

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1

FINAL EVALUATION OF OTI'S PROGRAM IN MACEDONIA

SCOPE OF WORK

A. OTI Background

The USAID Administrator created OTI in the Bureau for Humanitarian Response (now the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance) to assist priority countries to make successful transitions from crisis to recovery and stability. The volatile political and economic nature of transitioning countries requires fast, emergency-type political responses that show immediate, visible and positive effect.

Countries experiencing complex crises resulting from internal conflict and civil war have special needs that are often not addressed by traditional emergency assistance programs. OTI enables USAID to capitalize on 'windows of opportunity' where quickly deployed aid can make a critical difference to a country's transition to peaceful, democratic government. Interventions are tied to pivotal events, such as cease-fires, peace accords, or the advent of progressive leadership, often through key elections. OTI responds swiftly to these events with near-term, high-impact actions that support a country's transitional needs.

While operating in a country, OTI works to bring new groups into the transition process, tests new activities for advancing democratic governance, and provides fast and flexible support for immediate transition needs. OTI's program options for transition responses include: 1) expanding democratic political process, 2) building citizen security, 3) promoting reconciliation, 4) supporting peace negotiations, and 5) crosscutting themes, including community-based approaches and media activities. As appropriate and necessary, relationships and practices that prove productive may be handed off to the USAID Mission or other donors for further development when OTI phases out its assistance.

B. Macedonia Country Background – Will be provided upon award of task order.

C. OTI Macedonia

Purpose and Rationale for OTI/Macedonia Confidence Building Initiative (CBI)

In response to the eruption of violent conflict in Macedonia in March 2001, various offices within the U.S. government asked OTI to intervene in the country to help minimize further conflict and support the country's democratic transition. After undertaking a country assessment, OTI, in collaboration with the U.S. Embassy and USAID Mission in Macedonia, decided to 1) establish a quick-disbursing community stabilization component to the USAID Mission's existing Community Self-Help Initiative; 2) establish field offices in Tetovo and Kumanova to manage community stabilization fund activities and complement other ongoing USAID programs; and 3) develop media activities to emphasize multiethnic cooperation and peaceful

solutions to common problems. OTI began setting up its operations in Macedonia in May 2001 and was awarding its first grants by early June.

In August 2001, the parties to the conflict signed the internationally brokered Framework Agreement, officially ending the violent conflict. To support the political settlement, the U.S. government determined that Macedonia merited a more robust response. As part of that response, OTI agreed to invest significant TI funds and establish a new and separate contracting mechanism in order to quickly disburse those funds. The new program would be focused on community-level confidence building measures, small infrastructure projects and media campaigns, and would provide a flexible response that would address critical needs arising out of the implementation of the agreement.

At the time of CBI's launch in October 2001, apprehension was still widespread about whether the fragile cease-fire and peace agreement would hold. Structural underdevelopment, weak institutional capacities, political infighting and high unemployment served to further exacerbate tensions throughout the country.

OTI believed that many of the most pressing needs in the country existed at the community level, where confidence in the future of a peaceful, democratic, multiethnic nation had been ruptured. CBI, which is being implemented by the International Organization for Migration, moved quickly to provide support to moderate local leaders and communities to bolster their efforts to reduce tensions and rebuild confidence between ethnic groups and across political party divides. In its first year, OTI approved 300 small grants, buying time for political reforms to take place and peace to take root.

CBI Strategic Framework

Because it began as a response to the conflict, CBI was established as a community-based conflict mitigation program, with a specific goal: to lessen tension and mitigate conflict during the implementation of the Framework Agreement. OTI's grants were designed to:

- Objective 1: Support positive, community-based interaction among diverse groups of people.
- Objective 2: Promote citizen participation in community decision-making.
- Objective 3: Foster transparency, responsiveness, and accountability in the relationship between citizens and local government.
- Objective 4: Increase citizen access to balanced information and diverse points of view.

A program was developed to create quick and widespread impact by addressing community-level issues as they related to the four objectives and the goal. CBI established sub-offices to carry out programming. The offices are located in Bitola, Kicevo, Kocani, Skopje, and Tetovo, and a media office is located in Skopje to coordinate nationwide media efforts.

The sub-offices work by awarding grants to local communities, civil society organizations, local NGOs, local government, and media outlets. Communities and problematic issues are identified, grants are developed with the communities, grants are awarded, and activities are implemented within a time frame that is intended to provide quick relief to the targeted communities.

Often, these grants result in improved infrastructure, such as new water systems, new schools, etc., which contribute to lessened tensions by improving living conditions and thus increasing the opportunities for the different aspects of the Agreement to take hold. The basis for determining the activities is a community-based, consensus building process that OTI uses in many countries. The grants are not just about fixing a concrete problem, such as repairing a dilapidated school, but primarily about addressing social problems by encouraging community-based dialogue, building consensus and local capacity, and fostering democratic principles.

D. Objectives of the Evaluation

There are five basic questions to be answered by the final evaluation. They are:

1. To what extent did CBI meet its stated goal and objectives?
2. Did OTI's approach fill an important gap? Did it complement the efforts of other USAID offices and international organizations working to promote peace and support the democratic transition in Macedonia?
3. How did the management and operation of the CBI program contribute to or detract from achievement of the program goal and objectives?
4. What programmatic and management lessons can be learned from the CBI program that can provide useful guidance to other OTI programs in like environments?
5. Based on the evaluation findings, what are at least five recommendations for ways OTI can improve its programs?

These basic questions will be more clearly defined through discussions with OTI/Washington and field staff during methodology and work plan development.

E. Methodology

The Evaluation Team will be responsible for developing an evaluation strategy and methodologies that include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analyses approaches. Specific methods, and the appropriate instruments, will be developed in concert with OTI/Washington.

F. Evaluation Components and Deliverables

1. (10-12 work days, Washington, DC)
 - Conduct literature review and desk study including OTI/Macedonia grants database
 - Draft work plan
 - Develop methodology and instruments
 - Interview key Washington, DC stakeholders
 - Finalize work plan
2. (20 work days, Macedonia)
 - Collect evaluation data from Skopje, Tetovo, Kicevo, Kocani, and Bitola offices and other stakeholders
 - Conduct initial analysis and develop initial findings

Confer with field staff at mid-evalpoint
Debrief with Macedonia staff (present a 5-7 page report of key findings)

3. (10-15 work days, USA and Washington)
Produce complete draft report
Debrief to OTI/Washington and collect comments from Washington and the field
Produce Final Report

A USAID-wide presentation on the evaluation will be scheduled upon receipt of the final report.

F. Final Report

The outline for the final report shall comprise, but not be limited to the following:

Executive summary;
Table of contents;
Introduction and background;
Summary description of evaluation objectives;
Description of methodology and data sources, and limitations of the study;
Analysis and statement of findings; and
Recommendations for future OTI programs.

Fifty bound copies of the final evaluation report and supporting documents will be provided to OTI, along with an electronic version of the report and an electronic copy of all data files used to conduct analyses.

G. Composition and Qualifications of the Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team shall consist of three individuals: a senior level evaluation analyst, who will also serve as the team leader, and two mid-level evaluation analysts, one of which is to be an in-country national. The team leader should have extensive experience designing and conducting evaluations, and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data.

