



PROMOTING HUMAN RIGHTS  
AND MINORITY PROTECTION  
IN SOUTH EAST EUROPE

Funded  
by the European Union



COUNCIL OF EUROPE



Implemented  
by the Council of Europe



College of Europe  
Collège d'Europe



Natolin

Cross Country Report  
Project assessment  
Deliverable 3

Disclaimer:

*“This document has been produced using funds of a Joint Programme between the European Union and the Council of Europe. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union or the Council of Europe”*

# Joint EU/CoE Project: “Promoting Human Rights and Minority Protection in South East Europe”

## Cross-country report of the first project assessment

### Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Methodology .....	6
3. Possible strengths and risk factors of local projects .....	14
3.1 Albania.....	15
3.2 Bosnia and Herzegovina .....	25
3.3 Croatia .....	37
3.4 Kosovo* .....	49
3.5 ‘the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia’ .....	57
3.6 Montenegro.....	67
3.7 Serbia.....	75
4. Conclusions.....	87
Annex A: questionnaire first project assessment.....	93

## 1. Introduction

The beneficiaries in South East Europe<sup>1</sup> have committed themselves to ensure protection of minorities. All of them, except for Kosovo\* due to its special status, have signed and ratified the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM – hereafter Convention) and most have signed and ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML – hereafter Charter). Only Albania, 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' and Kosovo\* have not signed and ratified the Charter yet. In practice, however, not all rights are guaranteed in a satisfying manner for minorities in South East Europe.

The Council of Europe (CoE) and the European Union (EU) have joined forces to improve implementation of the Convention and Charter, and of EU legislation and policies concerning minority protection. Three projects have been initiated, one concerned with inclusion of Roma people, one concerned with inclusive education, and one concerned with the human rights and protection of minorities. The latter project is the last to start implementation.

In the course of the project to promote human rights and protection of minorities in South East Europe, 36 municipalities in seven beneficiaries were selected to implement small-scale projects to ensure basic services for minorities. From February 2015 onwards, these projects have been implemented by Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces in the municipalities, assisted by project consultants engaged by the Council of Europe.

Aside from a successful implementation of the local projects themselves, the overarching goal is to identify elements of good practice among the local projects, in order to disperse these practices further and thereby improve the implementation of the Convention and the Charter. To do this, a Research Team gathered by the College of Europe has been selected to carry out a participatory action research throughout the implementation phase of the local projects.

The Research Team consists of a lead expert, an international expert and seven national experts, one for each of the seven participating beneficiaries. The national experts have visited each of the municipalities in their country to interview municipal officers and minority persons, and submitted their results to the international and the lead expert for cross-country analysis. The Research Team is facilitated and coordinated by the College of Europe in Bruges (Belgium).

The Research Team will produce two assessments. Throughout the implementation of the local projects in the municipalities, the Team will carry out a project assessment to identify success and risk factors at the start, halfway through and at the end of the projects' implementation. The second assessment is an awareness assessment, carried out only at the start of the implementation phase of the local projects, to assess awareness of minority rights among groups that are involved in the local projects, either as organisers or as target group or participant.

This report conveys the results of the first project assessment, carried out at the beginning phase of the local projects' implementation, or in some cases just before the implementation started. It will first explain the methodology of the project assessments. In chapter three, the possible strengths and risks of each of the local projects will be briefly summarised per country. Score sheets for each of the projects are included, allowing for an overview of these strengths and weaknesses in one glance. The project assessment reports on which these score sheets are based will be confidential, so as to

---

<sup>1</sup> The beneficiaries covered by this project, in alphabetical order, are: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, Serbia, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and Kosovo\*.

\* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.

protect the anonymity of the respondents. Chapter four gives a cross-country summary of the results, draws overall conclusions and gives some general recommendations to the Council of Europe, the Research Team and the local Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces.

The Research Team wants to thank all respondents for their cooperation and their open and sincere answers, and hopes this report may be a helpful contribution to their work.

## 2. Methodology

The success of a project can only be evaluated once it is fully implemented, in this case at the end of 2016. Some projects might have a rocky start, but could still be a great success if the idea is solid, the support among the target group is broad and the implementing team is enthusiastic and capable of solving problems in an efficient and inclusive way. The reverse is also true; a project might start out very well, but run into trouble at a later stage, if for instance a central person in the organising task force falls ill, if a deadline cannot be made or if the target group loses interest in participation.

The project assessment will therefore be done in three parts, and will only be complete after the final assessment has taken place. The first assessment is undertaken at the start or even before the projects' implementation. This assessment could unearth some risk factors to the projects' eventual success, and provide information that can be used for a more project-specific second assessment halfway through the implementation. The third and last project assessment takes place after the implementation is finished, when an evaluation can be done as to whether the projects' goals were reached.

The reason to assess at these three moments, and not only at the end of the implementation phase, is to monitor the feelings of the persons involved in the projects at different stages of implementation. If a project is deemed a success afterwards, those involved in its implementation are likely to feel positive about all aspects of the project and towards each other, even if there was a difficult period halfway through in which deadlines were not reached, lines of communication were clogged or participants protested. Likewise, if the project is deemed a failure afterwards, those involved are likely to feel more negative about every aspect of the project and point out the actions of others that might have led to the failure, even if the project saw positive developments in an earlier phase. With the three assessments at different stages, the Research Team will be able to look back after implementation has finished and see which factors that led to success or failure were already in place at the start of the project, and which arose during implementation. This in turn will offer information as to which project ideas have worked well in practice and what circumstances need to be in place to make them a success.

It is important to note that the first and second assessments are 'snapshots' of the situation within the projects at the specific moment the interviews with respondents are held. The feelings and thoughts of respondents at that time are relayed. These might, however, change in the weeks or even days after the interview. A good meeting of the project team the week after might give everyone involved more clarity about organisation and task division, or increase the level of trust persons working on the project have in each other. Or a problem might come to light in the week after that poses a significant barrier to the implementation of the project.

### **Participative Action Research**

The project assessment is a form of Participative Action Research. This means that the research interacts with the subject. In this case, this report of the first project assessment will be public and can be used by the people implementing and co-ordinating the local projects to improve their work. It is therefore not a neutral observation of the local projects, in which the projects would take their course uninfluenced by the research.

A Participative Action Research is almost always qualitative rather than quantitative in nature. This research employs a qualitative method too; in-depth interviews with those persons most closely involved in the implementation of the local projects. A common questionnaire was used for the first project assessment, in order to draw out information that can be used for more project-specific questioning in the second assessment and to afford a small measure of comparability across municipalities. The first questionnaire contains mainly open questions, asking respondents about

things like their understanding of the project, the priority they attach to the project and their level of trust in one another. Aside from these open questions, respondents were also asked to rank some of these issues on a five-point scale, thus giving them multiple ways of expressing their thoughts and feelings. While some people may give direct answers to open questions, others might be more careful when asked to describe the situation in their own words. In the latter case, a five-point scale is sometimes more effective in drawing out the information sought. The second questionnaire will contain questions that are similar in the topics that are covered, but the focus of the questioning will be much more on the project itself, and leave even more room for variation within the interviews, exploring the answers of the respondents more in-depth.

This project assessment is not (only) a 'regular' form of project evaluation, in which the results are measured against the objectives when implementation has finished. This form of measurable, objectified evaluation will of course take place for the local projects in the spring of 2016, but it is only one part of this research. An evaluation of whether or not the project's objectives were reached, whether this happened within the timeframe and the available budget and how the results are appreciated by the target group will tell us in 2016 *whether* a project has been a success. However, this research also aims to find out *why* some projects are successful, while others might be less so. When all three phases of the project assessment have been completed, and an objective evaluation has taken place, the research will hopefully show what factors within the implementing team and within the municipality at large have been decisive for the success of a project. This in turn will offer information on what project topics are most successful and what circumstances need to be in place to make them a success, so they might be equally successfully implemented elsewhere.

### **Target group**

The target group for the project assessment is uniform across municipalities, in the sense that they are mainly composed of the members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces, which had to be set up in the context of the local projects in each municipality. There should be at least five members in each Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce, as stipulated by the Council of Europe. For the purpose of this research, it is assumed that all those closely involved in the implementation of the local projects have been included in these Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces, unless the municipal contact person indicates that some persons are not part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce but should be interviewed as important to the project's implementation or success nonetheless. Therefore, if relevant and according to the local situation and the nature of the project, others directly involved in the implementation of the projects could be involved in the project assessment too, such as participants, teachers, local minority leaders and other relevant parties. In the target group, there should be at least two municipal officers and two people belonging to (a) minority group(s). If multiple minority groups are targeted by the project, at least one person from each group should be included, unless this would make the group of respondents overly large, or if the minority groups are not involved in the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces and not indicated by the municipal contact person as relevant to the project's implementation. In some municipalities, it was not possible to include two or even any persons belonging to minority groups, since they were not involved in the project implementation (yet). The national experts were also instructed to find respondents of both sexes if possible, and in most cases succeeded in this.

The size of the sample could differ between municipalities, according to how many persons are involved in the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce and the project implementation. Considering the qualitative nature of the research, a difference in sample size has no bearing on the validity of the results, unless a minimum threshold is not reached. The minimum sample size in this research was set at three persons. In one municipality, this threshold was not reached since only two persons participated in the assessment. In one other municipality, there were no respondents at all. In all other cases, the minimum of three respondents was reached.

Mainly through the municipal contact persons, the national experts identified the persons to be interviewed, making sure the group includes enough persons involved in the project implementation to ensure representativeness. They were instructed to interview the members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces, and add respondents to this group where necessary.

The respondents were divided in four target groups:

- A. minority persons
- B. municipal officers
- C. both minority person and municipal officer
- D. neither minority person nor municipal officer

They were mainly identified as part of one of these target groups with two questions in the questionnaire, asking whether they considered themselves part of a minority group and whether they were municipal officers. They were also asked what tasks they would perform in the project, and whether they were part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

The second questionnaire will be put to the same group of people and will be conducted by telephone, Skype or by email if needed, halfway through the project's implementation. This is unless there was a shift in the project organisation meanwhile. If people are not involved in the project anymore, they may be substituted for new respondents. The third and last assessment will, in as far as possible, again be taken in a personal interview with the same people, barring organisational changes. If there were any changes in the target group during the project period, this will be clearly indicated in the report of the national experts on the project assessments.

Within the constraints of feasibility, an effort will be made to include two or three participants in the projects, or members of the target groups of the projects, in the third project assessment. Their opinion about the project will give information on the measure to which and the ways in which the projects' results are appreciated by the target group.

### **Five project capacities**

To be able to identify the factors that may decide the success or failure of a project, with a view to comparing projects across municipalities and beneficiaries and to promote adaptability of good practices into models for further implementation, a common assessment framework for projects has been developed. This framework is based on different project capacities. These capacities each in their own way may influence the success of a project.

#### **1. Assessment of the relevance of the project**

This assessment will only take place at the start of the project implementation, as it is not likely to change throughout implementation. For a project to succeed, both the persons implementing it and the projected target group should attach importance to it. If the persons implementing the project do not find it relevant enough, they are less likely to invest enough time and energy on its implementation to make it a success. Other work is then more likely to take precedence in their schedule. It could also happen that the organising team does consider the project very relevant, but the target group does not. There could be, for instance, a pressing issue concerning clean water among the target group, compared to which they consider a cultural dance evening a frivolous luxury. In that case, it will be difficult to get the target group to participate in the project, and the results of the project might not be appreciated by them even if implementation is successful.

To assess what relevance the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces attach to the projects, questions were asked, such as: *What is the problem to be solved by the project? Is this a priority, considering the local situation? Is the project a suitable way to solve the problem?* Moreover, the respondents were asked to describe the problem to be solved by the project in their own words. It could be that people have different ideas on what this is, which in itself can constitute a risk to the project's implementation.

A question was also included in the awareness assessment to ascertain whether minority persons as the projects' target group deem the project a priority. The answers to both the questions in the project assessment and the awareness assessment could thus be compared.

## **2. Assessment of the organisational capacity of the project**

This assessment will take place in all three phases: at the start of the project implementation, during its implementation phase and after implementation. The questions themselves, however, will be adapted to the phase of the project.

To assess the organisational capacity of the projects, questions were posed, such as: *How did the project design take place? How is the project organisation set up and coordinated? How effective and inclusive is decision-making within the project organisation? Is the project properly funded? Who are the persons directly involved in the implementation of the project, are their tasks clear to them and are they the most suitable persons for their task? What is the level of organisation of minority groups, and their level of involvement in drafting and implementing the project plans?*

If the project design is unclear to certain people, or if they have different ideas regarding what happened, this could be a risk to the project's success. A municipality and an NGO might then, for instance, compete for ownership of the project, or both feel the other should be taking the lead. Additionally, lack of clarity about the division of tasks, roles and decision-making procedures could be a risk if, for example, everyone or no one feels they should take decisions or is simultaneously carrying out the same task while others are left undone. However, some projects are at a very early stage of implementation or have not started yet. In those cases, a few meetings and briefings with the implementing team could clear up this lack of clarity and solve the risk. A final issue within the project organisation could be that some people were left out of the team, or were included in it for the wrong reasons. A minority leader might be left out because he or she was too critical of the municipality in the past, or someone might have been included as a friendly favour even if he or she is not suited for the tasks in the project.

