

SOCIAL INCLUSION
MPTF OFFICE GENERIC FINAL PROGRAMME¹ NARRATIVE REPORT
REPORTING PERIOD: FROM *mm.yyyy* TO *mm.yyyy*

<p style="text-align: center;">Programme Title & Project Number</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme Title: Children’s rights, policies and EU Integration. Evidence based policy • Programme Number <i>(if applicable)</i> • MPTF Office Project Reference Number:³ TBD 	<p style="text-align: center;">Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results²</p> <p><i>(if applicable)</i> Country/Region Montenegro</p> <hr/> <p><i>Priority area/ strategic results</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Participating Organization(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme 	<p style="text-align: center;">Implementing Partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Statistical Office- MONSTAT
<p style="text-align: center;">Programme/Project Cost (US\$)</p> <p>Total approved budget as per project document: USD 65,000</p> <p>MPTF /JP Contribution⁴: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Agency Contribution • <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> </p> <p>Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i></p> <p>Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i></p> <p>TOTAL:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Programme Duration</p> <p style="text-align: right;">9 months</p> <p>Overall Duration <i>(months)</i> 06/12/2012</p> <p>Start Date⁵ <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> *received on 04/01/13</p> <p>Original End Date⁶ <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i></p> <p>Actual End date⁷ <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i></p> <p>Have agency(ies) operationally closed the Programme in its(their) system? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Expected Financial Closure date⁸:</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.</p> <p>Evaluation Completed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Date: <i>dd.mm.yyyy</i></p> <p>Evaluation Report - Attached</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Date: <i>dd.mm.yyyy</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Report Submitted By</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Name: Slobodan Zivkovic ○ Title: Economic and Social Policy Officer ○ Participating Organization (Lead): UNICEF ○ Email address: szivkovic@unicef.org

¹ The term “programme” is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects.

² Strategic Results, as formulated in the Strategic UN Planning Framework (e.g. UNDAF) or project document;

³ The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to as “Project ID” on the project’s factsheet page on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#).

⁴ The MPTF/JP Contribution is the amount transferred to the Participating UN Organizations – see [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

⁵ The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

⁶ As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

⁷ If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed. As per the MOU, agencies are to notify the MPTF Office when a programme completes its operational activities. Please see [MPTF Office Closure Guidelines](#).

⁸ Financial Closure requires the return of unspent balances and submission of the [Certified Final Financial Statement and Report](#).

FINAL PROGRAMME REPORT FORMAT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- In ½ to 1 page, summarise the most important achievements of Programme during the reporting period and key elements from your detailed report below. Highlight in the summary, the elements of the main report that you consider to be the most critical to be included in the MPTF Office Consolidated Annual Report.

I. Purpose

- Provide a brief introduction to the programme/ project (*one paragraph*).
- Provide the main objectives and expected outcomes of the programme in relation to the appropriate **Strategic UN Planning Framework (e.g. UNDAF) and project document (if applicable) or Annual Work Plans (AWPs) over the duration of the project.**

MICS is an international household survey programme developed by UNICEF that produces internationally comparable and sound data on children, women and men. The survey produced broad range of (baseline) indicators in different areas that are essential for programming of all UN agencies in Montenegro such as in the area of: education, water and sanitation, child labour, child discipline, hand washing, child mortality, maternal and new born health, desire for last birth, illness symptoms, contraception, unmet need, attitudes toward domestic violence, marriage/union, sexual behaviour, HIV/AIDS, tobacco and alcohol use, life satisfaction, birth registration, early childhood development, breastfeeding, care of illness, immunisation, and anthropometry. Many indicators in these areas are not collected by national statistics and institutions.

Despite improvements made in the past period, systematic data collection and analysing child-related data remains one of the main challenges in Montenegro. The 2013 Montenegro MICS will fill in data gaps on many aspects of social development.

The primary objectives of 2013 Montenegro MICS survey are three fold: (i) to fill in the gaps in systematic data collection and analysing child-related data; (ii) to strengthen data collection and monitoring systems in Montenegro by developing existing technical expertise in designing, implementation, and analysis of disaggregated data through training and practical experience; and (iii) to strengthen use of evidence based policy making by key decision-makers at political and implementation level.

