is mainly due to complex political and governance situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and is beyond the control of the project. At lower level, the achievements and their outcomes are significant, even though the Project as such could not influence the way in which the “money would follow the policy”, i.e. changes and increase in financial allocations for SPI. This is the area of further focus: the
need to continue advocating and supporting initiatives for more equitable allocations of budgets at all levels to respond to the needs of most vulnerable children.

**Evaluation question 19. Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups**

Available data strongly indicate that project efforts have contributed to moving existing change processes into the desired direction, and that the policies, mechanisms and services have impacted lives of targeted groups of children positively. Still, a lot remains to be done in the area of strengthening social protection and inclusion systems in the country.

Available evaluation data allow validating the initial stages of the envisaged progression of change implied by the project’s results framework, up until changes in the extent and quality of implementing existing legal and policy commitments assuring social protection and inclusion of children. There is no information available, yet, on the extent to which achievements made to date have influenced, or will influence, changes in the extent to which marginalized and children from excluded groups are the subject of discrimination in different social spheres. However, as outlined in previous chapters, the project has made important contributions both in view of influencing the enabling environments for such changes at different levels of governance, as well as by facilitating the establishment of important baseline data. The latter provides the basis for tracking and identifying changes in relevant dimensions of discrimination of children from vulnerable and excluded groups over time. In doing so the project contributed to helping national actors better understand and ‘map out’ the dimensions of the issue and systematically track related progress, as well as to identifying gaps and needs as regards their own knowledge and skills to address it.

The question of progress towards the envisaged project impact cannot be discussed in separation of the larger context of the economic and political future of Bosnia and Herzegovina. One key question in this regard is, of course, whether and when the envisaged integration in the European Union will occur, and, if so, with what consequences.

**Evaluation question 20. Results of the interventions in children’s lives - intended and unintended, positive and negative - including the social, economic and environmental effects on targeted groups (children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families)**

The project has created mechanisms through legislation and policies, and new services and collaborative interventions that, if and when implemented have positive effects of children’s lives. Specifically, the ECD and ECI services provided in SPIS and non-SPIS locations reached out to 2,500 children, about 100 of them are children with delays and disabilities, while outreach to 134 children with disabilities was done through small grants. The lives of these groups of children have been improved as evidenced also by the survey response. Finally, the project reached out to over 10,000 children, out of which, at least 1000 children with disabilities through the Campaign activities. Feedback from the Campaign participants show positive changes in the way children think and relate to each other.

It may be expected that investment in legislation and policies which have been improved and further developed by the project will have positive impact on all children, particularly those with disabilities and excluded children, as the measures will be more focused and better suited to the needs. Also, the new services, based on evidence and innovative approaches have improved the lives of children as they empower them and teach them new skills and abilities to be better included in different social spheres.
**Evaluation question 21. Unintended results on human rights & gender equality in the intervention? Were they positive or negative and in which ways did they affect the different stakeholders?**

The project has contributed to better respect and protection of human rights, particularly of children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families. This evaluation could not establish any specific results on gender equality, due to lack of gender-disaggregated data collected by the project.

The Project has achieved important changes in the way how children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families are treated and how their rights are respected, as evidenced by the evaluation data and particularly the KAP follow up assessment conducted for the purpose of the Campaign. This is important achievement. However, the momentum of achievements should not be lost and further efforts need to be invested in strengthening the public awareness, understanding and building positive response to the needs and rights of these groups of children. Also, the momentum should be used for further strengthening of social welfare system to better correspond and address the needs of these groups.
3.5 SUSTAINABILITY: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE PROJECT OUTCOMES ACHIEVED SUSTAINABLE?

As with impact, sustainability is usually assessed after project intervention since it measures whether the positive outcomes of the project at purpose level are likely to continue after major development assistance has been completed. The sustainability prospect is assessed against the Evaluation questions as set out in the Terms of Reference for the Evaluation, so they guide the analysis within this criterion.

The sustainability prospects of the achievements of outcomes in all areas are less likely.

While the Project’s DoA does not include a comprehensive (stand-alone) sustainability strategy, it outlines important steps to ensure sustainability of changes achieved for most vulnerable groups. These steps include, but are not limited to capacity development and building know how, synergies between the international and local expertise; institutionalisation of mechanisms established; as well as adoption of legislation and policies, which all contribute to building solid basis for sustainable SPI.

The Project design includes section on sustainability, which is recognised as of outmost importance to all involved actors. The DoA outlines a number of measures and interventions that are to contribute to sustainability of the systemic reforms. It recognises the importance of capacity development for sustainability of the changes supported, stating, “improved capacity of the beneficiary institutions and their personnel will be a lasting gauge of the overall success of the project”\(^{18}\). The Project also sees added value of blending knowledge and experience and synergies between the international and local expertise. The Project envisages continued efforts for institutionalisation of mechanisms and services established and/or supported as critical driver for sustainability of changes achieved. Also, the Project design recognises positive factor of adoption of legislation and policies as a driver for sustainability of achieved reforms in the SPI system.

**Evaluation question 23. Extent to which the legislative framework developed and policy documents produced provide a ground for sustainable and coordinated service provision for the most vulnerable and excluded children and their families**

The legislative and policy solutions supported by the Project (in its entirety) serve as positive foundation for sustainable and coordinated service provision for the most vulnerable and excluded children and their families.

The SPIS Project, in its entirety, has supported the governments at all levels in developing policies and elaborating legislation to better serve the needs of the most vulnerable children. Relevant legislation and policies have been adopted and now present the foundation addressing the needs. However, due to political and socio-economic challenges as well as complexities of budgetary and decision-making procedures in the country, it is questionable if some of the new mechanisms set up by the policies adopted (such as the IECD Centres) will continue to live once project support disappears. This is mainly due to the fact that no clear budget allocations have been attached to these policies thus far. The Federal Strategy has allocated budget but it is still not implemented as it should.

**Evaluation question 24. Extent to which national level mechanisms that have been strengthened for monitoring and capacities improved for reporting on social protection and inclusion reforms, are likely to continue being effective beyond the project time-frame**

\(^{18}\) Project Description of Action, p. 29
The project has invested significant efforts in strengthening national level mechanisms for monitoring but also in strengthening reporting capacities on social protection and inclusion reforms. However, the likelihood of their sustainability depends on a number of factors.

The project has created a strong evidence base for reforms of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance. At national level, the Project worked with relevant ministries (Ministry of Civil Affairs and Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees) to strengthen their capacities for monitoring and reporting. Especially valuable were the SPIS consultants who worked closely with these ministries in different areas of social protection and inclusion, as confirmed by interviewees from relevant ministries. While some of the SPIS consultants were retained at different ministries and different levels, which is a good indicator; still the national mechanisms for monitoring struggle with general obstacles of lack of responsiveness of lower level of governance to monitoring requests. These challenges reflect the overall complex state in which the country is today, and will affect the quality of monitoring and reporting of the country in a unified manner.

**Evaluation question 25. Extent to which new knowledge and skills have been integrated into regular activities of professionals working with children without parental care, children with disabilities and children at risk of separation from their families, regardless of whether they work as service providers or case-managers in centres for social work**

The greatest achievements of the Project lay with local level and direct work with children. Evidence gathered within the evaluation process shows that new knowledge and skills have been integrated into regular activities of professionals working with children without parental care, children with disabilities and children at risk of separation from their families, regardless of whether they work as service providers or case-managers in centres for social work. New approaches to diagnostics, care and empowerment of children with disabilities and other groups have been acquired and already bring first outcomes on lives of children included in the improved services. However, the level to which the government counterparts will succeed in retaining and further building this knowledge remains a big question after the closure of this project. The survey shows ambivalent feedback by parents: while 77% of parents believe or strongly believe that the services will continue to be available for as long as children need them, 10.3% believe they will not be available due to lack of donor funds or government budget to support them. 12.8% of respondents are not sure or do not know (See Graph 2 below).
Evaluation question 26. Extent to which the Project promoted strengthening of already existing partnerships and establishment of new ones and to strengthening of inter-sectoral and cross-sectoral cooperation both at the national and local level

The project has moved the whole system of SPI forward through advocating for and supporting cooperation and partnerships among sectors. New partnerships and intersectoral cooperation initiatives have been forged and many such new forms of collaboration have strong sustainability prospects.

