

b. Joint Programme M&E framework

This template is the same as the one you will find in the JP documents. We have added 3 columns to provide spaces for baselines of the indicators as well as targets. All the values for indicators in this template are cumulative. This means the past values obtained accumulate (add up over time) as the joint programme gets implemented. We are expecting you to include not only the indicators but the value of these indicators. If you do not provide them, please explain the reason and how you are going to obtain this information for the next reporting period.

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
From Results Framework (Table 1)	From Results Framework (Table 1)	Baselines are a measure of the indicator at the start of the joint programme	The desired level of improvement to be reached at the end of the reporting period	The actual level of performance reached at the end of the reporting period	From identified data and information sources	How is it to be obtained?	Specific responsibilities of participating UN organizations (including in case of shared results)	Summary of assumptions and risks for each result
1. JP Outcome 1: Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of Millennium Development Goals.								

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
<p>1.1. National Rural Tourism Master Plan for Serbia developed and submitted to the Government</p>	<p>Outcome Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Serbia Rural Tourism Master Plan finalised and adopted by national partners at the beginning of Year 2. -Serbia Rural Tourism Master Plan is approved/ adopted by the Inter-ministerial Group and submitted to the Government for approval by end of first trimester of Year 2. -Number of tourists (domestic and international) and number of their overnight stays. -Number of beds. -Number of women employed in tourism related activities. -Number of new rural tourism businesses / number of households in tourism business. Amount of funds dedicated to rural tourism development, adopted and contained within MERD and MAFWM policy documents. 	<p>Baseline:</p> <p>11 individual Master Plans for various tourist destinations in Serbia; 4 in progress; but no broad-based Rural Tourism Master Plan / Policy with national strategy Data on international migration flows of young people are not collected in a systematic way. The migration profile of Serbia still does not exist. The Office also lacks more recent data on internal migration Social protection</p>	<p>SRTMP: National partners and Inter-ministerial Group submitted SRTMP to the Government.</p>	<p>The Sustainable Rural Tourism Development Master Plan was approved by the Government and has since been submitted to Parliament for approval.</p> <p>The Master Plan formulation and approval process was highly consultative with interviews and workshops conducted periodically with Government, partner UN agencies, and rural tourism stakeholders of Serbia.</p> <p>Child, youth and family tourism development framework defined</p>	<p>Inter-ministerial working group meeting minutes & attendance.</p> <p>Complete deliverables for all Master Plan components.</p> <p>Progress reports working group and contractor.</p> <p>Workshops/presentations attendance records.</p> <p>Surveys databases.</p>	<p>Annual Monitoring</p>	<p>Lead Agency: UNWTO</p> <p>Contributing Agencies: UNICEF, UNEP, FAO</p> <p>Partner: MERD Inter-ministerial working group, led by chairperson</p>	<p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Political and/or economic shocks shift the attention of policy-makers away from tourism and rural development. -Delays due to contracting procedures or performance. -National institutions fail to agree or cooperate on activities, or fail to honour prior commitments. -Turnover of policy makers and civil servants results in delays. -Private, public and/or civil society sectors are reluctant to cooperate. -RTMP not fully developed through a