Another important issue is the level of organisation of minority groups and their level of involvement in choosing the topic of the project and designing the project itself. For projects concerning minority groups, or any group that may be difficult to reach, a higher level of organisation can often be related directly to a higher chance of success of the project. It facilitates engaging participants, dispersing information and results and also gaining information that can be used to tailor the project to the target group. In some municipalities, enhancing the level of organisation and capacities of minority groups is the specific goal of the project. In those cases, a low level of organisation could even be a success factor, because much can be gained from a raised organisation level for any future projects aimed at improving the situation of minority groups. Aside from their level of organisation, their involvement in the project is also an important factor, because this might determine the general feeling of the target group towards the project and in turn their willingness to participate. It also means that there is a higher chance that the project's topic and design correlates to the reality of the target group.

## **3. Assessment of the cooperative capacity of the project**

This assessment will take place in all three phases: at the start of the project implementation, during its implementation phase and after implementation has finished. The questions themselves, however, will be adapted to the phase of the project.

Even if the implementing team is composed of the right people, who have a clear idea of their tasks and of the decision-making procedures in the team, and the target group has been properly involved, they need to be able to work well together for the project to succeed. If not, communication within the team will be difficult, and it is much harder to solve any issues that may arise during the project's

implementation. If the team members have low trust in each other, or feel that others are more responsible for the project's success than they are, this might be a risk factor.

To assess the cooperative capacity of the projects, questions were asked, such as: *What is the level of trust between the members of the multi-stakeholder task force? What is the level of ownership felt by different groups and persons involved in project implementation? What is the level of responsibility for solving the problem targeted by the project felt by different interlocutors?*

Considering the fact that many of the municipalities and minority groups are quite small, chances are that most of those involved in the project implementation will have worked together before on other minority protection projects in the past. Therefore, respondents were also asked whether they had worked together before, and if so, how successful this cooperation was. If teams had indeed cooperated before but the cooperation was not a success, it might have negatively influenced their feelings toward each other and hamper cooperation in this project.

#### **4. Assessment of the problem-solving capacity of the project**

This assessment will take place both during the project's implementation phase and after its conclusion, so not at the starting phase of the project. In all likelihood, most projects will not yet have run into problems to be solved at the start of implementation.

All projects run into at least a few minor or major problems to be solved during their implementation; a deadline that needs to be shifted, a team member that falls ill, a decision that takes a long time to be taken, a problem with getting enough participants, technology that breaks down, or anything else. What determines a project's success is how the team manages to tackle these problems. If they have a high problem-solving capacity, they will be able to display flexibility and come up with solutions that are successful in solving the problem and are well-communicated to all team members. If they have a low problem-solving capacity, they might panic, start blaming each other, start working against each other instead of together, do double work or leave tasks undone.

To assess the project's problem-solving capacity, questions will be asked like: *How do those involved in the implementation of the project deal with barriers? How successful are they in removing barriers and how far do they cooperate to remove barriers? How are possible personal tensions, lack of clarity about task divisions or other interpersonal issues dealt with within the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce? How are changes in the plan, the timetable or other changes communicated to the team?*

#### **5. Assessment of the results of the project**

This assessment will take place after the project's conclusion, to see whether the project can be called a success or not, and most importantly, why. After the project's conclusion, the Research Team will be able to compare the final results to the earlier assessments and see which aspect of the project might have led to a project's success or failure.

For the evaluation, questions will be asked such as: *Have the tangible results aimed at by the project been met? Are those persons targeted by the project helped? Did the project manage to keep within the financial and time frame? How has the cooperation within the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce and its handling of barriers been perceived by its members?*

These five assessments, monitored at the start, halfway through the implementation and after the conclusion of the projects, will deliver the information needed to analyse the relative contribution of different project capacities to the measure of success or failure of a project.

#### **Process**

The international and lead experts have drafted the model questionnaire for the first project assessment to guide the interviews on project capacities. In the questionnaire, the project capacities

were operationalised into sets of questions. The questions have been formulated in a non-confrontational way as much as possible, to avoid influencing the respondents negatively. They are, however, suggestive in some cases, because the aim of the questions is to unearth any flaws in the areas of the different capacities that might exist at the outset of the project. At the start of the questionnaire, basic information about the project, the project design and the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce was also asked. The questionnaire with an explanation of why each question was included can be found as Annex A to this report.

The questionnaire was put to the national experts and to the Council of Europe for comments before use, to ensure it complied with the Council's expectations and is suited to the local reality in the different beneficiaries. At the Council's suggestion, some questions were added. Where needed, questions were adapted to the national, local or project situation, while keeping the intention intact and bearing in mind the need for overall comparability of the results. For instance, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the term "regional authorities" was changed into "cantonal/entities' authorities" and "national authorities" was changed into "state authorities", to reflect the specific political structure of the country.

The national experts conducted the interviews in person where possible, or by telephone or Skype. They sent the questionnaire via email when a personal interview was not possible. Considering the time and financial restraints, they could only spend limited time in each municipality and were not able to conduct all interviews face to face if certain respondents were not available during their visit. In some cases, the national experts posed the open questions in a personal interview, but asked the respondents to fill out the quantitative questions with a five-point ranking in private to ensure more truthful answers, since in busy offices that are shared by colleagues respondents might be overheard and less inclined to be critical. In some other cases, the respondents filled out the questionnaire themselves in private, and were further questioned in a common meeting with the national expert.

The national experts received a template for their analysis of the results of the first project assessment for each municipality and also a template for the national report, to enhance the possibility to compare results.

A 'significant difference' in the analysis of responses to questions with a five-point ranking was considered to be present if there was a difference of 1.5 points or more. In the analysis, the subjective opinion of the national experts is also included. In order to get a full picture of the situation in a certain municipality, not only the answers to the questions of the respondents themselves are important, but also the atmosphere in which the interviews took place and any relevant information given by respondents outside of the scope of the specific questions. Again, the first project assessment is mainly meant to identify areas for further research in the second stage. It is not in any way an objective and neutral listing of possible success and risk factors that will determine the outcome of the project.

#### **Tools: project summaries and score-sheets**

As already pointed out in the introduction to this chapter, the project assessment is and will be undertaken at three different moments in the implementation phase, to record the situation at that time. This will give the Research Team information about success and risk factors that will not be biased by the eventual outcome of the project.

The first assessment was done in the form of a questionnaire with some open questions, and some questions that rank on a five-point scale. The same questionnaire was used in all 36 municipalities, in order to get a baseline overview of the projects' capacities and compare these to one another.

The findings of the project assessments are presented in a neutral manner to allow for some measure of anonymity for the respondents. The Research Team will make every effort to keep the

answers confidential and anonymous, and will not refer to respondents specifically. For a good result of the assessment, it is important that respondents answer truthfully to the questions, also in the second and third assessments, among others about the measure of confidence they have in their colleagues. Moreover, considering the fact that this is a Participative Action Research, the Research Team has a responsibility towards the respondents and the local projects. The report of the findings of the first project assessment should not negatively influence the chances of success and relations between members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces. For these reasons, the project assessment reports per municipality are kept confidential. It must be noted, however, that since the target group is relatively small, anonymity cannot be fully guaranteed even with these measures.

In this report of the findings of the first project assessment, project summaries and score-sheets are used as tools to relay the information drawn from the first assessment interviews. They are based on the confidential reports per municipality. This creates a measure of tension, because the qualitative information given to the Research Team by respondents in interviews is thus paraphrased in the summaries and presented in a score-sheet that may give the impression that the research is quantitative in nature. It must be emphasised that the summaries and score-sheets are mainly tools to relay the qualitative information from respondents, and not in themselves the core of the research. Despite this tension, the Research Team feels it may be useful to present the first project assessment in this manner to allow for use of the report by those implementing, co-ordinating and overseeing the local projects in order to improve them, in keeping with the participative nature of the research.

Score-sheets are a relatively crude tool. It should be kept in mind that there is more nuanced and varied information at the basis of these sheets, and that the information from respondents was analysed in a qualitative rather than a quantitative manner. In some cases for example, the opinion of some respondents was more decisive than that of others in identifying possible success or risk factors for the project. For instance, the opinion of the project leader counts more heavily in whether there will be enough funding for a project or not rather than the opinion of someone else less central to the organisation. To protect the anonymity of respondents, this sort of weighed decision is not described in this report, though the information can be found in the confidential individual project assessment reports.

### **Expectation for the first project assessment**

The expectation for this first assessment is that all project capacities measured at the very start of implementation would score well. This is the phase in which the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce has just been formed by people who should have an optimistic idea about the project's future success and each other's capabilities. The project idea has just been converted into a work plan that everyone should have faith in. Doubts and problems expressed in this phase of the project are expected to be rare.

In the score sheets per municipality, the projects received a **green** mark for the capacities where no significant doubts exist, and were given an **orange** mark or even a **red** mark for the capacities where some doubt or potential problem became apparent during the project assessment interviews. Many projects have mainly green marks, which complies with expectation. There are, however, several projects with a number of orange or even red marks. It must be emphasised that this does not in any way mean that these projects will fail to succeed. The first project assessment has in itself no prediction value. In some cases, an orange mark for clarity of tasks or decision-making will be due to the fact that the project implementation has not started, and the members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce have not been fully briefed yet. Likewise, an orange mark for involvement of minority persons could mean that no minority organisation to cooperate in the project has been found yet, but they may very well be found next week. All potential risks indicated in this assessment are solvable, and may be solved in the near future, putting all signs on green for the project's success.

### **Second and third project assessments**

The first project assessment, therefore, offers mainly questions to be asked in the second project assessment, not answers as such. The second project assessment will use a questionnaire that is common for all municipalities in the themes linked to the capacities that will be discussed, but the individual questions will be tailored more to the specific project. There will be more open questions in the second assessment, asking for in-depth answers. For the municipalities where some possible risk factors were identified in the first project assessment, these issues will be a focus in the second assessment to find out whether they are still indeed issues or whether they were solved and if so, how.

Moreover, in the second phase, questions will not only centre on possible risk factors and problems or barriers encountered, but also on results achieved in the first half year of implementation. In the first phase, most local projects had just started implementation or were even still at a pre-implementation stage. No successes or results could be explored at that time yet, although possible strengths of the project and project team were emphasised. Halfway through and after the implementation of the local projects, it will be possible to address results and successes.

The third project assessment questionnaire will be based not only on the results of the former two interview rounds, but also on an objectified evaluation of whether the project's goals were reached within the timeframe and budget. In that phase, the Research Team can combine these results to identify possible success or fail factors, and use this analysis to test possible hypotheses and anomalies in the final round of in-depth interviews with respondents.

### 3. Possible strengths and risk factors of local projects

The national experts have written full reports on each of the projects, based on the questionnaires filled out by members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces and other relevant respondents. In the following chapter, a summary of the possible strengths and risk factors for the projects as described in these reports is given. The reports themselves will remain confidential, to protect the anonymity of the respondents.

For each project, a score sheet was made, so the possible success and risk factors can be viewed at a glance while protecting the respondents' anonymity. In these sheets, possible strengths are indicated in **green**. These are the areas in which there was no indication of any possible problem, now or in the future. Possible risks are mainly indicated in **orange** or **red**. These were areas in which more than a quarter of the respondents indicated there might be a problem there, now or in the future. Since the target groups are mainly between five and ten persons, this is sometimes the opinion of two persons. If only one person indicated a possible problem, this usually does not lead to an orange mark in the score sheet, unless the position of this one respondent in the project is such that this should be taken seriously. For instance, if only one minority stakeholder not involved in the practical management of the project indicates there may be too little funding, this is not indicated as a possible risk in the score sheet. If, however, the project leader, who will have responsibility for the financing of the project, says the same, it is. If a possible risk seems directly threatening to the project's success, in a few cases this problem is indicated in red. This is for instance the case in the Albanian municipality of Rrethinat, where a territorial re-division may take place that will place the minority community involved in another neighbouring municipality. One more colour is used: **pink**. This is used in cases where there is a low level of organisation of minority groups in the municipality, but where this may not be a risk to the project's success because raising this level of organisation is the aim of the project. In those cases, the low level of organisation may even turn out to be a success factor to the project, since it indicates that the project is addressing a pressing need of the minority community. If there is a low level of organisation, but this is not the aim of the local project, this is indicated in orange as a possible risk in the score sheet.

<b>Green</b>	Possible strengths / no indication problems
<b>Orange</b>	Possible risks
<b>Red</b>	Possible higher risk
<b>Pink</b>	Low level organisation / not necessarily risk

As mentioned in chapter two, the score sheets are a relatively crude instrument, without much room for nuances. The scoring of possible strengths and risks is a subjective weighing by the international experts of the information from the respondents to the first project assessment, taking into account the opinions of the national experts after they interviewed the respondents.

Since, as also described in chapter two, all areas could be expected to score green in the initial stages of a project, the researchers have used orange wherever any doubt was raised in a certain area. This means that even when there are indications that a possible risk will probably be solved in the near future, an orange mark was given nonetheless. This is for instance in cases where the purpose of the project, the task division within the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce or the decision-making procedures were as yet unclear to respondents. These risks might be solved within a few weeks by briefings from the project management. The score sheet reflects the state of affairs at the moment the interviews with respondents were held, and have no prediction value in themselves for the areas that may become problems for the project. Conclusions can be drawn only after the third project assessment and the project evaluation.

## 3.1 Albania

### 1. Fier Municipality

*Theme covered: Effective participation*

*Affected minorities: Roma and Egyptians*

#### **Outline of the project:<sup>2</sup>**

The project idea is to draft and implement an inclusive Local Action Plan for Minorities in the Municipality of Fier. This Plan will include concrete activities to address the needs of Roma and Egyptians. It will contribute also to the enhancement of capacities of these minorities, which will be involved in the process of drafting of this Plan as well as gathering and analysing different necessary data.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

A team consisting solely of women will carry out the project in Fier. Six persons were interviewed. Three of them are municipal officers, and three are from NGOs or involved as specialists. None of the persons interviewed are from a minority group themselves, though the NGOs work closely with the minority target groups.