The last phase of the SPI Project has built on lessons learned and models applied throughout the project on building partnerships and strengthening inter-sectoral and cross-sectoral cooperation both at the national and local level. The Project succeeded in facilitating Protocols of cooperation between relevant government institutions at all levels and forged new partnerships between institutions that did not work so closely together before. Interviews with relevant stakeholders from all levels of governance agree that the partnerships and cooperation, particularly in the systems of referral, have increased. Still, all interviewed stakeholders agree that continued partnership, cooperation and exchange will depend to a large degree on personal contacts and personal motivation to move things forward.
4. Lessons Learned

The evaluation findings and feedback from stakeholders interviewed within the evaluation process, as well as analysis of the survey results point to a number of emerging good practices and lessons learned, as follows:

Investment in strengthening social protection and inclusion systems remains relevant for Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Project implementation proves the relevance of the type of interventions selected at all levels of governance in the country. The Project fits well within the strategic directions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the EU, particularly the IPA Component I – institution building. The Project responds to developmental context and challenges in target communities where it has been active.

Partnership between UNICEF and Bosnian Government is a good vehicle for supporting reforms in the sector. UNICEF is a good implementing partner, as it provides neutral and impartial venue for supporting reforms and development of new partnerships, cooperation mechanisms and services.

Long-term investment in partnerships, cooperation and coordination contributes to achievement of results. Several of the involved national partners were involved for the whole, or at least most of the duration of the project since its start. Several of these partners, e.g. the Ministries, had worked with UNICEF on similar issues prior to this particular project. The continued relationship allowed for building and deepening mutual trust, as well as a better understanding of the needs, capacities, and challenges faced by the respective partner. It also allowed UNICEF to achieve more with less: the partnerships were instrumental for facilitating access to local and cantonal level, as relevant Ministries at higher levels of governance supported and facilitated UNICEF’s initial steps in building relations with these levels.

Bottom up approach can bring about the desired legislative/policy changes at higher level through experiences, tested models and beneficiary satisfaction. Evidence gathered within the evaluation process shows the relevance and usefulness of locally generated experiences from testing models and approaches as the basis for evidence-based advocacy and policy making in the area of social protection and inclusion. Being able to refer to locally tested models and concepts was seen to be crucial for overcoming the otherwise common reaction of actors to dismiss efforts to promote new mechanisms for social protection and inclusion as being based on ‘foreign’ concepts and not being relevant in the respective national contexts. The project demonstrated how adapted and further developed models (e.g. the IECD and ECI and resulting recommendations informed policy and programme development.

Structural reforms in the area of social protection and inclusion require time and continuous effort. UNICEF, its partners and EUD as a donor invested years in bringing about changes in legislations, policies and mechanisms and services at all levels of governance. However, the momentum of reforms should not be lost, so there is still a need to continue with supporting concerted efforts of all parties to continue developing and institutionalising models that bring improvements of lives of children, particularly those most vulnerable: children without parental care, children with disabilities and children at risk of separation from their families.

Investment in empowerment and protection of right holders remains relevant. The project has enabled empowerment of children and their families, as rights-holders, through opening access to services and strengthening policies and legislation. The work is not finished and a lot remains to be done to ensure systematic, equitable access to services for children and their families.
There is a need for stronger investment by projects in ensuring that the gender dimension of social exclusion is understood and tackled. While this Project has contributed to women empowerment, its intervention logic and related reports do not follow a gender mainstreaming approach. Such practice should be introduced in the future UNICEF projects.
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

The SPIS is an EU funded Project, implemented in cooperation with government counterparts, with an aim to enhance the system for social protection and inclusion of children and is implemented by UNICEF.

The Programme builds on the momentum of the predecessor phases of the Project, while enriching the interventions by integrating activities including the so-called SPIS and non-SPIS municipalities into sharing best practices, lessons learned and models tested throughout the entirety of Project implementation. Analysis of interventions undertaken by the SPIS project shows that the project complies with the IPA purpose, i.e. to support the reforms undertaken as part of the European integration process, particularly with focus on institution building, sustainable economic and social development, and support to civil society.

The Programme is conceptually a very relevant vehicle for promoting and utilising opportunities provided by the EU accession process, particularly in terms of institution building and preparation of the government for undertaking measures to comply with EU Acquis. It is also very timely and appropriate to the current stage of development of the country. Its strengths are that it adopts a holistic approach to enhancing social protection and inclusion systems, and addresses the issue of social protection and inclusion of children both horizontally (within and among local governments), and vertically (between the local, cantonal, entity and state government institutions). The Project design and its objectives are aligned and respond to needs and priorities of beneficiaries, particularly children from vulnerable and excluded groups. There is evidence of alignment of the Project objectives with the needs of stakeholders and government partners at all levels of governance in BiH in the area of social protection and inclusion of children.

The Project DoA outlines a number of outcomes of activities and strategies implemented by the project. Evaluation findings as regards contribution to envisaged results are positive, overall, albeit to varying degrees in specific areas. The project fully or at least partly achieved all of its planned objectives, and there is evidence of contributions to progress towards the envisaged outcomes. Particularly strong contributions were made in view of strengthening the systems and capacities to deliver quality inclusive services at the local level, and in raising awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue, focusing on children with disabilities,(Objectives 2 and 3). Progress made towards strengthening the Social Protection and Inclusion legal and policy framework and coordination mechanisms (Objective 1) has varied considerably depending on the respective project partner and level of governance. This is the area where project did not succeed to great extent in ensuring that all levels are utilising coordination mechanisms and benefits these can bring. Within the IECD component, the Project did not succeed to ensure systematic investments, as there was no interest by RS government counterparts to continue working on this area as confirmed in the interviews with relevant ministry representatives.

The UNICEF team utilised project funds strategically and efficiently, ensuring timeliness and effective utilisation of resources. Despite having made the deliberate choice to work with a multitude of different partners at different governance and sectoral levels and addressing the wide range of issues within the social protection and inclusion of
children from different angles simultaneously, UNICEF was able to avoid spreading available resources too thin.

The Project has contributed significantly to the improvement of social protection and inclusion systems, primarily by lying down the foundations for systemic change, rather than focusing on isolated individual actors alone. Part of this approach included efforts to establish baseline data on existing attitudes, knowledge and practice in various sectors and/or institutions, and the conduct of targeted research to explore selected issues in the specific context of local communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In doing so the project contributed to clarifying the nature and scope of the issue of social protection and inclusion and child rights, thereby laying the foundations for future informed efforts by national and/or international actors. The established systems, mechanisms and services already show positive effects on children directly included and benefiting from innovative approaches and collaborative efforts of partners.

Overall, the Project has achieved important outcomes in all areas of its intervention: legislation, coordination, new services; skills and knowledge for service provision; monitoring and reporting, etc. However, the sustainability prospects of these achievements are less likely. The current legal and policy framework is strong and lays foundations for further development and expansion of services and measures for support to children. However, financial constraints at all levels of governance and scarce resources of service providers at local level demand further dependence on external funds.

