

Section I: Identification and JP Status

Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development

Semester: 1-12

Country	Serbia
Thematic Window	Development and the Private Sector
MDGF Atlas Project	
Program title	Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development
Report Number	
Reporting Period	1-12
Programme Duration	
Official Starting Date	
Participating UN Organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * FAO * UNDP * UNEP * UNICEF * UNWTO
Implementing Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management * Ministry of Economy and Regional Development * Tourism Organization of Serbia

Budget Summary

Total Approved Budget

UNEP	\$333,709.00
UNWTO	\$1,026,211.00

FAO	\$1,160,238.00
UNICEF	\$431,018.00
UNDP	\$1,048,824.00
Total	\$4,000,000.00

Total Amount of Transferred To Date

UNEP	\$333,709.00
UNWTO	\$1,026,211.00
FAO	\$1,160,238.00
UNICEF	\$431,018.00
UNDP	\$1,048,824.00
Total	\$4,000,000.00

Total Budget Committed To Date

UNEP	\$10,258.00
UNWTO	\$29,674.00
FAO	\$103,172.00
UNICEF	\$13,632.00
UNDP	\$54,000.00
Total	\$210,736.00

Total Budget Disbursed To Date

UNEP	\$14,518.00
UNWTO	\$270,176.00
FAO	\$166,401.00
UNICEF	\$100,321.00
UNDP	\$126,579.00
Total	\$677,995.00

Donors

As you can understand, one of the Goals of the MDG-F is to generate interest and attract funding from other donors. In order to be able to report on this goal in 2010, we would require you to advise us if there has been any complementary financing provided for each programme as per following example:

Please use the same format as in the previous section (budget summary) to report figures (example 50,000.11) for fifty thousand US dollars and eleven cents

Type	Donor	Total	For 2010	For 2011	For 2012
------	-------	-------	----------	----------	----------

DEFINITIONS

1) PARALLEL FINANCING – refers to financing activities related to or complementary to the programme but whose funds are NOT channeled through Un agencies. Example: JAICA decides to finance 10 additional seminars to disseminate the objectives of the programme in additional communities.

2) COST SHARING – refers to financing that is channeled through one or more of the UN agencies executing a particular programme. Example: The Government of Italy gives UNESCO the equivalent of US \$ 200,000 to be spent on activities that expand the reach of planned activities and these funds are channeled through UNESCO.

3) COUNTERPART FUNDS - refers to funds provided by one or several government agencies (in kind or in cash) to expand the reach of the programme. These funds may or may not be channeled through a UN agency. Example: The Ministry of Water donates land to build a pilot 'village water treatment plant' The value of the contribution in kind or the amount of local currency contributed (if in cash) must be recalculated in US \$ and the resulting amount(s) is what is reported in the table above.

Beneficiaries

Beneficiary type	Targetted	Reached	Category of beneficiary	Type of service or goods delivered
------------------	-----------	---------	-------------------------	------------------------------------

Section II: JP Progress

1 Narrative on progress, obstacles and contingency Measures

Please provide a brief overall assessment (1000 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

Please describe three main achievements that the joint programme has had in this reporting period (max 100 words)

Progress in outcomes

Joint Programme Outcome 1: Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to achievement of Millennium Development Goals

Outcome 1.1: National Rural Tourism Master Plan for Serbia developed and submitted to the Government.

The National Sustainable Rural Tourism Master Plan for Serbia was approved by the Government of Serbia. It comprises a Diagnostic, Strategy, Action Plan and Implementation Plan. All phases of the formulation and approval of the Master Plan were consultative with workshops organized at a national and regional level. The Master Plan is currently being submitted to Parliament for ratification. The National Rural Tourism Master Plan contains the framework for the development of child, youth and family tourism. Child and youth related tourism models were promoted and presented in 2 rounds of workshops and through Grant Scheme 2011 that was completed in the first half of 2012. It is in its Implementation phase by the newly formed National Rural Tourism Unit (MoERD), established in cooperation with NTOS and UNWTO

Outcome 1.2: Rural Development Program Planning: Rural Development Program planning is mainstreamed in Serbia's National policies; National Program for Rural Development for IPARD Axes 2&3 developed and submitted to Government for adoption

The Study on Access to Services of Women and Children in Rural Areas has been completed and published. The study analyses the problems of access to education, social and health care, and it offers the recommendations for solving the problems. The Study contains recommendations for national institutions dealing in key services, such as health, social care and education, as well as on other issues crucial for life quality in rural areas. The Study also contains an IPARD measure (Axis 3, measure code 302, Diversification and development of rural economic activities – sector services). The Study is promoted in target regions, more successfully than at national level.

Outcome 1.3: Investment Mainstreaming: Sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies.

Review of public support to rural tourism at the national level for the period 2008 – 2010 providing important data for activities related to promotion of investment in 2011. During the 2012 programme continued research of all opportunities to enhance public support for the creation of partnerships in rural areas, targeting both national and local decision-makers and other stakeholders. National Corporation for Tourism Development (NCTD), as SIFT focal point within JP, has presented National Investment Strategy in cooperation with UNEP.

The first International Conference on Sustainable Tourism took place in Belgrade, in February 2012. It was organized by the Programme, MoERD, NTOS and largely supported by UNWTO. The aim of this three-day event, which gathered a large number of regional and European experts, consultants and managers, was to explore viable possibilities for sustainable development of tourism, rural in particular. The conference hosted over 250 participants, including high state and UN officials.

Joint Programme Outcome 2: Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders' capacity is improved to deliver services and products in line with national strategies

Outcome 2.1 Capacity developed for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural tourism:

Over 1,000 rural tourism stakeholders were trained through workshops, practical trainings and coaching in programmes mainly concentrating on energy efficiency and

sustainable use of resources, support to local NGOs and other groups in proposal development; mobilizing local and other resources.

The capacity of local and national stakeholders for the development of child and youth educational tourism was improved through constant awareness-raising activities, promoted also by achievements within granted projects.

Partnerships between public, civil and private sectors in four regional stakeholder groups were fostered through all 66 projects granted within Grant Scheme 2011 and executed in the reporting period.

Training cycle on energy efficiency and alternative energy sources started in December 2011 and were continued in 2012. Regional environment studies are in their final phase.

Outcome 2.2 Tourism governance structures enhanced in target regions through dedicated organizations, pilot projects and investment promotions.

Tourism governance organizations are well-defined in the Master plan since it evaluates the potentials in each existing structure and proposes new mechanism for support tourism to be established.

The Guidelines for Tourism Service Providers on the Development of Child and Youth Educational Tourism have been published and disseminated.

The Guidelines for tourism service providers catering to children and pupils are published. The Guidelines defines key categories in child, youth and family tourism and represents the first document of this kind in Serbia. The document opened numerous questions and represents a good basis for constant scaling up;

The Grant Scheme 2011 is in its final phase, most of the projects were completed or will be finished within couple of months. With the additional, Quick-win, projects the granted amount reached almost 550.000 USD. The effects will be measured by the end of the Programme and a substantial impact/improvement is expected result.