Possible strengths of the project are that the implementing team cooperate well together, and have already worked together successfully in the past. Most of them have a very positive attitude towards the project and its probable success and they are all experienced in the field of minority policies.

Possible risk factors are that minority groups themselves do not form part of the implementing team, and have a low level of organisation in the municipality. Roma persons were consulted in the project design phase, while Egyptians were not. The opinion of the municipal officers and the persons from NGOs differed as well: the latter deems the level of organisation even lower than the former. It will become clear during implementation whether the target groups can be reached sufficiently well to carry out the project plans successfully despite their low level of organisation.

Another remarkable outcome was that while all implementing team members are convinced the project will be a success, slightly less than 30% of the respondents to the awareness assessment answered 'maybe' and 5% of them answered 'no' when asked whether they thought the project would succeed. This shows a potential gap between the experts implementing the project and targets of the project, which will be monitored in the second and third project assessments.

---

<sup>2</sup> All the project outlines presented in this document are taken from the Council of Europe "Short overview of the selected project ideas per Beneficiary" document. The American English style in these descriptions has been maintained even though the rest of the document follows British English. Changes have been made to the project outlines only in those instances where some minor grammar adjustments were deemed necessary.

### Summary project assessment<sup>3</sup> Fier, Albania

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

<sup>3</sup> The meaning of the colours used in the tables for each municipality (pp. 12-82) is summarised in a table on page 10 of this report. Green represent possible strengths/ no indication of problems; orange represents possible risks; red represents possible higher risks, and; pink represents low level of organisation which is not necessarily a risk.

## 2. “Dropulli i poshtëm/Sofratikë” Commune

*Theme covered: Culture*

*Affected minorities: Greek*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project aims to establish craft production, marketing and sales in the Greek minority area. Efforts will include business and retail sales training (including topics such as embroidery, musical instruments, planning, accounting, pricing, and retail sales), support for design and development of stores, design of a web-based tool to sell craft products to retail and commercial buyers.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Six respondents were interviewed in Dropulli i poshtëm/Sofratikë. Four of them were male, two were female. All respondents were part of the Greek minority group targeted by the project, and the four men and one of the women were municipal officers. Five of the respondents indicated they were part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

The respondents did not talk very clearly about how the project was designed. This could indicate a different understanding of what the project entails, but does not have to. They did indicate that everyone's tasks within the project were very clear.

Possible success factors for the project are that the minority group seems to have a high degree of organisation, and all members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce are members of the targeted minority group. This means that the measure of access to participants is probably quite good. Moreover, they are mainly municipal officers, which makes the connection to the municipal organisation a very close one. The team members have successfully cooperated in the past and have a great level of trust in one another.

Possible risk factors to the project's success are the lack of clarity among team members on the project design, as well as a possible lack of funding indicated by one relevant member of the team. Moreover, just under 25% of the respondents to the awareness assessment indicated they thought the project would 'maybe' be a success, while all respondents to the project assessment indicated it would certainly be a success.

## Summary project assessment Dropull, Albania

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### **3. Shijak Municipality**

*Theme covered: Education/Non-discrimination*

*Affected minorities: Bosniak community and Roma*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project aims to establish/furnish a center offering different services to the Bosniak community. The center will offer different courses, such as: Bosniak and other foreign languages, human rights, tailoring, artistic courses etc., to enhance the capacities of Bosniak communities in different aspects with the final aim to improve their lives. The center will offer also social services to people in need.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Three female and two male respondents were interviewed in Shijak, so there were five respondents in total. One woman and one man considered themselves part of a minority group, and all were municipal officers. Three respondents identified themselves as part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce, while two called themselves participants.

Possible strengths of the project are that there is a high degree of involvement of the minority group in the project implementation, and the minority group is in general well represented among municipal staff. The mayor for instance is from the Bosniak community. Two of the respondents had worked together successfully in the past, while the others did not yet cooperate together.

A possible risk factor for the project is that respondents were quite vague about how the project design took place in an open question. Especially the minority members of the team were not well informed on this, nor on the role of different actors in the project, even though they did indicate in a later question that the tasks of everyone involved were very clear to them. There did not seem to be a strong collaboration between team members yet either. This could well be remedied once the implementation of the project gets underway properly. Another issue is that while Roma people are one of the two target groups of this project, they are not explicitly mentioned in the project assessment. Therefore, the involvement of minorities is marked as a possible risk. The Bosniak minority seems very well involved, but the Roma minority may not be to a sufficient degree.

Something remarkable, though not in itself worrisome, is that this is one of the few municipalities in which the respondents to the awareness assessment attach a higher priority on average to the project than do the members of the implementation team.

## Summary project assessment Shijak, Albania

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

#### **4. Përmet Municipality**

*Theme covered: Effective participation*

*Affected minorities: Roma, Egyptians, Aromanian/Vllah*

##### **Outline of the project:**

The project aims to enhance the participation of minority groups in the local and regional decision-making institutions. Minority community members will be trained on civil and human rights in order to enhance their understanding of their rights. They will be part of different institutional structures within the municipalities.

##### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

In Përmet, there were eight respondents to the project assessment. Five of them were women and three were men. Only one woman was part of a minority group, and all but one man were municipal officers.

Possible strengths of the project are that the members of the implementing team seem well coordinated and motivated to make the project a success. The fact that the level of organisation of minority groups seems very low could in this case be a success factor, since enhancing the organisation level and participation capacity of minority groups is one of the main aims of the project. This indicates a high relevance of the topic of the project, although it will likely be a challenge to make it succeed. In the score sheet for the project in Përmet, this is therefore indicated in pink instead of orange or red. Six out of eight respondents worked together in the past, and indicated that this cooperation was very successful.

A possible risk factor to the project is that it seems quite hard to involve minority persons in the project organisation itself. The implementing team said to be working on that, but collaboration is as yet missing. Also, the one minority member of the team seemed to have received less information about the project design. It was underlined that it would be important that those involved in the project implementation would have influence on the minority groups. A further risk factor may be funding, as some respondents indicated they fear there might be too little funding, and one respondent said there might be a risk of jealousies and hostilities between minority groups among themselves.

## Summary project assessment Permet, Albania

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## 5. “Rrethina” Commune

*Theme covered: Media/Culture*

*Affected minorities: Montenegrins*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project aims to support and promote education, employment, traditions and culture of Montenegrins living in the Commune of “Rrethina”. Through this project equal chances for Montenegrins in local and regional level will be promoted through new education and employment opportunities. The project will also foster knowledge of the tradition, culture, history and language of Montenegrins and support initiatives that combat against discrimination.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

In Rrethina commune, two men and three women were interviewed, five respondents in total. One woman was part of the minority group, and four respondents were municipal officers. One of the five respondents, who sent the answers to the questionnaire by email, was unclear about what her task in the project was and generally seemed uninvolved with the project organisation. Her answers were not taken as decisive for any possible success or risk factors for the project, unless other respondents shared her opinion.

Possible strengths of the project are that the project design, tasks and decision-making procedures seem very clear to all relevant members of the implementing team. Two of the respondents have worked together successfully in the past. All respondents, both in the implementing team and in the awareness assessment, thought that the project will be a success.

The biggest risk factor for this project is something that cannot be influenced by the project team. After the local elections, there may be a territorial division after which the minority community will be part of the municipality of Shkodra instead of Rrethinat. It remains to be seen how this will affect the project implementation. Nearly all respondents pointed this out as a possible risk to their project.

## Summary project assessment Rrethinat, Albania

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## 3.2 Bosnia and Herzegovina

### 1. *Bosanska Krupa municipality*

*Theme covered: Education*

*Affected minorities: Roma*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea is to create a 'mobile' kindergarten in the areas where Roma children live to increase the number of children attending preschool education. To this end, it is planned to purchase a van, which will be modified for the teaching purposes. The local government will include all relevant stakeholders in creating the curriculum, which will best fit the needs of and contribute to the education of Roma and other children.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Three women involved in the project were interviewed in Bosanska Krupa. Two of them are municipal officers, one is not. None are from a minority group. The three respondents are all part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce, which has two more members who belong to a minority group. They, however, could not be reached to respond to the project assessment at this time.

Possible strengths of the project are that it is considered a priority by the team members as well as by the respondents to the awareness assessment, and the method chosen is considered very suitable. There is a great measure of support and enthusiasm for the project among the team and the municipality. Representatives of minority groups were well involved in the project design, as were all other relevant persons. Because the project is very concrete, the tasks are very clear to all respondents.

A slight risk could be that the decision-making procedures within the project team are not (yet) clear to those outside of the municipal organisation. This could well be clarified in the early stages of the project implementation, by properly informing all involved of the procedures. A more important risk could be that minority groups are not very highly organised in the municipality, and that they in general seem uninterested in expressing their interests if it does not concern a practical need. One respondent remarked that it may prove difficult to convince parents to send their children to mobile kindergarten. A final risk to the project, outside of the team's influence, could be that the procurement procedure might take some time, delaying other project activities.

## Summary project assessment Bosanska Krupa, Bosnia and Herzegovina

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **2. Gradiska municipality**

*Theme covered: Language and media*

*Affected minorities: Roma, Ukrainian, Polish and Montenegrin*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea is to create a web platform of the municipality which will have all relevant information translated in the languages of national minorities living in the Gradiska municipality. The web platform will serve to promote the work of the national minority organizations and encourage them to become more active. As a part of the activities, bilingual signs will be placed in local communities where minorities live.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Four women and one man responded to the project assessment, five in total. Three of the women and the one man all belong to minority groups. One of the women is a municipal officer while all others are not, and she is also the only one not from a minority group. They all indicated being part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

Possible strengths of the project are that it is quite concrete; so the purpose, method of project design and tasks of all involved are clear to very clear to everyone. Minority groups are included in the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce and the municipality seems to have close relationships with their organisations, although some groups did not feel highly involved in the project's choice of topic and design.

A possible risk to the project is that the problem to be solved by it is only considered moderately a priority by both the implementing team and the respondents to the awareness assessment, compared to other problems minority persons face in the municipality. Another risk could exist in a relatively low level of organisation of minority groups in Gradiska, but the project hopes to (indirectly) enhance this level. Minority groups do seem to be becoming more and more active in expressing their interests and finding the channels to do so in the municipality. Interesting to note is that most respondents said there was only a moderately good chance that both the municipal and minority stakeholders would execute their tasks in a proper and timely fashion. This is indicated in orange in the score sheet as a possible risk, but it could also just be modesty on the part of the team members because they scored their own group as low as others.

One last noteworthy aspect in Gradiska is that all respondents answered the questionnaire by email, because they did not come to a meeting that was organised with the national expert.

## Summary project assessment Gradiska, Bosnia and Herzegovina

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### **3. City of Sarajevo**

*Theme covered: Culture*

*Affected minorities: Albanians, Czechs, Italians, Jewish, Hungarians, Macedonians, Polish, Slovenian and Roma*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea is to provide a platform for national minorities in the City of Sarajevo where they can promote their tradition, culture and history, which will also serve to raise awareness on minority rights and needs and as a place for mutual respect, understanding and intercultural dialogue. The organization of a National Minorities Day in the City of Sarajevo would serve as a starting point in creating this platform, through presenting the handcrafts, cuisine, music, art, history and other aspects of the respective minority identities.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

As many as 12 respondents answered to the questionnaire in Sarajevo. Eight respondents are men, four are women. Two of the women and all men are minority representatives, and the two women from the majority group are both municipal officers. Eight of the respondents indicated they were part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce, the other four are participants.

The minority respondents indicated that the topic of the project was only moderately a priority for them. All indicated that their main problem as an organisation is the lack of affordable office space in Sarajevo. Related to this is their feeling that the project is only slightly suitable as a method to solve the problem of minority groups. Another possible risk is that it is felt that the choice of topic and the project design was mainly unilaterally done by the municipality. There is a lack of clarity among non-municipal officers as to what exactly the project entails, what everyone's tasks will be and how decision-making will take place. The decision-making up to now is not felt to be effective nor inclusive. Once the project gets underway, this may be remedied by the municipality, by properly informing everyone of tasks, purpose and procedures, and making sure these are inclusive.

Furthermore, most respondents had a differing and negative view both of the manner in which minorities express their interests and their level of organisation. Though this level is probably relatively high compared to that in other more rural municipalities, the respondents themselves were not content with this level and emphasised that all active minority persons are volunteers. Most respondents feared there may be too little funding for the project, and to the question whether respondents saw any other risks to a successful implementation of the project, a wide variety of possible risks was indicated. When asked who is most responsible for the success of the project, the minority stakeholders indicated this is the municipality, while the municipal officers indicated this is the minority stakeholders. All think there is only a moderately good chance that either the municipal or the minority stakeholders would execute their tasks in a proper and timely fashion.

The respondents do commonly feel that the project will be a success, and indicated they all have an interest in making it succeed.

## Summary project assessment Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

#### **4. Prnjavor municipality**

*Theme covered: Language*

*Affected minorities: Italian, Ukrainian, Czech, Polish, Roma and Slovakian*

##### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea is focused on use and teaching of the languages of national minorities in Prnjavor municipality. The on-line teaching of minority languages will be available to 150 students in two elementary schools. The local government will work together with the local community and kin states of national minorities to create curriculums appropriate for on-line teaching.

##### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

In Prnjavor, there were 13 respondents, seven women and six men. Two of the women and three of the men are minority representatives. Five are municipal officers, of whom one is also part of a minority group. Nine of them said they were part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce, while the others are participants.

All seemed very enthusiastic about the project and were content with the project design. The idea was initiated by minority groups themselves and further developed by the municipality. While the municipality is taking responsibility for the project, minority groups seem to feel a great sense of ownership of and involvement in it too. Another strength could be that all respondents feel that minority groups not only have a high level of organisation, but are also well integrated in the municipality through personal and familial ties. Those team members that worked together in the past did so successfully.

A possible risk is that while the implementing team feels the project is a priority, the respondents to the awareness assessment feel that it is only moderately a priority compared to other problems minority groups face in the municipality. Municipal and minority stakeholders seemed to point to each other as most responsible for the success of the project. However, considering the degree of responsibility all felt for the project, this is unlikely to be a risk. Some of the respondents noted that there may be a risk of insufficient interest among parents and pupils to participate, which has been indicated under 'other risks' in orange, but may turn out not to be a risk in practice.

## Summary project assessment Prnjavor, Bosnia and Herzegovina

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **5. Jablanica municipality**

*Theme covered: Political participation*

*Affected minorities: Roma*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea is to support the Roma community in organizing themselves and support the development of a coordination body. Good practice by Roma NGOs will be presented to Roma living in Jablanica, and all existing municipal instruments will be used to encourage Roma participation in public and political life.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Jablanica had six respondents, one woman and five men. Three of the men are municipal officers, all others are not. Only the woman is part of a minority group. All respondents indicated they are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

Possible strengths of the project are that the youth organisation involved seems to have a good cooperation with the municipality and all members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce seem enthusiastic about the project and optimistic about its success, and almost all have worked together successfully in the past. They all feel involved, although the minority representative in the team was replaced at the outset and the new representative still needs to be fully briefed.

Possible risks to the project might exist in the limited extent to which minorities express their interests in the municipality and their low level of organisation. They were not highly involved in the project design either. However, as the project is specifically aimed at increasing the level of organisation and capacities of the minority community, this could also be strength, as it indicates that the project is addressing a relevant problem. It does make it a challenge to find sufficient participants for the project among the minority group, as indicated by several respondents. Moreover, the majority of respondents indicated they thought it only a moderately good chance that the minority stakeholders would execute their tasks in a proper and timely fashion.

A last notable issue is that, while all Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce members are confident that the project will be a success, over 60% of the respondents to the awareness assessment thought it would only maybe or not be a success.

## Summary project assessment Jablanica, Bosnia and Herzegovina

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **6. City of Prijedor**

*Theme covered: Culture, language and media*

*Affected minorities: Ukrainian*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea focuses on improving the realization of rights of the Ukrainian minority living in Prijedor. The activities will focus on culture, education, official use of language, media and non-discrimination. The aim is to support the active participation of the Ukrainian minority in the cultural, social and economic spheres in the local community.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Only two respondents filled out the questionnaire in Prijedor; one man and one woman. This means that the sample group in this municipality is below the minimum threshold of three respondents, and the results cannot be taken as representative for the whole Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce in this municipality. The results are conveyed nonetheless, in case they might be useful to those implementing the project, but should be seen in this light.

Both respondents are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce. The man is a representative of the minority group; the woman is a municipal officer. The national expert held a common meeting with more persons involved in the project, but only two of them were willing to fill out the questionnaire at this meeting or return it by email afterwards. Some of the answers are therefore based on the opinion of just two people, while others are influenced by the opinions of a larger group expressed in the meeting.

Overall, the project organisation seems to be well on track, with the topic considered a priority by both those involved in the implementation and by the respondents to the awareness questionnaire. The organisation, tasks and purpose of the project seem clear to all involved, and the minority group feels involved in the project organisation and design.

One risk factor (that could be identified on the basis of only two respondents) is that there is a relatively low level of organisation of the minority group. Otherwise, no risks could be discerned at this time, except for a fear that also exists in some other Bosnian communities, namely that there will be a reoccurrence of the flooding that hit the country last year.

## Summary project assessment Prijedor, Bosnia and Herzegovina

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### 3.3 Croatia

#### 1. City of Pakrac

*Theme covered: Active participation*

*Affected minorities: Serbian, Italian and Czech*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea focuses on the importance of media, education, official use of the language, culture and non-discrimination. These issues will be tackled through capacity building of the national minorities, and promoting their active participation in public life.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Three women and four men participated in the project assessment in Pakrac, so seven respondents in total. One of the women and three of the men are part of a minority group. Four are municipal officers, of whom one is also from a minority group. Four of the respondents indicated they were part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce. A notable gender aspect is that the main NGO involved in the project implementation has no women who will be associated with the project.

Possible strengths of the project are that the management seems very motivated and possess the expertise and experience to make the project a success. Those in the implementing team that have worked together in the past have done so very successfully and their degree of trust in each other is high.

However, the project design seems to have been done by just two persons, while others were only engaged later. One of these persons is part of one of the minority groups targeted by the project, but the other minority groups do not seem to have been involved in the project topic or design. It will be a challenge to involve them. Their level of organisation is deemed low, but as this is a main aim of the project it does not have to be a risk to the project's success.

A risk to the project's success could be that there seems to be a significant difference in clarity of tasks, procedures and other aspects of the project between the management of the project that designed it, and others involved in the project implementation. And while the management seems to work together well, others indicate that lack of trust, personal animosities and lack of motivation might be risks to the project's success.

Other possible risks to the project are associated with the political situation in the municipality. Some respondents fear there may be political instability due to elections, or that the political influence on the project will be too great. 29% of respondents said they thought the project would only maybe be a success.

A final notable point is that, different from most other municipalities in the region, respondents felt that minority persons themselves are most responsible for solving the problem addressed by the project: their participation in public life in Pakrac.

## Summary project assessment Pakrac, Croatia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **2. Knezevi Vinogradi municipality**

*Theme covered: Language and media*

*Affected minorities: Hungarian and Serbian*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea has two aspects, which relate to the upgrading of the municipal website and translating relevant content to Hungarian, Serbian and English language; and refurbishment of the municipal library and increasing the number of books, and particularly in minority languages.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Four women and one man, so five respondents, were interviewed for the project assessment in Knezevi Vinogradi. All are from a minority group, and the one man and one of the women are municipal officers. Three respondents indicated they were part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

Possible strengths of the project are that the project design seems very inclusive, with the management taking the lead but involving all others. The implementing team consider the project a priority and the method very suitable. Those who worked together before deem this cooperation very successful, and they all seem to be quite clear on the tasks and procedures in this project. They display a high level of trust in each other and are content with the involvement of all stakeholders in choosing the project's topic and its design. A last asset for this project is that the level of organisation of minority groups is deemed considerably higher than in most municipalities, which can facilitate their participation and involvement in the project.

All signs seem to be on green for the success of the project in Knezevi Vinogradi. The only risk the team members could think of was a fear of delays in financing from the side of the Council of Europe.

## Summary project assessment Knezevi Vinogradi, Croatia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### **3. City of Cakovec**

*Theme covered: Education*

*Affected minorities: Roma*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea is to create a Roma women's enterprise which could serve as a training centre for Roma woman to learn more about the opportunities for self-employment and current market needs in Cakovec and to encourage participation in local economy.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Five respondents, two women and three men, were interviewed in Cakovec. Only one of the men belongs to a minority group, and the two other men are municipal officers. All said to be part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

Possible strengths of this project are that the team members are very motivated, have a high level of trust in each other and possess the experience and expertise to make the project a success. They all worked together successfully in the past, and the task division and procedures for this project seem clear to all.

The main challenge for this project will be to engage the target group of Roma women, and to make sure they have the necessary support in their community to participate successfully in the project. As indicated by the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce, Roma women have a low awareness of their rights, and a low level of organisation. The target group itself has not been involved in the project design, but an NGO that is experienced in working with Roma women took the lead. The expectation is therefore that the project activities will be suited to the target group, even if they were not involved in the design themselves.

Two other possible risks mentioned by the respondents were a possible lack of funding and a possible shortage of time for implementation. Moreover, one of the respondents pointed to a possible difference in political opinions within the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

## Summary project assessment Cakovec, Croatia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

#### **4. City of Pula**

*Theme covered: Language*

*Affected minorities: Italian*

##### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea focuses on the official use of Italian language in the public life of the City of Pula. It is planned to translate official documents/forms into Italian, post bilingual street/traffic signs, and provide additional Italian language classes. The activities will include media outreach in order to inform the community on how to best access the existing instruments for exercising rights to official use of Italian language.

##### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Five respondents, of whom three are women and two are men, were interviewed in Pula. All five are municipal officers, and two of them are part of a minority group. Two respondents indicated they are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

Possible strengths of the project are that the team members seem experienced and suited for their tasks. They have cooperated very successfully in the past and have a high level of trust in each other. They also seem to have a clear view of the purpose, task division and procedures in the implementing team.

Possible risks to the project lie mainly in the fact that the project seems driven by the municipality, without much involvement of organisations of the targeted minority or of individual minority persons. One of the respondents voices as a risk that the direct and indirect beneficiaries of the project may not be interested in it. The Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce consists of very suitable persons, but could be more inclusive of persons outside the municipal administration. Two other risks that respondents pointed out are a possible shortage of funding and possible changes to minority legislation at national level.

## Summary project assessment Pula, Croatia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **5. Gracac municipality**

*Theme covered: Education*

*Affected minorities: Serbian*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea focuses on educating the local authorities, civil society organizations and minority councils about minority rights and how to realize them at the local level. The education component will include the production and distribution of information brochures and study visits to view existing good practice.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Seven respondents were interviewed in Gracac, five women and two men. Both men and one of the women belong to a minority group, and five respondents are municipal officers. Five indicated they are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

A possible strength of the project is that suitable persons with the required expertise and experience have been engaged in the project, among others through an experienced NGO of the minority group and a highly motivated initiator of the project.

However, they do not form a close-knit team (yet). The deputy mayor, who belongs to a minority group himself, seems to have taken the lead in the project design, with an NGO. There seems to be a notable difference in clarity of tasks and procedures within the implementing team between various respondents, and they also have widely differing opinions about the effectiveness and inclusivity of decision-making about the project. These could be possible risks to the project if not solved.

Another risk could be that municipal and minority representatives point to each other as most responsible for the project, and that some respondents indicate lack of communication within the team, sub-groups forming within the team and a lack of common decision-making as possible risks. Two more risks that were indicated were late financing and lack of support from majority councillors. Some respondents said they only maybe thought the project would be a success, perhaps partly because discrimination of the minority group is still felt acutely in the municipality.

## Summary project assessment Gracac, Croatia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **6. Bogdanovci municipality**

*Theme covered: Media*

*Affected minorities: Ruthenian and Ukrainian*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea foresees the establishment of an internet radio station of Bogdanovci municipality in Ruthenian and Ukrainian languages. Thematic radio shows would be combined with traditional music. The aim of the radio being community outreach and encouraging minorities living in Bogdanovci to be more engaged in public life. It is planned that the radio would initially operate for four hours per day, and would eventually become a live broadcast.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

One woman and three men were interviewed in Bogdanovci. Two of the men are municipal officers, of whom one belongs to a minority community. In total, three respondents indicated they were part of a minority group. All said they were part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

The project has not started yet, which may explain why some of the team members are not yet very clear on what everyone's tasks in the project will be. Even so, all members of the team seem highly motivated and have confidence in the success of the project. They have a high level of trust in each other, even though they have not cooperated before in the past. Minority stakeholders feel a high degree of responsibility for the project and are closely involved, through NGOs as well as municipal officers with a minority background.

The only risk foreseen by respondents is the radio staff capacity, of which the success of the project is dependent. Another possible risk in the score sheet is the priority attached to the problem to be solved, as some of the municipal officers rated this significantly lower than the minority representatives.

## Summary project assessment Bogdanovci, Croatia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### 3.4 Kosovo\*

#### 1. Kamenica municipality

*Theme covered: Effective participation/Non-discrimination*

*Affected minorities: Non majority communities*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project will support and fulfil the preparatory steps needed for the municipality to enhance capacity of non-majority communities to participate and take active role in cultural, social and economic life and public affairs as well to develop the cultural strategy in Kamenica. The idea is to increase contact and communication among key stakeholders (civil society organizations, municipality, local communities and school communities etc.) with regard to cultural policies, strategies and initiatives at the local level and to revitalize cultural life in Kamenica through the development of local cultural policies.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

In Kamenice, three men and two women responded to the assessment. One male respondent belongs to a minority community; all others are of the majority group. Three are municipal officers, while two are members of NGOs that will help in the project implementation.

The answers of respondents to what the goal of the project is were diverse, but all correct. The project covers a multitude of topics, and the respondents emphasised various different aspects. This does not have to be a risk in itself, but could be if the expectations and emphasis of members of the implementing team continue to differ. Another slight risk might be that all respondents agreed that for minority groups, economic development and infrastructure is the main priority, while this is not addressed by the project. Especially the respondent from a minority group felt that the project was only slightly a priority. However, the respondents in the awareness research did consider the problems addressed by the project a priority or even a high priority.

Furthermore, the respondents had different ideas on what roles the municipality and NGOs took in the project design. Again, this does not have to be a risk to the project's success, but it could be if ownership of the project becomes a matter of strife. Overall, it seems that minority groups have not been very closely involved in the project design yet, and the level of information differs between the municipal officers and the NGO members in the implementing team. There could also be some competition between the different NGOs involved.

