**JOINT PROGRAMME MONITORING REPORT**

**CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACE BUILDING WINDOW**

**This report is due no more than 20 days following the end of the 2nd and 4thquarter. Please submit to the MDF-G Secretariat at:** [**mdgf.secretariat@undp.org**](mailto:mdgf.secretariat@undp.org)

**Section I: Identification and Joint Programme Status**

a. Joint Programme Identification and basic data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date of Submission:Submitted by: Name: Ljupco Gjorgjinski  Title: Coordination and Monitoring Officer  Organization: UNRCO  Contact information: [Ljupco.gjorgjinski@un.org.mk](mailto:Ljupco.gjorgjinski@un.org.mk)  +389 71 223 123 |  | Country and Thematic Window fYR Macedonia  Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building Window |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| MDTF Atlas Project No: 00067217Title:“Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration” |  | Report Number: 3Reporting Period: July-December 2010 **Programme Duration: 2009-2012**  **Official starting date: August 2009** |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Participating UN Organizations:  * UNDP * UNICEF * UNESCO |  | **Implementing partners**   * Secretariat for Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement * Municipalities of Kicevo, Kumanovo and Struga * Ministry of Culture * Ministry of Education and Science * Bureau for Education Development * State Education Inspectorate * Primary and Secondary Schools in the Selected Municipalities * Forum ZFD (NGO) * Centre for Intercultural Dialogue (NGO) * Centre for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution (NGO) * Commission for Relations with the Religious Communities and Faith Groups * University of Ss. “Cyril and Methodius” * School of Journalism and Public Relations * Additional NGO partners to be found in **Annex 1** |
|  |  |  |

The financial information reported should include overhead, M&E and other associated costs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Budget Summary** | | |
| **Total Approved Joint Programme Budget** | UNDP: | US $1,834,941 |
| UNICEF: | US $1,239,060 |
| UNESCO: | US $925,999 |
| **Total:** | **US $4,000,000** |
| **Total Amount of Transferred to date** | UNDP: | US $1,453,756 |
| UNICEF: | US $895,400 |
| UNESCO: | US $645,745 |
| **Total:** | **US $2,994,901** |
| **Total Budget Committed[[1]](#footnote-1) to date** | UNDP: | US $754,017 |
| UNICEF: | US $ 838,003 |
| UNESCO: | US $209,618 |
| **Total:** | **US $ 1,801,638** |
| **Total Budget Disbursed to date** | UNDP: | US $ 713,138 |
| UNICEF: | US $ 415,983 |
| UNESCO: | US $188,171 |
| **Total:** | **US $ 1,317,292** |

**BENEFICIARIES**

**Direct Beneficiaries:** *“The individuals, groups, or organizations, targeted, that benefit, directly, from the development intervention”.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicate Beneficiary type** | **Expected number of Institutions** | **Number of Institutions to date** | **Expected**  **Number of**  **Women** | **Number of**  **Women**  **To date** | **Expected number of Men** | **Number of men to date** | **Expected number of individuals**  **from Ethnic Groups** | **number of individuals**  **from Ethnic Groups to date** |
| National Government | 7 | 7 | 40 | 34 | 40 | 21 | 80 | 55 |
| Local Government | 3 | 3 | 15 | 9 | 25 | 37 | 45 | 70 |
| Professional Associations | 10 | 4 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 6 | 30 | 11 |
| Universities and Other Higher Education Institutions | 7 | 7 | 20 | 9 | 15 | 11 | 35 | 20 |
| CSOs | 35 | 12 | 100 | 52 | 100 | 32 | 200 | 85 |
| Secondary School Students | 90 | 90 | 44,595 | 44,595 | 49,248 | 49,248 | 93,843 | 93,843 |
| Primary School Students | 350 | 350 | 104,445 | 104,445 | 111,735 | 111,735 | 216,180 | 216,180 |
| Teachers/Professors | n/a | n/a | ~960 | ~960 | ~380 | ~380 | 1,340 | 1,340 |
| **Total** | 502 | 473 | 150,190 | 150,109 | 161,558 | 161,470 | 311,753 | 311,604 |

**Indirect Beneficiaries:** *“The individuals, groups, or organizations, not targeted, that benefit, indirectly, from the development intervention”*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicate Beneficiary type** | **Expected number of Institutions** | **Number of Institutions to date** | **Expected**  **Number of**  **Women** | **Number of**  **Women**  **To date** | **Expected number of Men** | **Number of men to date** | **Expected number of individuals**  **from Ethnic Groups** | **number of individuals**  **from Ethnic Groups to date** |
| Sub-national government | 12 | 3 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 120 | 199 |
| Parents | n/a | n/a | ~300,000 | ~300,000 | ~300,000 | ~300,000 | ~600,000 | ~600,000 |
| CSOs | 50 | 29 | ~200 | ~75 | ~200 | ~75 | ~400 | ~150 |
| Religious Institutions | 23 | 12 | 200 | 200 | 1,100 | 1,100 | 1,300 | 1,300 |
| Media Institutions | 50 | 28 | 50 | 30 | 50 | 30 | 100 | 60 |
| **Total** | 135 | 72 | 300,510 | 300,365 | 301,410 | 301,265 | 601,920 | 601,709 |