Evaluation research: Academic experience in the social sciences evaluating programs particularly with community participation, media and civil society organizations, in countries undergoing transitions;

Survey and statistical analysis: Academic preparation and experience in survey research methods (survey design, sampling techniques and statistical computer applications);

Rapid appraisal techniques: Academic training and experience with rapid appraisal techniques (survey development, direct observation, Focus Group interviews, community interviews and key informant interviews);

Local knowledge: General knowledge of the Balkans' unique political, social, economic, and cultural environment and specific knowledge of Macedonia; and

Language abilities: Ideally, some members of the team will have a demonstrated knowledge of Macedonian and Albanian. Experience with Roma and Turkish is also desirable.

ANNEX 2

**OTI MACEDONIA:
CONFIDENCE BUILDING INITIATIVE**

EVALUATION WORK PLAN

Submitted by:

William Millsap, Ph.D. and Emery Brusset

Submitted to:

USAID/DCHA/OTI
Mary Stewart/Program Development Team Leader

Under Contract No. Social Impact - HDA-I-02-03-000124-00

Task Order No. 2

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

USAID’s Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) was created in 1994 to assist countries making a transition from crisis situations to more stable conditions. Formerly located in USAID’s Bureau of Humanitarian Response (BHR), OTI is now (since 2002) part of the Agency’s Bureau of Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA). The role of OTI is to provide, fast, flexible, short-term assistance to enable “countries in crisis” to achieve more peaceful environments capable of promoting democratic institutions. Typically, OTI interventions last only a few years and then are “handed off” to longer-term USAID development projects.

Operating under special authorization from the Congress, OTI works directly with other government agencies (e.g., the State Department, military, etc.) through various contracting mechanisms that enable the quick deployment of professional specialists to mitigate conflict, jumpstart economic recovery, and provide emergency assistance (often through small grants) to communities and populations experiencing severe stress.

In May 1991, OTI staff began to assist the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to transcend severe political tensions between ethnic Macedonians and ethnic Albanians along the border regions of Kosovo and Macedonia.

Project Background

In February of 1999, NATO began to assist thousands of ethnic Albanian refugees fleeing the onslaught of fighting in Kosovo proper. The movement of so many refugees to the border regions of Albania and Macedonia placed a tremendous burden on both countries—especially the relative calm that had existed in Macedonia. Ethnic Albanians as a minority population in Macedonia began to demand greater participation in local and national governmental operations. Indeed, just as Kosovo was beginning its transition to peace, Macedonia represented a potential powder keg threatening the Balkan landscape. By August of 2001, the Macedonia government and Albanian insurgents (encouraged by widespread international support) signed a Framework Agreement to end the fighting and work out an arrangement to share political power in a movement towards democratization and decentralized authority.

Initially, OTI staff assisted the USAID Mission to design and implement a community stabilization program. However, in support of the political settlement, the U.S. Government felt greater efforts were needed to mitigate political and ethnic tensions. Subsequently, OTI agreed to develop an independent program in support of community-level confidence building measures that would provide funds for small infrastructure projects and media efforts to address critical needs arising out of the implementation of the Framework Agreement (OTI SOW 2003:2).

In October 2001, OTI launched its Confidence Building Initiative (CBI) with the specific goal of *lessening tension and mitigating conflict during the implementation of the Framework Agreement*. This initiative was designed to address four objectives:

Objective 1: Supporting positive, community-based interaction among diverse groups of people;

Objective 2: Promoting citizen participation in community decision-making;

Objective 3: Fostering transparency, responsiveness, and accountability in the relationship between citizens and local government; and

Objective 4: Increasing citizen access to balanced information and diverse points of view.

Working through its implementing partner, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), CBI has been operating from five field offices (i.e., Bitola, Kicevo, Kocani, Skopje, and Tetovo) and one media office for awarding grants to 123 local municipalities in promotion of activities aimed at reducing tension and mitigating conflict. From inception to closure, CBI will have awarded almost 500 small grants with an operating budget of \$17 million over a two-year period.

With CBI activities now due to be completed by September 30, 2003, OTI commissioned a final evaluation of the impact of this program to be carried out in June through August of 2003 over a 10-12 week period. Two Ex-Patriate Evaluation Specialists and a local Mid-Level Evaluation specialist and a translator (to provide assistance during the fieldwork phase of the evaluation) will review OTI project documents, conduct field site visits, and compile a final evaluation report.

Evaluation Objectives and Purpose

The evaluation will seek answers to five fundamental questions about the Macedonian CBI as cited in the Evaluation Scope of Work. As stated, these are:

1. To what extent did CBI meet its stated goal and objectives?
2. Did OTI's approach fill an important gap? Did it complement the efforts of other USAID offices and international organizations working to promote peace and support the democratic transition in Macedonia?
3. How did the management and operation of the CBI program contribute to or detract from achievement of the program goal and objectives?
4. What programmatic and management lessons can be learned from the CBI program that can provide useful guidance to other OTI programs in like environments?
5. Based on the evaluation findings, what are at least five recommendations for ways OTI can improve its programs?

In answering these questions, the **purpose** of the final evaluation is to provide OTI and USAID with an assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and probable impact sustainability of CBI activities.¹ The evaluators will also aim to provide a methodological model for future OTI operations to facilitate the establishment of monitoring and evaluation systems and generate comparable findings.

¹ As used in this evaluation, and described in the annexes, *impact* is defined as "attitudinal or behavioral" changes directly attributable to the interventions of the OTI CBI program, based on data collected from participants and stakeholders.

2. PROJECT WORKPLAN

The final evaluation of OTI's Confidence Building Initiative in Macedonia is designed to collect and analyze both quantitative and qualitative information for assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of program activities as implemented during 2001-2003. Program data will be collected through the application of rapid appraisal techniques for expediting the process as well as minimizing evaluation costs.²

The evaluation will consist of six operational tasks:

- Carrying out a thorough review of OTI documents on the Macedonian CBI;
- Developing site visit questionnaires consistent with answering the five broad evaluation questions;
- Conducting site visits to five regions in Macedonia and the media office in Skopje where OTI and IOM are carrying out CBI activities;
- Processing and analyzing collected data on Macedonia CBI operations;
- Submitting a draft evaluation report to the Evaluation CTO; and
- Preparing the final report for USAID/DCHA/OTI responding to review comments provided by the OTI CTO.

Proposed Evaluation Schedule

The schedule for the implementation of the aforementioned tasks is provided on the following page. Subsequently, a detailed work plan for completing each of the evaluation's major tasks is presented. By employing this work plan, the evaluators are confident that an efficient and reliable assessment of the characteristics, activities, outcomes, and impacts of the Macedonia OTI intervention will be accomplished.

Operational Tasks

Task 1. Review Appropriate OTI Documents on Macedonia Operations

During Weeks 1 and 2, the evaluators will meet with the OTI Evaluation CTO and other OTI staff to discuss and clarify the scope of work, evaluation priorities, and to resolve any issues or problems, which could impede the progress of the evaluation or its successful completion. These two weeks of the evaluation will be carried out in Washington, D.C. at USAID Headquarters and at other donor offices. Interviews will be conducted with OTI staff and with other relevant stakeholders in the area. Appropriate documents on the Macedonia program as well as the Country Grants Database shall be reviewed in preparation for fieldwork in Macedonia.

² Recognized rapid appraisal techniques include direct observation, key-informant interviews, group interviews, focus groups, and conducting mini-surveys.