## Summary project assessment Kamenica, Kosovo\*

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **2. Vushtrri municipality**

*Theme covered: Effective participation*

*Affected minorities: Non majority communities*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project aims to enhance the capacities of non-majority communities, civil society and municipality through different activities, in order to draft the municipal strategy for non-majority communities. This strategy will be drafted and implemented in collaboration with civil society. This project foresees investment in equipment for sports and recreation activities in mixed areas and non-majority communities in order to create conditions for sport and recreational activities.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Six respondents were interviewed in Vushtrri; four men, who are municipal officers, one man who is now retired but used to be a municipal officer, and one woman who belongs to the Ashkali minority community and will be involved in the project implementation. One of the municipal officers is also from a minority community, and one respondent preferred not to say whether they were of a minority group.

A possible strength of the project could be that while the project design phase did not seem very structured, minority communities were well involved and the implementing team seem enthusiastic and hopeful about its success. Most of them had already worked together successfully in the past, and the project coordinator is well trusted by the team members. The municipality displayed a great sense of ownership for the project.

As with other projects aimed at drafting and implementing a strategy, the respondents do not yet have a common and clear idea of what this strategy should entail, therefore 'clarity of purpose' is indicated as a possible risk. This could however well be overcome once the project gets underway. Furthermore, as elsewhere in Kosovo\*, the economic and social situation of minorities is the highest priority, while this is not explicitly addressed by the project. The majority of respondents to the awareness assessment in Vushtrri therefore felt that the project is only 'moderately a priority'. Also a majority of them said the project would only maybe or not be a success.

Moreover, aside from the role and tasks of the project coordinator, the other members of the implementing team did not seem to have a good idea yet of what they would be doing, some tasks seem to be awarded to several persons simultaneously. The relatively low level of organisation of minority groups might also constitute a risk to the project's success, as does their manner in which they express their interests. It seems that while the official channels to do so are in place, minority people are not accustomed to use these channels. It will be a challenge to organise the minority communities sufficiently for active participation in the project.

## Summary project assessment Vushtrri, Kosovo\*

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### **3. Rahovec Municipality**

*Theme covered: Culture*

*Affected minorities: Roma, Ashkali and Egyptians (RAE)*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The municipality of Rahovec/Orahovec will implement the project "Implementation of the Action Plan for Roma, Ashkali and Egyptian Communities in the Municipality of Rahovec/Orahovec". The project aims to build the professional capacities of the three most disadvantaged minority communities in this municipality, namely the Roma, Ashkali and Egyptian communities. There will be trainings of a selected group of individuals (including a 30% participation by women) as well as providing the tools that would make these individuals succeed in their chosen profession.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Six respondents participated in the first project assessment in Rahovec, four of whom were men. The others were women. Three of the men belong to a minority community, of whom one is a municipal officer, while all other respondents are of the majority. In total, three of the six respondents are municipal officers.

In Kosovo\*, the main priority for most minority communities is their economic and social situation. This project in Rahovec addresses these issues specifically, by training people for employment. Therefore, most of the respondents to the project assessment as well as to the awareness assessment consider the problem to be solved a high priority, which could be a possible success factor for the project. Especially considering the very low level of organisation among minority groups, it is important that the topic is considered a priority among the target group in order to engage participants. Another possible success factor is the great sense of ownership for the project by the municipality, with a monitoring committee including the mayor's office.

The task division has not been clearly defined yet for all persons involved, which is why this is indicated in the score sheet as a possible risk. However, respondents were confident that this would be remedied as soon as the project implementation gets underway. Another risk could be that minority groups seem to have a (very) low level of organisation in the municipality, and that respondents did not agree at all among themselves about what their level of organisation is. This indicates that at least some respondents have an unclear idea of the situation. Likewise, opinions differed substantially on the level of involvement of minority groups in the choice of topic for and design of the local project. Finally, the level of trust among minority stakeholders in both the municipality and their own group seems quite low. One other minor risk could be that some but not all minority communities in Rahovec are targeted by the project. This could, but does not have to, lead to jealousy among the communities omitted. This is linked to a possible risk that not all suitable persons have been included in the implementing team.

## Summary project assessment Rahovec, Kosovo\*

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

#### **4. Leposaviç Municipality**

*Theme covered: Effective participation*

*Affected minorities: Non majority communities*

##### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea is to identify and adopt the comprehensive strategy for cultural development in the municipality of Leposavic. The strategy aspires to identify the needs (and translate them into recommendations for municipal assembly) of inclusive cultural developments for all ethnic communities (Serbs, Albanians, Bosniaks, Roma) living in this municipality. With this objective in perspective, the project opens with initiation of dialogue between relevant representatives of these ethnic communities. The open dialogue method envisaged the application of standard methodological tools (workshops, round tables etc.) that will enable community dialogue and consensus over the issues, principles and milestones the very strategy should contain.

##### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Seven respondents were interviewed in Leposavic, four men and three women. One woman and two men said they belonged to a minority community, one respondent preferred not to say. Six of them are municipal officers, while one is a member of an NGO.

Possible strengths of the project may be that the two civil organisations working on the project have good relations with each other and with the municipality, there seems to be a great measure of trust between those working on the implementation of the project. They have however not worked together before, like the teams in most municipalities have, because recent elections have led to a significant shift in the municipal organisation.

A possible risk is that while there was minority involvement in the project design in the form of municipal officers with a minority background and a consultation, minority persons outside of the municipal organisation have not (yet) been involved much. The plans were mainly drawn up by the municipality in cooperation with one of the NGOs. Involving more minority persons may be a challenge for this project, because many communities live in villages at some distance from the municipal capital. Some respondents fear that the funding of the project may be insufficient, mainly because staff may not be paid from the funds. A minor risk exists in the fact that as in the Kosovar municipality of Kamenice, economic and social development is deemed the highest priority by respondents, but will not be addressed by the project. Finally, while all of the implementing team has faith in the success of the project, the respondents to the awareness assessment were not so sure. As many as 30% indicated they believed the project would not be a success, and another 28% believed it would maybe be a success.

## Summary project assessment Leposavic, Kosovo\*

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### 3.5 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'

#### 1. *Staro Nagoricane - Local Self-Government*

*Field: Culture*

*Key minority engaged: Serbs*

#### **Outline of the project:**

Establishment of Cultural Community Center aimed to promote traditional values of Serbian national community through production and sale of souvenirs. The municipality is willing to employ several persons in the Center and thus ensure sustainability of the project.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Five respondents of whom 3 are men and two are women were interviewed in Staro Nagoricane. They are all municipal officers, and one man and one woman belong to a minority group. Two respondents said to be part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

The implementing team seem a very close-knit group, who are motivated to work on the project. They all attach priority to the project; among others because it also contributes to the goal of the municipality to use the new youth centre there for cultural activities. The team have worked together in the past very successfully and display a high level of trust in each other.

A possible risk to the project might be that its success depends to a large degree on cooperation with a local NGO, which will have to perform many tasks. Therefore the respondents, while all municipal officers themselves, point to minority persons as mainly responsible for the project. The degree of organisation of minority groups in the municipality is however deemed relatively low, indicating that engaging the target group to a sufficient degree to make the project succeed may be a challenge.

**Summary project assessment Staro Nagoricane, 'Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'**

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **2. Krushevo - Local Self-Government**

*Field: Culture*

*Key minority engaged: Vlachs*

### **Outline of the project:**

Promotion of culture and language of Vlachs. Adaptation of traditional Vlach living room with traditional cultural items and costumes. Publication of promotional materials that will be also used as teaching material in the local primary school. Engagement of vocal and instrumental bands to perform traditional Vlachs' music.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Two men and two women were interviewed in Krushevo. Both women are municipal officers, and not part of a minority group. Both men do belong to the minority group and are engaged in the project from an NGO and as a local Councillor. All indicated they are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

Almost all signs are on green for this project. Everyone seems highly motivated and very suitable for their tasks, and there is support for the project within the mayor's office, the local Council as well as among civil society. In Krushevo, this project had long been debated already, and everyone seems to look forward to finally implementing it. The project design happened in a clear and inclusive way, and tasks and procedures seem clear and well-defined. Past cooperation among most of the persons involved was deemed highly successful by all of them.

The only possible risk to the project may be a delay or hesitation in appointing adequate housing for the Vlach room envisioned in the project. Otherwise, there are no indications of any risks to the project's success.

## Summary project assessment Krushevo, 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### **3. Saraj Skopje - Local Self-Government**

*Field: Effective participation*

*Key minority engaged: Albanians, Bosniaks*

#### **Outline of the project:**

Enhancing the capacity of the Commission for inter-ethnic relations (CICR) to actively convene [sic], participate in the work of the municipality and implement projects that improve inter-community relations. Proposed project activities will provide means and mechanisms for regular meetings of the CICR, develop 2 specific projects ideas and strategy for the CICR.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

In Saraj, three men and two women were interviewed, of whom two belong to a minority group. Two are municipal officers and three are from a local NGO. Three respondents indicated they are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

The NGO seems to have the lead in this project. The idea originated with them, and many of the activities will depend on their commitment and the cooperation between the municipality and the NGO. The NGO representatives had for now better insight and more detailed information on the project design and activities. The Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce seem highly motivated and display a high level of trust in each other, both from the side of the municipality as from the side of the NGO. Most members of the team have worked together in the past, and did so successfully.

Possible risks to the project are that most respondents indicate that the level of organisation of the minority groups is very low, while selecting motivated and interested individuals from these communities to participate in the work of the Committee for inter-ethnic relations is vital to the project's success. Furthermore, some members of the team indicated that the topic of the project is not a high priority compared to other problems minority persons face, nor is this project a very suitable method to solve the problem.

Fear of too little funding was expressed, and might constitute a risk. While all implementing team members were confident the project would be a success, in the awareness assessment as many as 80% of respondents indicated they thought it would only maybe be a success.

Summary project assessment Saraj Skopje, 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

#### **4. Tetovo - Local self-Government**

*Field: Effective participation*

*Key minority engaged: Albanians, Turks, Roma, Serbs, Bosniaks, Macedonians*

##### **Outline of the project:**

Inclusion of all ethnic communities in the decision-making process at the local level through stipulation of successive continuity in the work of the Commission for inter-ethnic relations (CICR). Proposed project activities will include research, drafting policy papers and CICR strategy, study visits, capacity building of CICR members and organization of conference.

##### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Due to difficulties beyond our control in getting responses from Tetovo, a first project assessment report for this municipality could unfortunately not be produced. The Council of Europe is aware of these outstanding issues.

## Summary project assessment Tetovo, 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **5. Center Zupa - Local self-Government**

*Field: Effective participation*

*Key minority engaged: Albanians, Turks, and Macedonians*

### **Outline of the project:**

Establishment of elderly corner that will improve the social life of elderly population in the municipality and strengthen inter-ethnic relations among different ethnic communities. Presently, the nearest cultural association is situated 15 km away from the municipality.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Four men and one woman were interviewed in Center Zupa. The woman is a municipal officer and belongs to a minority group. Of the men, three belong to a minority group, while two are municipal officers. The others are part of an Association of Pensioners that takes the lead in this project. Two respondents said they are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

Amongst the possible strengths of this project, is the fact that all persons who should be involved for a successful implementation are indeed involved: the implementing team includes people working for the municipality as well as representatives of NGOs. The idea for the project originated with the pensioners' NGO, and they are highly motivated since it has been discussed for a long time already to do this. The members of the implementing team display a high level of trust in each other, and most have worked together successfully in the past already.

Possible risks could be that the municipal officers consider the project a lower priority than those outside the municipal organisation, and they also consider it less a suitable method. The level of organisation of minority groups is deemed relatively low, but since one of the (indirect) purposes of the project is to enhance this, it is indicated in pink in the score sheet.

Some respondents were as yet unclear about some of the decision-making procedures, although this may well be solved when the project is further underway. The expectation of success is also marked as a possible risk, because while all the implementing team members are convinced it will be, 66% of the respondents to the awareness assessment had doubts.

A final possible risk is that adequate housing for the elderly corner is yet to be found. The success of the project is linked to a suitable and accessible place for it.

**Summary project assessment Center Zupa, 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'**

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### 3.6 Montenegro

#### 1. Tivat - Local Self-Government

*Field: Education*

*Key minority engaged: Egyptians and Roma*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea foresees the inclusion of Egyptian and Roma children in the educational system in Montenegro through cooperation with Egyptian and Roma teaching assistants and expert teams that closely cooperate with the Counselling Office for children and parents.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

There were seven respondents in Tivat; three male and four female. Two men and three women are municipal officers, while one man and two women belong to the minority group.

All signs seem to be on green for this project. The team seems well organised and motivated and have worked together very successfully in the past. They have a high level of trust in each other, confidence in the success of the project and there seems to be a high level of organisation of minority groups in the municipality. This is surprising, because in almost all other municipalities in the region where Egyptians or Roma people are targeted by the project, their degree of organisation seems quite low. All members of the implementing team as well as the respondents to the awareness assessment consider the problem to be solved a priority and no one saw any risks to the project's success.

## Summary project assessment Tivat, Montenegro

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **2. Kotor - Local Self-Government**

*Field: Media*

*Key minority engaged: Croats*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea provides for the use of Croatian language in printed media, in particular - Hrvatski glasnik magazine that promotes cultural heritage and events of members of the Croatian national minority in Montenegro.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Two male and seven female respondents answered to the questionnaire in Kotor, so nine respondents in total. Seven of them are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce, while two are participants. Five are of the minority group, while the other four are municipal officers.