1. **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 (31 December 2010)** | **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 |
| **Joint Programme Outcome 1:**  **By 2012, key national and local institutions dealing with inter-ethnic relations**[[2]](#footnote-2) **more effectively build inter-ethnic consensus.** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1 Indicators | 30% of 45 recommendations from **Assessment** **of National and Local Capacities** for strengthening inter-ethnic dialogue and collaboration fully implemented by government, media and civil society organizations | | 0% | 30% | 6% | Annual assessment by JP of implementation rate | Annual review of 45 recommendations and the extent to which they were implemented | | UNDP |  |
| No. of inter-ethnic situations where key national and local institutions follow the **coordination and communication protocol** per year | | 0 | 20 | 0 | Annual assessment by JP based on sample survey | Sample survey based on observation | |
| No. of cases where **pool of experts** was engaged per year | | 0 | 6 | 0 | Report by unit that hosts pool of experts | none | |
| No. of times **Commissions for Inter-Community Relations** in three target municipalities provide inputs[[3]](#footnote-3) into local decision making processes per year | | 0 | 10 | 0 | Annual assessment by JP | Communication by JP with three Commissions for Inter-Community Relations | |
| 1.1 Key national and local institutions in 3 micro-regions dealing with inter-ethnic relations have a system to address issues that may weaken inter-ethnic cohesion | Assessment of National and Local Capacities for strengthening inter-ethnic dialogue and collaboration completed (2008: no, 2010: yes) | | No | Yes | Yes | Assessment report | none | | UNDP | Political will to prioritise and revise the current regulatory framework low or political focus overwhelmed by other issues. (High)  Institutional stakeholders do not participate consistently in the process. (Medium)  Lack of willingness by local and national institutions to apply the coordination and communication protocol (Medium)  Shortfall of M&E officers at the national and local institutions (Medium) |
| % of 45 recommendations of the Assessment of national and local capacities addressed through at least one activity of the Joint Programme | | 0 | 30% | 0 | Annual assessment by JP of recommendations through JP activities | Annual Review of 45 recommendations and the extent to which they were implemented | |
| No. of national and local institutions that endorse **coordination and communication protocol** dealing with inter-ethnic relations | | 0 | 25 | 0 | Annual assessment by JP | Review of signed decision of institution | |
| Development of **training** to strengthen capacity and enhance functions for dialogue, consensus building and dispute resolution[[4]](#footnote-4) | | 0 | 3 points | 0 | curricula, training reports, How-To guide document | none | |  |
| Progress towards establishing an **M&E system** for inter-ethnic relations[[5]](#footnote-5) | | 0 points | 3 points | 0 points | methodology, training reports for M&E officers, reports of M&E officers | none | |
| 1.2 Key national and local institutions dealing with inter-ethnic relations have access to a pool of facilitation experts and resources | Establishment of a **pool of facilitation experts[[6]](#footnote-6)**, 2008: 0, 2012: 3 points) | | 0 | 3 points | 0 | Contract with institution, training reports, campaign reports | None | | UNDP | Critical number of facilitation experts may not be easy to attain. (Medium) |
| No. of times key national and local institutions call upon pool of facilitation expertise | | 0 | 20 | 0 |  |  | |
| 1.3 Local governments and community organizations have better opportunities to collaborate in 3 micro-regions | No. of **fora** on conflict-sensitive development, **study tours** and **training** of municipality stakeholders conducted | | 0 | 10 | 2 | Fora Reports;  Training reports | None | | UNDP | Community response affected by extra-municipal developments.  (Low)  Scarce collaboration of the local-self-government units with civil society (Medium) |
| No. of **Inter-Municipal Cooperation Agreements** that facilitate interethnic collaboration among ethnically diverse municipalities signed within 3 micro-regions | | 0 | 3 | 0 | Agreement documents | None | |
| No of cases of successful collaboration between civil society organizations and local self-government units that work to improve interethnic collaboration and dialogue that are result of Grant Scheme project activities | | 0 | 12 | 0 | JP on-going monitoring | Final project reports of grantees | |
| **Outcome 2:**  **Capacity of the National Education System to Promote and Enhance Ethnic and Cultural Diversity Strengthened.** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2 Indicators** | | **Life-Skills Based Education** introduced as separate subject in secondary education | No | Yes | No | National curricula for secondary education | none | |  |  |
| No. of new or revised **text books** that follow new methodology for review of text books | 0 | 13[[7]](#footnote-7) | 0 | Assessment by Bureau for Development of Education and MoE | Text analysis of new and revised text books based on criteria | |
| **Ministry of Education** adopt at least one policy or programme for dispute mitigation and resolution | No | Yes | Yes | Policy or programme document | none | |
| **No. of schools that implement inter-ethnic extracurricular activities** based on the national curriculum | 0 | 18 | 18 | Implementing partners reports | List of participants | |
| **Intercultural and conflict resolution courses** offered as elective offered at three universities | No | Yes | No | University Study Programmes | None | |
| 2.1 Understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity incorporated in the national education policies | | **Life Skills Based Education curriculum** for secondary education developed | No | Yes | No | Curriculum Development | None | | UNICEF | It is expected that textbook review in the language subject will be easier to agree upon; may not be so. (High)  Political consensus to allow objective assessment of textbooks, especially history textbooks, will be hard to achieve. (High) |
| No. of **primary education teachers** trained by 20 Bureau for Development of Education advisors in Live Skills Based Education | 750 | 1070 | 1070 | List of participants from training workshops | None | |
| No. of **secondary education teachers** trained by 20 Bureau for Development of Education advisors in Life-Skills Based Education ( 2008: 0, 2012: 300) | 0 | 300 | 0 | List of participants from training workshops | None | |
| No. of **revised text books** per grade following the new criteria to promote multiculturalism and inter-ethnic relations (2008: 0, 2012: 13) | 0 | 13 | 0 | Quarterly reports by Bureau for Development of Education to JP | Internal assessment of Bureau for Development of Education and the Pedagogical Service | |
| 2.2 Mechanisms For Democratic Participation, Good Governance And Dispute-Resolution In The Education Sector Strengthened In 3 Micro-Regions | | **Training** of students, teachers and parents to strengthen the existing school capacities and structures for democratic participation, governance and dispute resolution[[8]](#footnote-8) | 0 | 2 points | 1 points | Weekly reports by JP implementing partners | Training curricula and list of participants | | UNICEF | Low participation and effectiveness of bodies for participation of students, parents and community members. (Low)  Strong political influence in schools. (High) |
| No. of **municipality council** and **inter-ethnic commission** meeting attended by school representatives in 3 selected municipalities, 2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 10) | 0 | 10 | 0 | Weekly reports by JP implementing partners | Minutes and list of participants from municipality council and inter-ethnic commission meeting | |
| No. of schools in 3 selected municipalities that adopt **statute, mandate and working protocols** for schools[[9]](#footnote-9) bodies in a **democratic and participatory** manner (2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 12) | 0 | 12 | 0 | Monthly monitoring reports by Centre for Human Rights | Monthly assessment based on defined criteria | |
|  | | No. of decisions taken by school boards in 3 selected municipalities that pilot taking decisions of the school board upon **initiatives from students and parent bodies** (2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 10) | 0 | 10 | 5 | Monthly monitoring reports by Centre for Human Rights and the implementing partners | Monthly assessment based on defined criteria, reports | |  |  |
| OUTPUT 2.3.: Children and youth have opportunities for interaction and dialogue in school and the community | | No. of **joint curricular and extracurricular activities** for ethnically mixed groups (2008: 0, 2010: 125, 2012: 400) | 0 | 400 | 127 | Quarterly reports by JP implementing partners | Review of list of participants | | UNICEF, UNESCO | School space and availability of school staff and time may be limited since most of the schools operate in shifts; (Medium)  Sports and other activities may bring different ethnic groups together, but may also antagonize if first interactions not managed properly. (Low) |
| No. of children and youth that **complete a** **course** in 3 inter-ethnic community based centres | 0 | 2,500 | 517 | Quarterly reports by JP implementing partners | Review of list of participants | |
| A university set up a **centre of excellence** in intercultural and peace studies[[10]](#footnote-10) | 0 points | 5 points | 0 points | Quarterly JP assessment | Assessment of a) statute of university, b) 5 study papers, c) conference report, d) study programme | |
| No. of **youth clubs** that implement activities that promote inter-ethnic dialogue among university students (2008: 0, 2010: 9, 2012: 5) | 0 | 5 | 3 | Reports by youth clubs , reports by UNESCO national commission | Registry of clubs at national commission | |  |
| **World Heritage in Young Hands** programme piloted in Associated Schools Project Network schools as elective course or extra-curricular activity | No | Yes | No | reports by schools and implementing partners | Macedonian World Heritage in Young Hands teachers kits | |  |
| **Outcome 3:**  **Inter-cultural Sensitivity and Civic Awareness Promoted.** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3 Indicators** | | % of local and religious leaders and civil society representatives that participated in a leadership, communication skills, mediation, gender training in three municipalities that have engaged **at least in one mediation** over the past 12 months | 0% | 25% | 0% | Annual follow-up survey report of former training participants by JP | | Random sample survey by telephone of 20% of former participants done annually by JP |  |  |
| *[Indicator on changes in* ***media coverage*** *of cultural sensitivity and civil awareness* (pending the development of methodology for a MRRM media monitoring mechanism) ] |  |  |  | Monitoring report by MRRM monitoring team | | pending data collection |  |  |
| **OUTPUT 3.1.:** Local and religious leaders and civil society are better able to participate in **dispute resolution processes** | | Nr. of **participants** (local and religious leaders and civil society representatives) at **leadership, communication skills, mediation, gender training** in three municipalities | 0 | 200 | 90 | Training sheets | | Quarterly review of training sheets | UNDP,  UNESCO | Political/Party capture of process. (Medium)  External political developments that have spill over effect on interethnic and interreligious life.  (Medium) |
| % of participants at leadership, communication skills, mediation, gender training that are **women** | n/a | 35% | 30% | Training sheets | | Quarterly review of training sheets |
| % of participants at leadership, communication skills, mediation, gender training who are from **local non-majority groups** | n/a | 35% | 35% | List of invitees and training sheets | | Quarterly review of list of invitees and training sheets |
| Nr. of **events** which **raise awareness** on inter-cultural and inter-religious sensitivity[[11]](#footnote-11) | 0 | 35 | 18 | Event reports | | Quarterly review of event reports |
| **OUTPUT 3.2.:** **Journalists** supported to practice **culturally** and **conflict sensitive reporting** | | Nr. of **participants** (practicing journalist, students of journalism, related staff) at culturally and conflict sensitive **media** educationevents | 0 | 300 | 30 | Event reports | | Biannual review of event reports by JP | UNDP,  UNESCO | Politicization of the media (High)  Reluctance/apathy by journalists and media houses. (Medium/High)  Frequent turnover of journalists (Medium) |
| Progress towards a **higher education programme** on conflict sensitive reporting in School of Journalism[[12]](#footnote-12) (2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 3 points) | 0 points | 3 points | 1 point | Quarterly assessment | | curriculum; accreditation board in Ministry of Education; resource documents |
| **OUTPUT 3.3.:** **Media support mechanism** (*expertise, monitoring, tools*) established for reducing social tensions | | Nr. of **TV/radio/news programmes hours** produced to reduce social tension (2008: 0, 2010: 0, 2012: 20) | 0 | 20 | 0 | Reports by grantees | | Quarterly assessment of reports by grantees | UNDP,  UNESCO |  |
| Number of media products promoting the scope of the project produced | 0 | 4 | 0 | Media products | |
| Progress towards setting up a **Media Rapid Response Mechanism[[13]](#footnote-13)** | 0 points | 5 points | 0 points | Biannual report by the School of Journalism | | MRRM documentation and reports, website |
| Hits per month on Media Rapid Response Mechanism **website** *(proxy for level of usage & quality)* | 0 | 2000 | 0 | Quarterly review by JP | | visitor log of website |