EXHIBIT 1
Evaluation Schedule

<u>Evaluation Activities</u>	Week
1. Meet with Evaluation CTO/OTI Staff; interview Country Reps prior to their return to Macedonia; start review of Macedonian program documents.	Week 1 (6/16-20)
2. Prepare Draft Evaluation Work Plan; continue review of OTI program documents; become familiar with OTI Grants Database; continue interviews with OTI staff and other individuals knowledgeable of the OTI CBI program.	Week 2 (6/23-28)
3. Prepare for field site visit; travel to Macedonia; meet with OTI staff and local evaluation support staff; finalize field protocol and develop site visit plan with a focus group protocol.	Week 3 (6/30-7/5)
4. Visit each of five field offices and media office in Macedonia; interview field staff and conduct focus groups with local Confidence Building Units (CBU); debrief with evaluation staff at end of week.	Week 4 (7/7-12)
5. Use interview data to develop a survey instrument, pre-test, finalize and translate, develop data-entry screens, and begin implementation of survey to sample of CBUs; continue data collection on OTI program via staff and focus groups protocols; debrief with evaluation staff at end of week.	Week 5 (7/14-19)
6. Continue administration of survey; enter data, closeout individual interviews, debrief with OTI Country Rep and arrange for transfer of data still being collected from the CBUs; depart Macedonia for U.S.	Week 6 (7/21-26)
7. Prepare Draft Final Evaluation Report; submit to OTI CTO for comments [2 week review period 8/25-9/5].	Weeks 7-9 (8/4-22)
8. Upon receipt of CTO comments, Final Evaluation Report prepared and submitted to OTI on/or before September 15.	Week 10 (9/8-15)

Task 2. Develop Evaluation Questionnaires

In this task, the evaluators shall generate questionnaires for thoroughly answering the research questions stated as evaluation objectives. Open-ended semi-structured questionnaires will be developed for administration to Washington OTI and other stakeholder staff as well as CBI field staff operating in five field offices and the media office in Skopje. A focus group protocol will also be developed to administer to Confidence Building Units (CBUs). Lastly, the evaluation team intends to design a survey questionnaire for distribution to selected strata of communities that have or are currently participating in the CBI project.³

Step 1: Generation of Evaluation Questions

The first step is to develop a set of questions providing elaboration and amplification of the evaluation objectives into questions that assess the extent project tasks were accomplished; overall effectiveness of project operations and efficiency of the CBI program, and lastly, the extent to which CBI has had a discernable impact. These questions will be generated after reviewing Macedonian CBI (e.g., the original CBI project design, project mid-term evaluation, and other relevant materials). These questions are not intended to be exhaustive, but rather are illustrative of the issues to be investigated by the evaluators.

Step 2: Assumptions

These interview questions will involve the following principles: (a) the questions should address the central issues of the study as delineated in the SOW; (b) the items should only seek information which is relevant to the evaluation issues, that is, each item should be justified as part of an integrated analytic plan; (c) questions should be as clear and simple as possible with each item carefully screened for overly complicated sentences and unnecessary jargon; (d) the burden on the respondent should be minimal in order to facilitate data collection; and (e) a relatively straightforward sample frame should be used for capturing behavior/attitudinal changes among CBI participants.

Task 3: Conduct Macedonian Site Visit

The Evaluation Team will depart for Macedonia on July 1st arriving in-country on July 2nd. Initially, the Evaluation Team will meet with its in-country counterpart staff (one evaluation professional and a translator) to discuss the nature of the project, logistical matters, and the

³ In order to measure CBI impact, the Macedonian grant database will be used to create a sample frame comprised of active projects and completed projects, project themes, and grant matching amounts (25%, 26-50%, 51% or more) across five intervention sites. In the absence of a baseline, it is assumed that CBI participants in completed projects should acknowledge positive changes in their attitude and/or behavior in contrast to non-completed (active) projects. If possible, the survey instrument will also be administered to participants in 4-5 communities that did not participate in the CBI project. Overall sample size is estimated to be 250-300 participants (5 CBUs @ 10-12 members each=50-60 participants per CBI Field Office site x 5 = 250-300). The precision of these estimates will be finalized once the team meets with OTI and CBI managers in Macedonia.

evaluation schedule for Weeks 3-5. The team will then meet with the OTI Country Reps to discuss the evaluation schedule and any attendant logistical issues of relevance to the team. In concert with the Country Reps, a more detailed site visit plan and in-country schedule will be developed. The balance of week 3 shall be spent finalizing any changes to the site-visit questionnaires and focus group protocol.

Data collection will continue through Weeks 4-6; during Week 4, the Evaluation Team will visit each IOM Field Office to interview field staff in the morning and conduct initial focus groups with one CBU in the afternoon. An evaluation team debriefing will take place at the end of week 4; subsequently, the survey questionnaire will be finalized and translated. Logistical arrangements for the administration of the survey during weeks 5 and 6 (possibly week 7) will be made with each field office. The mini-survey will be the responsibility of the local evaluator with oversight being provided by the Evaluation Team Leader. During weeks 5 and 6, interviews shall continue with local government officials and further focus groups shall be conducted with CBUs as coordinated with IOM staff.

Task 4. Process and Analyze Collected Data

As the Evaluation Team carries out its work, the team will process collected data to ascertain whether data gaps exist with respect to the evaluation questions. At the end of Week 6, prior to departing Macedonia, the team leader will prepare a brief status report on “evaluation findings to date” for presentation to the OTI Country Representatives. Ex-Pat members of the Evaluation Team will depart Macedonia on July 26th returning to Washington, D.C. Weeks 7-9 shall be spent integrating all of the collected data into the evaluation draft final report. Survey data will be entered into data files for subsequent data analysis and comparison with qualitative data findings. The integration process will focus on determining the extent to which the Evaluation Team's findings respond to answering the original evaluation research questions.

Task 5. Prepare Draft Evaluation Report

The Draft Evaluation Final Report will be submitted to the OTI CTO at the end of Week 9 (on/about August 25th). It is envisioned that CTO and OTI team members will provide comments on the draft report within two weeks enabling the Evaluation Team to respond to or incorporate suggested changes in the production of the Evaluation Final Report.

Task 6. Submit Final Evaluation Report

The Final Evaluation Report on the Macedonian CBI shall be submitted to the Evaluation CTO at the end of Week 10—no later than September 15, 2003. The evaluation report should be succinct and easy to read yet presenting a comprehensive evaluation of OTI's Macedonia Confidence Building Initiative. Every effort will be taken to produce a pragmatic report consistent with USAID's manageable interest, free of technical jargon and complex statistics. An outline of the draft/final report is presented in Annex 1. In addition to the evaluation report in hard copy, the CTO shall be given report text files in Microsoft Word 2000 on a 1.4 MB 3.5 inch diskettes or a Compact Disk—whatever is requested by OTI.

ANNEX 3

REFERENCES CITED

AUSA (Association of the United States Army) / CSIS (Center for Strategic International Studies), Post-Conflict Reconstruction Task Framework, May 2002.

Bedford, Eleanor. "OTI-Providing Transition Technical Assistance: Past Experience and Future Potential," May 2003:2.

Creative Associates International, Inc., Julie Nenon et. al., "Potentials for Peace: A Mid-term Evaluation of OTI's Program in Macedonia," January 2003.

IOM-USAID/OTI Cooperative Agreement, "Conflict Mitigation Initiative," August 1, 2001.

Morin, Robert and Dana Stimson, "Transitioning to Long Term Development in Kosovo: An Evaluation of the USAID OTI Program in Kosovo," Associates in Rural Development, November 2001.

Stojanov, Zoran and Christa Skerry, "Mid-term Progress Report on Output and Outcome Indicators-Oct 2001-Oct 2002." OTI/Macedonia, April 2003.

