Fostering dialogue and social cohesion in and between Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Montenegro and Serbia (Dialogue for the Future)
MPTF OFFICE GENERIC ANNUAL PROGRAMME[1] NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT
REPORTING PERIOD: 1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2019

Programme Title & Project Number	Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results[2]
Programme Title: Fostering dialogue and social cohesion in and between Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Montenegro and Serbia (Dialogue for the Future) • Programme Number *(if applicable)* • MPTF Office Project Reference Number:[3] 00113873 (BiH), 00113874 (MNE), 00114184 (SRB)	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Republic of Serbia *Priority area/ strategic results*
Participating Organization(s)	**Implementing Partners**
• UNDP, UNICEF, UNESCO	
Programme/Project Cost (US$)	**Programme Duration**
Total approved budget as per project document: UNDP: $ 1,753,765.71 UNICEF: $ 1,297,910 UNESCO: $ 1,132,316.80 Total: $ 4,183,992.51 MPTF /JP Contribution[4]: • *by Agency (if applicable)* Agency Contribution • *by Agency (if applicable)* Government Contribution *(if applicable)* Other Contributions (donors) *(if applicable)*	Overall Duration *(months)* *27 months* Start Date[5] *(07.01.2019)* Original End Date[6] *(31.07.2020)* Current End date[7]*(30.04.2021)*

---

[1] The term "programme" is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects.

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

[3] The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to as "Project ID" on the project's factsheet page the MPTF Office GATEWAY

[4] The MPTF or JP Contribution, refers to the amount transferred to the Participating UN Organizations, which is available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY

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

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

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

TOTAL:

Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.

Assessment/Review - if applicable *please attach*
☐ Yes   ☐ No   Date: *dd.mm.yyyy*
Mid-Term Evaluation Report – *if applicable please attach*
☐ Yes   ☐ No   Date: *dd.mm.yyyy*

Report Submitted By

o   Name: Alma Mirvic
o   Title: Joint Regional Programme Coordinator
o   Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP
o   Email address: alma.mirvic@undp.org

NARRATIVE REPORT FORMAT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the launch of the joint program in January 2019 in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and the Republic of Serbia, the program has successfully achieved the following:

- 867 (out of 1,600) adolescents and youth enhanced their skills in capacity building workshops on socio-emotional skills, mobile journalism for social cohesion, voluntarism, project ideation and creation, social innovation, digital solutions
- Over 1,300 persons actively participated in 15 (out of planned 16) youth, national and regional dialogue platforms identifying common social cohesion priorities and recommending solutions
- 120 (out of 200) women received capacity building in advocacy, leadership, gender mainstreaming, political literacy
- 60 teachers (out of 200) were trained in inter-cultural communication skills and media and information literacy

National dialogue platforms, a novelty in this region, featured the participation of high-level government ministry officials across participating countries as well as over 300 participants drawn from joint programme's target groups (adolescents, youth, teachers, media, and women) and beyond. Institutional partners of the joint program (Presidency and Foreign Ministry offices) remained committed to the joint Dialogue for the Future (DFF) programme, actively participating in dialogue platforms, two Joint Programme Board meetings, one in April 2019 in Sarajevo and another in November 2019 in Podgorica. Both Joint Programme Board meetings resulted in a set of important decisions, providing strategic guidance to the DFF programme and ensuring coherence of approach.

The joint DFF program was fully capacitated with all required staff recruited in the three participating countries. Coordination remained essential in the implementation of the joint DFF program, and country programme teams agreed on a common approach to the organization of youth and national dialogue events. In accordance with the DFF project document, the Regional Dialogue Platform, held in Sarajevo on 2-3 December 2019, resulted in a series of validated joint social cohesion priorities that contributed to the identification of themes for cross-border Small Grants Facility that was launched on 23 December 2019.