II. Assessment of Programme Results

- This section is the **most important in the Report** and particular attention should be given to reporting on **results / and changes** that have taken place rather than on activities. It has three parts to help capture this information in different ways (i. Narrative section; ii. Indicator based performance assessment; iii. Evaluation & Lessons learned; and iv. A specific story).

The 2013 Montenegro MICS provided most recent and reliable baseline data on children, women and men in Montenegro that would inform relevant EU accession negotiations and reporting to the Committee on the Child Rights. It provides extensive, internationally standardised and comparable data that would form the basis of national reporting on MDGs. MICS provides data at the national level which can also be disaggregated by various geographical, social, ethnic, income and demographic characteristics covering children, women and men.

Uniquely, Montenegro MICS contains one innovation on Roma, which relate to of the critical aspects of human rights reform in the country.

Data obtained through 2013 Montenegro MICS survey would improve evidence based policy making and programming of all UN agencies in the country.

i) Narrative reporting on results:

From January to December 2012, respond to the guiding questions, indicated below to provide a narrative summary of the results achieved. The aim here is to tell the **story of change** that your Programme has achieved over its entire duration. Make reference to the implementation mechanism utilized and key partnerships.

- **Outcomes:** Outcomes are the strategic, higher level of change that your Programme is aiming to contribute towards. Provide a summary of progress made by the Programme in relation to **planned outcomes from the Project Document / AWP**s, with reference to the relevant indicator(s) in these documents. Describe if final targets were achieved, or explain any variance in achieved versus planned results. Explain the overall contribution of the programme to the Strategy Planning Framework or other strategic documents as relevant, e.g.: MDGs, National Priorities, UNDAF outcomes, etc. Explain who the main beneficiaries were. Highlight any institutional and/ or behavioural changes amongst beneficiaries at the outcome level.

Data obtained through 2013 Montenegro MICS survey are very comprehensive and of high quality, which would strengthen the capacity of the public sector to analyse and monitor situation on children, women and men, and compare it with other countries. It would also serve for equitable and inclusive evidence based policy planning in the areas of health, education, and social protection.

- **Outputs:** Outputs are the more immediate results that your Programme is responsible for achieving. Report on the key outputs achieved over the duration of the Programme, in relation to **planned outputs from the Project Document / AWP**s, with reference to the relevant indicator(s) in these documents. Describe if final targets were achieved, or explain any variance in achieved versus planned results. If possible, include the number of beneficiaries. Report on how achieved outputs have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes and explain any variance in actual versus planned contributions to the outcomes.

The Statistical Office of Montenegro (MONSTAT) was engaged as the implementing agency for the 2013 Montenegro MICS survey. Preparatory activities for 2013 Montenegro MICS were conducted in the period October 2012 until March 2013 according to the plan. The field work for general population within the survey, which had been funded by UN Country fund (MDTF), was conducted from 4 March until 10 May 2013. All funds were spent as planned.

Of the 4596 households selected for the sample, 4425 were found to be occupied. Of these, 4052 were successfully interviewed for a household response rate of 92 percent. In the interviewed households, 3606 women (age 15-49 years) were identified. Of these, 3493 were successfully interviewed, yielding a response rate of 97 percent within interviewed households. In addition, 1872 men (age 15-49 years) were listed in the household questionnaire. Questionnaires were completed for 1799 of eligible men, which correspond to a response rate of 96 percent within interviewed households. There were 1441 children under age five listed in the household questionnaire. Questionnaires were completed for 1420 of these children, which corresponds to a response rate of 99 percent within interviewed households. Overall response rates of 89, 88, and 90 are calculated for the women's, men's and under-5's interviews respectively.

- **Qualitative assessment:** Provide a qualitative assessment of the level of overall achievement of the Programme. Highlight key partnerships and explain how such relationships impacted on the achievement of results. Explain cross-cutting issues pertinent to the results being reported on. Has the funding provided by the MPTF/JP to the programme been catalytic in attracting funding or other resources from other donors? If so, please elaborate. For Joint Programmes, highlight how UN coordination has been affected in support of achievement of results.