Stukel, Thomas W. "Do We Stay or Do We Go?" Disengagement Report presented to OTI/Washington, February 6, 2003.

Taylor, David. Information Memorandum: "Rationale for FY03 Continuation of USAID/DCHA/OTI Program in Macedonia," December 30, 2002.

USAID/OTI/Macedonia, "Macedonia Confidence Building Initiative: Performance Management Plan," March 11, 2003.

USAID/Macedonia, "Strategic Plan; More Legitimate Democratic Institutions," (SO2) Project Update, June 2003.

USAID/Macedonia, Annual Report, January 2003.

USAID/DCHA/Office of Transition Initiatives, "2001-2002 Report" No date.

USAID/DCHA/OTI, "Macedonia Strategic Framework – DRAFT," October 2002.

USAID/BHR/OTI, "Macedonia Assessment Team Assessment and Recommendations," Carl Mabbs-Zeno, Kirpatrick J. Day, and Thomas W. Stukel, Washington, D.C. April 11, 2001.

United States Central Intelligence Agency, World Fact Book, 2002.

ANNEX 4

PERSONS CONTACTED

OTI/MACEDONIA FINAL EVALUATION (JUNE-SEPTEMBER 2003)

USAID/OTI/Washington, D.C.

David Taylor, Director	202-712-0962
Greg Gottlieb, Deputy Director	202-712-0959
Eleanor Bedford, E&E Team Leader	202-712-5231
Carlisle Levine, Program Manager	202-712-0955
Mary Stewart, Program Development Team Leader	202-712-4899
Roger Conrad, Chief-Management and Program Operations	202-712-5261

Jason Aplon, Senior Field Advisor-OTI/Macedonia 2001	389-70-383-380
Tom Stukel, Senior Field Advisor-OTI/Macedonia 2001	772-286-4424

USAID/Europe and Eurasia Bureau

Carl Mabbs-Zeno USAID/E&E/OM/OD, (Member-Macedonia Assessment Team-2001)	202-712-0158
Stacia George, Macedonia Desk Officer	202-712-5954
Cressida Slote, M&E Specialist in E&E	202-712-5417

USAID/DCHA/DG

Paul Nuti, USAID/Macedonia Country Representative 2001	202-712-4485
--	--------------

United States Department of State/Washington D.C.

Paul Pfeuffer, DOS/EUR/SCE, Macedonia Desk Officer	202-647-2452
Paul Jones, DOS/EUR/SCE, Director	202-647-0608

National Security Council

Peter Smith, Committee Staff Member	202-226-9968
-------------------------------------	--------------

MACEDONIA

United States Embassy in Skopje

Eleanor Nagy, Deputy Chief of Mission	389-2-31-16-180
---------------------------------------	-----------------

USAID Mission/Skopje 389-2-3080-446

Alfreda Brewer, Program Officer & Acting Mission Director (Summer 2003)
Michael Eddy, General Development Officer
Robert W. Resseguie, Community Self-Help Initiative (CSHI)
Kathy Stermer, Acting DG Officer

Office of Transition Initiatives/Skopje 389-2-3237-692

Nives Mattich, Country Representative
Christa A. Skerry, Deputy Country Representative

Implementing Partner-International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Pasquale Lupoli, Chief of Mission 389-070-252-148
Peter Collier, Program Manager, Skopje 389-2-3382-812
Katrin Eun-Myo Park, Information Officer
Vladimir Gjorgjiev, Senior Logistics Officer
Deniz Isa-Database/Admin Assistant, Skopje
Zoran Stojanov-Monitoring/Evaluation Assistant, Skopje

CBI Media Team

Sally Broughton-Media Program Officer, Skopje 389-2-3382-812
Vanja Mirkovski-Media Assistant, Skopje
Elena Bonevska-Admin-Finance Asst., Skopje

CBI Skopje Team

Theresa Obradovich-Program Officer, Skopje 389-2-3382-812
Malin van der Meer-Asst. Program Officer, Skopje
Maja Mikarovska-Program Assistant, Skopje
Marta Spirovska-Admin/Finance Assistant, Skopje
Bill Jovanoic, Technical Assistant, Skopje

CBI Bitola Team

Leanne Bayer-Program Officer, Bitola 389-047-257-709
Maja Mikarovska-Program Assistant, Bitola
Zoran Tatarcevski-Program Assistant, Bitola

CBI Kicevo Team

Michael Gabriel-Program Officer, Kicevo 389-045-224-055
Tase Dimitrieski-Program Assistant, Kicevo
Stephanie Broughton-Program Assistant Intern, Kicevo

CBI Kocani Team

Shannon Martinez-Program Officer, Kocani 389-033-277-538
Kliment Stoilov-Program Assistant, Kocani
Teodor Aleksov-Technical Assistant, Kocani

CBI Tetovo Team

John Storey-Program Officer, Tetovo 389-044-352-580
Besnik Xheladini, Program Assistant, Tetovo
Ivona Zakosa, Admin/Finance/Program Asst., Tetovo
Arijeta Potter, Admin. Asst., Tetovo
Natasha Apostoloska, Technical Assistant, Tetovo

Other Contacts in the area of Local Governance and Democratic Reform

Community Self-Help Initiative (CSHI), Louis Berger Assoc. 389-2-3124-411
Michael Wallace, Chief of Party-CSHI
Stefan Klosowski, Senior Community Planner
Nebojsa Mojsoski, CSHI, M&E Coordinator

Paul Parks, Institute for Sustainable Community (ISC) 389-2-3-114-855

Vlade Milcen, Open Society Institute 389-2-344-44-88

Other Contacts

Harry Blair, Team Leader, Civil Society Assessment Team 703-276-0677
Richard Blue, Team Leader, Civil Society Assessment Team 703-276-0677
Ljubinka Ajtovska, Tera Television 389-047-2580-90
Slobodanka Velickova, Macedonia Competitiveness Activity 389-02-339-1711

ANNEX 5

**FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS
CBI STAFF
CBU REPRESENTATIVES**

CBI FIELD QUESTIONNAIRE

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS - CBI OFFICES (5a1)

Focus Groups (FGs) consist of expertly moderated small-group discussions that center on the perceptions and experiences of knowledgeable "customers or beneficiaries" concerning key issues of interest to the 'company or agency' undertaking the Focus Group. These perceptions and experiences are elicited via carefully structured but open-ended questions. The information generated serves to complement other interview data and quantitative outcome data.

Date and location of Focus Group: _____

CBI Staff Represented: _____

Administered by: _____

BACKDROP—Provide a general summary of this CBI office to date.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. WHAT NEED DID YOUR PROGRAM SEEK TO MEET?
2. WHAT ASPECTS OF YOUR PROGRAM WORKED REALLY WELL?
3. DESCRIBE “COMMUNITY PROCESSING” LEADING UP TO A GRANT APPLICATION.
4. WHAT ASPECTS OF YOUR PROGRAM DID NOT WORK OUT WELL—THAT IS, DISCUSS THE PROBLEMS YOU ENCOUNTERED.
5. PLEASE DISCUSS ANY MANAGERIAL DIFFICULTIES YOU HAD IN THE PROGRAM; WITH OTHER DONORS?
6. WHAT PROCEDURES DID YOU USE TO MONETIZE COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS?
7. HOW DID YOUR PROGRAM MANAGERS DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF BENEFICIARIES TO BE SERVED BY A GRANT?
8. IN RETROSPECT, WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE IN THE CBI PROGRAM, IF ANYTHING?
9. DISCUSS YOUR APPRECIATION OF LESSONS LEARNED IN THE CBI PROGRAM.