I. Purpose
- Provide the main objectives and expected outcomes of the programme in relation to the appropriate **Strategic UN Planning Framework (e.g. UNDAF) and project document (if applicable) or Annual Work Plan (AWP)**.
- <u>Bosnia and Herzegovina</u>: Outcome 2: By 2019, BiH consolidates and strengthens mechanisms for peaceful resolution of conflicts, reconciliation, respect for diversity and community security[8].
- <u>Montenegro:</u> Outcome 1: By 2021, a people-centered accountable, transparent and effective judiciary, Parliament, public administration and independent institutions ensure security, equal access to justice and quality services for all people
- <u>Serbia</u>: Outcome 1: By 2020, people in Serbia, especially vulnerable groups, have their human rights protected and have improved access to justice and security and
  Outcome 5: By 2020, an efficient education system is established that enables relevant, quality, inclusive and equitable education to all, particularly the most vulnerable, and increases learning and social outcomes.
  Outcome 9: By 2020, Serbia has inclusive policies ensuring an enhanced cultural industries sector, promoting cultural diversity and managing cultural and natural heritage as a vehicle for sustainable development

II. Results

---

[8] The UNDAF has been officially extended until 2020.

i)   Narrative reporting on results:

- **Outcomes:**
  Outcome 1: Stability and trust in the region, and especially in BiH, are enhanced.

- **Outputs:**

  Output 1.1: Different groups in the countries of the region, and youth in particular, acquire and practice skills to help break stereotypes and constructively interact across divides.
  In 2019, 867 youth (boys and girls) and women have participated in capacity building seminars organized through the joint programme. For adolescents and youth, these trainings focused on social and emotional skills curriculum (focusing on empathy, tolerance and trust), as well as UPSHIFT (social innovation and entrepreneurship platform), and mobile journalism for social cohesion. In November, 2019 the first bilateral UPSHIFT workshop in Europe, bringing together adolescents from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, took place. This approach enabled youth to work in diverse teams on their jointly identified initiatives. In Serbia, the cooperation with the Institute for the Improvement of Education has focused on innovation in citizenship education teaching programme in secondary schools. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the joint programme is supporting a cross-Entity focus where universities across BiH are partnering in delivering intercultural dialogue training for teachers, librarians and pedagogues.
  In July and December 2019, two digital hackathons were organized for youth from participating countries where 40 young activists, programmers and designers worked on IT solutions to improve social cohesion in their surroundings, on both national and regional level.
  Additionally, capacity building for 120 women, focusing on gender equality and participation, social cohesion, advocacy and leadership, project design and implementation, has taken place in all three countries.
  Through partnerships with universities, ministries of culture and education in the three participating countries, the joint programme has been delivering capacity building for media and teachers. The combination of actions will further promote the cross-cutting importance of education and culture in advancing achievement of the SDG 2030 Agenda in the respective countries.

  Output 1.2: Citizens from different groups jointly identify and implement actions that promote social cohesion in the region, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
  Over 1,300 persons actively participated in 15 (out of planned 16) youth, national and regional dialogue platforms, discussing challenges to social cohesion within and among the three participating countries from a multi-stakeholder perspective. All dialogue platforms provided important insights into emerging priorities of youth (such as insufficient spaces for youth, need for additional non-formal education in the area of intercultural competences and mutual understanding, need for dialogue, lack of government transparency, political illiteracy, climate change, corruption, nationalism, prejudice) and reaffirmed the joint DFF programme's assumptions on the commonality of challenges (and proposed solutions) people in all three countries face. The Regional Dialogue Platform in December 2019 was particularly relevant as it represented the culmination of various dialogue events that had previously taken place across three countries, emphasizing the joint nature of priorities that all three countries were focusing on and providing recommendations how to address these jointly. The outcomes and priorities identified at the platforms served as a contribution to the themes of the cross-border Small Grants Facility that was announced on 23 December 2019.

  Output 1.3: Policy recommendations to improve social cohesion in the region are effectively advocated for, and endorsed by, authorities and relevant stakeholders.
  Implementation of activities under this Output is planned for 2021.