MONSTAT conducted the survey strictly following the global MICS methodology, which is design in such a way to ensure high quality outputs.

During the field work, communication and collaboration with the implementing partner was very good and MONSTAT team demonstrated high level of commitment and professionalism.

ii) Indicator Based Performance Assessment:

Using the **Programme Results Framework from the Project Document / AWP**s - provide details of the achievement of indicators at both the output and outcome level in the table below. Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, clear explanation should be given explaining why.

	<u>Achieved</u> Indicator Targets	Reasons for Variance with Planned Target (if any)	Source of Verification
Outcome 1⁹: OUTCOME 1.3: Montenegro reduces disparities and gaps in access to quality health, education and social services, in line with the EU/UN standards Indicator: Field work of MICS survey (general population interviews) conducted Baseline: No MICS survey Planned Target: MICS survey implemented	2013 Montenegro MICS successfully conducted in the period from 4 March until 10 May 2013 - 4052 households interviewed (response rate 92%) - 3493 women age 15-49 years interviewed (response rate of 97%) - 1799 men age 15-49 interviewed (response rate 96%) - 1420 of children under 5 years interviewed (response rate 99%)	The field work was extended for 10 days due to problem with a sample identified in the first week of the field work.	Regular internal reports Survey report
Output 1.1 Indicator 1.1.1 Baseline: Planned Target: Indicator 1.1.2 Baseline: Planned Target:			
Output 1.2 Indicator 1.2.1 Baseline: Planned Target: Indicator 1.2.2 Baseline: Planned Target:			

⁹ Note: Outcomes, outputs, indicators and targets should be **as outlines in the Project Document** so that you report on your **actual achievements against planned targets**. Add rows as required for Outcome 2, 3 etc.

iii) Evaluation, Best Practices and Lessons Learned

- Report on any assessments, evaluations or studies undertaken relating to the programme and how they were used during implementation. Has there been a final project evaluation and what are the key findings? Provide reasons if no programme evaluation have been done yet?
- Explain challenges such as delays in programme implementation, and the nature of the constraints such as management arrangements, human resources etc. What actions were taken to mitigate these challenges? How did such challenges and actions impact on the overall achievement of results? Have any of the risks identified during the project design materialized or were there unidentified risks that came up?
- Report key lessons learned and best practices that would facilitate future programme design and implementation, including issues related to management arrangements, human resources, resources, etc. Please also include experiences of failure, which often are the richest source of lessons learned.

Filed work was monitored on a regular basis by team of editors and supervisors, and by UNICEF regional MICS consultant. In addition, the survey coordinators and supervisors were using filed check tables that were used to correct mistakes identified during the field work. In the end, the review and internal evaluation of the field work was done. As a result of very good preparation of the teams that conducted the survey in the field (interviewers, editors, measurers and supervisors) ongoing monitoring in the field, and correcting errors identified in the field check tables, the quality of data collected was very good and there were no major problems during the field work apart from extension of the field work for 10 days due to problem with a sample that was identified in the first week of the field work.

iv) A Specific Story (Optional)

- This could be a success or human story. It does not have to be a success story – often the most interesting and useful lessons learned are from experiences that have not worked. The point is to highlight a concrete example with a story that has been important to your Programme.
- In ¼ to ½ a page, provide details on a specific achievement or lesson learned of the Programme. Attachment of supporting documents, including photos with captions, news items etc, is strongly encouraged. The MPTF Office will select stories and photos to feature in the Consolidated Annual Report, the GATEWAY and the MPTF Office Newsletter.

Problem / Challenge faced: Describe the specific problem or challenge faced by the subject of your story (this could be a problem experienced by an individual, community or government).

Programme Interventions: How was the problem or challenged addressed through the Programme interventions?

Result (if applicable): Describe the observable *change* that occurred so far as a result of the Programme interventions. For example, how did community lives change or how was the government better able to deal with the initial problem?

Lessons Learned: What did you (and/or other partners) learn from this situation that has helped inform and/or improve Programme (or other) interventions?