Unlike most of the other projects, the NGO of the Croatian minority seems better informed of the purpose and design of the project than the municipal officers. The idea originated with them, and municipal officers were only engaged later on. It is therefore mainly the municipal officers that feel decision-making could be more inclusive, while the minority representatives feel it is inclusive or very inclusive. This is confirmed by the answers to the question "who is most responsible for the success of the project": both minority representatives and municipal officers pointed to minority groups as the most responsible. This however does not have to constitute a risk to the success of the project. Moreover, differently from most other projects, the priority attached to the problem to be solved is higher among respondents to the awareness questionnaire than among the implementing team.

Strikingly, the respondents do indicate that the level of organisation of minorities in the municipalities is relatively low, and their involvement in the project design is slight or moderate. This might be because they make a distinction between the organisations involved in the project and the minority group at large. While the organisation is the initiator of the project, the group at large has been less involved and is less organised. A possible risk to the project is funding, as almost all respondents feel that the funding might be inadequate.

## Summary project assessment Kotor, Montenegro

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### **3. Bijelo Polje - Local Self -Government**

*Field: Culture*

*Key minority engaged: Bosniaks*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea will aim to promote and affirm the tradition and culture of the Bosniak national minority with the active participation of civil servants and local self-government bodies. The project will support scientific and expert meetings that deal with international and national mechanisms for the protection of national minorities and Bosniak contemporary literature.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Four men and two women responded to the first project assessment in Bijelo Polje. Three of the men are from a minority group, while the others are of the majority. All but one man are municipal officers. This one man is from a minority group. Half of the respondents indicated they are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

Possible strengths of the project are that most of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce members have worked together successfully in the past and that they trust each other to execute their tasks within the project in a proper and timely fashion. The level of organisation of minority groups in the municipality seems relatively high, and the municipal officers feel responsibility for the problem to be solved by the project. Even so, the expectation of success of the project is lower than for most projects, as half of the respondents said it would only maybe be a success.

Possible risks to the project are that the purpose of the project seems as yet unclear to mainly the municipal officers, and they attach a lower priority to the project than the minority stakeholders. Moreover, the relevance of the project scores very low with the respondents to the awareness questionnaire that are municipal officers not involved in minority policies. This could indicate a lack of support for the project within the municipal administration as a whole. Most of the municipal officers involved in the project seem to find the project only a moderately suitable solution to the problem. This could be because it seems only a few people were closely involved in the project design up to now, and the municipal officers have not been engaged fully (yet). This is also apparent from the very different answers to the question how minority groups were involved in the project design, indicating that at least some of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce is not well informed of the project design and purpose.

## Summary project assessment Bijelo Polje, Montenegro

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

#### **4. Plav - Local Self -Government**

*Field: Official Use of Languages*

*Key minority engaged: Albanians, Bosniaks*

##### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea will aim to improve the work of municipal services by establishing an office for translation of the main municipal documents in Albanian and Serbian languages. The project will engage local interpreters and equip conference rooms to provide translation.

##### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Five respondents were interviewed in Plav, all are men, all are municipal officers and all are part of the (Multi-)Stakeholder Taskforce. No women were interviewed, because there are no women in the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce in Plav. The respondents indicated they were mainly Bosniak, which at national level is a national minority group, but forms the majority group in the municipality.

Possible strengths of the project are that it is very concrete and all tasks and procedures seem very clear to all involved. The Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce feels responsible for the problem as well as the project, and the project is considered a priority by the respondents to both assessments. All men in the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce have worked together before and deem this past cooperation very successful.

The team implementing the project is very homogenous and all respondents gave almost exactly the same answers to all questions, even though they were interviewed separately in a personal interview. This could be a success factor for the work of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce itself, since cooperation between persons who seem to agree on everything is more likely to happen smoothly. On the other hand, it could be a risk factor to the eventual success of the project, since a group that is too homogenous might be exclusive to others and not be sufficiently open to differing opinions.

One possible risk to the project is that all respondents indicated there will probably be too little funding. They will try to secure funding from other sources, mainly to buy equipment in order to fully implement the project. Another slight risk may be a lack of involvement of one of the targeted minority groups: Albanians. Although respondents feel that minority groups were involved in choosing the topic for the project and designing it, it is not clear whether and how minority groups and especially Albanians outside of the municipal administration were involved.

## Summary project assessment Plav, Montenegro

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### 3.7 Serbia

#### 1. *Bosilegrad - Local Self-Government*

*Field: Effective participation*

*Key minority engaged: Bulgarians*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea focuses on capacity building training for state officials at local level on the international mechanisms and national legal framework for the protection of national minorities. The project will also facilitate an exchange of experiences with Kovacica local self-government inhabited by Slovaks, Serbs, Hungarians and Rumanians.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

In Bosilegrad, five people were interviewed. All of them are part of the Bulgarian national minority in Serbia. One is a woman, and four are men. The woman and one of the men are municipal officers, the others are mainly involved in the project from the side of an NGO. Three respondents are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce.

The idea for the project originated with an NGO that was very involved in the project design as well. Most respondents seem very motivated to make the project a success, and the purpose, tasks and procedures within the project are clear to all.

Respondents did disagree on the level of organisation of minorities in the municipality, as well as the degree to which they were involved in the project so far. The municipal officers have the opinion that they are more organised and have been more involved than the respondents outside the municipal administration. Moreover, while the level of trust of respondents that the minority stakeholders will execute their tasks in a proper and timely fashion is very high, they feel there is only a moderately good chance that the municipal stakeholders will do the same. Those who are not municipal officers seem to fear that the municipality will not invest enough time and energy in the project. This is also the reason why some of them have said that they think that the project will only maybe be a success.

## Summary project assessment Bosilegrad, Serbia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **2. Bujanovac - Local Self-Government**

*Field: Non-discrimination / Media*

*Key minority engaged: Albanians*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea will aim to promote human and minority rights among youth through various activities (round tables etc.), including launching of six TV shows in Albanian and Serbian languages to promote diversity and inter-culturalism. The shows will be produced in the Office for Youth in Bujanovac.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Two men and one woman were interviewed in Bujanovac. The two men are municipal officers, the woman is manager of the project but not a municipal officer. All are of the minority group and all are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce. The reason that only three respondents were interviewed is that the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce does not consist of any more people. That could in itself be a possible risk, the implementing team might be small for the project, especially as some respondents remarked that some of them have other duties too and may not be able to make enough time for this project.

Possible strengths of the project are that the members of the implementing team display a high level of trust in each other and seem suitable for their tasks. The level of involvement of minority persons in the project and in decision-making is high, even if this detracts slightly from the effectiveness of decision-making.

Overall, the minority community seems to be in the lead, with all respondents pointing to them as most responsible for the success of the project. This creates a slight concern over the feeling of ownership among the municipal administration, but may not be a problem. The task division seems to be unclear to some members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce, which could be solved once the project gets underway.

All respondents were pessimistic about the level of organisation and the way in which minority persons express their interests in the municipality. It is hoped that the project will contribute to more organisation and greater awareness of minority rights, so young people will be more inclined to express their interests.

Something to note is that respondents at the end of the interview expressed the hope that the project would become permanent and sustainable after its implementation.

## Summary project assessment Bujanovac, Serbia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

### **3. Petrovac na Mlavi - Local Self -Government**

*Field: Culture*

*Key minority engaged: Vlachs*

#### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea focuses on the protection and preservation of intangible cultural heritage of Vlachs through the collection of data on their cultural heritage; and development of proposals for entry into the national register of intangible cultural heritage in Serbia. The project will also aim to raise awareness of Vlach culture and tradition among young people and establishment of an informal network of Vlach associations.

#### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

In Petrovac na Mlavi, eight respondents were interviewed, of whom seven are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce. Four are men, four are women, and all but one woman are municipal officers. Five of the respondents are part of the minority community.

All signs seem to be on green for this project. All members of the team have high hopes for its success and attach priority to it. They also have a great level of trust in each other, and have worked together very successfully in the past. Purpose, tasks and procedures seem clear to all, and everyone is content with the level of involvement of minority groups and their level of organisation.

The only remark that might be made, although this is not indicated as a problem by any of the respondents, is that the municipality might consider including people from outside the municipal administration as official members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce, in order to make the project organisation even more inclusive.

## Summary project assessment Petrovac na Mlavi, Serbia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

#### **4. Novi Pazar - Local Self-Government**

*Field: Culture*

*Key minority engaged: Bosniaks*

##### **Outline of the project:**

The project idea aims to facilitate a revival, preservation and promotion of Bosniak culture and traditions through Bosniak folklore that includes traditional dances, songs, music and costumes. The project will also aim to introduce majority and other national minorities with Bosniaks' cultural specificities.

##### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

All four members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce in Novi Pazar were interviewed. Two are men, two are women. One of the men and one of the women are municipal officers, the other two are involved from the side of the local cultural centre.

No risk at all can be discerned for this project. The municipality and the cultural centre seem to have a long-standing successful cooperation and all members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce are highly motivated to make it a success. They form a close-knit team with a high degree of trust in each other, also based on highly successful past cooperation. The minority community seems to be relatively organised here, and are used to expressing their interests. All feel they have been well involved with the choice of topic for and design of the project.

Of all project assessments, this is the project that scores the highest marks of all among its Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce members. On almost all five-point rankings, respondents give five points to things like effectiveness and inclusiveness of decision-making and success of past cooperation.

## Summary project assessment Novi Pazar, Serbia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **5. Pancevo - Local Self -Government**

*Field: Official Use of Languages and Scripts*

*Key minority engaged: Macedonians, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project aims to facilitate accessing to the most important decisions of the Assembly of City of Pancevo in minority languages that are in official use in the city; holding meetings of the Assembly in the languages of the national minorities; and creation of an electronic database of the most important decisions within the jurisdiction of City of Pancevo, in Serbian and minority languages.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

Seven people were interviewed in Pancevo, four men and three women. Three of them are part of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce. Two of the men and two of the women belong to a minority group, and three of the respondents are municipal officers.

All respondents were confident in the success of this project and positive about the project design. They said the tasks, procedures and purpose are clear to them, and they have trust in each other's abilities to execute their tasks in a proper and timely fashion. The municipality has the lead in this project, both with regard to coming up with the topic for it and with regard to the project design, but it is felt that minority groups are nonetheless well involved. These groups are relatively well organised, according to respondents, which may facilitate the engagement of minority participants.

No discernible risks to the project's success were indicated in the first project assessment in Pancevo, all signs seem to be on green.

## Summary project assessment Pancevo, Serbia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## **6. City of Subotica - Local Self-Government**

*Field: Official Use of Languages and Scripts*

*Key minority engaged: Hungarians, Croats*

### **Outline of the project:**

The project aims to improve the use of official languages by building the technical capacity of representative bodies of local self-government; procurement of specialized software for systematic organization of documents, with the application for electronic implementation of sessions of the City Council and the City Assembly ("electronic sessions"); and training for use of applications for systemic organization of documents.

### **Summary of results first project assessment:**

In Subotica, all seven members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce were interviewed. Four of them are men, three are women. The women are all from a minority group, and two of the men are too. They are all municipal officers in Subotica.

This project is highly technical in design, calling for specialised expertise. The team members seem well-suited to the tasks and are clear among themselves on the purpose, task division and decision-making procedures. They have a high level of trust in each other and do not see any risks to the project. They all expect it to be a success.

The only possible risk is that while minority groups are relatively well organised in the municipality, according to respondents, they have not been involved much in choosing the topic or design of the project. Considering the highly technical nature of the project, this might not be a risk to the successful execution of tasks within the project itself, but it might mean that the technical possibilities that will be created will not be as widely used by the target group as when minority NGOs would have been more involved from the outset.

## Summary project assessment Subotica, Serbia

		1st assessment	2nd assessment	3rd assessment
<b>relevance of the project</b>				
Q7	clarity of purpose			
Q8	priority			
Q9	suitable method			
<b>project design</b>				
Q10	method of project design			
<b>staff</b>				
Q11	clarity of tasks			
Q12	criteria for selection			
Q13	suitable persons			
<b>decision-making</b>				
Q14	clarity of procedures			
Q15	effectiveness			
Q16	inclusiveness			
<b>organisation &amp; involvement minorities</b>				
Q17	expression of interests			
Q18	level of organisation			
Q19	involvement			
<b>funding</b>				
Q20	funding			
Q21	other organisation risks			
<b>ownership/responsibility</b>				
Q22	responsible for problem			
Q23	responsible for project			
<b>past experience</b>				
Q25	past cooperation			
<b>trust</b>				
Q26	in municipal officers			
Q27	in minority stakeholders			
Q28	other cooperation risks			
<b>expectation</b>				
Q29	expectation of success			
Q30	other risks			

## 4. Conclusions

For each of the project capacities assessed in the first project assessment, a cross-country summary of the results is given and any remarkable situations in specific beneficiaries or municipalities will be pointed out.

### **Differences between municipalities**

It must be noted that, for a number of reasons, a direct comparison between projects cannot be made. The first reason is that the seven beneficiaries as well as the thirty-six municipalities differ from each other. In a larger municipality with multiple minority groups, a project is often more challenging than in a smaller municipality with only one major minority group. Moreover, the social and economic situation of minority groups differs significantly in different municipalities. In municipalities with minority groups that have a relatively low education level and low living standards, it will be more difficult to engage them in the project, either as members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce or as participants. However, a project aimed at improving these living standards and the exercise of rights of minority groups might be more challenging there, but also more essential.