- **Describe any delays in implementation, challenges, lessons learned & best practices:**

  During the program design in 2018, the DFF program initially included activities in the Republic of Croatia as well, these were drawn from consultation with counterparts in civil society and government. Given the absence of the formal endorsement from the Croatian Presidency Office or the Croatian Foreign Ministry, the joint DFF program proceeded with anticipation that Croatia may join the project in the first quarter of 2019. Even though no operational activities took place during that time, the joint DFF program constituted country project teams through recruitment, and developed the joint program and country action plans, setting up the monitoring and evaluation framework and refining the Standard Operating Document for the joint regional DFF program.

  Throughout 2019, the project team in Bosnia and Herzegovina was implementing two joint DFF projects: one focused solely on Bosnia and Herzegovina and another with an outlook to strengthening cross-border cooperation and joint action with Montenegro and the Republic of Serbia. This placed a significant burden on the project teams, as one project was in the closing and another in the first year of implementation. This gave rise to prioritization challenges within the larger project team (comprising of UNDP, UNICEF and UNESCO staff) in Bosnia and Herzegovina, resulting in adapted timelines to the planned launch of capacity building activities for some groups.

  The joint DFF program faced a challenge with the methodology and implementation of the baseline perception survey, looking into possible synergies with the methodology chosen under the national joint DFF project, while at the same time adapting to the requirements of a multi-country format. As program activities were already being implemented, the joint DFF program faced the challenge that it had to carry out a baseline survey while some activities were already underway. Ultimately, to address this methodological challenge and ensure rigor, the DFF project teams agreed that end-line measurements of all target group samples would be compared against control group samples in each country, while a baseline/end-line approach would be implemented for the beneficiaries of cross-border small grants, thereby increasing the overall survey sample and gaining insight into the changes of perceptions for the final beneficiaries of the joint program.

  Through a series of in-country and regional activities, programme has successfully facilitated encounters, collaboration and joint action of people from three countries. Over 1,300 people from all sectors from three countries discussed joint challenges and solutions through regional dialogue event, whose results will enable joint action through cross-border project proposals. To enable participation of unorganized youth, programme delivers multi-country solution-generating UPSHIFT initiative which brings together young people and supports them to put their ideas into practice. This programme is a unique platform which gives voice to people and provides tools and resources to translate solicited ideas into practice. In times of broken feedback loops, participation fatigue and low trust in participation processes, such an approach serves as an example of meaningful participation and collaboration for impact.

  The innovative aspect of the cross-border Small Grants Call has been that applicants were asked to identify, develop and solidify their regional partnership early on, specifically at the application stage. This meant that as early as at the applications stage, partnerships were developed and trust and cohesion advanced at this stage as the two (and in some instances three or more) partners from three countries were jointly working together to develop the project proposal and agree on shares of funding allocations. Not only were partnerships advanced in between countries, but also partnerships were advanced between different types of partners, where the DFF programme leveraged innovative applications and partnerships between municipalities and CSOs in different countries, breaking away from the more traditional forms of partnerships, municipality to municipality, and CSO to CSO. As an example of best practice, the project teams consolidated updated grant application forms seeking to harmonize agency grant requirements and thus simplifying grant award procedures for future grantees. Online video tutorials in three language versions for the project proposal and budget

application forms were produced and widely advertised on social media and open day events, seeking to facilitate applications from prospective applicants. The application process was handled entirely in electronic form, through joint email addresses established in each programme country.