1. Joint Programme Results Framework with financial information

This table refers to the cumulative financial progress of the joint programme implementation at the end of the semester. The financial figures from the inception of the programme to date accumulated (including all cumulative yearly disbursements). It is meant to be an update of your Results Framework included in your original programme document. You should provide a table for each output.

**Definitions on financial categories**

* **Total amount planned for the JP**: Complete allocated budget for the entire duration of the JP.
* **Estimated total amount committed:** This category includes all amount committed and disbursed to date.
* **Estimated total amount disbursed**: this category includes only funds disbursed, that have been spent to date.
* **Estimated % delivery rate**: Funds disbursed over funds transferred to date.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Output 1.1:**  **Key National And Local Institutions In 3 Micro-regions Dealing With Interethnic Relations Have A System To Address Issues That May Weaken Interethnic Cohesion**  **Rate of Delivery**: Funds transferred for Output 1.1: **$429,407**; Funds disbursed for Output 1.1: **413,437**  **Estimated % delivery rate: 97%** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme**  **Outputs** | | **Activity** | **YEAR** | | | **UN AGENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **Estimated Implementation Progress** | | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** |  | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | **Total amount**  **Planned for the JP** | **Estimated Total amount**  **Committed** | **Estimated Total**  **Amount**  **Disbursed** | **Estimated**  **% Delivery rate of budget** | |
| **Output 1.1:**  **Key National And Local Institutions In 3 Micro-regions Dealing With Interethnic Relations Have A System To Address Issues That May Weaken Interethnic Cohesion** | | 1.1.1 Mapping of existing capacities and capacity gaps of central and local level institutions for democratic dispute settlement. |  |  |  | UNDP | Local Contracted Experts | 68,100 | 87,890 | 81,963 | 121% |
| 1.1.2 Initiating consensus-building dialogue at local and national level for establishing comprehensive systems of dispute resolution. |  |  |  | UNDP | Local and International experts | 125,000 | 107,807 | 101,624 | 82% |
| 1.1.3 Establishing systemic coordination of facilitation expertise to support dispute settlement institutions and procedures |  |  |  | UNDP | Local and International experts | 167,000 | 96,401 | 106,500 | 64% |
| 1.1.4 Supporting the establishment of M&E functions within national system for inter-community dialogue. |  |  |  | UNDP | International Experts (to be contracted) | 82,645 | 25,000 | 66,000 | 80% |
| 1.1.5 Development of training to strengthen capacity and enhance functions for dialogue consensus building and dispute resolution of existing bodies. |  |  |  | UNDP | International Experts | 66,600 | 43,000 | 57,350 | 87% |
|  | | **Total** | | | | |  | **509,345** | **360,098** | **413,437** | **82%** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Output 1.2:**  **Key National And Local Institutions Dealing With Interethnic Relations Have Access To A Pool Of Facilitation Experts And Resources**  **Rate of Delivery:** Funds transferred for Output 1.2: **55,086;** Funds disbursed for Output 1.2: **97,200**  **Estimated % delivery rate: 177%** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme**  **Outputs** | | **Activity** | **YEAR** | | | **UN AGENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **Estimated Implementation Progress** | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** |  | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | **Total amount**  **Planned for the JP** | **Estimated Total amount**  **Committed** | **Estimated Total**  **Amount**  **Disbursed** | **Estimated**  **% Delivery rate of budget** |
| **Output 1.2:**  **Key National And Local Institutions Dealing With Interethnic Relations Have Access To A Pool Of Facilitation Experts And Resources**  **Rate of Delivery: Below 35%** | | 1.2.1 Strengthening capacity of ZELS to coordinate facilitation expertise. |  |  |  | UNDP | ZELS | 79,000 | 31,629 | 31,629 | 40% |
| 1.2.2 Identification of experts with dispute resolution skills and conducting advanced training |  |  |  | UNDP | ZELS | 104,000 | 71,500 | 65,571 | 63% |
|  | | **Total** | | | | |  | **183,000** | **103,129** | **97, 200** | **17%** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Output 1.3: Local Governments And Community Organizations Have Better Opportunities To Collaborate In 3 Micro-Regions.**  **Rate of Delivery:** Funds transferred for Output 1.3: **552,129;** Funds disbursed for Output 1.3: **230,578**  **Estimated % delivery rate: 42%** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme**  **Outputs** | | **Activity** | **YEAR** | | | **UN AGENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **Estimated Implementation Progress** | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** |  | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | **Total amount**  **Planned for the JP** | **Estimated Total amount**  **Committed** | **Estimated Total**  **Amount**  **Disbursed** | **Estimated**  **% Delivery rate of budget** |
| **Output 1.3:**  **Local Governments And Community Organizations Have Better Opportunities To Collaborate In 3 Micro-Regions.** | | 1.3.1 Facilitating dialogue on conflict-sensitive development at local and micro-regional levels, involving relevant stakeholders. |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 41,000 | 22,500 | 21,200 | 52% |
| 1.3.2 Facilitate development of Inter-Municipal Cooperation agreements among municipalities in micro-regions on conflict-sensitive and inclusive economic development plans |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 75,500 | 71,000 | 19,598 | 26% |
| 1.3.3 Creating links among local bodies for conflict transformation, including inter-ethnic relations commissions, school boards, religious leadership and student organizations |  |  |  | UNDP | 3 Municipalities  CICRs | 53,000 | 10,604 | 9,980 | 19% |
| 1.3.4 Organizing a Grant Scheme with incentives for conflict transforming initiatives |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 344,600 | 250,000 | 163,990 | 48% |
| 1.3.5 Enhancing capacity of municipalities to take up decentralized responsibilities on managing local culture and cultural diversity |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 37,950 | 10,284 | 15,810 | 42% |
|  | | **Total** | | | | |  | **552,050** | **364,388** | **230,578** | **42%** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Output 2.1: Understanding, Tolerance And Respect For Ethnic And Cultural Diversity Incorporated In The National Education Policies**  **Rate of Delivery:** Funds transferred for Output 2.1: **237,238;** Funds disbursed for Output 2.1: **262,298**  **Estimated % delivery rate: 111%** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme**  **Outputs** | | **Activity** | **YEAR** | | | **UN AGENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **Estimated Implementation Progress** | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** |  | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | **Total amount**  **Planned for the JP** | **Estimated Total amount**  **Committed** | **Estimated Total**  **Amount**  **Disbursed** | **Estimated**  **% Delivery rate of budget** |
| **Output 2.1:**  **Understanding, Tolerance And Respect For Ethnic And Cultural Diversity Incorporated In The National Education Policies** | | 2.1.1 Strengthen capacity of the MoES and its related institutions for incorporating contents related understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity in the secondary education curricula |  |  |  | UNICEF | BED  MoES;  Centre for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution (CHRCR) | 10, 000 | 8,000 | 2,000 | 20% |
| 2.1.2 Create capacity within the existing in-service teacher training system for enforcement of understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity in both primary and secondary education schools |  |  |  | UNICEF | BED  MoES  CHRCR | 500,000 | 356,680 | 143,320 | 29% |
| 2.1.3 Support the Pedagogical Service in the BED (MoES) for introducing and applying criteria related to multiculturalism, understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity in textbooks development and accreditation |  |  |  | UNICEF | BED  MoES  CHRCR | 40,000 | 24,096 | 15,904 | 40% |
| 2.1.4 Support the Department for Advancement of the Education of Minorities in building their capacity to develop policies and programmes for communication and dispute resolution |  |  |  | UNICEF | BED  MoES | 60,000 | 40,874 | 100,874 | 169% |