The projects themselves also differ substantially. Some municipalities have a very concrete and relatively easy to implement project idea (such as translating municipal documents), while others have a much more encompassing and ambitious project plan that is less concrete and less easy to implement. Some projects are also politically more controversial and challenging than others, especially when the targeted minority group shows low levels of organisation. Moreover, a few of the more ambitious projects aim to find additional financing, or require some physical infrastructure, which is not yet assured. It could however well be that the less concrete, more encompassing and more controversial projects will eventually have a greater reward for the target group than the more concrete and less ambitious or controversial projects.

A final difference lies in the stage of implementation of the project at the moment in which the research was undertaken. Some of the projects had already started implementation, while others had yet to start. The contracts with the Council of Europe had not been signed in all municipalities, and some waited until this would happen before the project could start. Projects that were already underway would score better on issues such as clarity of purpose, tasks and decision-making than projects that were not.

It can therefore never be concluded that projects for which more risks are indicated in the score sheet 'are doing worse' than projects that have less. The specific nature of the country, municipality, minority group and project always need to be taken into account, as well as the stage of implementation the project is in.

### **Difference in methodology**

While an effort was made to coordinate the methodology across beneficiaries and municipalities, among others by using a common questionnaire and following the same directions for choosing the target group, some differences in methodology occurred in this first project assessment.

In some municipalities, many more respondents were interviewed than in others. The least respondents were two in Prijedor, and the most were thirteen respondents in Prnjavor, both in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In some municipalities, a low number of respondents can be explained by the fact that no additional people are involved in the project implementation. In a few other cases instead, it is due to the fact that no other respondents returned the questionnaire, even after multiple reminders. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, some difficulties arose in the communication between some municipalities and the national expert in the Research Team, which may also have

contributed to a lower number of respondents in those municipalities. The number of respondents, however, does not seem to have any correlation with the number of possible risks or success factors for the project in any of the municipalities with a relatively high or relatively low number of respondents compared to others.

Due to local circumstances, the interviews did not all take place face to face. In some municipalities, the distances between villages are great and respondents living in remote areas could not be interviewed face to face. In others, some of the respondents could not make time to meet with the national expert, or cancelled the meeting at the last moment. In those cases, the questionnaire was sent by email. In some cases, a combination of face to face interviews and email exchange was used. This was mainly in municipalities where the interviews could not be held in private. To afford the respondents some privacy and encourage them to give honest answers, they answered the quantitative questions asking for a five-point score in private and sent these by email, while they were interviewed face to face on the open questions. For the projects where most or all interviews were face to face, more information is available and a weighing of the information from different respondents is easier because the atmosphere of the interview as well as any side remarks by the respondents could be taken into account.

As a final note, it must be emphasised that not only the local circumstances, the projects and the methodology necessarily differ between municipalities, but the personality of the respondents does too. The results as conveyed in this first project assessment report are not the personal opinion of the Research Team, nor are they an objective opinion of a neutral outsider. They are the subjective thoughts and feelings of the persons most closely involved in the implementation of the projects, and these may be more positive or more negative depending not only on the situation but also on the character and personality of the individual respondents.

**Projects with the most success factors**

Emphasising again that comparisons are not possible, some projects can be highlighted as facing the least possible risks and having the most success factors in place. There are five municipalities in total where no risks at all could be discerned and all signs are on green for a successful implementation. The project team in Novi Pazar in Serbia had the best scores of all. The Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce members there seem to be brimming with enthusiasm for this project and have formed a close-knit team that have a high level of trust in each other, clarity about all organisational aspects and a high level of involvement of minority groups. Interestingly, two of the other four projects with no discernible risks are also in Serbia: Petrovac na Mlavi and Pancevo. The remaining two are Knezevi Vinogradi in Croatia and Tivat in Montenegro. Krushevo in ‘the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia’ and Subotica in Serbia deserve mention too. In those municipalities, only one slight risk could be discerned, as can be seen in the summaries of their first project assessment.

**Target groups**

In most municipalities, the members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce were the target group for the project assessment, as identified by the contact person for the project in the municipality. In some cases, participants or outside experts were added to the target group, if they are also closely involved in the project implementation. On average, six respondents were interviewed per municipality. The total number of interviews held across the region is 208, divided by country in the following manner:

Albania	- 5 municipalities	- 30 respondents in total
Bosnia and Herzegovina	- 6 municipalities	- 41 respondents in total
Croatia	- 6 municipalities	- 33 respondents in total
Kosovo*	- 4 municipalities	- 24 respondents in total
“the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (excl. Tetovo)	- 4 municipalities	- 19 respondents in total

Montenegro	- 4 municipalities	- 27 respondents in total
Serbia	- 6 municipalities	- 34 respondents in total

Most target groups include men as well as women. In Fier in Albania and Bosanska Krupa in Bosnia and Herzegovina, however, the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce or respondent group consists solely of women, while in Plav in Montenegro there are only men involved in the project implementation. In most beneficiaries, the women and men share management and implementation positions, with women being responsible for the project management to a slightly higher degree. An exception is 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia', where most often men hold management positions and women have implementation roles.

A few municipalities have Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces that are one-sided in some way: either they consist solely of minority persons, or they consist solely of municipal officers. This is often correlated to possible risks, such as a lack of support from the municipal administration in general if the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce consists solely of minority persons or a lack of involvement of minority groups if the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce consists solely of municipal officers.

### **Relevance of the project**

In most municipalities, the project was deemed relevant by the respondents to the project assessment as well as to the awareness assessment, meaning that municipal officers and minority groups both think that the project addresses a problem that has priority and that the project is a suitable way to do so. In Kosovo\*, however, many respondents across almost all municipalities pointed to the social and economic situation as the most pressing problem for minority groups, and attached a relatively low priority to the projects there that do not address this problem directly. In a few instances in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the relevance of the project also was questioned.

A difference could be noted between projects plans that have been debated in the municipality for quite some time and now finally have a chance to be implemented with funding from the Council of Europe, and project plans that were recently newly designed specifically for this purpose. Where project ideas had been debated for some time already, the relevance attached to it was higher, and most often the opinion of respondents about the level of involvement of minority groups and the way the project design took place was more favourable.

In some municipalities, there was a significant difference in the priority attached to the project between minority respondents and municipal respondents. This mostly correlates to the way the project design took place. When the project was designed mainly by the municipality whereas the minority stakeholders were only later engaged, the municipal officers would attach higher priority to the project than the minority respondents. In some cases the reverse was true: the project was devised and designed by a minority NGO and the municipality was only engaged later. In those cases, minority respondents would attach higher priority to the project than the municipal officers.

### **Organisational capacity**

#### ***Project design, staff, decision-making***

In many municipalities, the purpose of the project and the task division and decision-making procedures within the team are not clear to all Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce members. Three common reasons for this could be discerned from the project assessment. The first is that some projects have not started implementation yet. The Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce members have therefore not been fully briefed on all aspects and have not had any common meetings yet. This lack of clarity can be fairly easily solved once the project implementation does get underway. In the second project assessment, the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces will again be questioned on this topic, and the expectation is that in these cases the lack of clarity will no longer be an issue then.

Another reason for a difference in clarity of purpose, task division and procedures between projects is that some projects are much more concrete and tangible, while others are vaguer in nature. For concrete projects such as the mobile kindergarten or the translation of municipal documents into minority languages, the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces usually have a clear idea of purpose, tasks and procedures. For projects that are less tangible, such as those aimed at drafting and implementing a strategy or an action plan, these things are much less clear. In those cases, it will be important for the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce to work on a common focus, realistic expectations and a clear outline of what will and will not be covered by the strategy or action plan in an early stage of the project. If opinions, expectations or emphases keep differing, these could be risks to the project's success. The second project assessment will show whether this has happened or not.

A final reason for a lack of clarity among some members of the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce in some municipalities is that only a few people were closely involved in the project design, while others feel less engaged and do not fully understand the purpose, task division and procedures of the project yet. Hopefully, the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce will be able to close this rift in the early stages of project implementation. The second project assessment will show whether this has succeeded.

### ***Organisation level and involvement of minority groups***

The involvement of minority groups is a main possible risk for many projects. Almost all projects depend in some way on the engagement of minority groups and persons as the target group for their successful implementation. The Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce may be able to furnish a cultural centre, provide translation, design a language programme or organise a minority rights class, but if the target group does not participate or use these facilities, the project will not succeed.

The situation seems to be the most difficult for projects aimed at Roma people or Egyptians. In general, they seem to have a very low level of organisation and are difficult to reach and engage. Only one municipality, Tivat, indicates that the Roma community there has a relatively high level of organisation and has been able to engage the target group in their project design. All other projects aimed at Roma people or Egyptians have concerns about reaching the target group.

Many other Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces have difficulties engaging minority groups too. In many cases, this correlates to a low level of organisation of minority groups in the municipality. There are, however, also cases in which the level of organisation of minority groups is low, but they are, nonetheless, engaged in the project through local NGOs with extensive experience of working with these groups.

Another difficulty seems to arise in municipalities where there are multiple minority groups involved in the project. In some cases, the project design included only one group, and the others were not closely involved. In Fier (Albania) for instance, Roma were involved, while Egyptians were not. In Shijak (Albania), Bosniaks were involved, while Roma were not. In Pakrac (Croatia), Serbs were involved, while Italians and Czechs were not and in Plav (Montenegro), Bosniaks were involved, while Albanians were not. There are projects where multiple groups were involved, but seem to be in competition with each other for financing and attention within the project. Minority respondents in these municipalities pointed to jealousies and hostilities between different minority groups as possible risks to the project.

### **Cooperative capacity**

#### ***Ownership***

In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rank different authorities and organisations they thought were more and less responsible for solving the problem addressed by the local project and for the success of the project itself.

Municipal authorities were most often mentioned as most responsible for solving the problem addressed by the project in all beneficiaries except for Bosnia and Herzegovina. There, the national or state authorities were mentioned most often as most responsible. Three municipalities mentioned minority people themselves as most responsible for solving the problem, one in Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina each.

Though not directly of influence to the projects, the assessment also shows how much responsibility the respondents award to the international community for solving minority problems. Especially considering the stereotypical image that some beneficiaries have vis-à-vis depending on the international community to solve their problems, it would be interesting to see whether they find the international community more responsible than others. The stereotypical image was not confirmed at all in this assessment. In general, respondents put the international community in fourth or even fifth place, after municipal and national authorities and minority groups. The country where on average the respondents awarded the most responsibility to the international community was Croatia, although the answers between municipalities differed so widely that no general conclusion can be drawn from this.

Directly of interest to the projects is who respondents consider the most responsible for the successful implementation of it. In 28 of the 36 municipalities, the municipal authorities are seen as most responsible, as expected. Minority groups were seen as most responsible in five municipalities. In a few of these, this is not a cause for concern, because the minority group has taken the lead in the project and awarding them responsibility for its success is reasonable. In the others, it could be a risk to the project, because while the municipality has the lead, the municipal officers do not feel they are the most responsible. Cause for concern also exists in the three municipalities where municipal officers and minority groups point to each other as most responsible for the project's success. There could be a risk there that no one takes full responsibility and any problems encountered in the course of implementation will be blamed on the other group. The second project assessment will show whether this is indeed a problem or not.

### ***Past experience***

The first project assessment asked respondents whether they had cooperated together in the past, and if so, how successful this was. Considering the small size of many of the municipalities, and the fact that most respondents have extensive experience in the field of minority protection, it is highly probable that people in the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces had worked together before. If this cooperation had been successful, this could be a success factor to the project, because Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce members are already familiar with each other and have a good experience to build on. If on the other hand the experience was not good, it could be a substantial risk to the project, creating distrust between Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce members before implementation even begins.

The expectation was confirmed by the results. In almost all municipalities, at least some of the respondents had cooperated before. In almost all cases, this cooperation was successful or even highly successful. Only in very few cases, the respondents were less enthusiastic. This was always in a project where the same respondents were also discontent with the way the project design had taken place or with other aspects of the project.

### **Trust**

In general, the respondents display a high level of trust in each other. They feel that there is a good chance or even a very good chance that the municipal and minority stakeholders will execute their tasks in a proper and timely way. Only in a few municipalities are some Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce members worried that others will not prioritise the project enough to make it a success, or that they will not have the capacities to do so.

The level of trust is on average higher within Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces that are more homogenous. If the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforce consists of only women, only men, only minority persons or only municipal officers, their opinions are more similar and they trust each other more to do what is needed. Of course, this also has a downside: a more homogenous group will often trust each other more, but those outside of the group less.

Past cooperation seems even more decisive for the level of trust than homogeneity. Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces where all members have proven to work together successfully in the past display a higher level of mutual trust, also if the team is diverse in sex, ethnicity or function.

### **Expectation**

Fortunately, there are no municipalities where a majority of the respondents said the project would not or only maybe be a success. This is to be expected, at the outset of the project implementation, all involved should feel confident that it can and will be carried out successfully. Therefore, if even two of the respondents indicated it would only maybe or not be a success, this is indicated as a risk in the score sheet. This is only the case for projects where the respondents also identified other risks, or where some respondents feel insufficiently engaged in the project.

Respondents who are implementing projects that have been debated in the municipality for a long time, and that can now finally be implemented with Council of Europe financing and support, expect the best chance of success. In those cases, everyone has intimate knowledge of the purpose of the project and attaches high priority to it.

### **Conclusions**

Although for only five of the 36 projects all signs are on green for a successful implementation, it can be said that the possible risks for the vast majority of them are such that they could be solved in the early stages of implementation. The second project assessment halfway through the implementation phase will show whether the Multi-Stakeholder Taskforces have indeed overcome these initial problems and are on track for a successful implementation.