Progress in outputs

Governance and Coordination:

- ☐ The PIU retreat was held in March 2012. During the retreat, the participating agencies reflected on previous period and lessons learnt, discussed the detailed plan of activities and defined priorities for 2012 as well as potential follow-up project potential.
- ☐ The eight PMC meeting was held on 26 March 2012 with the participation of all UN agencies and national partners.
- ☐ PIU meetings are held regularly and provide an effective mechanism to jointly plan and execute activities.
- ☐ Meetings of the participating UN agencies (including participation via Skype for non-resident agencies) are held when needed.
- ☐ JP contributes to the monthly NSC letter, which the RC sends to NSC members and participating agencies and national partners, to share information in regards to progress made.

Joint Programme Visibility:

- ☐ Programme Communication and Advocacy Strategy implemented, contributing to the overall effectiveness of the programme.
- ☐ The programme was promoted on several occasions such as International Conference on Sustainable Tourism, Belgrade Tourism Fair 2012, Third International Congress on Rural Tourism, final events and presentations of Programme's grantees and through printed and electronic media.
- ☐ In addition to the media coverage of the visibility events, news pieces on these visibility events have been written and posted on UN Serbia websites.
- ☐ Previously developed visual identity tools (JP logo, letterhead, various presentations, publications) are actively used by the team, beneficiaries and partners.
- ☐ Majority of workshops were organized, mainly in rural tourism households, as part of promotion of upcoming activities in 2012.

Joint Programme Management, Implementation & Operations:

- ☐ All agencies actively participated in the implementation of the Master Plan in accordance with their components. 4 regional rural development centres organised capacity building through trainings and mentoring for strategic and action planning.
- ☐ The cooperation with SIFT focal point progresses well, including organization of Tourism and Business Forum.
- ☐ Regional environmental studies almost completed exploring opportunities and challenges and examining sustainability of tourism development in target regions.

- ☐ Study on access to services in rural areas, barriers to access and potential solutions is completed and published.
- ☐ Revision of local strategies in terms of inclusion of rural tourism initiatives and gender-responsive aspects finalised and work on introducing proposed recommendations almost completed.
- ☐ Joint Call for Proposals for Diversification of Rural Economy through Tourism issued and Grant Scheme 2011 in progress.
- ☐ Framework for the development and stimulation of child-related tourism is shaped through the documents (Master Plan and the guidelines for tourism service providers catering to children and pupils) that are disseminated.

Monitoring and Evaluation:

- ☐ Baseline analysis report has been delivered. The company for collecting the data needed for Monitoring and Evaluation of whole JP is contracted. Key objective is to collect data for M&E and to provide data to national stakeholders for future planning and policies for rural development purposes. The key data that need to be gathered include: Estimate the income generated from rural tourism in 19 target municipalities during 2009 and 2010; Identify the number and quality of functional partnerships for rural tourism in 19 target municipalities until 2010; and analyze the effects that the public investment (national, local and international) had on diversification of economy towards rural tourism in 19 target municipalities.
- ☐ As a part of the preparation of the potential second phase of the Programme a concept of Information Portal was developed followed by a questionnaire for gathering relevant data. Methodology for processing gathered information is being developed.

Measures taken for the sustainability of the joint programme

National and Local Partner Ownership:

The representatives of the national partners have actively participated in organised workshops; collecting the data for policy documents; participated in all PMCs and additional meetings have been organized to share and include national partners in decision-making and implementation processes.

Rural Development Network (RDN):

The Rural Development Network (RDN) has been implementing following actions: organisation of workshops and collect the data for policy documents. RDN also actively participated in the development of a stakeholder database for the target regions.

Local tourism organisations and other local institutions: Key local tourism organizations take active part in data gathering and in participation on most important educational events such as EIAT conference, Green Hotels Forum, International Rural Tourism Congress, International ENAT conference, International Belgrade Tourism fair, Danube floating conference, as well as national and local tourism events.

Are there difficulties in the implementation?

Coordination with Government

Joint Programme design

What are the causes of these difficulties?

Other. Please specify

Briefly describe the current difficulties the Joint Programme is facing

1. Coordination with Government is no longer a cause for difficulty in the project. Still, national implementing partners MoERD and NTOS strongly requested from Programme Implementation Unit to increase the visibility of the Programme and it is being done presently, in close cooperation with C&A Advisor and RCO.

2. Key Statistical data are insufficient for effective monitoring of programme implementation. The Official data from the Serbian Statistical Office are not disaggregated and need

to be updated for 2009/10 and 2011. The real picture on the number of rural tourism service providers, the income generated from the tourism and the levels of partnerships is, therefore, collected and analysed.

Briefly describe the current external difficulties that delay implementation

The decline in living standards will negatively affect tourism in Serbia, this will be demonstrated in 2010 and 2011 statistics:

According GFK extensive regional survey

- ☐ 60 % of the population in Serbia had decline in living standards in Serbia.
- ☐ 20 % of them had a drastic drop in standards.

Given that the Joint Programme was launched in the midst of the economic crisis and faces unforeseen challenges, additional effort and creativity is required to adapt its activities to the difficult economic circumstances.

Explain the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or mitigate the difficulties

b) Actions regarding Coordination with Government and Joint Programme design challenges:

1. Timely and extensive dissemination of information is the key for a positive change:

- ☐ Exchange of ideas at the early planning stage of the planned activities.
- ☐ Factsheet updates (summary information products) circulated to the national partners on a regular basis by the JPM.
- ☐ Communication and exchange of programme information through governance mechanisms (via STRD PMC/NSC meetings and reports);
- ☐ Inclusion in STRD activities, e.g. invitations to special events (grant signing ceremony, certificates for trainings).
- ☐ In-person meetings on key topics as required – establishment and maintenance of professional relationships, fostered by the JPM; meeting reports to be shared with the STRD team.
- ☐ JPM liaises with the Ministries to obtain the contact person and deputy contact person of each of the implementing partners and shares those details with the team and any other relevant stakeholder.
- ☐ Monthly meeting with contact persons from the partner ministries (JPM and POs (with the Pos rotating each month).
- ☐ Establishment and maintenance of professional relationships between STRD “expert” staff with specific agencies.
- ☐ Communication and advocacy strategy provides a platform for all to implement the above-mentioned points.
- ☐ Joint programme already took some actions to overcome communication issues. Efforts have been made on revising of the master plan with national partners, and have shown good results and positive reactions, so this practice will continue.

2. In order to measure the project results and to give recommendations for the further public investments, it is necessary to collect and analyze rural tourism related data in 19 target municipalities. This will enable the evidence based situation and results monitoring and provide up-to-date information to national stakeholders for planning and policy development purposes. Official data from the Serbian Statistical Office need to be disaggregated and updated for 2009 and 2010. The real picture on the number of rural tourism service providers, the income generated from the tourism and the levels of partnerships will be therefore collected and analysed. That is why the revision and inclusion of the new baseline data is needed.