CBU FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS (5a2)

Focus Groups (FGs) consist of expertly moderated small-group discussions that center on the perceptions and experiences of knowledgeable "customers or beneficiaries" concerning key issues of interest to the 'company or agency' undertaking the Focus Group. These perceptions and experiences are elicited via carefully structured but open-ended questions. The information generated serves to complement other interview data and quantitative outcome data.

Name of CBU Represented: _____

Location/Setting of Focus Group: _____

Administered by: _____ Date Conducted: _____

CBU Interview Questions:

1. WHAT NEED DID YOUR PROJECT SEEK TO MEET?

2. WHAT ASPECTS OF YOUR PROJECT WORKED REALLY WELL?

3. DESCRIBE "COMMUNITY PROCESSING" LEADING UP TO A GRANT APPLICATION?

4. PLEASE DISCUSS ANY MANAGERIAL DIFFICULTIES YOU HAD IN THE PROGRAM; WITH OTHER DONORS?

5. IN RETROSPECT, WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE IN THE CBI PROGRAM, IF ANYTHING?



**International Organization for Migration
Organisation Internationale Pour Les Migrations
Organizacion Internacional para las Migraciones**

CONFIDENCE BUILDING INITIATIVE PROGRAM (CBI) (5B)

MACEDONIA

COMMUNITY OPINION SURVEY

QUESTIONNAIRE OVERVIEW

This questionnaire is part of an evaluation being conducted by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for the purpose of assessing the effects of the Confidence Building Initiative (CBI) Program on its participants. The survey is seeking to learn about your experiences with the CBI program.

USAID and its partner, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), are particularly interested in your candid views about the CBI program; the views you now have about citizen participation, the knowledge you have gained in participating in CBI process groups, and how working with CBI is likely to be applied to future community problems.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and no individual will be identified in any report resulting from this survey. These questions should take approximately 25-30 minutes to complete.

Thank you for your participation in this survey

PROJECT DATA: (This information will be completed by your questionnaire facilitator)

- 1. Field office: Bitola Kicevo Kocani Skopje Tetovo
 - 2. Year Project Ended 2002 2003
 - 3. Grant Number _____
 - 4. Sector _____
 - 5. Program Category _____
 - 6. CBU Contribution (%) _____
-

7. How did you learn about the CBI project? **(Circle only one item)**

- People from CBI came to the community1
- My relatives, family friends told me about CBI2
- Through media (newspaper, radio, TV)3
- Other communities told me about the CBI project4
- I don't know5

8. How did you become involved with the CBI program? **(Circle only one item)**

- Referred by a friend1
- Referral by other community groups2
- By CBI staff3

9. What was the main purpose of the CBI project in your community? **(Circle all items that apply)**

- To do infrastructure projects (bridges, schools, water supply)1
- Resolve conflict between different groups2
- Involving more citizens in community affairs3
- Stimulate people to work together4
- I don't know5

10. How did your community decide what kind of project should be done? **(Circle only one item)**

- Through discussion at the meetings1
- Local authorities decided2
- The village council decided3
- A few people from the community made the decision4
- I don't know5

11. Do you know who participated in this project? **(Circle all items that apply)**

- People from community1
- Local government officials2
- CBI3
- Some foreign organization, I don't know the exact name4
- USAID5
- IOM6
- I don't know7

12. Now that you have participated in the CBI program, are you interested in becoming more involved in the activities of your community? **(Circle only one item)**

- Yes1
- No2
- Not sure3
- Not at this time4
- No opinion5

13. How many community (CBU) meetings have you attended? **(Estimate the number)**

14. What was your primary interest in participating in these meetings? **(Circle the item that best applies)**

- To gain skills in working with others.....1
- To cooperate with different people2
- To insure that money is spent fairly3
- To contribute to improvements in my community4
- I was selected/appointed by the community to serve on the CBU5

15. How did your group or community participate in the project? We provided:

(Circle all items that apply)

- Materials1
- Local labor2
- Local knowledge and suggestions.....3
- Financial support.....4
- Technical equipment5
- Obtaining building permits and other legal documents.....6
- Technical assessment.....7
- Management8
- Nothing.....9

16. Estimate the total number of persons that participated in your project? _____

17. How did CBI participate in your community project?

(Circle all items that apply)

- Provided money1
- CBI organized people from community.....2
- Provided equipment.....3
- Paid for contractors.....4
- Did nothing5
- I don't know.....6

18. What do you feel are the most important personal attributes members of community groups gain from participating in CBI community projects? Using a scale of 1 to 5 (1=very poor; 2=poor; 3=average; 4=good; 5=best; don't know=6), please rate the following attributes.

(Circle one number for each activity)

Willingness to listen to others	1	2	3	4	5	6
Tolerance of other's opinions	1	2	3	4	5	6
Personal connections with local officials	1	2	3	4	5	6
Building self-reliance to start community initiatives	1	2	3	4	5	6
Promoting commitment to one's community	1	2	3	4	5	6
A desire to make positive changes in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ability to lead others	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cooperating and working together	1	2	3	4	5	6
Learning to reach agreement with others	1	2	3	4	5	6

19. Before the CBI project, community needs were provided by: **(Circle one item that best applies)**

- Local community members1
- Other NGOs2
- Local and national government3
- International donors.....4
- The community did not have needs5
- No help provided.....6
- Don't know7

20. Community members, before the CBI program, showed initiative in the following ways: **(Circle all items that apply)**

- Gathered together to discuss solutions to common problems1
- Initiated meetings with authorities2
- Looked for outside donors.....3
- Showed little initiative and relied on local government.....4
- All of the above.....5

21. What was your experience with the CBI meetings? **Circle all items that apply)**

- The meetings were open to the public1
- Everybody could participate equally2
- Few people attended these meetings3
- Most people from the community attended these meetings4
- We did not have meetings5
- We had meetings very often.....6
- We only had meetings when it was necessary7
- CBI staff were present at every meeting.....8

22. These meetings were useful because: **(Circle one item that best applies)**

- We talked about our community problems1
- Different people from our community were present in these meetings.....2
- Together we agreed on solutions to community problems3
- I become friendly with more people in my community4
- These meetings involved participatory decision-making.....5
- These meetings were not useful6

23. In your opinion, how do you view CBI staff participation in the project? Again using a scale of 1 to 5 (1=very poor; 2=poor; 3=average; 4=good; 5=best), please rate the following attributes.