|  | | **Total** | | | | |  | **610,000** | **429,650** | **262,298** | **43%** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Output 2.2:**  **Mechanisms For Democratic Participation, Good Governance And Dispute-Resolution In The Education Sector Strengthened In 3 Micro-Regions**  **Rate of Delivery:** Funds transferred for Output 2.2: **57,000;** Funds disbursed for Output 2.2: **39,975**  **Estimated % delivery rate: 71%** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme**  **Outputs** | | **Activity** | **YEAR** | | | **UN AGENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **Estimated Implementation Progress** | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** |  | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | **Total amount**  **Planned for the JP** | **Estimated Total amount**  **Committed** | **Estimated Total**  **Amount**  **Disbursed** | **Estimated**  **% Delivery rate of budget** |
| **Output: 2.2: Existing mechanisms for democratic participation, good governance and conflict resolution at all levels of the education sector strengthened in 3 selected micro-regions.** | | 2.2.1 Strengthen capacity (mandate, statute, working protocols, election criteria) of existing governance bodies and structures at schools level (school boards, parents’ councils, students’ organization) |  |  |  | UNICEF | BED  FORUM ZFD  CID  CHRCR | 150,000 | 110,025 | 39,975 | 27% |
| 2.2.2 Support establishment of communication and coordination mechanism between school boards and municipal bodies (councils and inter-ethnic committees) and national structures (MoES, BED) for increased democratic participation and dispute resolution |  |  |  | UNICEF | BED  FORUM ZFD  CID  CHRCR | 23,000 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
|  | | **Total** | | | | |  | **173,000** | **110,025** | **39,975** | **24%** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Output 2.3:**  **Children And Youth Have Opportunities For Interaction And Dialogue In School And The Community**  **Rate of Delivery:** Funds transferred for Output2.3: **378,094;** Funds disbursed for Output 2.3: **176,501**  **Estimated % delivery rate: 47%** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme**  **Outputs** | | **Activity** | **YEAR** | | | **UN AGENCY** | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | | **Estimated Implementation Progress** | | | | | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** | |  | | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | | **Total amount**  **Planned for the JP** | | **Estimated Total amount**  **Committed** | **Estimated Total**  **Amount**  **Disbursed** | | | **Estimated**  **% Delivery rate of budget** | |
| **Output 2.3: Children And Youth Have Opportunities For Interaction And Dialogue In School And The Community** | | 2.3.1 Joint curricular activities in mixed schools (e.g. on subjects such as IT, physical education, civic education, foreign languages) and extracurricular activities (e.g. sport activities, school events, school camps) organized |  |  |  | | UNICEF | | 3 Municipalities;  FORUM ZFD  CID  CHRCR | | 180,000 | | 131,171 | 48,829 | | | 28% | |
| 2.3.2 Support the functioning of community-based youth centers. |  |  |  | | UNICEF | | 3 Municipalities  FORUM ZFD  CID | | 195,000 | | 153,139 | 41,861 | | | 22% | |
| 2.3.3 Promote intercultural dialogue and multiple partnerships through higher education structures (e.g. student clubs , university chairs) |  |  |  | | UNESCO | | Ministry of Education;  UNESCO National Commission  Ministry of Culture  University of Ss. “Cyril and Methodius”  FON  MIT  UNESCO Clubs  School of Journalism and Public Relations | | 239,620 | | 100,230 | 85,811 | | | 36% | |
|  | | **Total** | | | | | |  | | **614,620** | | **565,791** | | | **176,501** | **29%** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Output: 3.1: Local And Religious Leaders And Civil Society Are Better Able To Participate In Dispute-Resolution Processes**  **Rate of Delivery:** Funds transferred for Output3.1: **152,500;** Funds disbursed for Output 3.1: **95,934**  **Estimated % delivery rate: 63%** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme**  **Outputs** | | **Activity** | **YEAR** | | | **UN AGENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **Estimated Implementation Progress** | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** |  | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | **Total amount**  **Planned for the JP** | **Estimated Total amount**  **Committed** | **Estimated Total**  **Amount**  **Disbursed** | **Estimated**  **% Delivery rate of budget** |
| **Output: 3.1: Local And Religious Leaders And Civil Society Are Better Able To Participate In Dispute-Resolution Processes** | | 3.1.1 Identification of local leaders and facilitation of local civic dialogue on topical issues |  |  |  | UNDP | (Implementing Partners to be determined upon end of Procurement process) | 22,000 | 22,500 | 8,603 | 40% |
| 3.1.2 Leadership and communication skills training of local leaders |  |  |  | UNDP |  | 18,500 | 6,000 | 4,200 | 46% |
| 3.1.3 Support for the establishment of public dialogue opportunities on topics relevant to intercultural and interreligious dialogue . |  |  |  | UNESCO | Ministry of Culture;  Commission for Relations among the Religious Communities and Faith Groups  UNESCO National Commission;  UNESCO Clubs | 205,000 | 83,131 | 83,131 | 41% |
|  | | **Total** | | | | |  | **245,500** | **111,631** | **95,934** | **39%** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Output 3.2:**  **Journalists Supported To Practice Culturally And Conflict Sensitive Reporting**  **Rate of Delivery:** Funds transferred for Output3.2: **148,026;** Funds disbursed for Output 3.2: **19,151**  **Estimated % delivery rate: 13%** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme**  **Outputs** | | **Activity** | **YEAR** | | | **UN AGENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **Estimated Implementation Progress** | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** |  | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | **Total amount**  **Planned for the JP** | **Estimated Total amount**  **Committed** | **Estimated Total**  **Amount**  **Disbursed** | **Estimated**  **% Delivery rate of budget** |
| **Output 3.2: Journalists Supported To Practice Culturally And Conflict Sensitive Reporting** | | 3.2.1 Formal and informal education of reporters, editors and media owners on the aspects of the conflict-sensitive reporting. |  |  |  | UNESCO | School of Journalism and Public Relations  Association of Journalists | 220,000 | 26,179 | 19,151 | 9% |
| 3.2.2 Facilitating a 'Community of Interest' among opinion-makers nation-wide on providing conflict-mitigating perspectives |  |  |  |  |  | 17,000 | n/a | n/a | 0% |
|  | | **Total** | | | | |  | **237,000** | **26,179** | **19,151** | **8%** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Output 3.3: Media Support Mechanism Established For Reducing Social Tensions**  **Rate of Delivery:** Funds transferred for Output3.3: **207,000;** Funds disbursed for Output 3.2: **0**  **Estimated % delivery rate: n/a** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme**  **Outputs** | | **Activity** | **YEAR** | | | **UN AGENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **Estimated Implementation Progress** | | | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** |  | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | **Total amount**  **Planned for the JP** | **Estimated Total amount**  **Committed** | **Estimated Total**  **Amount**  **Disbursed** | **Estimated**  **% Delivery rate of budget** |
| **Output 3.3:**  **Media Support Mechanism Established For Reducing Social Tensions** | | 3.3.1 Setting up of an online resource, connected to the Pool of Facilitation Expertise housed in ZELS, with the aim of making a positive contribution to debates on sensitive multicultural and multireligious issues. |  |  |  |  |  | 200,000 | n/a | n/a |  |
| 3.3.2 Support to local media in developing and broadcasting social content programmes and public service announcements that promote harmony and peaceful settlements of disputes |  |  |  |  |  | 200,000 | n/a | n/a |  |
|  | | **Total** | | | | |  | **400,000** |  |  |  | |

**SECTION II: Joint Programme Progress**

The second section of the report is intended to shed light on the major advances and difficulties of the Joint Programme. It also aims to collect information on two important objectives that all joint programmes are contributing towards (interagency work, delivering as One and Development effectiveness as described by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Action Agenda).