Actions regarding the negative effects of the financial crisis: Potentials for rural tourism to increase revenue for the public and the private sector and other stakeholders are more highlighted in public discussions and events like International tourism fair in Belgrade and International Danube floating tourism conference, Investment Forum.

More than 250 representatives of the national partners, local self-governments, regional and local tourism organisations, NGOs, private rural households, rural tourism associations and LAGs had the opportunity to influence the Master Plan for rural tourism during public discussions regarding the Master Plan. Finally, relevant Government bodies had their say before the Adoption of the Plan.

2 Inter-Agency Coordination and Delivering as One

Is the joint programme still in line with the UNDAF?

Yes true
No false

If not, does the joint programme fit the national strategies?

Yes
No

What types of coordination mechanisms

In order to ensure smooth communication between the PMC and NSC, the PMC for DPS is attended by the Spanish Embassy representative, UN Coordination Officer and SEIO/DACU Representative.

The PMC has rotational chair between the Ministry of Agriculture/FAO and Ministry of Economy and Regional Development /UNWTO. This mechanism proves to function very well.

The horizontal cooperation between STRD and other programmes is most appreciated by donors, particularly in the context of the contribution that STRD and other programmes make to the EU integration processes in the country.

The last PMC meeting was held in Belgrade in March, where main points of discussion were about the reporting on the current status of the programme, especially regarding the grant scheme 2011-2012, improvement plan and planned activities till the end of the programme, as well as communication and advocacy plan. The PMC telephone conference was held by the end of June regarding the approval of the Quick-win Projects.

The National Steering Committee worked and communicated by e-mail during the reporting period (approving numerous documents/requests submitted to it). The last NSC meeting took place in June 2011. The NSC appreciated the progress and value brought in by the three MDG F JPs and in particular the contribution that the programmes bring to the EU integration processes. It is not expected for another NSC meeting to take place before autumn, as parliamentary, local and presidential elections were held in May, and the new government is expected to be formed in July. National ownership promoted through the JPs is seen to pave the way for the forthcoming decentralized implementation modality to be put in place on the way to the EU integration.

Regular meetings for the MDG F JPM and UN RC and RCO are held regularly and communication/ cooperation is maintained.

JPM takes part at UNCT meetings and other related activities.

STRD was given great visibility during the International Conference “Sustainability of Rural Tourism – Defining Success of Tomorrow”, held from 22-24 February 2012, and the Tourism Fair in Belgrade, as well as through Grant Scheme 2011-2012. The quality of STRD work and presentation of their activities was most appreciated by all partners, including Spanish Embassy.

Draft proposal for the continuation of the JP Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development (phase 2) has been completed based on the participatory approach and contributions from UNDP, UNEP, UNWTO and the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development.

Please provide the values for each category of the indicator table 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 MDF-F JPs	2			Online submissions
Number of joint analytical work (studies, diagnostic) undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs	Strategic rural tourism development document for Serbia		Published on the MoERD website	Surveys , interviews
Number of joint missions undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs	Regional Conferences :2		Internal reports	Internal surveys

The key statistical data for rural tourism in Serbia are missing and the Programme is trying to find a solution to the problem. The problem is more severe because the selected 19 municipalities in Serbia cannot be representative of the whole Serbian population. However, the Programme will continue in gathering data jointly.

Coordination between the Agencies in the Programme in gathering data for different policy documents have so far been one of the key successes in the Programme implementation.

3 Development Effectiveness: Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action

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

Not Involved false
Slightly involved false
Fairly involved false
Fully involved true

In what kind of decisions and activities is the government involved?

Policy/decision making

Who leads and/or chair the PMC?

Institution leading and/or chairing the PMC: UNWTO, MoERD, FAO, rotating.

Number of meetings with PMC chair

Number of meetings: 6

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

Not involved false
Slightly involved false
Fairly involved false
Fully involved true

In what kind of decisions and activities is the civil society involved?

Management: service provision

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

Not involved false
Slightly involved false
Fairly involved false
Fully involved true

In what kind of decisions and activities are the citizens involved?

Management: service provision

Where is the joint programme management unit seated?

National Government

Current situation

Key points in relation to ownership to be mentioned are the following:

National ownership

- ☐ All national implementing partners are members of the JP PMC.
- ☐ The Government of Serbia – through the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development, the Ministry of Agriculture, Trade, Forestry and Water Management, and the National Tourism Organization of Serbia - is included into all aspects of implementation of the JP.
- ☐ Rural Development Council established.
- ☐ The JP Manager regularly liaises with the national implementing partners.

Regional and local ownership

- ☐ Rural Development Network as well as local Tourism Organizations actively participated in programme implementation through various activities

4 Communication and Advocacy

Has the JP articulated an advocacy & communication strategy that helps advance its policy objectives and development outcomes?

Yes true
No false

Please provide a brief explanation of the objectives, key elements and target audience of this strategy

The JP has articulated a communications and advocacy strategy, outlining 4 most important objectives

- ☐ Guide JP Communications internally among partner agencies to support JP implementation.
- ☐ Provide guidance and quality assurance for JP external communication in order to ensure consistent and appropriate visibility for JP activities, and to support the creation and maintenance of positive and successful relationships with STRD stakeholders.
- ☐ Outline JP communication activities' framework to support the achievement of programme outputs and outcomes.
- ☐ Provide the basis for co-ordinate advocacy action among all JP partners and team members, utilizing advocacy opportunities and resources to help achieve the positive change identified, contributing to advocacy around the achievement of JP goals and MDGs.

The JP Communication and Advocacy Strategy contains a matrix on stakeholder communication, which outlines the stakeholder groups, communication goals, and communication tools and processes to be used; detailed guidelines on visibility of the JP and C&A events and products; and the framework for the implementation of the C&A activities over the course of the JP as well as a template for quarterly C&A work plans. The Communication and Advocacy Analyst works closely with the PIU team and other partners (see Joint Programme Visibility under the 'Progress section above). Some aspects of enhanced communication include the following:

1. Clear and effective visual identity of the JP,
2. Targeted promotional activities at the local, national and international levels,
3. Media presence in the local and national media,
4. Partnership building with relevant organizations.

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

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?

Faith-based organizations

Social networks/coalitions

Local citizen groups 20

Private sector 17

Academic institutions	1	
Media groups and journalist		7
Other	19	

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?

Household surveys
 Use of local communication mediums such radio, theatre groups, newspapers
 Open forum meetings
 Capacity building/trainings
 Others

Most important region based events

Section III: Millenium Development Goals

Millenium Development Goals

Additional Narrative Comments

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

At the national level

- The Master Plan for Sustainable Rural Tourism Development targets the following achievement of the MDGs: to reduce poverty, achieve gender equality, foster sustainable development and a Global Partnership for Development.
- The creation and implementation of the Master Plan for rural tourism should ensure that rural development contributes to the improvement of living conditions of the rural population, primarily of women and children and to create opportunities for job creation in rural communities.
- Introducing two sets of measures of the Axis 2 and Axis 3 related to nature protected areas and sustainable environmental management connected to the farming sector and tourism and rural tourism development as a component of the rural economy diversification (on-farm and rural community based) into the Serbian IPARD plan.
- Providing input to build capacities on the Governmental level to deal with decision making for rural development on the inter-ministerial level.
- In order to support rural development, contributes to both outcomes that will be achieved only through cooperation between the partners on the national and on the local level and capacity building for local level to be able to channel and lobby for their interest with governing structures and cultivate community interests in rural development through local partnerships.
- The creation of strategy guidelines for securing and leveraging public-private partnerships and provision of strategic investment training for target group of public decision-makers and private investors.
- Partnerships for development and fight against poverty are the cornerstone of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This commitment embedded in MDG 8 calls for partnerships between governments, civil society, private sector and other stakeholders to develop and implement strategies that would improve the quality of living for children, women and men in rural areas.