- **Qualitative assessment:**
  Multi-country joint programmes require strong coordination of various components among countries and agencies, as well as continuous commitment of the programme's high-level counterparts. This is especially significant if moving in the same direction and pace is considered. Such endeavor is both challenging and time consuming, particularly with various negative narratives and rhetoric impacting the region. he joint DFF programme has therefore prescribed the establishment of country coordination bodies, the Joint Programme Board and the Strategic Advisory Board to allow for layered, country-specific and 'regional' perspective, stock-taking and partnership at political and programmatic levels. Additionally, the programme has established national coordination bodies to ensure a more detailed attention and direction to project activities in each country is taking place. Membership in national coordination bodies and Joint Programme Board is overlapping, to preserve institutional memory. Ensuring strategic coherence of the approach across main components, delivering and communicating as one rather than as individual agencies, while recognizing the need for country-specific interventions based on the country context can be a challenge for joint programmes. This challenge is mitigated in the DFF programme by holding regular face-to-face and online meetings among programme coordinators, and meetings of strategic advisory board, consisting of UN highest representatives. Where communications and M&E components are concerned, the agency communications specialists have developed a joint internal and external communications protocol to facilitate the flow of requests and clear decision-making lines. All joint documents are consulted broadly among all teams which is time consuming, but necessary, to reach a levelled understanding.

Using the **Programme Results Framework from the Project Document / AWP** - provide an update on the achievement of indicators at both the output and outcome level in the table below. Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, clear explanation should be given explaining why, as well as plans on how and when this data will be collected.

	Achieved Indicator Targets	**Reasons for Variance with Planned Target (if any)**	**Source of Verification**
Outcome 1[9] Stability and trust in the region, and especially in BiH, are enhanced. **Indicator:** Indicator 1.1 Rank of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 2018 Global Peace Index. **Baseline:** 89, out of 163 countries. **Planned Target:** Improved ranking	Improved ranking, in 2019 BiH ranking has already improved – 81st - compared to the 2018 (89th) ranking when the project started.	The programme recognizes that it has no significant attribution to this indicator; however, given the nature of this composite index (GPI investigates the extent to which countries are involved in ongoing domestic and international conflicts. It also seeks to evaluate the level of harmony or discord within a nation; 23 indicators are used to establish each country's peacefulness score), it was assessed as a useful reference for the programme.	Source: http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2019/06/GPI-2019-web003.pdf
Indicator 1.2 Percentage of youth indicating higher levels of trust towards other ethnic groups in the region.	n/a	Planned surveying of youth that have participated in capacity building across the three countries has been postponed to 2020.	Perception Survey Data uReport data (UNICEF led) Entry- and exit surveys for youth grantees and dialogue platform participants.

---

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

Baseline: Low overall level of trust between youth of different ethnicities. **Planned Target:** 50% of surveyed youth, particularly in BIH (including youth who are direct project beneficiaries) report increased trust toward members of other ethnicities			
Indicator 1.3 Level of collaboration to address mistrust and social divides between citizens from different groups in the participating countries, with their peers in Bosnia and Herzegovina. **Baseline:** Low overall levels of cross-country collaboration addressing mistrust and social divides (BiH vis-a-vis neighboring countries). **Planned Target:** Increased level of cross-country collaboration to address mistrust and social divides between citizens, manifested through at least 20 sustainable social cohesion partnerships generated as a result of the programme.	n/a	The cross-border Small Grants Facility was published on 23 December 2019, results will be evaluated in 2020.	Perception study commissioned by the programme. Entry- and exit surveys for grantees and dialogue platform participants.

Output 1.1 Different groups in the countries of the region, and youth in particular, acquire and practice skills to help break stereotypes and constructively interact across divides.			
Indicator 1.1.1 Number of people (teachers, youth, women, journalists and editors, sex- and gender-disaggregated) from participating 4 countries with increased knowledge and skills to bridge social divides. **Baseline:** Insufficient number of people (particularly teachers, youth and women) capacitated to support social cohesion in the region. **Planned Target:** At least 1900, as follows: (i) 800 adolescents (10 – 18 years old); (ii) 800 young people (18 – 30 years old) among whom 50% women; (iii) 200 teachers, among whom 50% women and (iv) 120 journalists and editors	Skill building training for 867 adolescents and youth (including 287 boys and 580 girls), 60 teachers (42 women, 18 men) and 120 women.		Entry- and exit capacity development surveys filled in by trainees. Lists of participants in training activities. Programme progress/final report.
Indicator 1.1.2 Number of stakeholders who apply the acquired skills and	n/a	Information about this indicator progress will	