The Project had a major contribution to the promotion and realisation of child rights through opening access to social protection and inclusion services and early development to children left out of the system, empowering them, as rights-holders, to make informed choices and have their opinion heard. It had a positive contribution to the strengthening of the capacity of a wide range of Bosnian duty-bearers to protect and fulfil the child rights. The Project has paid particular attention to capacitating parents, as rights-holders, to organise themselves and advocate for child rights and better local governance. The Project contributed to women empowerment, but without having a necessarily gender mainstreaming approach. It managed to ensure an equity focus especially in case of rural children and by orienting investment to municipalities with lowest coverage of children in social protection and inclusion services.
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations to UNICEF are based on the evaluation conclusions outlined in section 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Conduct Impact assessment and draw lessons learnt for the SPIS Project in its entirety to inform future policy measures and projects that will focus on children with disabilities, children without parental care, and children at risk of separation from families</td>
<td>UNICEF and partners</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact assessment of the SPIS Project is seen as an important process to gain knowledge on effects and impacts of these interventions in the country, at all levels of governance. This process will inform all involved actors how relevant experiences and insights gained through the implementation of the project under review might be used even more effectively to inform organizational learning, particularly for development of measures to empower children with disabilities, children without parental care, and children at risk of separation from families. Impact assessment will also provide understanding of results and impacts of the Project, and reflect on lessons learned. It would also be an important as policy advocacy tool for both UNICEF and partners in continued efforts to strengthen systems of social protection and inclusion of children with disabilities, children without parental care, and children at risk of separation from families at all levels of governance as well as service delivery.

| O2 | Organise a promotional campaign to promote best practices from the SPIS-municipalities and enable sharing them with underdeveloped municipalities (e.g. peer-to-peer) | UNICEF and partners | 2015-2016 |

The implementation of the SPIS Project has brought significant changes in ways municipalities operate. Some municipalities have advanced significantly during the period of interventions. Lessons learnt and best practices from these municipalities would offer valuable lessons and/or models for other municipalities, which would help them to improve their focus and operations. That is why, promotional campaign in the form of workshops and events to share lessons learned and best practices between municipalities and peer-to-peer learning.

| SP1 | Further invest in country-wide expansion of international standards in the area of social protection and inclusion of children, particularly children without parental care, children | UNICEF, government partners | 2015 - 2020 |
with disabilities and children at risk of separation from their families.

Despite the noted progress made towards the long term goal of improvement of the social protection systems for children at all levels of governance through strengthening the social protection and inclusion policy framework and service delivery for vulnerable families and children, in particular for children with disabilities, a lot remains to be done in this regard. To this end, the project under review has laid valuable foundations that can and should be built upon. It is recommended that UNICEF and partners continue building capacities of local governments and service providers that have not benefited from the project so far to organise and offer quality services to citizens. Priority should be given to under-developed, rural municipalities where children are deprived of social services. The main partners in this process are expected to be the municipalities, social service providers, parents and civil society organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP2</td>
<td><strong>Ensure continuation of support to IECD and other new services established by the Project, to strengthen their mechanisms for sustainability.</strong></td>
<td>Government, with support of UNICEF and donors</td>
<td>2015 - 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IECD and other services established through the Project have a high threat to sustainability due to a mix of factors, as elaborated in the Key Findings sections of this Report. IECD services are in line with the new policy and legislation provisions, making them integral part of statutory service provision. To support implementation of legislative provisions, all available resources should be invested in continuous support to the established services and to advocating for their institutionalisation. This is particularly due to the fact that these services present innovative, caring and valuable space for children, particularly those with disabilities to get prompt and adequate care and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP3</td>
<td><strong>Advocate for development of the framework for securing the financial sustainability on long-run of support and empowerment services developed by the Project, particularly those targeting children with disabilities, children without parental care, and children at risk of separation from families.</strong></td>
<td>Government in partnership with municipalities, UNICEF and international donors</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The evaluation assessed the sustainability prospects of the Project to be very challenging and drew the attention on the financial constraints faced by the government and service providers. Although continuation of reforms in social protection and inclusion sector is dependent on external funding at least on short term, policy makers are nevertheless advised to revisit the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>current funding model of social protection and inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF is recommended to continue to advocate for more efficient financing of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social protection and inclusion services at local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP4</td>
<td>**Improve monitoring and reporting practices in future projects and the</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>For future projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluable of impact**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Theory of Change for this Project has been developed retrospectively for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the purpose of the evaluation. It is much more useful to construct the theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of change at the beginning of a project, as outcomes and processes are viewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>differently with hindsight. A theory of change approach can sharpen the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning and implementation of a project. In its design phase, it increases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the likelihood that stakeholders will have clearly specified the initiative’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intended outcomes and outputs, the activities that need to be implemented to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>achieve those outcomes, and the contextual factors that are likely to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>influence them. A project should be designed from start in a way which allows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impact evaluability, with clear baseline indicators and targets,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disaggregated by gender, and with established “control” and “treatment”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

FINAL EVALUATION

Enhancing the Social Protection and Inclusion of Children in Bosnia and Herzegovina

RATIONALE/ BACKGROUND

The State of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), in its current structure defined by the 1995 Dayton Peace Agreement, has limited central power, with most government functions delegated to two entities: the Republika Srpska and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Brcko District is a third administrative unit, which has been under international administration. BiH is a potential candidate for EU membership. The Stabilization and Association Agreement has been ratified but has not yet entered into force. However, progress on EU-related reforms has been limited.

Spending on social protection is around 3.3% of GDP, however, allocations for those with very low incomes, for child benefits, and for people with non-war related disabilities are small or non-existent and vary considerably depending on where the person lives. In both entities, over 27% of the budget allocations is “captured” by the richest 20% of the population and only 5% of the poorest quintile receive some kind of cash assistance provided by the Centers for Social Work (CSW).

Major identified bottlenecks include a highly fragmented configuration comprising of thirteen almost independent systems resulting in disparities in availability, accessibility and budgetary allocations; poor targeting of social assistance; status-based cash benefits allocation (war veterans benefits) and lack of competencies and resources of the centers for social work. UNICEF is working jointly with the governments on harmonization of laws, revision of the legislation, capacity building and local level initiatives aiming to address some of the bottlenecks.

In the past 3 years, BiH institutions, EC and UNICEF collaborated to strengthen Social Protection and Inclusion (SPI) systems through: coordination and governance structures at all levels, including the establishment of permanent municipal SPI Commissions; identification of vulnerable groups of children using the Human Rights Based Approach to Programming; development of action plans and signature of protocols of cooperation between social sector service providers in 20 municipalities and Brcko district; programmes to promote the rights and address the needs of children with disabilities and Roma children; capacity development in budgeting for children; application of evidence-based fiscal planning tools by the RS Ministry of Education and selected target Municipalities.

Regarding the key policies overarching the project - there are thirteen Ministries at different levels of governments and minimum of thirteen policy documents defining the scope of social protection in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The competencies concerning social protection are on the levels and under jurisdictions of the entity governments and Brcko District– with the exception of Federation of BiH (FBiH) where cantons have competencies to define and implement the scope of social protection. In both entities and the Brcko District, municipalities provide for ‘extended benefits’ from their own budgets, covering various types of financial assistance, such as scholarships. In the FBiH the main laws relating to social protection are: a) Framework Law on Basics of Social Protection, Protection of Civilian Victims of War and Protection of Families with Children (all cantons were supposed to harmonize their legislation with this law); and b) Family Law (legal in all cantons). In Republika Srpska (RS), the main laws relating to social protection are a) Law on Social

OBJECTIVE

The main objective of the assignment is to conduct a final evaluation of the project “Enhancing the Social Protection and Inclusion of Children in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, in order to evaluate the final (end) results and achievements of the project.

More specifically the evaluation objectives are to:

1. **Provide feedback to UNICEF BiH office and its national counterparts on the soundness (defined as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability) and impact of the Project approach in strengthening the social protection and inclusion policy framework and service delivery for vulnerable families and children, in particular for children with disabilities, with the aim to:**
   a. Reveal good practices and its implementation modalities in with particular focus on local levels of governments
   b. Identify systemic gaps in application of SPI approaches at entity and local levels
   b. Evaluate Project Impact following Description of the Action and Logical Framework

2. **Extract lessons learned and recommendations** aimed at further enhancement of the Social Protection and Inclusion system in BiH at local and policy level based on the experiences from the Project implementation.

MoRES determinant analytical framework will be used explicitly to identify which bottlenecks were affected, diminished or removed and how change was achieved. The evaluation need to focus on the targeted groups by the Project and not provide ‘general only’ recommendations, but specific for the each group: children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families.

SCOPE

The Project evaluation should cover the entire project implementation period (November 2013 – February 2015).

Description of the Action (DoA) and Logical Framework (LF) should be used as the main reference point, because they capture relevant information at each level: the necessary inputs and activities were conceived to lead to specific outputs and finally to the project purpose and the wider goal in impacting the social policy and inclusion in the area. Since the Project had no Theory of Change (ToC), it is expected that a retrospective ToC be created by the evaluators.

Based on the information available at the time of writing this inception report, there are no significant limitations to the evaluation.

FINAL EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will look at the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project (OECD-DAC evaluation criteria as the humanitarian ones are not relevant for
this task). The evaluation will specifically address the following categories of questions with respect to UNICEF’s contribution to system level changes.