(Circle one number for each activity)

CBI responded to our requests when others did not	1	2	3	4	5
CBI staff were very supportive of our group activities	1	2	3	4	5
CBI staff worked closely with community members	1	2	3	4	5
CBI staff did what they promised to do	1	2	3	4	5
CBI staff approved our project with little delay	1	2	3	4	5

24. Is there another project currently going on in your community? **(Circle all items that apply)**

- Yes, another CBI project1
- Yes, some other donors are providing assistance.....2
- Yes, by the local government, self-initiated and financed.....3
- No other group is assisting us at this time4
- I don't know.....5

25. What attitude changes have you observed taking place in your community in the last 2 years? **(Circle one item that best applies)**

- Community member are interested in further projects1
- Community members are willing to work together on other projects2
- Community members are willing to work together with Local Government.....3
- There is little interest in further projects in my community4
- People are more willing to talk together about community problems5
- I don't know of any changes in people's attitudes6

26. As a result of your experience with CBI, what have you learned about solving local community problems? **(Circle only one item)**

- Community members can work together to solve community problems1
- Only local government should solve community problems2
- With local government, communities can address their problems3
- Nothing can be done without outside resources of money4
- Nothing.....5
- I don't know.....6

27. The benefits from this project in the community were mainly for: **(Circle all items that apply)**

- Economic development.....1
- Infrastructure2
- Employment.....4
- Health.....5
- Improving ethnic relations6
- Improving community interaction7
- Participation in decision-making.....8
- Expanding gender participation in community affairs9

28. What community activities did you participate BEFORE CBI? **(Circle all items that apply)**

- Participating in local NGO activities1
- Attending commune/municipal council meetings.....2
- Serving on community committees3
- Participating in an agricultural organization4
- Participating in the parent/teacher association.....5
- Talking to local politicians/officials6
- Writing to local politicians/officials.....7

29. What community activities do you participate in NOW? (Circle **all items** that apply)

- Participating in local NGO activities1
- Attending commune/municipal council meetings.....2
- Serving on community committees3
- Participating in an agricultural organization4
- Participating in the parent/teacher association.....5
- Talking to local politicians/officials6
- Writing to local politicians/officials7

Please circle the number that you feel is closest to your opinion:

30. Will you use your experience working with CBI to find solutions to other problems in your community?

- Yes.....1 No.....2 Not Sure.....3

31. Are there places in your community that you go to now that you did not go before the CBI program?

- Yes.....1 No.....2 Not Sure.....3 Same as Before.....4

32. Are there people you visit now that you did visit before participating in the CBI program?

- Yes.....1 No.....2 Not Sure.....3 Same as Before.....4

33. Are people in area where the project was implemented aware of the CBI program?

- Yes.....1 No.....2 Not Sure.....3

34. Since you participated in CBI, estimate how many persons you have talked with about this program?

Enter an Estimated Number: _____

35. In your opinion, how many persons will become directly involved in some type of community activity in your community as a result of your participation in CBI?

(Circle **only one** item)

- None1
- 1-5 persons2
- 6-15 Persons3
- 16-304
- Greater than 30 persons.....5
- Have no idea6

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

(circle the most appropriate response)

36. Your Age _____

37. Your Gender

Male.....1
Female.....2

38. Marital Status

Married1
Single..... 2
Widowed.....3
Divorced.....4

39. Number of Children

One1
Two.....2
Three3
More than three4
Do not have children5

40. What is your highest level of education you have completed?

Primary School.....1
Secondary School2
Specialized Technical Training3
Some College/University Courses4
University Degree5
Post-Graduate Courses.....6

41. What is your occupational area?

Industry and/or mining.....1
Agriculture and/or forestry.....2
Transportation3
Construction.....4
Private business5
Commercial services6
Public health7
Public utilities8
Education and/or cultural activities9
Local or national government.....10
Prefer not to answer.....11
Other.....12

42.Are you currently employed?

Yes.....1; No.....2;

If Yes, please complete Question 42

43. Full time employment..... 1
Part time employment.....2

44. What ethnic group do you identify with?

Macedonian.....1
Albanian2
Serb.....3
Roma4
Vlach5
Turk6
Bosnian.....7
Other.....8
Prefer not to answer.....9

45. Where do you live?

Village.....1
City.....2

ANNEX 6: SURVEY PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

Sample size=42 CBUs, 260 Respondents

Age range 13-78; Average=41.4

Gender: Males=61%, Females=39%

Marital Status

Married = 79%

Single = 18%

Widowed = 1%

Divorced = 2%

Number of Children

1 = 10%

2 = 41%

3+ = 9%

None = 22%

Highest Level of Education

Primary School = 8.5%

High School = 21.2%

Technical Training = 11.5%

Some College = 19.6%

University Degree = 36.5%

Post Grad Courses = 2.7%

Occupation Area

Industry and/or Mining = 4.6%

Agriculture and/or Forestry = 7.7%

Transportation = 1.5%

Construction = 1.9%

Private Business = 8.8%

Public Health = 5.0%

Public Utilities = 1.5%

Education/Cultural Activities = 35%

Local/National Government = 6.5%

No Response = 1.5%

Other (not coded) = 25.8%

Currently Employed: yes=69%; no=31%

Percent Employment: Full-time=92%; Part-time=8%

Ethnic Identification

Macedonian = 49.2%

Albanian = 40.4%

Serb = 1.9%

Roma = 1.5%

Vlach = 1.5%

Turk = 3.5%

Bosnian = 1.5%

Other = .4%

Residence: City=60%; Village=40%

ANNEX 7

**OTI/MACEDONIA EVALUATION ITINERARY
(JUNE-SEPTEMBER 2003)**

Date	Evaluation Activities
June 16, 2003	Received basic OTI documents; started reading in preparation for initial OTI meeting.
June 17, 2003	Met with Social Impact Project Manager for initial orientation; later met with OTI Contract Technical Officer (CTO) and OTI/Washington staff to discuss SOW and work expectations.
June 18, 2003	Met with Database Manager to review OTI database, installed same and received additional documents for review.
June 19, 2003	Met with EE Evaluation Officer and Macedonia Country Representative.
June 20, 2003	Started work on evaluation work plan design, initiated phone calls with former OTI staff.
June 23, 2003	Completion of draft work plan; added section on conceptual overview.
June 24, 2003	Met with CTO and OTI Director to discuss evaluation work plan; continued interviews with OTI staff and persons formerly involved in Macedonia transition.
June 25, 2003	Made revisions on work plan based on discussion with OTI staff, continued interviews.
June 26, 2003	Final debriefing on proposed work plan, additional interviews at USAID.
June 27, 2003	Final interviews with OTI support staff; continued with phone interviews.
June 30, 2003	Continued review of OTI documents; initial work on field protocols.
July 1, 2003	Continued review of Macedonia database, departed for Macedonia 3:30 pm.
July 2, 2003	Travel day; arrived Skopje 3:20 PM; picked up vehicle—arrival at Tims Apts. 5 pm.
July 3, 2003	Team planning day—discussed logistics and work assignments, initial OTI briefing.
July 4, 2003	Attended media presentation at International Organization for Migration (IOM) office; additional materials provided to Evaluation Team at OTI.
July 5, 2003	Worked with OTI database to understand project components; continued briefing with IOM and OTI managers.
July 6, 2003	Traveled to Bitola and met with IOM program staff.
July 7, 2003	Met with Community Self-Help Initiative (CSHI) managed by Louis Berger Associates and