1. Narrative on progress, obstacles and contingency measures
2. Please provide a brief overall assessment (250 words) of the extent to which the joint programme components are progressing in relation to expected outcomes and outputs, as well as any measures taken for the sustainability of the joint programme during the reporting period. Please, provide examples if relevant. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

A full, results-based report on outputs and outcomes can be found in Annex 2 of this document. These are the highlights of results achieved by the Joint Programme during the reporting period:

* The Report, “Results of a Participatory Assessment: National and Local Capacities for Strengthening Interethnic Dialogue and Collaboration,” was launched and endorsed formally by all stakeholders of the national and local levels. Thirty-one activities were implemented by eleven organizations as part of a Grant Scheme launched to address some of the issues raised in the Assessment.
* Two Study Visits were organised by the Programme – one with a focus on education and another on governance. The aim of the study visits was to see successful approaches in different places to similar issues and problems as faced in Macedonia. The focus was on policies and mechanisms for implementing multiculturalism, dispute resolution and peace and tolerance and to consider what can be applied in Macedonia. The participants returned to their communities with practical ideas to be implemented within their spheres of work.
* A textbook titled“*Media, Citizens and Intercultural communication*” was published, intended for undergraduate students in Journalism and in Public Relations, for the courses of *Media and Society* and *Intercultural Communication,* as well as to be used as a resource by professional journalists in their culturally- and conflict-sensitive journalism practices*.*
* Over 50 Teachers and 120 students were trained to integrate democratic participation in the school decision-making processes and in the election of school and student boards. This is part of the ‘Democratic Schools’ approach, which aims to ensure that school governance mechanisms (school boards, student and parent councils, student organizations and other school bodies) are transparent and based on democratic principles.
* The work of the Joint Programme was further strengthened by mobilising an additional CHF 100,000 ($US 104,000) from the Swiss Government, as well as consolidated by undergoing a workshop for the technical level on results-based reporting and communication and advocacy and another workshop during which the Monitoring and Evaluation framework was revised.

**Are there difficulties in the implementation? What are the causes of these difficulties? Please check the most suitable option**

b.

UN agency Coordination

Coordination with Government

Coordination within the Government (s)

Administrative (Procurement, etc) /Financial (management of funds, availability, budget revision, etc)

Management: 1. Activity and output management 2. Governance/Decision making (PMC/NSC) 4. Accountability

Joint Programme design

c.

External to the Joint Programme (risks and assumptions, elections, natural disaster, social unrest, etc)

Other. Please specify:

1. Please, briefly describe (250 words) the current difficulties the Joint Programme is facing. Refer only to progress in relation to the planned in the Joint Program Document. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

**Have not encountered major problems that hamper progress in relation to the planned results outlined in the Joint Program Document.**

1. Please, briefly describe (250 words) the current external difficulties (not caused by the joint programme) that delay implementation. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

**Have not encountered major external difficulties that have delayed implementation.**

Please, briefly explain (250 words) the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or mitigate the difficulties (internal and external referred B+C) described in the previous **text boxes b and c**. Try to be specific in your answer.

N/A

1. Inter-Agency Coordination and Delivering as One

The MDG-F Secretariat asks the office of the Resident Coordinator complete this subsection, briefly commenting on the joint programme, providing its perspective from within the broader country context. The aim is to collect relevant information on how the joint programme is contributing to inter-agency work and Delivering as One.

You will find some multiple choice questions where you can select the most appropriate to the case, text boxes to provide narrative information and 2 indicators on common processes and outputs to measure interagency coordination. These indicators have been already used to measure progress on the One UN pilot countries. Please, refer to the examples in the subsection to complete the information requested.

* Is the Joint Programme still in line with the UNDAF? Please check the relevant answer

Yes No

* If not, does the Joint Programme fit into the national strategies?

Yes No

If not, please explain:

What types of coordination mechanisms and decisions have been taken to ensure joint delivery?

Are different joint programmes in the country coordinating among themselves? Please reflect on these questions above and add any other relevant comments and examples if you consider it necessary:

**Joint Coordination Mechanisms & Decisions**

The programme teams of each implementing agency sit together in common premises to allow for better coordination and cross fertilisation between the programme’s components. The team, while having its own office space, also use office space provided by the Government where specifically joint programme meetings with Government partners take place.

A tri-lateral MoU has been developed and agreed between agencies for the common premises and programme services.

An online workspace for the programme team has been established that contains a calendar of activities, news feed, important documents / reports, etc.

*Organisational arrangements*

The Programme Management Team meets weekly to discuss and decide on joint implementation issues.

The JP has a Programme Coordinator to ensure day-to-day coordination and coherence of programme activities.

The heads of UN implementing agencies meet at least every two months to assess progress and to give direction to the PMT.

The PMC responsible for the technical and operational oversight, management and coordination meets bi-annually.

The NSC responsible for the overall programme activities meets annually.

**Other Joint Programmes**

The area of intervention of this MDGF Joint Programme is quite specific and has no overlap with the other Joint Programme area of the UN – domestic violence. However, the programme coordinators are encouraged to share best practices and the RC and RC Office act as a conduit to and between the two programmes.

Please provide the values for each category of the indicator table described below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Current Value** | **Means of Verification** | **Collection methods** |
| Number of managerial practices (financial, procurement, etc) implemented jointly by the UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs. | 0 | 6 | Internal Reporting System | Internal Minutes |
| Number of joint analytical work (studies, diagnostic) undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs. | 0 | 4 | Internal Reporting System | Internal Minutes |
| Number of joint missions undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs. | 0 | 8 | Internal Reporting System | Internal Minutes |

Please provide additional information to substantiate the indicators value (150 words). Try to describe qualitative and quantitative facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

The JP has taken several missions and trainings together, such as on communication, conflict-sensitivity, capacity assessment, as well as gathering other donors on inter-ethnicity in education.

Many field visits are organised jointly among the agencies, and several workshops were organised as a joint activity between agencies.

1. Development Effectiveness: Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action

This subsection seeks to gather relevant information on how the joint programme is fostering the principles for aid effectiveness by having appropriate ownership, alignment, harmonization and mutual accountability in the last 6 months of implementation.

You will find some multiple choice questions where you can select the most appropriate to the case, text boxes to provide narrative information and 2 indicators on ownership ad alignment. These indicators have been used extensively to measure progress on the Paris Declaration. Please, refer to the examples in the subsection to complete the information requested.

**Ownership**: Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions

**Are Government and other national implementation partners involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

Not involved

Slightly involved

Fairly involved

Fully involved

**In what kind of decisions and activities is the government involved? Please check the relevant answer**

Policy/decision making

Management:  budget  procurement  service provision  other, specify

**Who leads and/or chair the PMC and how many times have they met?**

Institution leading and/or chairing the PMC Resident Coordinator and DPM for Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement Number of meetings. 2

**Is civil society involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

Not involved

Slightly involved

Fairly involved

Fully involved

**In what kind of decisions and activities is the civil society involved? Please check the relevant answer**

Policy/decision making

Management:  budget  procurement  service provision  other, specify

**Are citizens involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

Not involved

Slightly involved

Fairly involved

Fully involved

**In what kind of decisions and activities are citizens involved? Please check the relevant answer**

Policy/decision making

Management:  budget  procurement  service provision  other, specify

**Where is the joint programme management unit seated?**

National Government  Local Government  UN Agency  By itself  other, specify

Based on your previous answers, briefly describe the current situation of the government, civil society, private sector and citizens in relation of ownership, alignment and mutual accountability of the joint programmes, please, provide some examples. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

Government fully supportive and involved in the programme through regular meetings, consultations, coordination with and among other government bodies, adopting methodologies and concepts for JP activities. The highest level political leadership has consistently supported JP activities. The Deputy Prime Minister co-chairs the Programme Management Committee and all government counterparts have demonstrated their commitment to the programme through the engagement of senior representatives.