**Relevance:** To what extent is the Project responding to the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries?

To what extent does the Project address underlying causes of exclusion and respond to the needs of the most vulnerable target groups?

To what extent is the Project design relevant in regard to the overall Project goal and the achievement of its objectives in the given period of time?

To what extent are the Project design and its objectives relevant in regard to national policies and strategies?

Was the Project designed according to international norms and agreements on Human Rights (HR) and Gender Equality (GE) and in line with national strategies to advance HR & GE?

Optional - What does the literature and current experience suggest about the appropriateness of the current or proposed strategy? If successfully implemented would this strategy be likely to address the key issues affecting most marginalized groups?

**Effectiveness:** To what extent does the Project meet the outcomes as defined by the DoA and LF?

To what extent have the planned results been achieved to date (quantitative and qualitative)?

To what extent and how has the project contributed to the strengthening the Social Protection and Inclusion legal and policy framework, and coordination mechanisms?

To what extent and how has the project contributed to the enhancement of systems and capacities to deliver inclusive services at the local level, with a focus on children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families?

To what extent has the Project contributed to raising awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue?

To what extent has the Project contributed to strengthening capacities of service providers to provide quality assistance to the most vulnerable groups in line with national and international standards?

What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the Project objectives to date?

Has the project provided any additional (not directly planned by the Project) significant contribution/outcomes towards development of services and social inclusion of most vulnerable and excluded children, with a focus on children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families?

**Efficiency:** To what extent did the management of the Project ensure timelines and efficient utilization of resources?
How well have the implementation of activities been managed? To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled? What management and monitoring tools have been used?

How well have the financial resources been used / were funds managed in a cost-effective manner / what is the correlation between funds utilized and outputs / results achieved / could the same results be achieved with less resources?

Did the project ensure co-ordination with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps?

How flexible was the Project design in adapting to the changing environment (impact of the recent flood, etc.)?

To what extent are HR & GE a priority in the overall Project budget and implementation?

**Impact:** To what extent has the Project improved the social protection and inclusion systems for children in BiH?

To what extent has the project contributed to the promotion of multi sectorial approach to SPI through establishment of protocols of cooperation and referral mechanisms in targeted municipalities?

How successful was the project in supporting a structural reform of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance?

Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups.

What were the results in children’s lives of the interventions - intended and unintended, positive and negative - including the social, economic and environmental effects on targeted groups (children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families)?

Were there any unintended results on human rights & gender equality in the intervention? Were they positive or negative and in which ways did they affect the different stakeholders?

**Sustainability:** To what extent are the Project outcomes achieved sustainable? Sustainability looks to the probability of continued long-term benefits to most marginalized groups.

Did the Project design include an appropriate sustainability strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of local capacity, etc.) to support positive changes for the most vulnerable groups after the end of the intervention?

To what extent the legislative framework developed and policy documents produced provide a ground for sustainable and coordinated service provision for the most vulnerable and excluded children and their families?

To what extent are national level mechanisms, strengthened for monitoring and capacities improved for reporting on social protection and inclusion reforms, likely to continue being effective beyond the project time-frame?
To what extent are new knowledge and skills integrated into regular activities of professionals working with children without parental care, children with disabilities and children at risk of separation from their families, regardless of whether they work as service providers or case-managers in centers for social work?

To what extent has the Project promoted strengthening of already existing partnerships and establishment of new ones and to strengthening of inter-sectoral and cross-sectoral cooperation both at the national and local level?

EXISTING INFORMATION SOURCES

Initial documents and analysis to be taken in consideration:

SPIS DoA

ROM report 2014

SPI Mapping Report

SPIS Joint Evaluation Report


SPI Manual for local levels of governance

Other relevant documents

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will be guided by the Norms and Standards of the United Nation Evaluation Group (UNEG).

(www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4)\textsuperscript{19}.

The contractor is expected to observe the UNEG ethical guidance to evaluation as guiding principle to ensure quality of evaluation process.

(www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ETHICAL+GUIDELINES)

Based on the OECD/DAC questions above listed and on the UNDG Evaluation Guidelines, the Consultant is expected to develop a detailed research design and methodology prior to the evaluation (Inception Report), which should be approved by the UNICEF team.

The Final evaluation will be based on primary and secondary data and information collected at national/entity/district and local level. Information collected will be explicitly triangulated.

The evaluation process will be based on:

Desk reviews and analyses of existing programme and project related documents

Analysis of existing national/entity/district/local policy and planning documents

\textsuperscript{19} UNEG Norms: http://www.uneval.org/indexAction.cfm?module=Library&module=Library&module=Library&action=GetFile&DocumentAttachmentID=1491

Analysis of primary and secondary data

Data collection instruments, such as, questionnaires

Field visits to the municipalities (structured observation and/or focus groups discussions with service providers)

Interview of key stakeholders (structured interviews with government and non-governmental sector)

The direct beneficiaries of the Project were relevant ministries on all levels; Decision makers; Local administrations in selected municipalities; and the Service providers. The final beneficiaries are at least 5,000 children and their parents (through increased access to inclusive and protective social services), and approximately 40,000 children and their parents and teachers (through increased awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building, inter-cultural education/dialogue and “It’s about ability” campaign).

DELIVERABLES, WORK PLAN and EVALUATION MANAGEMENT

The final evaluation report should follow UNEG Norms and Standards, UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards and should follow the GEROS Quality Assessment System.

The consultant is responsible for:

Inception report – (5 working days)

Field work – (10 working days)

The Draft Evaluation Report – (10 working days)

The Final Evaluation Report, which should include executive summary, description of sampling and evaluation methodology, data collection instruments, types of data analysis, assessment of methodology (including limitations), findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned, attachments with developed list of indicators and questionnaires – Submit by Feb 20, 2015 (7 working days)

Presentation of the Report in power point to UNICEF staff (1 working day)

The reports should be provided in electronic form in English in the required UNICEF format. Completed data sets are to be submitted to UNICEF (filled out questionnaires, records of individual interviews and focus group discussion, etc.).

Contractor should be sensitive to beliefs and act with integrity and respect to all stakeholders. In the report evaluators may not refer to individual children. Contractor may not share findings with media in Bosnia and Herzegovina or abroad concerning individual children or individual institutions.

UNICEF premises will be available during the time spend in Bosnia and Herzegovina if needed. Printers, photocopying services, and other similar services will be provided by UNICEF. It is expected that contractor will bring their own laptops.

Management: The evaluation will be managed by the UNICEF Child Rights Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and the Social Protection Specialist. The contractor will be supervised by Child Rights Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. The management of the evaluation will include development of the terms of reference, assignment of the evaluation team, liaison
between the evaluation team and partners / stakeholders involved (supporting organisation of meetings / interviews and field visits), as well as quality assurance of the report.

**Organization:** Individual consultancy is required for this evaluation.

**DURATION OF CONTRACT AND TRAVEL**

Duration: January 28 – February 20, 2015

Duty Station: work from home, with some travel involved.