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
		<p>indicators for youth are not defined and means of their regular collection not identified.</p> <p>Indicators for youth labour market, youth migration and social protection not integrated into DevInfo database system.</p>						<p>participatory process, i.e. few rural tourism entrepreneurs and other stakeholder representatives participated, resulting in lack of full commitment to the implementation of the Master Plan.</p> <p>Assumptions -No major institutional change of any partner occurs during the implementation of the project. -The commitments taken at policy level are executed. -There is a reliable and timely flow of information and</p>
<p>1.2. Rural Development Program Planning: Rural Development Program planning is mainstreamed in Serbia's</p>	<p>-IPARD Axes 2 & 3 measures prepared & submitted to Government by end of JP. -Number and type of organizational stakeholders & partners involved in development of Rural Development Program: At least 100 stakeholders - LTO representatives, local governments' representatives, farmers, rural entrepreneurs, civil sector. -At least 20% of all stakeholders</p>	<p>Baseline: IPA financial envelope 2007-2013: €10.2 billion (all candidate countries).</p>	<p>-IPARD National Agriculture & Rural Development Program (2010-2013): Strategic guidelines for inclusion of rural tourism & related activities to Axes 2 & 3 developed, facilitating Serbia's access to EC IPARD Axis 2 & 3 funds -IPARD Life-</p>	<p>Study on Access to Services of Women and Children in Rural Areas containing recommendations for national institutions and IPARD measure completed. The Study will be published in August.</p>	<p>Complete deliverable of IPARD Axes 2 & 3 measures submitted to Government.</p> <p>Workshops/presentations/meetings/attendance reports.</p> <p>Working Group(s) meeting minutes & attendance.</p>	<p>Annual Monitoring</p>	<p>Lead Agency: FAO</p> <p>Contributing Agencies: UNICEF Working group, led by chairperson.</p> <p>Partner:</p>	<p>partner occurs during the implementation of the project. -The commitments taken at policy level are executed. -There is a reliable and timely flow of information and</p>

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
	representatives included in development of Rural Development Program are representing rural women. -Number of workshops, presentations & coordination meetings held during preparation and adoption of IPARD Axes 2 & 3 measures: At least 4 strategic planning workshops and 4 project planning workshops.		Conditions Study: Provide strategic input into IPARD with life-conditions so as to ensure integrated rural tourism development addresses issues of access to services (health, education & social protection) for children & women in rural areas				MAFWM	data among the partners and within the working group. -No changes in roles and responsibilities of partners, contributing local organizations. Existing obligatory system of charging for rural tourism services via intermediary (travel agents and LTOs) changed, rural households allowed to charge directly to guests.
1.3. Investment Mainstreaming: Sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia's national	Output Indicators: -Amount of public investment made in line with Investment plan as part of Rural Tourism Master Plan. -Number of individual public investments made in line with Investment plan as part of Rural Tourism Master Plan. -Amount of private funds secured for realization of Rural Tourism	2008 public tourism investment: €50M. 2009 public tourism investment: €22M. <i>Due to the complexity of calculating</i>	Public Investments toward Rural Tourism Master Plan: Serbia public sector commits minimum \$75 million in rural tourism initiatives and supporting infrastructure in line with Rural Tourism Master Plan by end of	Public funding for tourism development has being reviewed at the national level, in preparation for the Investment Forum which will take place in the second half of the 2 nd year. SIFT Focal Point	Copies of project payments and delivery receipts through public investment. Reports & public records of investments. Reports from M&E	Annual Monitoring	Lead Agency: UNDP Contributing Agencies: UNEP Partner: MERD	Risks economic shocks shift. -National institutions fail to agree or cooperate on activities. -Private, public and/or civil