At the local level:

- Contributing through capacity building for local stakeholders, which should provide services to local beneficiaries of rural development support programmes (national and IPARD).
- Provide support through variety of trainings specified in programme document
- Thought grant schemes to all local stakeholders ready to work in the partnership
- Institutional and governance structure of rural tourism development.
- Market-oriented products.
- Sustainable quality of tourism services.

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

Section IV: General Thematic Indicators

1 Promote and support national and local policies and programmes in favor of enterprise development

1.1 Number of laws, policies or plans supported by the Joint Programme related to the advancement of enterprises (including agro industry)

Policies

National	2
Local	19

Laws

National	1
Local	-

Strategies

National	1
Local	66

1.2 Please briefly provide some contextual information on the law, policy or plan and the country/municipality where it is going to be implemented

- The development of the National Rural Tourism Master Plan will synchronize, clarify and unify all existing local plans and strategies.
- The creation of the IPARD plan will enable the access to IPARD resources.
- The Public Private Partnership Guidance will merge efforts of both Ministries in regards to creation of partnerships.
- 19 local, municipal and regional strategies will be revised with regards to tourism and gender.

1.3 Number of entrepreneurs and/or entities that the law, policy or strategy directly affects

Farmers

Total	1,039,886
Urban	
Rural	1,039.886

Entrepreneurs

Total
Urban
Rural

Micro enterprises

Total	300
Urban	
Rural	300

Small enterprises

Total	350
Urban	
Rural	350

Medium enterprises

Total	20
Urban	
Rural	20

Large enterprises

Total
Urban
Rural

Finanacial providers

Total
Urban
Rural

Business development providers

Total
Urban
Rural

Other, Specify

Total 1,040,556

Urban

Rural 1,040,556

Agricultural/Farming enterprises

1.4 Please indicate the sector of focus of the law, policy or plan

Agro-industry

Tourism

1.5 Government's budget allocated to support enterprise development before the implementation of the Joint Programme

National Budget total public support for tourism in 2009 was EUR 21,702,759 (USD 30,221,390)

Total Local Budget(s) Not available

1.6 Variation (%) in the government's budget allocated to programmes or policies on enterprise development from the beginning of the joint programme to present time

National Budget

% Overall

% Triggered by the Joint Programme

Local Budget

% Overall

% Triggered by the Joint Programme

2 Promote and support national and local policies and programmes in favor of enterprise development

2.1 Type and number of programmes or interventions supported by the joint programme aiming to improve enterprises' capacities, competitiveness, and / or access to market:

Technical Assistance

Total 66
Microenterprises
SME
Farms
Cooperatives
Other

Business Development Services

Total
Microenterprises
SME
Farms
Cooperatives
Other

Access to finance

Total
Microenterprises
SME
Farms
Cooperatives
Other

Certification

Total
Microenterprises
SME
Farms
Cooperatives
Other

Other, Specify

Total
Microenterprises
SME
Farms
Cooperatives
Other

2.2 Total number of individuals directly assisted through those interventions

Technical Assistance

Farmers	22
Entrepreneurs	
Employees	
Other	260
Women	126
Men	134

Business Development Services

Farmers
Entrepreneurs
Employees
Other
Women
Men

Access to finance

Farmers
Entrepreneurs
Employees
Other
Women
Men

Certification

Farmers

Entrepreneurs
Employees
Other
Women
Men

Other, Specify

Farmers
Entrepreneurs
Employees
Other
Women
Men

2.3 What impacts have these interventions had?

Higher quality of products and services
Access to new markets: national
Access to new markets: International
Aggregation and integration of small producers

3 Creating or strengthening organizations and partnerships to contribute to enterprise development and competitiveness

3.1 Type and number of organizations created or strengthened

Clusters

Total
Participating Business
Total participating individuals
Participating men
Participating women

Cooperatives

Total

Participating business

Total participating individuals

participating men

participating women

Farmers Associations

Total

Participating business

Total participating individuals

participating men

participating women

Business groups

Total

participating business

Total participating individuals

participating men

participating women

Other, Specify

Total 31

Participating business

Total participating individuals 1,100

participating men 670

participating women 430

Rural development network, Tourist organizations, High schools

3.2 Number of target enterprises who realize a financial benefit as a result of the joint programme's contribution

Clusters

Total

Participating Business

Total participating individuals

participating men

participating women

Cooperatives

Total

participating business

Total participating individuals

participating men

participating women

Farmers Associations

Total

participating business

Total participating individuals

participating men

participating women

Business groups

Total

participating business

Total participating individuals

participating men

participating women

Other, Specify

Total

participating business

Total participating individuals

participating men

#participating women

[illegible]

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
1.1. National Rural Tourism Master Plan for Serbia developed and submitted to the Government	Outcome Indicators -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.	Baseline: 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	SRTMP: National partners and Inter-ministerial Group submitted SRTMP to the Government.	Activities related to the dissemination of the Master Plan and promotion of its implementation have continued both as part of MDGF activities through the support of the organization of an International Rural Tourism Conference hosted by the Government of Serbia, and, through direct initiatives taken by the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development and the National Tourism Organization of Serbia.	Inter-ministerial working group meeting minutes & attendance. Complete deliverables for all Master Plan components. Progress reports working group and contractor. Workshops/presentations attendance records. Surveys of databases.	Annual Monitoring	. Lead Agency: UNWTO Contributing Agencies: UNICEF, UNEP, FAO Partner: MERD Inter-ministerial working group, led by chairperson	Risks -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
		indicators for youth are not defined and means of their regular collection not identified. Indicators for youth labour market, youth migration and social protection not integrated into DevInfo database system.						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. Assumptions -No major institutional change of any partner occurs during the implementation of the project.
1.2. Rural Development Program Planning: Rural Development Program planning is mainstreamed in Serbia	-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	Baseline: IPA financial envelope 2007-2013: €10.2 billion (all candidate countries).	-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-	UNDP supported organization of Sustainable Tourism Conference with emphasis on rural tourism (22-24 February, Belgrade). Globally recognized speakers and most prominent leaders in tourism industry presented topics such as product	Complete deliverable of IPARD Axes 2 & 3 measures submitted to Government. Workshops/presentations/meetings/attendance reports. Working Group(s) meeting minutes & attendance.	Annual Monitoring	Lead Agency: FAO Contributing Agencies: UNICEF Working group, led by chairperson. Partner:	-The commitments taken at policy level are executed. -There is a reliable and timely flow of information and