Travel Arrangements: No DSA will be paid to consultant and no transport will be provided by UNICEF; an agreed lump sum includes the cost of travel and DSA)

**QUALIFICATION OR SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE/EXPERIENCE REQUIRED**

The contractor/consultant should have:

University degree in Social Sciences/Economics and extensive experience, knowledge and expertise in M&E, in conducting evaluation and different kinds of surveys

Extensive work experience in evaluations, including but not limited to data collection and data analysis for opinion polls, assessments, evaluation, and research

Demonstrated skills in qualitative and quantitative research methods

Good knowledge of the administrative structure of Bosnia and Herzegovina and different jurisdictions as stated in Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Good knowledge of Social Protection and Inclusion system in BiH

Be fluent in BHS and English languages

Excellent analytical and report writing skills

Experience in monitoring and evaluation of Social Protection/Inclusion programmes
## Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE - to what extent is the Project responding to the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 1 To what extent does the Project address underlying causes of exclusion and respond to the needs of the most vulnerable target groups?</td>
<td>Project design founded on the needs assessments, social exclusion and poverty data focusing on targeted vulnerable groups. Alignment of the strategy for social protection and inclusion of children with needs and priorities identified in national and local strategies aimed to guide and advance of social services and other social protection and inclusion measures.</td>
<td>Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities for social protection and inclusion of children and the strategy/approach developed by the project</td>
<td>National and local reports, research studies, interviews with key stakeholders, project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 2 To what extent is the Project design relevant in regard to the overall Project goal and the achievement of its objectives in the given period of time?</td>
<td>The Project activities and outputs respond to the objectives of the project as assessed by: linkages between outputs/results linkages between outputs and outcomes influence of external factors assumptions and risks</td>
<td>The project has a well defined intervention logic, demonstrating how the outputs will produce the intended results project activities in combination will deliver the projected outputs / results project outputs in combination are sufficient to produce outcomes, given the identified assumptions</td>
<td>Project document, project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 3 To what extent are the Project design and its objectives relevant in regard to national policies and strategies?</td>
<td>Extent to which the project activities are in line with overarching objectives and priorities for improvement of social protection and inclusion</td>
<td>Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities for improvement of social protection and inclusion of children in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the content of national and local reports, research studies</td>
<td>National and local reports, research studies, interviews with key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</td>
<td>Judgement Criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 4</td>
<td>Was the Project designed according to international norms and agreements on Human Rights (HR) and Gender Equality (GE) and in line with national strategies to advance HR &amp; GE?</td>
<td>Extent to which the project interventions are based on and integrating international agreements on human rights and gender equality</td>
<td>The project design reflecting the standards and norms of HR and GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>Optional - What does the literature and current experience suggest about the appropriateness of the current or proposed strategy? If successfully implemented would this strategy be likely to address the key issues affecting most marginalized groups?</td>
<td>Extent to which the project interventions are based on and integrating national strategies to advance human rights and gender equality</td>
<td>Evidence of consistency between strategies to advance HR and GE and the strategy/approach developed by the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 6</td>
<td>To what extent have the planned results been achieved to date (quantitative and qualitative)?</td>
<td>The project produced the planned outputs</td>
<td>% outputs and results achieved (indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 7</td>
<td>To what extent and how has the project contributed to the strengthening the Social Protection and Inclusion legal and strategies and legislation in the Social protection and inclusion thematic area in</td>
<td>The extent to which the project contributed to strengthening the Social Protection and</td>
<td>Evidence and examples of new/updated Social Protection and Inclusion legal and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection and Inclusion legal and policy framework, and coordination mechanisms?</td>
<td>Inclusion legal and policy framework The extent to which the project contributed to mobilisation and strengthening of coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>policy framework Evidence of policies/legislation put to practice in order to improve Social Protection and Inclusion</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina National and local reports, research studies Interviews with key stakeholders Project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 8</strong></td>
<td>Quality of models of inclusive services at the local level developed with the project support The extent to which the project contributed to the mobilisation and capacity building of selected municipalities for delivery of inclusive services at the local level, with a focus on children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families</td>
<td>No. and quality of modalities of inclusive services at the local level, with a focus on children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families Evidence and examples of municipal initiatives for delivery of inclusive services at the local level No. of municipal authorities familiar with priorities and strategies for improvement of social protection and inclusion of children Evidence of new decisions put to practice in order to ensure delivery of inclusive services at the local level Quality of models observed; no major shortcomings identified Examples of successful/ unsuccessful results of interventions at local level</td>
<td>Project reports Site visits to a selected communities Interviews with key stakeholders Group discussions Mini survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</td>
<td>Judgement Criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>To what extent has the Project contributed to raising awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue?</td>
<td>The extent to which the project contributed to raising awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue</td>
<td>Evidence of raised awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>Project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>Site visits to a selected communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>Interviews to key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>Group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>Mini survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>To what extent has the Project contributed to strengthening capacities of service providers to provide quality assistance to the most vulnerable groups in line with national and international standards?</td>
<td>The extent to which the project contributed to the mobilisation and capacity building of service providers to provide quality assistance to the most vulnerable groups in line with national and international standards</td>
<td>Evidence and examples of municipal initiatives for improvement of provision of quality assistance to the most vulnerable groups in line with national and international standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>Project reports (yearly, monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>Municipal decisions/regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>Site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>Interviews to key stakeholders and discussion groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>Mini survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the Project objectives to date?</td>
<td>Extent to which external factors affect the operations of the Project</td>
<td>Evidence of external factors and their effects on the Project operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>Project reports (yearly, monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>Site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>Interviews to key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 12</td>
<td>Has the project provided any additional (not directly planned by the Project) significant contribution/outcomes towards development of services and social inclusion of most vulnerable and excluded children, with a focus on</td>
<td>Identification and assessment of additional (planned and unplanned) outcomes</td>
<td>Evidence through examples of additional outcomes and their appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 12</td>
<td>EQ 12</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 12</td>
<td>EQ 12</td>
<td>Government policy reviews and reports on social protection and inclusion of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ 12</td>
<td>EQ 12</td>
<td>Research studies and reports developed within the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Questions (EQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 13</th>
<th>How well have the implementation of activities been managed? To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled? What management and monitoring tools have been used?</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management of the project ensured timeliness and efficient use of resources</td>
<td>Evidence that chosen management modalities provided for needed efficiency, timely delivery and adaptation/flexibility in project implementation</td>
<td>Project reports (annual, monitoring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chosen management and implementation modalities are in line with best practices of other UNICEF or donors' interventions</td>
<td>Examples of management intervention for overcoming barriers and constraints in project implementation</td>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project reports (annual, monitoring)</td>
<td>Site visits to selected projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 14</td>
<td>How well have the financial resources been used / were funds managed in a cost-effective manner / what is the correlation between funds utilized and outputs / results achieved / could the same results be achieved with less resources?</td>
<td>Financial and human resources spent for the achievement of outputs and results</td>
<td>Examples of project activities with a good/poor cost-effectiveness level</td>
<td>Project reports (annual, monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results could have been achieved at a lower cost (or not)</td>
<td>Examples of alternative ways of minimising costs of achieving the same or better outcomes</td>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same / better results could have been achieved (or not) at same cost using other means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 15</td>
<td>Did the project ensure co-ordination with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps?</td>
<td>Judgement will be based on the examination of:</td>
<td>Coherence between the project and similar interventions' objectives; co-ordinated implementation schedules</td>
<td>Projects documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complementarity with other projects</td>
<td>Complementarity with other projects</td>
<td>Demonstrable effects of complementarity or/and overlaps, both upstream on the level of donor coordination and downstream on project implementation level</td>
<td>Interviews with key informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functioning donor coordination and consultation processes with stakeholders and beneficiaries</td>
<td>Functioning donor coordination and consultation processes with stakeholders and beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes of coordination meetings (if available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</td>
<td>Judgement Criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EQ 16 How flexible was the Project design in adapting to the changing environment (impact of the recent flood, etc.)? | The extent to which the Project design was flexible in adapting to the changing environment (impact of the recent flood, etc.)? | Evidence of mitigation measures to adapt to the changing environment (impact of the recent flood, etc.) | Projects documentation
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | Interviews with key informants                                                           |
| EQ 17 To what extent are HR & GE a priority in the overall Project budget and implementation? | The extent to which the HR&GE is been priorities in the overall budget and implementation. | Evidence and examples of prioritisation of HR&GE in the overall budget and implementation | Projects documentation
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | Interviews with key informants                                                           |
| **IMPACT:** How successful was the Project in supporting a structural reform of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance? | Contribution of the project to the increase of children from vulnerable groups benefiting from quality services, cooperation and referral mechanisms in targeted municipalities Services are used by families from vulnerable groups | Qualitative evidence that the project made a visible contribution to meeting this strategic priority of reform compared to baseline numbers Evidence of beneficiaries' increased use of services | Project documentation
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | National statistics and reports                                                          |
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | Reports of international organisations (EC, CRC, WB, etc.)                             |
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | Research studies and assessments                                                        |
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | Interviews with key stakeholders                                                        |
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | Site visits and focus groups, Mini survey                                               |
| EQ 19 How successful was the project in supporting a structural reform of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance? | Contribution of the project to the structural reform of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance | Qualitative evidence that the project made a visible contribution to the structural reform of social protection and inclusion systems at all levels of governance | Project documentation
<p>|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | National reports                                                                         |
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | Reports of international organisations (EC, CRC, WB, etc.)                             |
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | Research studies and assessments                                                        |
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            | Interviews with key stakeholders                                                        |
| EQ 20 Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term | Identification and assessment of positive and negative long-term effects produced by | Evidence through examples of positive and negative long-term effects produced by | Government policy reviews and reports on social protection and inclusion of                |
|                                                                                           |                                                                                      |                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups</td>
<td>term effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups</td>
<td>UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups</td>
<td>children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and assessment of primary and secondary long-term effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level, directly or indirectly, on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups</td>
<td>Evidence through examples of primary and secondary long-term effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level, directly or indirectly, on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups</td>
<td>Evidence through examples of intended or unintended long-term effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups</td>
<td>mini survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and assessment of intended or unintended long-term effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups</td>
<td>Evidence and examples of positive effects and benefits of measures and services developed with support of the project for children participating in the program (skills, abilities and knowledge)</td>
<td>Evidence and examples of intended or unintended long-term effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups</td>
<td>mini survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 21</td>
<td>What were the results in children’s lives of the interventions - intended and unintended, positive and negative - including the social, economic and environmental effects on targeted groups (children with disabilities, children without parental care and children at risk of separation from their families)?</td>
<td>New measures and services developed with support of the project have positive (or negative) - - including the social, economic and environmental - effects in terms of benefits for children participating in the program (skills, abilities and knowledge)</td>
<td>factors reducing the impact of projects (external and internal to the management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence and examples of positive effects and benefits of measures and services developed with support of the project for children participating in the program (skills, abilities and knowledge)</td>
<td>mini survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence and examples of intended or unintended long-term effects produced by UNICEF’s SPIS interventions at system level on the most-marginalized groups as well as inequities between best-off and most marginalized groups</td>
<td>mini survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evaluation Questions (EQ)** | **Judgement Criteria** | **Indicators** | **Sources of information**
--- | --- | --- | ---
|  | Identified systemic barriers (administrative, institutional, financial, human resources, etc.) which reduce the identified impact of the project | Evidence through examples of intended or unintended human rights & gender equality in the intervention | Project documentation, Research studies and assessments, Interviews with key stakeholders, Feedback from discussion groups, Mini survey |
**EQ 22** | Were there any unintended results on human rights & gender equality in the intervention? Were they positive or negative and in which ways did they affect the different stakeholders? | Identification and assessment of unintended (positive/negative) results on human rights & gender equality in the intervention | No. of laws, mechanisms and policies adopted/approved ensuring sustainable and coordinated service provision for the most vulnerable and excluded children and their families | Relevant legal framework on social protection and inclusion in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Project documentation, Analytical reports by government and independent experts, Interviews with key stakeholders |
**SUSTAINABILITY: To what extent are the Project outcomes achieved sustainable? Sustainability looks to the probability of continued long-term benefits to most marginalized groups.**
**EQ 23** | Did the Project design include an appropriate sustainability strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of local capacity, etc.) to support positive changes for the most vulnerable groups after the end of the intervention? | Evidence of existence of an appropriate sustainability strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of local capacity, etc.) to support positive changes for the most vulnerable groups after the end of the intervention | Project documentation |
**EQ 24** | To what extent the legislative framework developed and policy documents produced provide a ground for sustainable and coordinated service provision for the most vulnerable and excluded children and their families? | The extent to which legislative framework developed and policy documents produced provide a ground for sustainable and coordinated service provision for the most vulnerable and excluded children and their families | Evidence of implementation of adopted legislation that supports implementation and further development of services and approaches put in place by the project | Project documentation, Analytical reports by government and independent experts |
**EQ 25** | To what extent are national level mechanisms effective? | The extent to which the national level mechanisms for | No. of professionals applying new knowledge and skills in their regular work | Project documentation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 26</td>
<td>To what extent are new knowledge and skills integrated into regular activities of professionals working with children without parental care, children with disabilities and children at risk of separation from their families, regardless of whether they work as service providers or case-managers in centers for social work?</td>
<td>The extent to which professionals working with children integrate their newly acquired knowledge into regular activities to be judged by: Extent to which new approaches are integrated in the regular activities of professionals working with children without parental care, children with disabilities and children at risk of separation from their families, regardless of whether they work as service providers or case-managers in centers for social work Further staff development planning, based on capacity building packages developed by the project, for keeping abreast with professional challenges</td>
<td>No. of professionals applying new knowledge and skills in their regular activities, measured through extent of integration of new methodologies in their work practice Evidence of staff development plans, based on capacity building packages developed by the project, for keeping abreast with professional challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 27</td>
<td>To what extent has the Project promoted strengthening of</td>
<td>Evidence through examples of already existing partnerships strengthened and</td>
<td>Project documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent to which the Project promoted strengthening of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>already existing partnerships and establishment of new ones and to strengthening of inter-sectoral and cross-sectoral cooperation both at the national and local level?</td>
<td>already existing partnerships and establishment of new ones</td>
<td>new ones established</td>
<td>Analytical reports by government and independent experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which the Project promoted strengthening of inter-sectoral and cross-sectoral cooperation both at the national and local level</td>
<td>Evidence through examples of strengthened inter-sectoral and cross-sectoral cooperation both at the national and local level</td>
<td>Interviews with key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group discussions with professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3. INTERVIEW GUIDE