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
policies.	<p>Master Plan.</p> <p>-Number of tourist destinations (municipalities) receiving public investment.</p> <p>-M&E strategy and indicators developed and adopted by Government for Rural Development Fund & Fund for Tourism Development.</p> <p>-Amount of MAFWM funds dedicated to support rural tourism.</p> <p>-Number and structure of users of MAFWM funds.</p> <p>-Ratio of MAFWM fund beneficiaries coming from the JP target regions (number of beneficiaries and amount of awarded funds to total).</p> <p>-Number of users and amount received from MERD tourism development loans for rural tourism.</p> <p>-Ratio of MERD tourism development fund beneficiaries coming from the JP target regions (number of beneficiaries and amount of awarded funds).</p>	<p><i>public investments made by various government institutions, the amount included in the project document was only an estimate, which has now been refined through detailed follow up. in 2008 was EUR 46.608.133 (USD 68.380.302) and in 2009 it was EUR 21.702.759,22 (USD 30.221.390)</i></p>	<p>JP.</p> <p>Public-Private Partnership Guidelines: Functional guidelines for successful public-private partnerships developed and institutionalized, evidenced by completion of at least six PPP initiatives by end of JP.</p> <p>SIFT Network: National focal point established for Sustainable Investment and Finance in Tourism (SIFT) Network.</p> <p>Investment Monitoring & Evaluation Strategy: Formal process installed to feed lessons learned from Outcome 2 into public tourism investments.</p>	<p>organized investment workshop, in cooperation with UNDP</p> <p>3 projects aiming Diversification of Rural Economy through Tourism were supported through grants.</p> <p>3 NGOs in partnerships with public and private sector were granted, and these partnerships are very important for establishment of LAGs.</p>	<p>monitoring agency on fund investments.</p> <p>Report on investment workshop</p>		<p>Local agent ultimately tasked with Government investment M&E.</p> <p>UNEP/UNDP</p>	<p>society sectors are reluctant to cooperate.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>-No major institutional change of any partner occurs during the implementation of the project.</p> <p>-There is a reliable and timely flow of information and data among the partners and within the working group.</p> <p>No changes in roles and responsibilities of partners, contributing local organizations</p>
<p>2. Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies.</p>								

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
<p>2.1. Capacity developed for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural development</p>	<p>Outcome Indicators: Number of projects developed as a result of JP capacity building, mentoring support. Number of new products developed and marketed. Visitor satisfaction levels. Increase in the training participants' income from rural tourism activities.</p> <p>Output Indicators: Number of LAGs established and trained. Number of tourism stakeholders trained (with exam based certificates, where applicable), disaggregated by gender and public vs. private sector. Number of local development strategies that include rural tourism. Number and type of different training courses provided over life of JP.</p>	<p>-Rural Development Network is existing & functional. -Projects supported through public funds are not accessible for persons with disabilities. -Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management provides grants for rural women's NGOs. -Tourism Governance Organizations do not exist in Serbia.</p>	<p>- Local Action Groups: Capacity of public, private and civil society stakeholders strengthened to enable establishment of six Local Action Groups (representing 10,000-100,000 citizens) and develop local rural development strategies, by end of JP.</p> <p>-Rural Development Network: Capacity of national Rural Development Network strengthened in the target regions to lead development and facilitation of Local Action Groups, independently lobby for development initiatives and secure resources for regional development by end of JP.</p> <p>- Local planning: All 19 target</p>	<p>11 regional trainings on Standards for processing meat, fruits and vegetables in rural households; culinary standards and techniques for rural tourism providers with about 176 trainees will help in adjusting to new regulations which will be introduced during Serbian accession to the EU.</p> <p>Study Tour to Slovenia on child tourism for local and national partners conducted. 14 stakeholders visited 17 destinations and processed the lessons learnt through workshops.</p> <p>Workshops regarding the inclusion of tourism in municipal strategies were organised in 2 regions, for municipal structure. In total 20 participants were</p>	<p>Training attendance records, tabulated & recorded in M&E system.</p> <p>Training participants profile information collected.</p> <p>Copies of project payments and delivery receipts.</p> <p>Reports on two workshops</p>	<p>Annual Monitoring</p>	<p>Contributing Agencies: UNWTO, FAO, UNEP, UNICEF</p> <p>Partners: MERD & MAFWM, by output level.</p> <p>Programme activities, results, participation, information tracking: UNDP</p>	<p>Risks Political and/or economic shocks shift the attention of policy-makers away from tourism & rural development. Delays due to contracting procedures or performance. Local institutions fail to agree or cooperate on activities, or fail to honour prior commitments. Turnover of local government officials and civil servants results in delays. Private, public and/or civil society sectors are reluctant to cooperate. Governments see rural tourism purely as tool for</p>