Many of the activities of the JP are fully implemented by civil society organisations.

Citizen involvement has thus far been concentrated on one-way outreach from JP activities, though next stages will seek more input from citizenry through local forums, debates, open days, etc.

1. Communication and Advocacy

Has the JP articulated an advocacy & communication strategy that helps advance its policy objectives and development outcomes?  Please provide a brief explanation of the objectives, key elements and target audience of this strategy, if relevant, please attach (max. 250 words).

Yes No

A draft Advocacy and Communication Strategy was developed. However, it was decided that a full-time UNCT Communications Officer will be hired who will be in charge, above all, of the two UN Joint Programmes in the country. Thus, the principles outlined in the advocacy and communications strategy now compose the Terms of Reference of this person. This was decided as the strongest way to move forward in communicating the messages of the Programme.

A website dedicated to the JP has been finalized and will be operational before the end of January 2011. It will form a part of the UN website, but with its own identity.

Last, one of the major products of the JP to come out during this reporting period, the Capacity Assessment Report, was launched having been translated in 7 languages, including all minority languages – demonstrating a good communication practice and precedent.

What concrete gains are the advocacy and communication efforts outlined in the JP and/or national strategy contributing towards achieving?

Increased awareness on MDG related issues amongst citizens and governments

Increased dialogue among citizens, civil society, local national government in relation to

development policy and practice

New/adopted policy and legislation that advance MDGs and related goals

Establishment and/or liaison with social networks to advance MDGs and related goals

Key moments/events of social mobilization that highlight issues

Media outreach and advocacy

Others (use box below)

What is the number and type of partnerships that have been established amongst different sectors of society to promote the achievement of the MDGs and related goals? Please explain.

Faith-based organizations   Number

Social networks/coalitions   Number 1

Local citizen groups               Number

Private sector Number

Academic institutions Number 2

Media groups and journalist Number

Others (use box below) Number

Informal Civil Society Network on local level in three municipalities formed under JP.

UNESCO Chair to be set up in the University of Ss “Cyril and Methodius,” as well as in the School of Journalism, represent partnerships of a number of academic institutions. Other universities will also participate in JP through established clubs.

What outreach activities do the programme implement to ensure that local citizens have adequate access to information on the programme and opportunities to actively participate?

Focus groups discussions

Household surveys

Use of local communication mediums such as radio, theatre groups, newpapers, etc

Open forum meetings

Capacity building/trainings

Others

**Section III: Millennium Development Goals**

1. **Millennium Development Goals**

The MDG-F main objective is to contribute to progress to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals worldwide. This subsection aims to capture data and information on the joint programmes contribution to 1 or more Millennium Development Goals and targets.

For this purpose the Secretariat has developed a matrix where you should link your joint programme outcomes to 1 or more Millennium Development Goals and Targets. This matrix should be interpreted from left to right. As a first step you should reflect on the contributions that each of the JP outcomes is making to one or more MDGs. Once this linked is established, it needs to be further developed by connecting each joint programme outcome to one or more MDG targets. As a third step you should estimate the number of beneficiaries the JP is reaching in each of the specifics outcomes. Finally you should select the most suitable indicators from your joint programme’s M&E framework as a measure of the Millennium targets selected. Please, refer to the example provided below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MDG 2** | **Joint Programme Outcome 1** | **MDG Target** | **# Beneficiaries reached** | **MDG Indicators** | **JP Indicator** |
| **Goal #2: Achieve Universal Primary Education** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Joint Programme Outcome 2** | **MDG Target 2.A** |  | Indicator | JP Target |
| **Outcome 2:**  Capacity of the national education system to promote and enhance ethnic and cultural diversity strengthened | Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling |  | 2.1 Net enrolment ratio in primary education 2.2 Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary 2.3 Literacy rate of 15-24 year-olds, women and men | - Proportion of ethnic groups in the completion of primary and secondary education.  - Proportion of girls and boys completing primary education, by ethnic background.  - Proportion of girls and boys completing secondary education, by ethnic background.  - No of revised textbooks as per new criteria promoting multiculturalism and inter-ethnic relations |
| **Joint Programme Outcome 3** | **MDG Target** |  | Indicator | JP Target |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Additional Narrative comments**

Please provide any relevant information and contributions of the programme to the MDGs, whether at national or local level.

Please provide other comments you would like to communicate to the MDG-F Secretariat:

**Section 4: General Thematic Indicators**

1. **National capacities to prevent, reduce, mitigate and cope with the impact of violent conflict strengthened**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * 1. **Type/number of new mechanisms (supported by the joint programme) that respond to popular demands/dissatisfaction related to existing and/or potential sources of conflict (i.e. denial of rights, urban violence, discrimination, etc.)**   Applies  Does not apply. if so, please move forward to section 2 | | | | | | |
| Policies  Laws  Plans  Forums/roundtables  Working groups  Dialog clubs  Cooperation agreements  Other, pls. specify: | No. National 2  No. National  No. National 1  No. National 2  No. National 1  No. National  No. National  No. National 1 | | No. Regional  No. Regional  No. Regional  No. Regional  No. Regional  No. Regional  No. Regional | | No. Local  No. Local  No. Local 1  No. Local  No. Local  No. Local  No. Local  No. Local | |
| * 1. **Please briefly provide some contextual information on the above mentioned mechanisms and the country/municipality where it will be implemented** (base line, stage of development and approval, potential impact): * **“Participatory Assessment of National and Local Level Capacities Strengthening Inter-Ethnic Dialogue and Collaboration”**   + - Baseline: None     - Stage of Development: Assessment finalized     - Potential impact: Systemic approach at national and local levels for addressing tensions; same mechanisms to be used for development planning in mixed communities. * **Donor’s coordination meetings on donors’ activities on inter-ethnic issues in education**    + - Baseline: N/A     - Stage of Development: Matrix of activities completed. To be disseminated.     - Potential impact: Improved coordination among donor organizations which have activities related to inter-ethnic relations in education for greater overall impact. * **Working group for policy and programme development for communication and advancement of the inter-ethnic relations in education established within the Ministry of Education and Science as part of the programme.**    + - Baseline: None     - Stage of Development: Established, one meeting.     - Potential impact: Coordination of activities among ministry bodies on inter-ethnic issues. Channel of implementation of JP activities. | | | | | | |
| * 1. **Number of citizens benefiting from the above mentioned mechanisms to channel their concerns:**   Applies  Does not apply | | | | | | |
| Total No. Citizens  Youth under the age of 25 years  IDPs/refugees  other, pls. specify: municipal staff, parents, teachers,... | | Total No. ~900,000 ( % of ethnic groups100%)  Total No. 310,164  Total No  Total No  Total No ~600,000 | | **Total Women Men**  Urban  Urban ~230,000~115,000 ~115,000  Urban  Urban ~450,000 ~225,000 ~225,000 | | **Total Women Men**  Rural  Rural ~80,000 ~40,000 ~40,000  Rural  Rural ~150,000 ~75,000 ~75,000 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * 1. **Number of local and/or community plans for violence prevention implemented targeted to:**   Total No. 0  Youth No.       ( % of ethnic groups     )  Women No.       ( % of ethnic groups     )  Ethnic groups No.  other, pls. specify: No.       ( % of ethnic groups     ) | **Comments** |