knowledge in their follow-up work as a result of the programme support. **Baseline:** n/a **Planned Target:** At least 50% of all stakeholders (in various target groups) apply the skills and knowledge acquired through the programme in their follow-up work.		be available once all target groups have had at least one round of capacity building in each participating country.	
Output 1.2 Citizens from different groups jointly identify and implement actions that promote social cohesion in the region, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina. **Indicator 1.2.1** Total number of people (particularly youth) from participating countries who meaningfully engage in and contribute to identification of social cohesion barriers and priorities for the 3 countries **Baseline:** 600 people in the national platform events in Bosnia and Herzegovina. **Planned Target:** At least 1,600 people (among whom at least 800 youth and women) from participating countries engage in and contribute to identification	Over 1,300 participants from participating countries contributed to identification of social cohesion challenges and solutions within and among the three participating countries.		Lists of participants from the dialogue events. Programme reports. Media monitoring/press clipping. Recommendations from the dialogue platforms. Calls for Proposals and Reports from implementation of the grants. Feedback from grant facility beneficiaries (indirect and direct).

of regional social cohesion barriers and priorities.			Photos and videos from the implementation of social cohesion initiatives in the region.
Indicator 1.2.2 Total number of dialogue platforms (gender balanced) bringing together political leaders and various stakeholders from the 4 participating countries in joint discussions on how to strengthen social cohesion in the region. **Baseline:** n/a **Planned Target:** At least 16 broad-based social cohesion dialogue platform events (gender balanced) bringing together political leaders and various stakeholders from the 3 participating countries.	10 youth and 3 national and 1 regional dialogue events have taken place across the three participating countries.		
Output 1.3 Policy recommendations to improve social cohesion in the region are effectively advocated for, and endorsed by, authorities and relevant stakeholders. **Indicator 1.3.1** Number of effective advocacy channels (engaging equal numbers of both sexes) leveraging political and public support	n/a	Activities surrounding this Output are planned in 2020.	Media coverage, photos, videos capturing advocacy and formal endorsement of social cohesion recommendations. Programme reports. Materials from advocacy events. Formal decisions and documents of authorities or the international community evidencing endorsement of the social cohesion recommendations.

within participating countries for endorsement of social cohesion policy recommendations. **Baseline:** UN agencies in the participating countries have deployed successful advocacy efforts to promote social cohesion. **Planned Target:** At least 4 inter-connected and mutually-reinforcing advocacy channels help leverage political and public support for endorsement of social cohesion policy recommendations, including: (i) UN-led discussions with political leaders and policy-makers; (ii) regional dialogue platform; (iii) civil society **Indicator 1.3.2** Number of social cohesion policy recommendations voiced through the regional dialogue platform that are endorsed by authorities and international community and contribute to their effective follow-up implementation. **Baseline:** n/a **Planned Target:** At least 5 policy recommendations formally endorsed by	n/a	Activities surrounding this Output are planned in 2020.	

authorities and the international community.			

iii) A Specific Story (Optional)

- The first bilateral UPSHIFT 4-day workshop was hosted by Montenegro where 20 teams of adolescents and youth from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro identified and developed social innovation solutions to common challenges. "Amina Begović, Ilma Gutić, Milica Burić, Šćepan Popović and Vuk Peković, who never met before the workshop, decided to show how art and culture can transcend borders and personal differences. They will be organizing an art festival that will take place in Tuzla (BiH) and Niksic (Montenegro) and bring young people together.

  Photo gallery is available here:
  https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=561568681277151

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

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

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

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

III. Other Assessments or Evaluations (if applicable)
- Report on any assessments, evaluations or studies undertaken.

IV. Programmatic Revisions (if applicable)
- Indicate any major adjustments in strategies, targets or key outcomes and outputs that took place.

V. Resources (Optional)
- Provide any information on financial management, procurement and human resources.
- Indicate if the Programme mobilized any additional resources or interventions from other partners.