General methodological notes:

Each interview and discussion group will start with the presentation of the Evaluator and of the evaluation objectives, followed by the presentation of the interlocutors. Whenever necessary, a brief presentation of the Project will be also done. The questions will be sent in advance to the people who are going to be interviewed.

The participants in discussion groups will be briefed in advance about the major topics to be discussed during the meeting. The groups will be composed of 6-8 people. The discussion groups will last 1.5-2 hours each and will take place in the municipalities sampled for site visits and in-depth review.

In line with best evaluation practices, the interviews and focus groups and discussion groups will be attended only by the Evaluator and the interviewees.

Interview Guide for UNICEF management and project staff

To what extent has the project achieved its intended overall objectives and outputs?

Please provide examples of project contribution to the attainment of its specific objectives:

**Specific objective 1** - Strengthening the Social Protection and Inclusion legal and policy framework, and coordination mechanisms

**Specific objective 2** - Enhancing systems and capacities to deliver quality inclusive services at the local level, with a focus on children with disabilities and children, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families

**Specific objective 3** – Raising awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue, ensuring the participation of children and young people, focusing on children with disabilities, at the local level and throughout programme and media Campaign It’s About Ability

What types of mechanisms/policies/legislation/services were most improved by the project activities?

Which capacity building activities and mechanisms were the most / least successful in achieving the planned results and outcomes and why?

Did some municipalities perform better than others and why?

Which, if any, contextual factors (e.g. political, economic, social) have affected the work of the project and your own efforts in this area?

To what extent were relevant actors and stakeholders included in UNICEF’s programming and implementation?

What efforts did UNICEF undertake, and what challenges did it face in view of managing available funds efficiently?

Looking ahead, which of the achievements made to date are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support? Which of them will require further support?
The project was aiming to contribute to the longer-term goal of “improving the social protection systems for children in Bosnia and Herzegovina through strengthening the social protection and inclusion policy framework and service delivery for vulnerable families and children, in particular for children with disabilities.”. Looking beyond the work of individual actors, how far or close do you feel Bosnia and Herzegovina currently is from that goal? What are the main bottlenecks/obstacles to achieving this goal?

**Interview Guide for Institutional Partners**

To what extent was the project aligned with explicit priorities and needs of the (national/local) government and/or your institution?

What positive changes has the project contributed to?

As regards strengthening relevant legal and policy frameworks and budgets related to reforms of social protection and inclusion of children?

As regards enhancing the capacity of your institution? (Please specify what capacities and how) Which capacity building activities and mechanisms were the most / least successful in enabling your institution/organization to conduct pre-school education reforms and improve access for vulnerable children?

As regards improving access to social services for children from vulnerable groups?

Other changes?

What, if any, contextual influences (e.g. political, economic, social) have influenced the work of the project as well as your own efforts in this area?