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>representatives included in development of Rural Development Program are representing rural women.</p> <p>-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.</p>		<p>Conditions Study:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>development, local economic development in the field of tourism, marketing and promotion. They were focused on the opportunities Serbia and countries in the region may have in near future.</p> <p>STRD participated in the thematic gathering “Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development – Tourism in Protected Areas”, held on 26-27 April 2012, at the “National Park Tara” Visitors’ Centre. The aim of thematic gathering was to present the working models in the framework of the STRD represented in 19 municipalities of the regions where the programme is being implemented, and to assess the possibilities of application of</p>			MATFWM	<p>data among the partners and within the working group.</p> <p>-No changes in roles and responsibilities of partners, contributing local organizations.</p> <p>Existing obligatory system of charging for rural tourism services via intermediary (travel agents and LTOs) changed, rural households allowed to charge directly to guests.</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>lessons learned in other regions of Serbia, particularly in the Western Serbia region.</p> <p>Programme team participated on the Third International Rural Tourism Congress, which was held May 23 - 26 in Osijek. Specialized topics, good practice examples and the "Quo Vadis, European Rural Tourism?" round table, were main characteristics of this Congress and contributions of <i>STRD</i> were well received, lessons learnt accepted as relevant for the whole region.</p> <p>New plan of activities for capacities building for Inter ministerial group for 2012 has been developed. Activities launching has been planed after</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
				establishment of new Government, most likely in October.				
1.3. Investment Mainstreaming: Sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies.	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 Master Plan. -Number of tourist destinations (municipalities) receiving public investment. -M&E strategy and indicators developed and adopted by Government for Rural Development Fund & Fund for Tourism Development. -Amount of MAFWM funds dedicated to support rural tourism. -Number and structure of users of MAFWM funds. -Ratio of MAFWM fund beneficiaries coming from the JP target regions (number of	2008 public tourism investment: €50M. 2009 public tourism investment: €22M. <i>Due to the complexity of calculating 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</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 JP. 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. SIFT Network: National focal point established for Sustainable	Analysis of the public budget lines that refer to tourism in order to track trends in the last 4 adopted budgets, budget revisions and expenditure reports (for 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011) for the Republic of Serbia, Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and selected public enterprises was done. The objective of this analysis was to inform policy-making regarding the diversification of rural economy through development of tourism. All documents necessary for the analysis (approved government budgets, budget revisions, expenditure reports,	Copies of project payments and delivery receipts through public investment. Reports & public records of investments. Reports from M&E monitoring agency on fund investments. Report on investment workshop	Annual Monitoring	Lead Agency: UNDP Contributing Agencies: UNEP Partner: MERD Local agent ultimately tasked with Government investment M&E. UNEP/UNDP	Risks economic shocks shift. -National institutions fail to agree or cooperate on activities. -Private, public and/or civil society sectors are reluctant to cooperate. Assumptions -No major institutional change of any partner occurs during the implementation of the project. -There is a reliable and timely flow of information and data among the partners and

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>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>(USD 68.380.302) and in 2009 it was EUR 21.702.759,22 (USD 30.221.390)</i></p>	<p>Investment and Finance in Tourism (SIFT) Network.</p> <p>Investment Monitoring & Evaluation Strategy:</p> <p>Formal process installed to feed lessons learned from Outcome 2 into public tourism investments.</p>	<p>detailed programmes adopted by the Government separately for some subsidies and funds etc.) were collected. Budget lines relevant for tourism based on functional specification code and research of budget lines likely to contain tourism-related expenditures was identified. Also, trends throughout the 4 years were identified.</p> <p>SIFT focal points activities which are finalized:</p> <p>- Study that analyses address how Serbian investments and policy reforms provide the mechanisms and the financing for the reconfiguration of businesses, infrastructure and institutions, and the adoption of sustainable consumption and</p>				<p>within the working group. 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
				production processes; - Advocacy and communication strategy to inform policy decisions on investments in the tourism sector including web portal for available tourism investments opportunities in English, Serbian, Italian, Spanish, etc; - Identification and establishment of a Serbian sustainable tourism investment advisory group; - Foster dialogue between national actors in the Serbian tourism sector and potential investors to promote sustainable investments in the sector.				
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.								
2.1. Capacity	Outcome Indicators: Number of projects developed as	-Rural Development	- Local Action Groups: Capacity of public,	Publication "Local capacity building for	Training attendance records, tabulated &	Annual Monitoring	Contributing Agencies:	Risks Political and/or

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
developed for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural development	<p>a result of JP capacity building, mentoring support.</p> <p>Number of new products developed and marketed.</p> <p>Visitor satisfaction levels.</p> <p>Increase in the training participants' income from rural tourism activities.</p> <p>Output Indicators:</p> <p>Number of LAGs established and trained.</p> <p>Number of tourism stakeholders trained (with exam based certificates, where applicable), disaggregated by gender and public vs. private sector.</p> <p>Number of local development strategies that include rural tourism.</p> <p>Number and type of different training courses provided over life of JP.</p>	<p>Network is existing & functional.</p> <p>-Projects supported through public funds are not accessible for persons with disabilities.</p> <p>-Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management provides grants for rural women's NGOs.</p> <p>-Tourism Governance Organizations do not exist in Serbia.</p>	<p>private and civil society sector stakeholders strengthened to enable initiation 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 municipalities have included sustainable rural tourism</p>	<p>rural development aimed at tourism promotion”, has been finalized and printed in February 2012. This publication/report was written to present the results of the Programme “Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development”. It will benefit the participants of the Programme, the implementation partners, but also all citizens of the Republic of Serbia who are interested in the development of tourism. This report present the activities conducted within the Programme „Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development“, the purpose of which was to build local capacities for rural development aimed at the promotion of tourism.</p>	<p>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>UNWTO, FAO, UNEP, UNICEF</p> <p>Partners: MERD & MAFWM, by output level.</p> <p>Programme activities, results, participation, information tracking: UNDP</p>	<p>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 diversification of rural economy,</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>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 100 different organizations, architecture &</p>	<p>In order to achieve the above mentioned goal, a special programme was designed and implemented, consisting of four components:</p> <p>Trainings aimed at strengthening local capacities for the development of rural tourism, which were attended by 638 entrepreneurs, representatives of tourism organizations and the non-governmental sector.</p> <p>Allocation of non-refundable financial assets for projects contributing to the development of rural tourism, which involved more than 450 direct beneficiaries.</p> <p>Revision of local development strategies in 19 local self-government units in order to include</p>				<p>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>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 active stakeholders in Tourism Master Plan Implementation.</p>	<p>measures for tourism promotion in these strategies. Study trips to EU member states in order to learn about their experiences in the development of rural tourism.</p> <p>A workshop on Sustainable Tourism Principles for Rural Tourism Development in Serbia was organized in Belgrade, on 21st February 2012. This training was designed for public, private and NGO-based participants active in Serbian rural tourism including travel & transportation, accommodation, food and beverage, handicraft, planning, finance, administration, and community networks, among others. 12 workshops on Energy efficiency 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
			<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>renewable energy and 12 workshops for sustainable resource management as a precondition for sustainable rural tourism were organized between January and July.</p> <p>Participants were, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Economy and Regional Development representatives - Local municipality public officials in charge of environmental, construction, urbanism - Local authority representatives - Local tourism organization representatives - Rural tourism providers - Civil society and NGO representatives - Students - Hoteliers 				