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
			<p>municipalities have included sustainable rural tourism measures in local development strategies, by the end of JP.</p> <p>-Organizational Capacity Development: 500 individuals trained via 20 workshops, representing at least 50 different tourism and rural stakeholder entities trained on organizational subjects by end of JP.</p> <p>Marketing & Promotion: local tourism stakeholders trained via 15 workshops on product development issues, marketing and promotion in Years 2 and 3 of the JP.</p> <p>-Energy Efficiency & Alternative Energy: 300 individuals via 12 workshops trained representing at least</p>	actively took part on these two workshops.				<p>diversification of rural economy, failing to recognize it as local development tool.</p> <p>Assumptions No major institutional change of any partner occurs during the implementation of the project.</p> <p>No changes in roles and responsibilities of partners, contributing local organizations</p>

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
			<p>100 different organizations, architecture & engineering firms, construction firms, and public officials trained on energy efficiency and alternative energy technical matters and funding opportunities by end of JP.</p> <p>-Rural Tourism-Oriented Networks: Twelve groups of regional tourism-oriented producers and processors provide a common touristic offer (integrating local services and products) by end of JP.</p> <p>-Product Development: Local tourism stakeholders actively participating in Product Development discussions through the TGOs and are trained to become</p>					

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
			<p>active stakeholders in Tourism Master Plan Implementation.</p> <p>-Sustainable Resource Management: 300 individuals trained via 12 workshops, representing at least 100 different tourism stakeholders in sustainable resource management by end of JP.</p> <p>- Agriculture Quality Standards Training: 600 producers, farmers and processors trained in agriculture quality production and standards.</p>					
<p>2.2 . Tourism governance structures enhanced in target regions through dedicated organizatio</p>	<p>-Number of TGOs established and trained based on needs assessment and with attention to gender and PPP.</p> <p>-Amount of public and private investment leveraged through JP pilot projects and investments.</p> <p>-Guidelines/standards for schools and tourism service providers catering for children submitted to</p>	<p>Rural Development Network is existing & functional.</p> <p>-Tourism Governance Organizations do not exist.</p>	<p>- Tourism Governance Organizations (TGOs) in four regions (one per target region) established throughout JP through expert support, while engaging local stakeholders.</p> <p>-Child-Related</p>	<p>-Tourism governance organizations are well-defined in the first draft of the Master plan since it evaluates the potentials in each existing structure and proposes new mechanism for support tourism to be</p>	<p>Training attendance records, tabulated & recorded in M&E system.</p> <p>Copies of project payments and delivery receipts.</p>	<p>Annual Monitoring</p>	<p>Contributing Agencies: UNWTO, FAO, UNEP, UNICEF</p> <p>Partners: MERD & MATFWM</p> <p>Programme</p>	

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
<p>ns, pilot projects, investment promotion</p>	<p>the Ministry of Education for endorsement by the end of JP. -Number of pilot projects financed and functional over life of project. -Number of pilot projects supported through the JP, which are accessible to persons with disabilities. -Number of pilot projects supported through the JP, which specify rural women as beneficiary.</p>	<p>Statistical offices of the republic of Serbia ,Local tourism organisation and regional rural development network offices are limited to obtaining the data needed</p>	<p>Tourism Supply & Demand: Guidelines/standards for schools and tourism service providers catering for children submitted to the Ministry of Education for endorsement by the end of JP. -Investment Forum: One national investment forum organized in Year 2 of JP. Joint UN Fund for Sustainable Rural Tourism -Thematic window on Diversification of Rural Economy through Tourism: 23 projects for developing rural tourist sites, products & services supported by the end of JP. -Thematic window on Tourism Destination Development: Basic tourism services,</p>	<p>established. Grants scheme for new call for grants is currently being prepared for launching in the second half of 2011. Draft Guidelines for tourism service providers completed. Active Learning Tourism Grant Scheme developed and promoted. Minimum 6 child, youth and/or family tourism will be developed with max 120.000 USD</p>			<p>activities, results, participation, information tracking: UNDP</p>	

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
			Development of attractions, specific niche products and tourism clusters in target regions enhanced, in the last two years of JP. -Thematic Window on Active-Learning Tourism Investments: 4 tourist sites developed through child-, family-, and school-centred tourism					