To what extent were relevant actors and stakeholders included in UNICEF programming and implementation?

Looking ahead, which of the achievements made to date are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support? Which of them would require further support?

What do you consider the key factors likely to support or hinder the sustainability of results?

The project was aiming to contribute to the longer term goal of “improving the social protection systems for children in Bosnia and Herzegovina through strengthening the social protection and inclusion policy framework and service delivery for vulnerable families and children, in particular for children with disabilities.”. Looking beyond the work of individual actors, how far or close do you feel Bosnia and Herzegovina currently is from that goal?

Do you have any other observations or comments that you would like to share with us?

**Guide for Discussion Groups with pre-school principals, representatives of Regional School Administrations and LSGs**

**Introduction**

Introduction of the consultant to the group

Provision of information on background to the discussion group:

The purpose of the discussion
The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used

How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)

Rules of the discussion group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak

The time allocated for discussion and explanation of the discussion group approach

Answering any questions participants may have.

Discussion

How do you see your role in the process of improving social protection and inclusion, particularly with regards to children from vulnerable groups? What are the measures your institution took to support the process of improving access to social services?

How did the project support your efforts? What do you think have been the biggest achievements of the project (e.g. capacity building, introduction of new approaches to working with children, assisting the reform processes initiated in the community, inclusion of children from vulnerable groups in social services)?

Would it have been possible to achieve these changes (if any) without the project?

Has your municipality ensured funds for continuation of models and practices initiated by the project? If yes, in what way?

What are the challenges ahead and ways to overcome them?

End of Discussion

Thanking participants for attending and giving feedback

Guide for Focus Groups with parents

Introduction

Introduction of the consultant to the group

Provision of information on background to the focus group:

The purpose of the discussion

The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used

How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)

Rules of the focus group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak

The amount of time the discussion is anticipated to take and explanation of the focus group approach
Answering any questions participants may have.

**Discussion**

What do you think have been the benefits that the Project brought to your children?

Would it have been possible to achieve these changes (if any) without the project?

What priority needs do you still have and how could be addressed in the future?

**End of Discussion**

Thanking parents for attending and giving feedback.
ANNEX 4. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Enclosed to the Report as a separate pdf. file.
ANNEX 5. SURVEY FINDINGS

Enclosed to the Report as a separate excel file.
# Annex 6. List of Interviewed Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Selma Kazic</td>
<td>UNICEF BiH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sabina Zunic</td>
<td>UNICEF BiH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Nineta Popovic</td>
<td>UNICEF BiH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Alma Herenda</td>
<td>UNICEF BiH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Amina Bukvic</td>
<td>UNICEF BiH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Mario Tokic</td>
<td>UNICEF BiH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lidija Markota</td>
<td>Ministry of Civil Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Emin Terko</td>
<td>Ministry of Civil Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sanela Foco</td>
<td>Ministry of Civil Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Dunja Smitran</td>
<td>Ministry of Civil Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Malicbegovic</td>
<td>Ministry of Civil Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Nadija Bandic</td>
<td>Ministry of Education FBIH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Nirvana Pistoljevic</td>
<td>EDUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Mirjana Mehicic Topic</td>
<td>Novi Travnik, Center for Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Dragica Djokic</td>
<td>Director, Primary school 19 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Slavica Tanaskovic</td>
<td>Team member, Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Tatjana Spasojevic</td>
<td>UG Sunce Derventa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Branimir Paljevic</td>
<td>MUP Derventa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Vladan Popovic</td>
<td>Center for children Buducnost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Dijana Tabak</td>
<td>Dom zdravlja Derventa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Ljubinka Lasic</td>
<td>Center for Social Work, Derventa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Nevezeta Rezakovic</td>
<td>Pedagogical Institute, Zenica-Doboj Canton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ljubo Lepir</td>
<td>Ministry of Health and Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization/Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Tanja Bosancic</td>
<td>ECD Center Laktasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Dijana</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Senad Sehic</td>
<td>Municipality of Velika Kladusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Emira Veljacic</td>
<td>Center for Social Work, Velika Kladusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Camil Cuturic</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Mirsada Krupalija</td>
<td>Center for Social Work, Velika Kladusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Mirzeta Puric</td>
<td>ECD Center Velika Kladusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Lirija Jusufovic</td>
<td>ECD Center Velika Kladusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Adnan Kreso</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Una-Sana Canton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Samra Selimović</td>
<td>Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Saliha Djuderija</td>
<td>BiH Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Milena Juric</td>
<td>BiH Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Miro Mauhar</td>
<td>FBIH Ministry of Labour and Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Edmira Ascic</td>
<td>FBIH Ministry of Labour and Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Goran Cerkez</td>
<td>FBIH Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Aida Pilav</td>
<td>FBIH Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 7. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE PROJECT

### Enhancing Social Protection and Inclusion of Children in BiH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective</strong></td>
<td>Increased capability of institutions in BiH to provide adequate social protection and inclusion services for children, particularly for children with disabilities.</td>
<td>EC Progress Reports</td>
<td>Newly adopted legal and policy framework are being adequately implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Project Report</td>
<td>Relevant ministries continue to be engaged and support the established coordination structure on social protection and inclusion, beyond the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Reports</td>
<td>Municipalities show continued interest and commitment in applying social protection and inclusion approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Municipalities show continued interest and commitment for strengthening cooperation between service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutions providing capacity building services on child related matters continuously supported with adequate budgets, programmes and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant government institutions continue to raise awareness on child rights, SPI and issues of children with disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specific Objectives
**Objective 1.**
Strengthening the Social Protection and Inclusion legal and policy framework, as well as coordination mechanisms

- By-law and training curriculum on Early childhood interventions approved by relevant Ministries
- Secondary legislation in support of service delivery for children with disabilities and development of alternatives to institutionalization under the new Social protection legislation approved by relevant Ministries
- # of recommendations brought up in the coordination meetings addressed
- Protocols with focus on children with disabilities at local levels revised, approved and signed by local service providers
- SPI Commissions functional in at least 20% of BiH municipalities
- Protocols of cooperation and referral mechanisms are functional in at least 20% of BiH municipalities

- EC Progress Reports
- Official Gazettes
- BiH relevant institutions' reports and policy documents
- Project reports
- Project evaluation reports:
  - Monitoring Missions' reports
  - Meetings minutes.

- New Social and Child protection Laws for FBiH adopted
- Continuous engagement of professionals from various sectors ensured
- Political will for implementation of the SPI policy recommendations exist
- Secondary legislation adopted
- Relevant line ministries are willing to support
  - enhancement of communication and coordination mechanisms for social protection
  - and inclusion of children and families.

**Objective 2.**
Enhancing systems and capacities to deliver quality

- New services and good practice models replicated

- Annual reports on the work of municipal administration for

- 32 municipalities show interest and commitment to build further the SPI services for children with
inclusive services at the local level, with a focus on children with disabilities and children, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>between the municipalities</th>
<th>2013/14 in 32 municipalities;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ At least 100 service providers gained new knowledge and are able to apply Early Childhood Interventions, inclusive education and child protection services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ New services on ECI available in at least 6 municipalities. Yes/no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ At least 100 teachers improved knowledge and gained specific skills necessary for successful inclusion of children with disabilities in the regular teaching and learning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ At least 10 School Teams for Inclusion formally established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>disabilities and their families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Official data sources and reports from the relevant gvt institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Programme quantifiable results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 3.
Raising awareness on social inclusion, child rights, peace building and inter-cultural education/dialogue, ensuring the participation of children and young people, focusing on children with disabilities, at the local level and throughout programme and media Campaign It's about Ability

| Enhanced visibility and raised awareness of BiH population on the social protection and inclusion of children, and in particular of children with disabilities; |
| Approximately 10,000 children and parents have better knowledge and awareness of social inclusion issues, child rights and peace building. |
| Social mobilisation and |

| ▪ Project reports |
| ▪ KAP survey |
| ▪ Press clippings and TV-coverage; |
| ▪ Communication campaign and design; |
| ▪ PR reports; |
| ▪ PR materials. |