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
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chambers of commerce representatives - Farmers -Agricultural extension services representatives. <p>Total number of participants was 569 (Central Serbia: 168; Eastern Serbia: 116; South Banat: 109; Lower Danube Region: 176). Workshops were supported by regional and local media.</p> <p>The workshops on Energy efficiency and renewable energy as a precondition for sustainable rural tourism included the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Legislative in the European Union and in the Republic of Serbia; - Funding opportunities and the project implementation in this sector; - Energy management and the typical 				

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>measures in the tourism sector; - The contemporary energy technologies in the tourism sector with examples of good practices. One of the project's objectives was to train local community stakeholders of energy exploitation influence on the environment, and of the importance of sustainable energy management and alternative energy sources. The objective of the workshops on <i>"Sustainable Resource Management as the Precondition to Sustainable Tourism"</i> was a demonstration of possibilities to increase competitiveness and to increase negative environmental impacts at the same time, by implementing measures for waste</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>management, water and energy savings via low-costs/no-cost opportunities and voluntary instruments for environmental protection. Participants presented main activities of their organizations, problems regarding environmental pollution and current practice in resource management.</p> <p>Recruitment process for started for following FAO activities: Provide capacity building and Training-of-Trainers for RDN to serve as outreach & implementation tool to i) promote Ministry programs & IPARD; ii) support and mentor local NGOs and other groups in local initiatives and proposal development; iii)</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>facilitate and promote local partnerships; iv) motivate and mobilize local partners for LAG development; v) provide inputs for policy changes at the national level. FAO team provides support for development of projects in order to complete Grant Scheme.</p> <p>Two sets of trainings for Branding of products and regions completed. 4 branding initiatives have been developed, one national, one interregional, one regional and one local initiative which will be further developed through Grant Scheme.</p> <p>Opening of “Srpska Magaza” (one of 2010 grants) supported including presentation of projects and grantees from both</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
				2010 and 2011. Draft Terms of references developed for trainings in Organic production and ECEAT certification. Recruitment started and trainings will be delivered in September.				
2.2 . Tourism governance structures enhanced in target regions through dedicated organizations, pilot projects, investment promotion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Number of TGOs established and trained based on needs assessment and with attention to gender and PPP. -Amount of public and private investment leveraged through JP pilot projects and investments. -Guidelines/standards for schools and tourism service providers catering for children submitted to 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 	<p>Rural Development Network is existing & functional.</p> <p>-Tourism Governance Organizations do not exist.</p> <p>Statistical offices of the republic of Serbia ,Local tourism organisation and regional rural development network offices</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 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.</p>	Process of revision of local development strategies with focus on tourism has been finished. Final reports for each of 19 Programme participating municipality with recommendation for improvement of tourism aspect in local development strategies have been finalized. Final reports, with recommendation emphasized, will be submitted to each municipality in the following period.	Training attendance records, tabulated & recorded in M&E system. Copies of project payments and delivery receipts.	Annual Monitoring	<p>Contributing Agencies: UNWTO, FAO, UNEP, UNICEF</p> <p>Partners: MERD & MATFWM</p> <p>Programme 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
	specify rural women as beneficiary.	are limited to obtaining the data needed	-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, 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	5 projects aiming Diversification of Rural Economy through Tourism were supported through call for proposal. 5 NGOs in partnership with public and private sector were granted and these partnerships are very important for establishment of LAGs. Grant projects were selected in the second half of 2011, and were implemented in the first half of 2012. Grant project are in the final phase of implementation, and will be finished by the end of June/beginning of July 2012. During the implementation of grants, in the period of 6 months, PIU team has regularly monitored all 5 grantees. Second tranche of funds has been paid to grantees upon submission, and				