	Civil Society Assessment Team doing a sector analysis for the USAID/Macedonia.
Date	Evaluation Activities
July 8, 2003	Traveled to Kocani and met with IOM program staff and conducted focus groups with three Confidence Building Units (CBUs).
July 9, 2003	Briefing with Acting Mission Director; returned to Bitola to conduct focus groups with two CBUs and observe community initiative projects.
July 10, 2003	Met with IOM Media program team, interviewed two local CBUs in Skopje, and had a protocol meeting with the Acting U.S. Ambassador, also met with Director of Institute for Sustainable Communities (ISC).
July 11, 2003	Met with IOM Program Manager to go over IOM operations and grant budget; evaluation team met to begin identifying programmatic themes based on field site visits completed.
July 12, 2003	Traveled to Kocevo and met with IOM program staff and carried out focus groups with two CBUs.
July 13, 2003	Review of collected data and planning for next workweek.
July 14, 2003	Met with IOM Skopje program team, 2 local CBUs, attended Civil Society briefing.
July 15, 2003	Traveled to Tetovo and met with IOM program staff and two CBUs.
July 16, 2003	Met with CSHI M&E Manager at Louis Berger; conducted initial briefing on evaluation finding with IOM and OTI staff.
July 17, 2003	Further debriefing with IOM/OTI managers on evaluation findings; one evaluation team member (Brusset) departs Macedonia.
July 18, 2003	Design and development of draft community assessment questionnaire.
July 19, 2003	Continued work on questionnaire design and development.
July 20, 2003	Completion of draft questionnaire along with additional editing by team members.
July 21, 2003	Draft questionnaire distributed to OTI staff for review and comment; began translation of questionnaire into Macedonian and Albanian.
July 22, 2003	Incorporated comments from OTI staff into questionnaire; continued with translation of questionnaires.
July 23, 2003	Pre-tested the draft questionnaire(s) on one CBU in Skopje and with select IOM staff.
July 24, 2003	Final changes made to questionnaires; master copy to printer; sample frame constructed with designation of CBU to be contacted for survey participation.

Date	Evaluation Activities
July 25, 2003	Final logistical arrangements made with Survey Team to conduct survey with local IOM field offices and arrangements made with Data Entry person for handling questionnaire data.
July 26, 2003	Evaluation Team Leader departed Skopje for Washington D.C.
July 28-Aug 1, 2003	Local Survey Team members conduct survey interviews in Tetovo; Ex-Pat Evaluation Team members begin initial write-up of field notes.
Aug 4-8, 2003	Local Survey Team members conduct survey interviews in Kicevo and Bitola; interviews also carried out with media CBUs.
Aug 11-15, 2003	Local Survey Team members conduct survey interviews in Kocani and complete survey interviews in Skopje; Ex-Pat Evaluation team members working on evaluation report.
Aug 18-22, 2003	All questionnaires are entered into SPSS with data file sent to Evaluation Team Leader; data file reviewed for accuracy with data analysis completed by Team Leader in Washington.
Sep 15 2003	Draft Evaluation Report of Macedonian OTI Program completed and submitted to USAID OTI/Washington for review and comment.
Oct 30, 2003	Comments and revisions from OTI are incorporated into final evaluation report and submitted to USAID/OTI Washington.

ANNEX 8: OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

USAID

The United States Government has traditionally been active in Macedonia to help stabilize the country, most notably through preventive military deployments, and governance and liberalization type initiatives. USAID has been central to these efforts made to protect the integrity of the country, by administering U.S. \$273 million from the initiation of the aid programs in 1992 to September 2002. This was increased in 2001 to U.S. \$38.4 million, and U.S. \$45 million in 2002. It has since been scheduled to decrease, but Mission reporting reflects a belief that the overall objectives over the critical last two years have been met⁴. The gradual scaling down of U.S. resources in southeast Europe is due to begin in Macedonia with the ending of most of the current programs as from FY 2007.

The program includes the following Strategic Objectives:

- Strategic Objective 1: Private sector development;
- Strategic Objective 2: More legitimate democratic institutions;
- Strategic Objective 3: Mitigation of the social consequences of economic transition; and
- Strategic Objective 4: Special initiatives: support to the census, budget support, organizational training.

The second Strategic Objective is the most relevant in terms of activities, and the one with which CBI has had most contacts. Under this SO, U.S. \$15.845 million have been obligated in FY 2003, making it equal to twice the CBI program. This SO breaks down into the following Intermediate Results:

Intermediate Result 1: "Increased citizen's participation in political and social decision-making" with the following programs:

1. Democracy Network, Institute for Sustainable Communities (ISC)

Active Implementation: March 1995
Estimated Completion: December 2002 (Extension in process.)

Goal: To enhance democracy by strengthening non-governmental organizations in Macedonia through technical assistance, training and financial assistance. The Democracy Network Program promotes public participation, partnerships, networking among Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and mentoring other organizations. This goal is accomplished through three components: CSO Strengthening, Community Action and the Grants Program.

2. NGO Legal Framework, International Center for Not-For-Profit Law (ICNL)

Active Implementation: April 1995
Estimated Completion: April 2004

Goal: To support the development of a legal environment in Macedonia that supports the creation and operation of NGOs and the development of a sustainable NGO sector through: a) technical assistance, research and drafting support of the NGO legal framework, and b) building indigenous capacity to implement NGO laws and undertaking future legislative reform efforts.

⁴ See "USAID Macedonia: Annual Report FY 2003", in particular section "Cover Memo."

3. Community Self-Help Initiative (CSHI), Louis Berger Group

Active Implementation: June 2000
Estimated Completion: September 2003

Goal: To foster self-determination at the community level. Expected results include: partner communities are using open and collaborative planning approaches to prioritize and resolve community needs; ethnic minorities within communities are well-integrated into self help committees and working jointly to solve community problems; communities are able to prepare community services or small infrastructure projects, manage or implement the ensuing work, and maintain the service or facility; communities are encouraging employment and local economic growth through labor intensive service and infrastructure projects; and local contractors, preferably Small and Micro Enterprises (SMEs), are benefiting from contracts generated through CSHI funding.

4. Labor Unions Program, American Center for International Labor Solidarity (ACILS)

Active Implementation: May 2001
Estimated Completion: September 2002 (extension through July 2004 currently in process)

Goal: To strengthen the role of labor unions and their membership in the social, economic and political development of Macedonia. ACILS will implement education and creative advocacy initiatives in the economic and social transition areas to strengthen the capacity of labor unions to fully participate as effective civil society organizations.

5. Professional Media Program, International Research and Exchanges Board

Active Implementation: July 2000
Estimated Completion: December 2004

Goal: To support the development of an independent and financially viable media sector in Macedonia. ProMedia focuses on developing legal and regulatory framework to support free speech, developing effective media associations to represent the professional interests of the media sector, strengthening the managerial and journalistic skills of the media and increasing competitiveness and efficiency of media enterprises.

6. Children's Educational and Multi-Cultural Television Series, Search for Common Ground

Active Implementation: September 1998
Estimated Completion: July 2004

Goal: To produce a children's television series which seeks to strengthen the culture of peace and ethnic cooperation among future generations of Macedonian citizens. In 1998, SCG in collaboration with Children's Television Workshop (CTW) created a pilot weekly TV series called Nashe Maalo (Our Neighborhood). Aimed at children aged 7-12 in multiethnic societies, the series seeks to promote intercultural understanding and conflict resolution skills among children. The objective is to teach conflict resolution to children in situations they can relate to, and be entertained by.

7. Civic Education: Path to a Civil Society, Catholic Relief Services (CRS)

Active Implementation: September 1998

Estimated Completion: September 2003

Goal: To provide Macedonian citizens with the knowledge and skills they need to be citizens in a democratic society, to increase their participation in democratic decision-making processes, and to teach the next generation to do this independently of ethnicity, religion, and economic status. This activity has two main objectives: a) to help students acquire the skills to participate in civil society through the introduction of civic education into Macedonian primary schools. This will be achieved through curriculum development and teacher training, and b) to involve parents in the introduction of civic education into their children's lives and to support their ability to participate in education decision-making through support for the development of Parent Councils in the schools.

Intermediate Result 2: "Adherence to the Rule of Law Enhanced" with the following programs:

1. Rule of Law, American Bar Association/Central and East European Law Initiative

Active Implementation: January 1993

Estimated Completion: April 2003

Goal: Support of the transition to a democratic system under the rule of law through judicial education, continuing legal education, institution building of judges and bar associations, court administration, and related legal reforms.