| ▪ Schools, community members and government/municipal authorities are taking follow up actions to strengthen impact of communication activities related to social inclusion, child rights and inclusive education of children with disabilities |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results related to Objective 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Relevant institutions are fully committed to developing new legislation and policies aimed at improving social protection and inclusion services, with a focus on children with disabilities and their families.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result related to Objective 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political instability and competing priorities do not jeopardize efforts to ensure continuous coordination of SPI between counterparts at all levels; Protocols on social inclusion and protection, including children with disabilities applied at municipal levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Institutions mandated to develop laws and policies have developed by-laws, standards and protocols strengthening the service delivery for children with disabilities, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families, including through strengthened coordination of Social protection and inclusion at all levels. | • No of by-laws and training curriculum on Early childhood interventions developed  
• No of by-laws on services for children with disabilities approved by the RS Ministry of Health and Social Welfare and Federal Ministry of Labor and Social Policy developed  
• # of coordination meetings on SPI reform  
• # of municipalities that assessed, revised and signed protocols with focus on children with disabilities | • Programme narrative report;  
• SPIS Management Board meeting minutes;  
• Relevant documents;  
• Web sites of partners;  
• Approved and signed decisions. |
| SPI systems strengthened on the local level through enhanced capacities for service delivery, | • Mapping of the available services and gaps for children with disabilities in 32 municipalities completed  
• # of local service providers with increased capacity in Early Childhood | • Monitoring reports;  
• SPI Commissions annual reports for 2013 and 2014;  
• Project progress reports;  
• Project Evaluation reports; |
and quality inclusive services provided, particularly to children with disabilities, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions, inclusive education and child protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- # and types of new or improved services established at local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- # of boys and girls with disabilities and children at risk of separation from their families who benefit from integrated IECD/ECI, inclusive education and protection services in selected locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- # of School Teams for Inclusion formally established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- # of teachers and other educational professionals with increased capacity to provide quality inclusive education to children with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal databases;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Feedback from beneficiaries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trainings evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SPI Commissions and Operation teams are willing to work on development and adoption of referral mechanisms children with disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result related to Objective 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children, young people, community members and Municipal authorities have participated in Campaign It's About Ability, at the local and country level and increased their knowledge of social inclusion, child rights, peace building, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 20 media promote CRC/SPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- # of children and parents who have been directly exposed to information related to social inclusion, child rights, peace building, and inclusive education/dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- # of children and parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PR Campaign report;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- PR materials;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Press clippings and TV-coverage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Web statistics;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <a href="http://www.zasvakodijete.ba">www.zasvakodijete.ba</a>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UNICEF’s and partners’ websites;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Media campaign It’s about ability well designed and perceived by public |
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inclusive education/intergenerational dialogue focusing on disabilities. who have been indirectly exposed to information related to social inclusion, child rights, peace building, and inclusive education/dialogue

- # of public events within the It’s About Ability campaign organized
- # of workshops designed and implemented to promote child rights, social inclusion, peace building and inclusive education/dialogue
- # of One minute junior movies produced, featuring children with disabilities
- # of children who participated in production of OMJ movies
- % of municipalities with participation of representatives of Student’s Councils and children with disabilities in the SPI Commissions
- % of municipalities that supported “It’s About Ability” Campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities related to the result 1.</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Advocacy and technical assistance to develop by-law</td>
<td>Representative, Deputy</td>
<td>• Workshops attendance, agenda, feedback; • Press clippings; • Press coverage.</td>
<td>• There is political will to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and training curriculum on Early childhood interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>Technical assistance to develop secondary legislation in support of service delivery for children with disabilities and development of alternatives to institutionalization, under the new Social protection legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Coordination/consultative meetings at all levels (primarily state and entity/canton) level to sustain policy dialogue and support identification of a joint policy framework for social protection and inclusion including dissemination of good practices, lessons learned and social innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Promote the development of protocols and referral mechanisms at municipal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Promote the use of established municipal Commissions for SPI at municipal level for the benefit of vulnerable children and children with disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representative, Project Manager, SPI Specialist, Child Protection Specialist, Health/ECD Specialist, Education Officer, Communications Officers, Project Assistants, Drivers, Consultants

- Progress reports;
- Reports from relevant institutions;
- Official Gazettes;
- MB meetings minutes.

Adopt the new legislation, standards and principles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities related to the result 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1.</strong> Mapping of existing services for children with disabilities and their families in selected locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2.</strong> Capacity building of professionals working in Centres for Social Work and residential care institutions on the protection of children with disabilities, children without parental care (CWPC) and children at risk of separation from their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3.</strong> Training for service providers on Early Childhood Interventions (ECI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4.</strong> Technical assistance for the establishment of ECI services in 6 Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5.</strong> Advocacy for institutionalization of training through Pedagogical Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.6.</strong> Technical and financial assistance to strengthen services for children with disabilities and their families in selected locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7.</strong> Training for teachers and education professionals on inclusive education for children with disabilities and establishment of School Teams for Inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Means Verification of Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager, SPI Specialist, Child Protection Specialist, Health/ECD Specialist, Education Officer, Communications Officers, Project Assistants, Drivers, Consultants</td>
<td>• Progress reports; • Reports by relevant institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activities related to the result 3.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Means of Verification of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Use of social networks and media to promote social</td>
<td>Representative, deputy</td>
<td>UNICEF website; Partner Ministries web sites; Progress reports; Media records; Billboards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusion, child rights, peace building, and inclusive</td>
<td>Representative, Communication for Development Officer, Communications Officer, Project Manager, SPI Specialist, Project Assistants, Drivers, Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education/intergenerational dialogue, focusing on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is general interest of the public in child rights and social protection and inclusion of children with disabilities issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign “It’s about Ability”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Organization of public/media presentations and workshops within the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign “It’s about Ability”, to present the activities at the local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level, focusing on inclusive education and dialogue with participation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Work with schools to promote inter-cultural education and dialogue,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the active participation of children and teachers (children will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design and implement local project activities to promote key principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as respect, tolerance and diversity, focusing on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of children with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Production of One minute Junior movies, with the participation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Establishment of formal linkages between schools and municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by ensuring participation of children from Student’s Councils, including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children with disabilities in the work of MMBs and facilitating the open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dialogue among local stakeholders and children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 8. LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

**Project documents**

- 13-0203 Budget III Addendum
- 13-0203 DOA SPIS 3
- 13-0203 Justification for SPIS Addendum 3
- 13-0203 LFA II Amendmen
- ANNex 1 – DOA BIH SC130715 amended
- Justification of Addendum
- SPIS IV budget addendum
- SPIS IV LFA amended

**Project reports**

- Final Report –ECD
- Genesis Project – Final Report
- ROM Report
- SPIS Final report Nov-2011 – Dec 2013
- SPIS Interim Report to EU 28 February 2013

**Strategies and legislation of BiH:**

FBiH Law on the Protection of the Families with Children
draft Law on Social Protection

B&H Early Childhood Development (ECD) Framework Policy

FBiH Law on the Protection of Families with Children
draft FBiH Law on Social Protection

Framework Policy for Early Childhood Development in BiH

**Other documents**


Economic Quarterly (3/2014), “EU Candidate and Potential Candidate Countries”


Ministry of Civil Affairs (2012), “Information on Implementation of Strategic Directions for Development of Preschool Upbringing and Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina”

UNICEF (2013), ”Situation Analysis of Children’s and Women’s Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina”


Databases:

TransMonEE (2014)

MICS 2011-2012

Internet sources for BiH strategic documents


http://www.mhrr.gov.ba/ljudska_prava/djeca_bih/Akcioni%20plan%20za%20djecu%202011%202014.pdf


http://www.heckmanequation.org/content/resource/invest-early-childhood-development-reduce-deficits-strengthen-economy

http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

https://www.parlament.ba/sadrzaj/about/ustav/docs/default.aspx?id=27892&langTag=bs-BA&pril=b

http://www.bhas.ba/tematskibilteni/demografija%20konacna%20bh.pdf

http://www.bhas.ba/obavijestenja/Preliminarni_sr.pdf


http://www.bhas.ba/saopstenja/2014/Migracije%202013%20bos.pdf


http://www2.rzs.rs.ba/static/uploads/saopstenja/socijalna_zastita/korisnici_socijalne_zastite/2013/Korisnici_socijalne_zastite_2013.pdf,