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
			developed through child- , family-, and school-centred tourism	<p>approval of quarterly narrative and financial reports submitted in April/May 2012.</p> <p>Five of six projects selected through the Grant Scheme within the thematic window Educational Tourism based on Active Learning have been successfully implemented and finalized. These include:</p> <p><i>Educational Adventure</i> by Knjazevac Homeland Museum,</p> <p><i>Banat Diversity</i> (Now I Can, I Know and I Want) by Vrsac Red Cross,</p> <p><i>Magical Village</i> Ethno-Eco School by Kreativa CA, Mionica,</p> <p><i>Camp of Diligent Hands</i> (Paleznica and Brankovina, Synergy of Knowledge and Skills) by Sava Kerkovic Elementary School</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>from Ljig, and</p> <p><i>Open Village School</i> (Village School Open for its Surroundings) by Ivo Andric Elementary School from Pranjani.</p> <p>One project - <i>Miraculous Djerdap Treasures</i> (Educational Tourism) by Svetozar Radic Elementary School from Tekija) has been extended because of the unfinished works at the school building reconstruction.</p> <p>UNICEF distributed the funds through the Friends of Children of Serbia who have become an implementing partner that actively participate in all project activities and events. The FCS is the oldest civil society organisation in Serbia and has a long tradition of successful cooperation with</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>UNICEF. It also has a network in most of the municipalities in Serbia and is an excellent partner for promotion of the activities.</p> <p>All the projects include a school – either as a lead or an implementing partner. The importance of partnerships and participation of wide community has been recognised in all projects, so they include various institutions: civil society organisations, museums, Red Cross branches, local self-government institutions, private sector representatives, etc.</p> <p>What is also common for all these projects is the high quality of educational programmes these tourism sites offer. Producing the</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>programmes which affect the quality of education, recreational learning, school in nature and other forms of out-of-classroom learning was one of the objectives of piloting educational tourism. The activities and workshops vary from practicing archaeology, conservation, pottery and painting on silk and glass to journalism, puppet theatre play preparation, learning chess and traditional meteorology, history and heritage, etc. All the workshops, although entertaining, are connected with school curricula and they enable the children and youth to learn through active participation in the processes and to develop their functional knowledge. The destinations</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>combine education and entertainment and pilot edutainment in Serbia.</p> <p>The destinations combine the models defined in the Sustainable Rural Tourism Master Plan (farm school, edutainment centre, discovery centre, thematic centres, etc.).</p> <p>The projects have also produced new facilities, or gave old facilities new purposes. The illustration of the first case is building the Magic Village, a village fit for children where most of the workshops are conducted. The example for the second case is turning an old and abandoned village school on Stara Planina into a museum with interactive workshop of reconstruction of a school class from the</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>past, thus setting up the Museum of Education on Stara Planina.</p> <p>All the projects have organised promotional events for children and adults– 2 events monthly, from April to June. The events included various forms of awareness raising activities: press conferences, round tables and presentations of all six destinations.</p> <p>About 500 children and 200 adults (mostly school representatives, but numerous other actors from all three sectors and parents) participated in promotional events.</p> <p>The participants came not only from Serbian schools, but from Poland, Slovenia and Macedonia.</p> <p>A press conference and the national</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>presentation was organized in the Tourism Organisation of Serbia in May. This event initiated a series of newspaper and internet texts and TV and radio reports (described in the Visibility and Communication chapter).</p> <p>Apart from the promotion events, all the destinations have been tried out with children and youth who have shown high level of satisfaction.</p> <p>Evaluation conducted with the teachers who brought the groups showed not only satisfaction and highly rated the destinations and activities, but have began to recommend the sites for carrying out all forms of school tourism.</p> <p>Regarding the progress in acquiring the</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>approval to perform expanded operations by the MoES, one school (Mosa Pijade from Gudurica) has received the approval to perform expanded operations by the Secretariat for Education, Administration and National Communities of Vojvodina. Another school (Dimitrije Todorovic Kaplar from Knjazevac) has had this approval before the project was initiated. Other 4 schools are still waiting for the approval due to complex procedures.</p> <p><i>After the Guidelines for the Development and Realisation of Tourism Services for Children and Youth were completed, it was agreed with the National Tourism Organisation of Serbia</i></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>that a brochure-like Tool Kit (booklet) convenient for promotion of the concept of educational tourism in rural areas should be produced.</p> <p>The Tool Kit named <i>Child and Youth Educational Tourism in Rural Areas</i> has been prepared and promoted at the February International Tourism Fair. This document familiarises the readers with the idea of child and youth tourism, educational tourism, the role of school in the process and the models this tourism niche can be developed through. It also includes the suggestion of the labelling system for child-specific destinations.</p> <p>The Tool Kit contains a</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>CD with the Guidelines for the Development and Realisation of Tourism Services for Children and Youth, as well as Slovenia and Italy study tour reports, the Master Plan, and several other documents in the field of tourism and education.</p> <p>The Tool Kit was published and printed (5.000 copies in Serbian and 1.000 copies in English) in cooperation with the National Tourism Organisation of Serbia. Out of total of 6.000 copies, 3.000 contain a CD with the Guidelines and other documents.</p> <p>After the promotion of the idea of child and youth educational tourism in rural areas through interactive workshops at the Rural</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>Tourism stand which included over 100 guest children from Belgrade schools and 30 host children included in the projects (described in Visibility and Communication chapter), the Tool Kit was distributed to all local tourism organizations in Serbia.</p> <p>Guidelines/standards for schools and tourism service providers catering for children submitted to the Ministry of Education for endorsement by the end of JP.</p> <p>A Rural Tourism Task Force has been set up within the Ministry which will undertake the role of the tourism governance organization. It will be responsible for spearheading the implementation of the</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>Rural Tourism Master Plan by coordinating activities and stakeholders at the national, regional and local level. It implements activities according to a workplan developed jointly between UNWTO and the MERD. Grants scheme has been launched successfully. In the case of UNWTO, 37 grants were approved. These are expected to be completed in their entirety by September 2012. MERD and NTOS were actively involved in the process, from the conceptualization of the call for grants, to the MERD Inspectors reviewing projects with an infrastructure component, to NTOS which is responsible for the monitoring and evaluation of grants.</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
				Grant scheme trough Ministry of Agriculture, Trade, Forestry and Water Management ongoing. Ministry has been supported in Business Plan evaluation. FAO consultant has been engaged to improve Business planning for Grant winners. First control and monitoring of grant projects conducted. Remain budget for grants committed for 8 projects of branding initiatives.				

c. 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.
- Estimated % delivery rate: Funds disbursed over funds transferred to date.

JP Outcome 1: Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism is developed and contributes to the achievement of Millennium Development Goals.											
Please highlight the rate of delivery for each joint programme's output:											
a. Less than 30% b. between 31%-50% c. between 51-60 d. between 61%-70% e. between 71%-80 f. More than 80%											
Output	Activity	YEAR 3		UN Agency	Responsible Party	Source of Funding	Budget Description	Amount Planned	Estimated amount Committed	Estimated Amount Disbursed	Estimated % Delivery rate
		Q1	Q2								
1.1. National Rural Tourism Master Plan for Serbia developed and submitted to the Government.											
1.1.1 National Rural Tourism Master Plan for Serbia developed and submitted to the Government. *Point 1.1.1 summarizes all financial data regarding UNWTO activities!	1.1.1.b. Conduct permanent information and decision making activities with all stakeholders and ensure incorporation of studies by other participating UN agencies (1.1.2-4 and 1.2.1).			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	f	15,711	8,000	41,106*	262%
* this includes committed expenditure from previous years which were disbursed between Jan-June 2012. Expenditure for Output 1 is 100%.							Total	15,711	8,000	41,106	262%

1.2. Rural Development Program Planning: Rural Development Program planning is mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies; National Program for Rural Development for IPARD Axes 2 & 3 developed & submitted to Government.

1.2.1. 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.	1.2.1.a. In cooperation with UNWTO and MoERD, establish an inter-ministerial working group, with a sub-group for elaboration of National Rural Development Programme.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	b	10,000	1,500	3,080	31%
1.2.2. IPARD Life-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.	1.2.2.b. Present at national level and at regional events in all JP targeted regions.			UNICEF	MERD	MDG-F	f	11,504	0	9,326	81%
							Total	21,504	1,500	12,406	58%

1.3. Investment Mainstreaming: Sustainable tourism investments mainstreamed in Serbia's national policies.

1.3.1. 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 JP.	1.3.1.b. Engage with all relevant line ministries to promote public investments that are in line with Rural Tourism Master Plan and environmentally sustainable.			UNDP	MERD	MDG-F	b	21,515	0	10,373	48%
1.3.3. SIFT Network: National focal point established for Sustainable Investment and Finance in Tourism (SIFT) Network.	1.3.3.c. Engage SIFT network to share best practices, match destination demand with financial resources, & build network capacity.			UNEP	MERD	MDG-F	d	15,675	0	9,753	62%
1.3.4. Investment Monitoring & Evaluation Strategy: Formal process installed to feed lessons learned from Outcome 2 into public tourism investments.	1.3.4.a. As part of M&E of the JP, adopt at least three indicators for evaluation of pilot projects.			UNDP	MERD	MDG-F	c	52,296	14,150	28,461	54%
							Total	89,486	14,150	48,587	54%

JP Outcome 2.: Local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; local stakeholders' capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies.