2. Legal Reform Support

Estimated date of start: September 2002

Estimated Completion: August 2007

Goal: To further the development of rule of law in Macedonia by enabling the Macedonian judiciary to: a) develop into a stronger, more effective and independent branch of government; b) resolve legal disputes in a more timely, consistent and legally-correct manner and reduce case backlogs; c) function in a more transparent, open, responsive and accountable manner; and d) develop the capacity and mechanisms for improving court organization, practices and performance over time.

Intermediate Result 3: "More effective, responsive and accountable local government" with the following programs:

1. Local Government Reform Project, Development Alternatives, Inc.

Active Implementation: October 1999

Estimated Completion: September 2004

Goal: To decentralize local government competencies and fiscal authorities, build public participation in local government, develop the capacity at the local level, and strengthen municipal associations to serve as a mechanism for a better national policy and more effective local government. Through this activity, USAID has been assisting the Government in amending the Law on Local Self-Government that was adopted in January 2002 and will continue

providing assistance for its implementation. In addition, it provides assistance in drafting the Law on Local Government Finance. USAID also supports strengthening of local understanding of and advocacy for reforms, as well as making the policy reform process more participatory and inclusive. This activity assists local governments to institutionalize citizens' involvement in the delivery of public services, providing information and assistance to citizens at Citizen Information Centers, and development of effective relationships among local government, the media and NGOs. It also assists local governments to improve several local government functions: local economic development, information management systems, budget/finance in the delivery of public services, and public service performance standards. Strengthening municipal associations is vital to representing municipalities at the national level and having a voice in national policy making strong municipal associations is another component, crucial for local government reform, where USAID will continue to focus its technical assistance.

2. Environmental and Economic Development Project, International Center for Environmental Resources and Development Alternatives (ICERD); City University of New York

Active Implementation: October 2000

Estimated Completion: August 2003

Goal: To address wastewater treatment problems throughout the country, especially in areas that have difficulties connecting to larger wastewater treatment plants.

Intermediate Objective 4: "Increased confidence in democratic institutions and political processes" with the following programs:

1. Parliamentary Development and Political Party Reform, National Democratic Institute (NDI)

Active Implementation: November 1993

Estimated Completion: March 2005

Goal: To strengthen the capacity of Parliament to serve as a vehicle for directing legislative initiatives, to increase the capacity of members of Parliament in their roles as legislators and elected political representatives, to enhance communication between elected representatives and their constituents, and to assist Parliament and political parties in becoming more accountable and effective institutions, so that they are better able to represent the interests of citizens. Support includes a parliamentary intern program, training and consultations with MPs on a host of topics including legislative drafting, media relations, and public speaking, upgrading the Parliament's information technology, and working with political parties. To promote the integrity of the electoral process for the 2002 parliamentary elections supports a domestic NGO coalition to conduct domestic election monitoring and works with political parties on election related issues.

2. Election Reform – Election Administration Assistance, International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES)

Active Implementation: July 2000

Estimated Completion: February 2003

Goal: To improve the legal framework for elections, to increase the capacity of election administration structures and personnel to effectively administer elections, and to conduct voter education activities.

3. Political Party Support, International Republican Institute (IRI)

Active Implementation: June 2001

Estimated Completion: June 2003

Goal: The activity supports the development of more genuine and competitive political processes through the development of competitive, democratic and representative political parties capable of serving as channels of collective societal interests.

EU and OSCE, Bilateral donors, UN agencies

European Union

The EU has become engaged in a large scale in the Balkans due to the combined pressure of member states and the perception that this was an opportunity in which could be developed the Common Foreign and Security Policy, as well as channeling large scale structural assistance. This led to the development of four separate structures in Macedonia:

- The Office of the EU Special Representative, with a small political unit, responding to the European Council and its head Mr. Javier Solana in Brussels;
- The European Community Military Monitors, whose task is to monitor cease-fires and collate information on incidents at the community level, reporting to the Council through its Military committees;
- The European Agency for Reconstruction, based out of Thessaloniki, which is a separate agency of the European Union designed to handle development funds for the Balkans; and
- The European Commission Delegation, which handles funds for a regional program.

In recent months, the NATO command over international peacekeeping forces in Macedonia has been transferred to the EU (Operation Concordia). This has had limited impact however, as many NATO command and control elements (Naples) are still involved in the decision-making circuit. The focus of EU cooperation is on good governance, rule of law, market economy development, environment, infrastructure, and civil society strengthening. None of these programs is designed for rapid implementation of a peace-building strategy, with the exception of the Delegation of the European Commission, which has enjoyed funding from the Rapid Reaction Mechanism. The funding from this mechanism has been used for military related activities, and not for a grass-roots initiative comparable to CBI. The opportunity for a direct linkage of CBI to EU programs is therefore limited.

However, large-scale development funds are being used for small-scale reconstruction. A large part of this is used for the reconstruction of housing destroyed during the conflict, and the reintegration of the 100,000 internally displaced persons. In the AORs this has resulted in less consultative but nevertheless complementary projects, contributing to a climate of international concern for rural Macedonia.

The EU consultation process is very developed, and certainly contributed to creating a unified policy framework for bilateral activities by the EU member states, the military contingents, and the European Commission and Agency. The Framework Agreement remains the central element of policy making. The EU gap analysis notes however that the Framework Agreement remains unlinked to a lot of development assistance, either indirectly (in terms of proportions of funding) or directly (mention of the Framework Agreement in aid initiatives and NGO work).

Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)

The OSCE has been present in Macedonia since its independence. It is currently running programs in election monitoring when these are relevant, police redeployment, and rule of law (anti-trafficking, Public Attorney/Ombudsman, trial observation, judicial reform, and capacity building of human rights NGOs). Of particular relevance to CBI are the Community Advisory Groups (CAGs) that are present in 121 villages throughout Macedonia to discuss issues of concern relating to security and police. These Groups have gradually been attached to the Municipal structure but remain informal. The elaboration of the CAGs is very similar to that of the CBUs. These are all the more relevant to CBI in that they often result in the definition of projects relating to key services (schools, etc.) whose implementation would strengthen multiethnic cooperation, as well as the existence of the CAGs themselves. These cannot be funded by the OSCE, which does not handle funding, and ad hoc requests are presented to donors, in particular the Dutch Ministry of Cooperation, which has been the most responsive. Even if contacts are made between some of the AOR/CBI personnel and the OSCE offices, there is little mutual awareness of programs between the CBI and OTI personnel and the OSCE personnel in Skopje.

Bilateral Agencies and United Nations

CBI has come into contact in the field with similar programs, at times positively (for example handing over for funding of some of the media projects to Norway) or negatively (the duplication of funding by the Greek Ministry of Cooperation in Skopje). The prevailing scenario, however, is one of convergent implementation, with all the activities contributing, probably with varied degrees of effectiveness, to the sense of international engagement in favor of a stable multiethnic Macedonia. The impact of these programs consequently merges with that of CBI in contributing to an abatement of the 2001 conflict. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) for employment generation has been funded by USAID, and covered a few thousand youth in the conflict areas. It had few contacts with the CBI program, and there appears to have been no regional representation of the UNDP programs outside Skopje. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) programs were phased out after the repatriation of the 200,000 Kosovo refugees. The opportunities for coordination with CBI were consequently very limited in both these cases.