1. **National capacities to prevent, reduce, mitigate and cope with the impact of violent conflict strengthened**
2. **Capacity to prevent, reduce, mitigate and cope with the impact of violent conflict strengthened**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * 1. **Number of organizations and individuals with strengthened capacity in the following areas:** |  |
|  |  |
| Violence prevention/conflict  Conflict mediation  Conflict resolution  Resolution and settlement of disputes  Cooperation agreements  Create dialogue | Religion leaders No. 10 ( % of ethnic groups100)  Community leaders No. 10 ( % of ethnic groups100)  Citizens: women #       men No.       ( % of ethnic groups     )  Judges No.       ( % of ethnic groups     )  Policeman No.       ( % of ethnic groups     )  Civil servants No. 6 ( % of ethnic groups100)  Government representatives No. 20 ( % of ethnic groups100)  Youth organizations No. 7 ( % of ethnic groups100)  Community based organizations No       ( % of ethnic groups     ) |

1. **Impact of violent conflict reduced and/or mitigated**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * 1. **Number and type of violent incidents reported in the area of intervention through formal and informal channels:** | **Comments:**  **None.** |
|  |  |
| Social incidents (e.g. riots) No.  Crime (Theft, etc) No.  Ethnic groups related No.  Other, pls. Specify No. |  |

**Annex 1:**



**UNITED NATIONS JOINT PROGRAMME**

***“Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration”***

**LIST OF NGO PARTNERS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Geographical Focus of Work** | **Name of NGO** | **UN Agency** |
|  |  |  |
| Skopje | Centre for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution | UNICEF |
| Skopje | Stranskite jazici – prozorec kon svetot (,,Foreign languages - a window of the world”) | UNESCO |
| National | Visokata skola za novinarstvo I odnosi so javnosta | UNESCO |
| National | Institut za razvoj na zaednicata (IRZ) -Community Development Institute (CDI) - | UNESCO |
| Kicevo | Centar za razvoj na zaednicata - Kicevo | UNESCO |
| Kicevo | Association of Albanian Women in Macedonia | UNDP |
| Kicevo | Civic Association “Dituria”, | UNDP |
| Kicevo | Active of Roma women “Prerodba” | UNDP |
| Kicevo | “DEA” | UNDP |
| Kicevo | “ORT” | UNDP |
| Kicevo | “Gajret” | UNDP |
| Kicevo | “Alliance of blind” | UNDP |
| Kicevo | Women association “Integra” | UNDP |
| Kicevo | NGO ”Center for rural development” | UNDP |
| Kicevo and Struga | Forum ZFD | UNICEF |
| Struga | Women’s Association Struga | UNDP |
| Struga | Association of Egyptian “Esnafot” Struga | UNDP |
| Struga | “Uranija” | UNDP |
| Struga | "Ezerka” | UNDP |
| Struga | “Aureola” | UNDP |
| Struga | “Punkte” | UNDP |
| Struga | “Akva” | UNDP |
| Kumanovo | Centre for Intercultural Dialogue | UNICEF |
| Kumanovo | “Kolo Srpskih Sestara” | UNDP |
| Kumanovo | “Vior” Women Multiethnic Center | UNDP |
| Kumanovo | “Majka” Center, Youth Organization, | UNDP |
| Kumanovo | “Sirma” | UNDP |
| Kumanovo | “Roma Information Center” (part of DROM) | UNDP |
| Kumanovo | Mesecina”, Humanitarian Association of Roma | UNDP |
| Kumanovo | DROM-Kumanovo | UNESCO |
| UNDP |
| Bitola | Mladinski Kulturen centar - Bitola | UNESCO |
| Krusevo | Mladinska alijansa - Krusevo | UNESCO |
| Ohrid | Mladinski sovet - Ohrid | UNESCO |
| Struga | Trening centar za menagment na konflikti - Struga | UNESCO |
| Stip | Detski parlament - Stip | UNESCO |

**ANNEX 2:**

***17 December 2010***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UN logo |  |

***UN Programme to Enhance Inter-Ethnic****Dialogue and Collaboration*

**Report on Results**

July – December 2010

**Programme Duration: August 2009- December 2012**

**Programme Funds: USD $4 Million**

**Donor: Government of Spain through the UN MDG Achievement Fund**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UN Implementing Agencies**   * UNDP * UNICEF * UNESCO | **Implementing partners**   * Secretariat for Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement * Municipalities of Kicevo, Kumanovo and Struga * Ministry of Culture * Ministry of Education and Science * Bureau for Education Development * State Education Inspectorate * Primary and Secondary Schools in the Selected Municipalities * Commission for Relations with the Religious Communities and Faith Groups * University of Ss. “Cyril and Methodius” |

**Results Summary**

**Highlights:**

* The Report, “Results of a Participatory Assessment: National and Local Capacities for Strengthening Interethnic Dialogue and Collaboration,” was launched and endorsed formally by all stakeholders of the national and local levels. Thirty-one activities were implemented by eleven organizations as part of a Grant Scheme launched to address some of the issues raised in the Assessment.
* Two Study Visits were organised by the Programme – one with a focus on education and another on governance. The aim of the study visits was to see successful approaches in different places to similar issues and problems as faced in Macedonia. The focus was on policies and mechanisms for implementing multiculturalism, dispute resolution and peace and tolerance and to consider what can be applied in Macedonia. The participants returned to their communities with practical ideas to be implemented within their spheres of work.
* A textbook titled“*Media, Citizens and Intercultural communication*” was produced, intended for undergraduate students in Journalism and in Public Relations, for the courses of *Media and Society* and *Intercultural Communication,* as well as to be used as a resource by professional journalists in their culturally- and conflict-sensitive journalism practices*.*
* Over 50 Teachers and 120 students were trained to integrate democratic participation in the school decision-making processes and in the election of school and student boards. This is part of the ‘Democratic Schools’ initiative, which aims to ensure that school governance mechanisms (school boards, student and parent councils, student organizations and other school bodies) are transparent and based on democratic principles.
* The work of the Joint Programme was further strengthened by mobilising an additional CHF 100,000 ($US 104,000) from the Swiss Government, as well as consolidated by undergoing a workshop for the technical level on results-based reporting and communication and advocacy and another workshop during which the Monitoring and Evaluation framework was revised.

***Outcome 1: National Systems and Capacities for Inter-Ethnic Cohesion Enhanced***

**Output 1.1 - National confidence building expertise consolidated and operationalised**

The Programme organized four workshops to assist key national and local institutions dealing with the complexity of interethnic life to better address issues that may undermine interethnic cohesion. The focus was on understanding the legal mandates and parameters, as well as improving and creating various tools and approaches to enhance coordination and communication among all of the key stakeholders, including central and local governments, the business community, civil society and media. Ten more complementary activities were developed and will be implemented during the next period.

UNDP’s report, “Results of a Participatory Assessment: National and Local Capacities for Strengthening Interethnic Dialogue and Collaboration,” was successfully launched and endorsed formally by all stakeholders of the national and local levels in partnership with the Secretariat for Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (SIOFA).

**Output 1.2 - Pool of Facilitation Expertise Created within ZELS**

Experts will be trained who can mediate in escalated situations and facilitate dialogue within diverse communities. The strategy and design of the pool of facilitation expertise and resources are in progress. Activities will start during the next reporting period.

**Output 1.3 - Consensus-building community processes in municipalities and micro-regions enhanced**

Inter-Municipal Cooperation Agreements were used by the programme to improve inter-ethnic relations in wider micro-regions by addressing local needs among ethnically diverse municipalities that may not have otherwise had incentives to cooperate on local development matters.

In response to a recommendation that came out of the capacity assessment process, the UNDP launched a Grant Scheme in three target municipalities. Eleven Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) were awarded grants. So far, they have implemented thirty-one activities. These included: a forum on religious diversity and its influence in a multi-ethnic environment; a debate on perceptions of ethnic diversity; a round table on the perspectives of the Ohrid Framework Agreement; a round table on Decentralization as a part of the Ohrid Framework Agreement; a training on facilitation and mediation for the Members of the Commissions for Inter-Community Relations; workshop about development of a programme for CICR, encompassing representatives of the CICR, Neighborhood Local Communities and representatives of CSOs; and many more. The Project Unit team organized two more meetings of the informal networks in the municipalities of Kicevo and Struga, which aim to continuously follow and monitor the progress of dialogue among ethnic groups.