Please highlight the rate of delivery for each joint programme's output:

a. Less than 30% b. between 31%-50% c. between 51-60 d. between 61%-70% e. between 71%-80 f. More than 80%

Output	Activity	YEAR 2		UN Agency	Responsible Party	Source of Funding	Budget Description	Amount Planned	Estimated amount Committed	Estimated Amount Disbursed	Estimated % Delivery rate
		Q1	Q2								
2.1. Capacity developed for sustainable rural tourism in order to enhance rural development											
2.1.1. Local Action Groups: Capacity of public, private and civil society sector 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.	2.1.1.b. Using the EU's Leader approach, mobilize public, private & civil society actors to engage in Local Action Groups and support them in increasing benefits for rural population from available financing & donation instruments.			UNDP	MOA	MDG-F	a	32,473	0	5,492	17%

2.1.2. 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.	2.1.2.a. Provide capacity building and Training-of-Trainers for RDN to serve as outreach & implementation tool to i) promote Ministry programs & IPARD; ii) support and mentor local NGOs and other groups in local initiatives and proposal development; iii) facilitate and promote local partnerships; iv) motivate and mobilize local partners for LAG development; v) provide inputs for policy changes at the national level.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	b	10,000	1,500	3,080	31%
2.1.3. Local planning: All 19 target municipalities have included sustainable rural tourism measures in local development strategies, by the end of JP.	2.1.3.a. Follow-up with target municipalities on the implementation of gender-responsive local development strategies and provide expert support for inclusion of sustainable rural tourism initiatives			UNDP	MOA	MDG-F	f	34,260	0	30,834	90%

	where appropriate.										
2.1.5. Marketing & Promotion: local tourism stakeholders trained via 15 workshops on product development issues, marketing and promotion in Years 2 and 3 of the JP.	2.1.5.a. Local Stakeholders helping designing strategic marketing (including positioning issues) and collaborating in promotional campaigns			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	a	37,450	2,106	0	0%
2.1.7. 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.2011	2.1.7.c. Support producer groups through training, capacity building and organizational development activities, including branding of products and regions.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	e	51,800	16,700	38,400	75%
	2.1.7.d. Organize networking events of tourism and agriculture stakeholders (women & men) in pilot project areas to improve linkages and strengthen local and regional brands and present themselves							10,000	1,500	7,841	

	together with regional tourism offer on the national and international tourism markets.										
2.1.8. Product Development: Local tourism stakeholders actively participating in Product Development discussions through the TGOs and are trained to become active stakeholders in Tourism Master Plan Implementation 2011	2.1.8.a. Facilitate active participation of local stakeholders in fine-tuning of National Rural Tourism Master Plan through established TGOs, especially with regards to product development.			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	b	25,296	0	10,800	43%
2.1.9. Sustainable Resource Management: 300 individuals trained via 12 workshops, representing at least 100 different tourism stakeholders in sustainable resource management by end of JP.2011	2.1.9.b. Adapt UNEP Sustainable Management Training for delivery in targeted Serbian regions; provide training to identified stakeholders.			UNEP	MOA	MDG-F	a	49,326	8,725	4,298	8%
	2.1.9.c. Conduct environmental studies of the target regions examining that aspect of rural tourism								14,019	1,533	

	sustainability, and present at trainings.										
2.1.10. Agriculture Quality Standards Training: 600 producers, farmers and processors trained via 25 workshops in agriculture quality production and standards.	2.1.10.b. Train formal and informal groups of farmers in resource-based planning, quality and production standards, HACCP, GlobalGAP quality standards & certification.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	b	13,000	2,000	4,000	31%
							Total	277,624	34,064	105,212	38%
2.2. Tourism governance structures enhanced in target regions through dedicated organizations, pilot projects, investment promotion											
2.2.1. Tourism Governance Organizations (TGOs) in four regions (one per target region) established throughout JP through expert support, while engaging local stakeholders.	2.2.1.a. Assess the needs of the Tourism Governance Organizations in the target regions, including possible models and existing capacities (namely the Local Action Groups and local tourism organizations)			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	a	59,323	18,000	10,448	18%
2.2.2. Child-Related Tourism Supply & Demand: Guidelines/standards for schools and tourism service	2.2.2.a. Provide input, through presentations and facilitation, into workshops, seminars &			UNICEF	MERD	MDG-F	f	10,194	0	8,683	85%

providers catering for children submitted to the Ministry of Education for endorsement by the end of JP.	planning processes organized with LAGs, RDN and DMOs on child-related tourism issues.										
2.2.4. 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.	2.2.4.b. LAG subcommittees collect & evaluate proposals in (i) Integrated rural tourism and agriculture development on the rural community level; (ii) Conservation & maintenance of traditional rural cultural & natural heritage for integrated rural and rural tourism development; (iii) Diversification and upgrade of the production of food and non-food products and activities for local/regional rural tourist markets.			FAO	MOA	MDG-F	b	222,884	79,972	110,000	49%

2.2.5. Joint UN Fund for Sustainable Rural Tourism / Thematic window on Tourism Destination Development: Basic tourism services, Development of attractions, specific niche products and tourism clusters in target regions enhanced, in the last two years of JP. (Average project investment \$10,000)	2.2.5.a. Support the development of basic tourism services such as accommodation, food and beverage, reservation systems and tourism offices.			UNWTO	MERD	MDG-F	d	315,289	1,568	207,822	66%
2.2.6. Joint UN Fund for Sustainable Rural Tourism Fund / Thematic Window on Active-Learning Tourism Investments: 20 tourist sites developed through 8 child- , family-, and school-centered tourism competitions organized (4 per year, 2 in Lower Danube region due to higher number of municipalities; top 3 awards per competition).	2.2.6.c. Conduct training and workshop on active learning and child-centered tourism to tourism stakeholders; stakeholders form consortia to compete for active learning programs.			UNICEF	MERD	MDG-F	d	40,077	792	12,473	65%
	2.2.6.e. Announce active learning tourism grant scheme, based on the findings, results and framework designed in year 1; Select the winning sites and programmes;							86,688	12,840	69,839	

	winning competitors work with UNICEF to detail and install child-centered and active-learning components. Support the implementation and realization of the projects										
							Total	734,455	113,172	419,265	57%

Joint Programme Management, Coordination and Monitoring & Evaluation

Please highlight the rate of delivery for each joint programme's output:

a. Less than 30% **b.** between 31%-50% **c.** between 51-60 **d.** between 61%-70% **e.** between 71%-80 **f.** More than 80%

Output	Activity	YEAR 2		UN Agency	Responsible Party	Source of Funding	Budget Description	Amount Planned	Estimated amount Committed	Estimated Amount Disbursed	Estimated % Delivery rate
		Q1	Q2								
JP Management & Coordination											
A functioning and coordinated Program Implementation Unit (PIU) is established and operating throughout the life of the JP.	Program Implementation Unit (PIU) operational under direction of the Program Manager.			UNDP	MOA/MERD	MDG-F	c	97,784	39,850	49,720	51%

Monitoring & Evaluation System An information-management M&E system is developed and used to assess the performance of the program in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact by the end of the first six months.	a. Design M&E system requirements for each outcome of the JP. b. Conduct regular program performance monitoring to measure relevance and efficiency; input findings into the JP implementation system. c. Present monitoring & evaluation information back to key stakeholders and partners to improve programming.			UNDP	MOA/MERD	MDG-F	a	70,550	0	1,699	2%
							Total	168,334	39,850	51,419	31%