The risk most often seen is a difficulty in engaging the target group of minority persons. In some municipalities, there is a good chance that this can be solved at an early stage, if the level of organisation of minority groups is relatively high there. In those where minority groups have a low or very low level of organisation, it will be a greater challenge.

## Annex A: questionnaire first project assessment

*Since the interviews are, inter alia, taken in person, the respondents might make remarks outside of the scope of the questionnaire that are nonetheless relevant for the project assessment. The national experts can indicate this at the end of each question, or at the end of the report. The subjective opinion of the national expert is also asked for some questions and at the end of the report, in order to gather as much information as possible on success and risk factors for the local projects.*

*Considering national and local differences, and the different nature of the projects, the national experts could adapt the questionnaire, so the intention of the question is kept intact but suits the specific situation in the municipalities.*

*A 'significant difference' in responses given to questions with a five-point ranking is a difference of over 1.5 points.*

### General information on the project

Name of the country and municipality

....

Target group(s) of the project

....

Short description of the project

.....

Organigramme of the project organisation (from interview with municipal contact person)

.....

### Section I: Personal information on the respondents

Total number of respondents to the first project assessment: ...

#### Gender

1. *Gender:*

- male*
- female*
- other*

2. *You are a:*

- a member of multi-stakeholder taskforce*
- a participant*
- otherwise involved in the project, namely: ....*

3. *What is your task in the local project?*

*.... (open question)*

4. *What is your position in the local project?*
- *Management and design of the project*
  - *Implementation and daily follow-up of the project*

**Main groups to distinguish for analysis**

*For the project assessment analysis, the main groups to distinguish are municipal officers and minority stakeholders. There may be overlap between both groups, in which case there are more categories of respondents for analysis. These groups can be distinguished using questions 5 and 6.*

5. *Would you consider yourself part of a national minority in your country?*
- *yes*
  - *no*
6. *Are you a municipal officer?*
- *yes*
  - *no*

Section II: Analysis of content questions

**Relevance of the project and project design**

***Common idea of problem, priority and project***

7. *What is the problem to be solved by the project?*

*..... (open question)*

*If the idea of the problem to be solved by the project among people working on the implementation of the project differs significantly, this could be a risk factor to successful implementation. For this specific question, it is also useful to know whether there is a significant difference in answers between persons involved in project management and persons involved in project implementation. If there is a significant difference, this could indicate a management flaw.*

8. *According to you, is this problem a priority, compared to other problems that minority groups in your municipality face?*

12      3      4      5      *[1, not at all; 5, high priority]*

*The ranking will indicate:*

- 1 not at all a priority*
- 2 slightly a priority*
- 3 moderately a priority*
- 4 a priority*
- 5 a high priority*

*In the awareness assessment questionnaire, the same question about the relevance of the project is asked too. This score can be compared to the score of the persons involved in the project who have completed the project assessment questionnaire.*

A low average score (1 or 2) could indicate a risk to the project's success, as could a significant difference in the priority attached to the problem to be solved between groups involved in implementation (lack of interest of a certain part of the organisation), or between those involved in implementation and the larger group of respondents to the awareness questionnaire.

9. According to you, is this project a suitable method to (help) solve the problem?

1 2 3 4 5 [1, not at all suitable; 5, very suitable]

1. not at all suitable
2. slightly suitable
3. moderately suitable
4. suitable
5. very suitable

A low average score (1 or 2) could indicate a risk to the project's success, as could a significant difference of opinion on the suitability of the project to help solve the problem between groups involved in implementation (lack of common opinion).

### **Project design**

10. How did the project design take place? What role did the local consultants (short term experts), the municipality, minority stakeholders and/or any other stakeholders take in the project design?

.... (open question)

Opinion national expert: was any discontent with the project design expressed by (certain) respondents? Or was everyone generally content with the way the project design took place?

Opinion national expert: who in your opinion mostly took the lead in the project design? Does the municipality feel ownership of and responsibility for the project?

If (certain) groups involved in the project are discontent with the way the project was designed, this could be a risk factor to the project's success. Also, if opinions on how the project design took place differ among (groups of) respondents, this could be a risk since it may give rise to bad feelings and gossip. Furthermore, if the municipality did not take active part in the design, if certain stakeholders feel left out of the design, or if there was any issue with too much or too little involvement of the local consultant, these could also constitute risks.

### **Organisational capacity**

#### **Staff**

11. Are the tasks of all persons involved in the implementation of the project clear to you?

1 2 3 4 5 [1, not at all clear; 5, very clear]

1. not at all clear
2. slightly clear
3. moderately clear
4. clear
5. very clear

A low average score (1 or 2) could indicate a risk to the project's success, as could a significant difference of clarity on the tasks between groups involved in implementation (lack of teamwork, lack of clarity on tasks of self or others, management flaws). For this specific question, it is also useful to know whether there is a significant difference in answers between persons involved in project management and persons involved in project implementation. If there is a significant difference, this could indicate a management flaw.

12. According to you, what should be the criteria for selecting the persons to perform tasks within the project implementation?

... (open question)

13. According to you, are the persons involved in the implementation of the project the most suitable persons for their task?

1      2      3      4      5      [1, not at all suitable; 5, very suitable]

The ranking will indicate:

1. not at all suitable
2. slightly suitable
3. moderately suitable
4. suitable
5. very suitable

Opinion national expert: did you get the impression that there are stakeholders kept out of the project that should have been involved, or that there are persons involved in the project that others feel should not have been?

A low average score (1 or 2) could indicate a risk to the project's success, as could a significant difference of opinion between groups involved in implementation (lack of trust, management flaws, even nepotism or cronyism in the worst case).

### **Decision-making**

14. Are the decision-making procedures within the project organisation clear to you?

1      2      3      4      5      [1, not at all clear; 5, very clear]

The ranking will indicate:

1. not at all clear
2. slightly clear
3. moderately clear
4. clear
5. very clear

A low average score (1 or 2) could indicate a risk to the project's success, as could a significant difference of clarity between groups involved in implementation (lack of structure, management flaws). For this specific question, it is also useful to know whether there is a significant difference in answers between persons involved in project management and persons involved in project implementation. If there is a significant difference, this could indicate a management flaw.

15. According to you, is decision-making within the project organisation undertaken in an **effective** way? (meaning that decisions can be taken relatively quickly and have a good chance of being implemented)

1      2      3      4      5      [1, not at all effective; 5, very effective]

The ranking will indicate:

1. not at all effective
2. slightly effective
3. moderately effective
4. effective
5. very effective

Effective decision-making is important for the success of a project, unless this goes too far and decision-making becomes too quick or authoritarian. A low average score (1 or 2) could indicate a risk to the project's success, as could a significant difference of opinion between groups involved in implementation (more than 1.5 point difference). Also, a very high average score (4.5 to 5) could indicate a risk.

16. According to you, is decision-making within the project organisation undertaken in an **inclusive** way? (meaning that relevant stakeholders are consulted and involved in decision-making)

1      2      3      4      5      [1, not at all inclusive; 5, very inclusive]

The ranking will indicate:

1. not at all inclusive
2. slightly inclusive
3. moderately inclusive
4. inclusive
5. very inclusive

Inclusive decision-making is likewise important for the success of a project, but could also have a shadow-side. Decision-making that is too inclusive could be lengthy and ineffective, and could indicate lack of leadership. A low average score (1 or 2) could indicate a risk to the project's success, as could a significant difference of opinion between groups involved in implementation (more than 1.5 point difference). Also, a very high average score (4.5 to 5) could indicate a risk.

In project organisations, there can be a tension between effective decision-making on the one hand and inclusive decision-making on the other hand. Therefore, questions 15 and 16 should be analysed in correlation. If there is a significant difference in score between the answers to questions 15 and 16, this could indicate that the organisation is either effective but not inclusive enough, or inclusive but not effective enough. If an organisation scores low (3 or below) on both questions 15 and 16, the decision-making within the project is neither effective nor inclusive, indicating a management flaw. And if an organisation scores high on both questions 15 and 16 (3.5 or higher), it has struck a good balance between effectiveness and inclusiveness.

#### **Level of organisation of minority groups**

17. According to you, how do representatives of minority groups in your municipality participate and express their interests?

... (open question)

*This information is interesting in general for the project assessment. Any significant differences in answers of different groups could indicate a risk factor for the project (for instance lack of knowledge about the situation on the part of municipal workers, or lack of realism on the part of minority groups).*

*18. According to you, what is the level of organisation of minority groups within your municipality? (meaning are they organised in broadly supported organisations that can represent the (majority) opinion of the community as a whole)*

*1      2      3      4      5      [1, not at all organised; 5, very organised]*

*The ranking will indicate:*

- 1. not at all organised*
- 2. slightly organised*
- 3. moderately organised*
- 4. organised*
- 5. very organised*

*A higher level of organisation of the target group often correlates to a higher chance of success of a project. In a few cases, enhancing the level of organisation of minority groups is the topic of the project, instead of one of the circumstances under which the project is implemented. This needs to be clear in the analysis. In those cases, a low score is to be expected and does not have to be a risk factor to the project's success. If, however, the level of organisation is low, while enhancing this level is not a purpose of the project, it could indeed be a risk factor to the project's success.*

*19. To what extent have minority groups been involved in choosing the topic of the project, drafting the project plans and setting up the project organisation?*

*1      2      3      4      5      [1, not involved; 5, very involved]*

*The ranking will indicate:*

- 1. not involved*
- 2. slightly involved*
- 3. moderately involved*
- 4. involved*
- 5. very involved*

*A higher level of involvement of the target group often correlates to a higher chance of success of a project.*

*20. According to you, is the project funded properly for successful implementation?*

- I fear there might be too little funding*
- The funding is adequate for the project*
- I fear there might be unused funds at the end of the project*

*NB Respondents who have no involvement with the financial side of the project may decline to answer this question.*

*21. Do you see any risks to a successful implementation of the project, connected with the project organisation, such as the division of tasks within the organisation, decision-making procedures, involvement of stake-holders, etc.? If so, which?*

*..... (open question)*

## Cooperative capacity

22. According to you, who is in general most responsible for solving the problem targeted by the project? Rank the stakeholders, going from 1, most responsible, to 6, least responsible.

- International community
- National authorities
- Regional authorities, if applicable
- Local/municipal authorities
- Civil society
- Minority groups

23. According to you, who is most responsible for a successful implementation of this project? Rank the stakeholders, going from 1, most responsible, to 4 or 5, least responsible.

- Municipality
- National authorities
- Minority groups
- Council of Europe
- Other, namely ....

The answers to this question give an indication of the ownership or responsibility felt by respondents for the success of the project. Ideally, each group should give themselves one or two points in this ranking, indicating that they feel a high responsibility and ownership.

## Cooperation in the past

24. From what you know about the project organisation, have the persons involved worked together on other projects in the past?

- yes
- no
- don't know

If respondents indicated there has not been any cooperation in the past, question 25 may be disregarded.

25. If so, how successful would you consider this cooperation?

1      2      3      4      5      [1, not at all successful; 5, very successful]

The ranking will indicate:

1. not at all successful
2. slightly successful
3. moderately successful
4. successful
5. very successful

There is a good chance that the persons cooperating in this project have worked together on other minority protection projects in the past in their municipality. The success or failure of these past

projects could have an effect on the success or failure of this project, influencing among others the level of trust between stakeholders.

26. According to you, what are the chances that the **municipal officers** will execute their tasks in the project implementation in a proper and timely fashion?

1      2      3      4      5      [1, very low chance; 5, very high chance]

The ranking will indicate:

1. very low chance
2. low chance
3. moderately good chance
4. high chance
5. very high chance

27. According to you, what are the chances that the **minority stakeholders** will execute their tasks in the project implementation in a proper and timely fashion?

1      2      3      4      5      [1, very low chance; 5, very high chance]

The ranking will indicate:

1. very low chance
2. low chance
3. moderately good chance
4. high chance
5. very high chance

Questions 26 and 27 are meant to measure the level of trust between the persons and groups involved in project implementation. It is mainly interesting to know whether the minority stakeholders have faith in the municipal officers and vice versa, but it could also be interesting to know whether municipal officers and minority stakeholders have faith in their own group or not. A low level of trust between persons involved in the project implementation could be a risk factor, while a high level of trust could be a success factor.

28. Do you see any risks to a successful implementation of the project, connected with the cooperation between the persons involved in the project implementation, such as lack of willingness to work together, personal animosities, lack of trust, lack of feeling of responsibility? If so, which?

..... (open question)

### **Expectation**

29. From what you know about your municipality, do you think this local project will be a success?

- yes
- no
- maybe

In the awareness assessment questionnaire, the same question about the expectation of success of the project is asked too. This score can be compared to the score of the persons involved in the project who have completed the project assessment questionnaire. If the results of the awareness questionnaire take longer to collect and analyse, this part can be left open in this report until this has taken place.

*A low expectation of success or a significant difference between respondents could be risk factors, diminishing the level of enthusiasm for the project at the outset. A high expectation of success on the other hand could contribute to the success of the local project, heightening enthusiasm for the project at the start of its implementation.*

*30. What other possible risks or success factors could there be for a successful implementation of the project, that have not been covered in the questions above, if any?*

.....

### Section III: Other

*31. Do you have any final remarks on the topic of this questionnaire?*

.....

### Opinion national expert

What was the atmosphere in which the interviews took place? Were there significant differences in the atmosphere of the interviews between different respondents?

How open and truthful do you think the respondents answered the questions? Why?

What is your opinion of the project organisation?

Do you see possible risk or success factors to a successful implementation of the project that were not explicitly mentioned by the respondents?

Do you have any other observations that might be of relevance to the project assessment?