Also in this period, UNDP in partnership and the British Council and with the participation of UNESCO implemented a workshop to provide knowledge to municipalities as they take up decentralized responsibilities, particularly in terms of managing local culture and cultural diversity. The participants learned how to use different approaches and models for management of cultural diversity. This activity encompassed representatives of the central government, local authorities, civil society organizations dealing with culture, directors of museums, members of the commissions for inter-community relations and media.

UNDP organised a Study Tour for a group of stakeholders from central government, local government and civil society. The visit was to the cities of Pécs, Hungary and Timisoara, Romania – identified as positive examples of the inclusion of minority communities into participatory and governance processes at local level. The aim of the study visit was to learn more about the governance approaches in these communities, focusing on policies and mechanisms for implementing multiculturalism, dispute resolution and peace and tolerance and to consider what can be applied in Macedonia. The participants returned to their communities with practical ideas to be implemented within their spheres of work.

***Outcome 2: Capacity of national education system to promote and enhance ethnic and cultural diversity strengthened***

**Output 2.1 - Understanding, tolerance and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity incorporated in the national education policy and curricula, and enforced in schools**

The Bureau for Educational Development (BED) finalized the Concept for textbook development and methodology for textbooks review in line with multiculturalism and other aspects (age appropriate, promotion and respect of the ethnical, religious and gender differences, values of the different cultures, languages, traditions. Workshops on planning and record keeping for around 1000 primary school teachers were held within the frame of Life Skills-Based Education (LSBE) curriculum, through the existing in-service teacher training system supported by the BED.

Following the establishment of the Working Group for strengthening the capacities of the MoES for policy and programme development for communication and advancement of interethnic relations in education in May 2010 -- a part of the capacity development programme on multiculturalism, peace and tolerance in education for national and municipal policy makers – UNICEF led and organized a study visit for national policy makers to Belfast, Northern Ireland . The group comprised of representatives from the Ministry of Education and Science, Bureau for Development of Education, State Educational Inspectorate, municipalities and implementing partners.

An experienced and proven team of professors from Queen’s University, Belfast, were selected to plan the study visit and to provide further in-country capacity development for Macedonian national and municipal policy makers. The participants had a chance to explore education initiatives that have been introduced to build relationships between the main ethno-religious communities (Protestants and Catholics), and between these communities and smaller groups. The national policy makers were also informed of the main interventions with respect to: policy; structural responses; curriculum responses; Local and Global Citizenship education; the core religious education syllabus and a common history curricula; the requirement of all subjects to address to a greater or lesser extend issues of mutual understanding, cultural awareness and citizenship.

In January 2011, the national policy makers along with the experts from Queen’s University will work together to develop and implement national policy and programmes related to multiculturalism and conflict resolution, as well as to establish mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of these programmes.

**Output 2.2 - Existing mechanisms for democratic participation, good governance and conflict resolution at all levels of the education sector strengthened in 3 selected micro-regions**

During the reporting period, students, teachers and parents from selected schools in the targeted municipalities participated in on-going workshops during which approaches to multiculturalism were explored. Over 50 Teachers and 120 students were trained to integrate democratic participation in the school decision-making processes and in the election of school and student boards. This is part of the ‘Democratic Schools’ approach, which aims to ensure that school governance mechanisms (school boards, student and parent councils, student organizations and other school bodies) are transparent and based on democratic principles.

**Output 2.3 - Opportunities for interaction and dialogue created for children and youth in school and the community**

The school based and the community based centers that work with UNICEF actively continued providing extracurricular activities for ethnically mixed groups, such as theatre performances, animation, pottery, photography, journalism, leadership and many more. The extracurricular activities piloted in the workshops held in the 4 primary and 6 secondary selected schools were developed to contribute towards the national education programme and Manual for extracurricular activities.

The municipalities of Kumanovo, Struga and Kicevo allocated municipal premises free of charge for the community based Youth Centers in these cities. The Implementing partner signed a contract in duration of 5 years.

The UNESCO Club at the Community Development Institute engaged youth organizations and municipality representatives in preparations to establish municipal youth councils in Kicevo, Kumanovo and Struga, modeled on successful examples from other communities in the country. Youth councils are designed to be a part of the decision making process in each municipality, representing the views and interests of youth in each community and of all ethnic and social groups.

A call for proposals has been issued for activities in university settings and the three pilot municipalities aiming to develop the capacity of youth CSOs in improving interethnic dialogue and cooperation. Small awards will be supporting CSOs and university Clubs in designing and implementing sustainable structures and programs for multiethnic activities on topics of culture, environment, science, and information and communication technologies.

***Outcome 3: Inter-cultural sensitivity and civic awareness promoted***

**Output 3.1 - Capacity for civic dialogue and civic engagement in development of conflict resolution processes enhanced**

A baseline study on the role of gender and inter-ethnic relations was produced. The study findings will be presented through a forum planned for the next period, with the aim of opening a wider discussion on the role of women in interethnic relations and in local development, including the specific role that women can play through participating in public life at all decision-making levels, dialogue, conflict-sensitive development, and in enhancing interethnic relations through mediation and similar activities. In addition, the forum will provide a platform for sharing other experiences in areas such as social inclusion and community security, including the fight against domestic violence.

The Ministry of Culture is preparing a book about the Second World Conference on Inter-religious and Inter-civilization Dialogue, held in Ohrid last May. Planning is under way for the Second National Youth Conference *Shared Visions.* This event will focus on helping youth leaders to promote diverse, balanced and constructive views and opinions on intercultural and interfaith issues in their communities and the Macedonian society. Amongst other activities, the conference will offer advocacy, media and public relations training for youth from UNESCO Clubs and other organizations participating in the Joint Programme.

**Output 3.2 - Journalists engaged constructively in community dialogue and conflict transformation**

The UNESCO Chair candidate, the School of Journalism and Public Relations, has produced a textbook titled “*Media, Citizens and Intercultural communication.*” This textbook is primarily intended for undergraduate students in Journalism and in Public Relations for the courses *Media and Society* and *Intercultural Communication.* However, itwill also serve active journalists and editors as a comprehensive learning resource from which they can draw recommendations and guidelines related to the role of media in the promotion of intercultural dialogue. The publication of the book was promoted during a round table where media professionals and experts joined efforts to identify the main issues and requirements for professional and culturally sensitive journalism.

**Output 3.3 - Rapid Response Media Mechanism to reduce social tensions created**

A proposal for the Rapid Response Media Mechanism was finalized by the School of Journalism and Public Relations and its partners. The project is planned to be fully developed and a contract signed by the end of January 2010. The Concept and design for the support of local media in developing and broadcasting social content programming is completed.

1. Committed here follows the instructions given for the Results Framework and refers to committed plus disbursed. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Ministry of Local Self-Government, Secretariat for the Implementation of Ohrid Framework Agreement, Agency for Realization of the Minority Rights, Association for Local Self-Government Units (ZELS), National Committee for Interethnic Community Relations [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. attend planning meeting or submit official written opinion [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. training curricula developed: 1 point, 6 training sessions delivered for 60 participants: 1 point, How-To Guide produced: 1 point [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. methodology for monitoring and evaluating drafted: 1 point, M&E officers trained in methodology: 1 point, M&E officers produce first monitoring report: 1 point [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. institution that manages pool contracted: 1 point, experts in pool trained: 1 point, awareness campaign completed: 1 point [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. for all 13 grades in primary and secondary education [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. training curricula developed: 1 point, 1000 participants trained: 1 point [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. school boards, school communities, parents councils, students organizations [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. established: 1 point; needs assessment report with recommendations published: 1 point, at least 5 studies published: 1 point, recommendations published from conference on the role of higher education and the strategy for integrated education: 1 point, curriculum developed for inter-cultural communication and conflict resolution developed: 1 point [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. conferences, forums, round tables, community events, knowledge cafes [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. curriculum developed: 1, all planned resources developed: 1, programme accredited: 1 point [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. contract signed with School of Journalism: 1 point, structure of MRRM designed: 1 point, quarterly media monitoring reports started: 1 point, panel of experts established: 1 point, website online: 1 point [↑](#footnote-ref-13)