



CONFLICT
MANAGEMENT
CONSULTING

30th December 2019

Third Party Monitoring – Kosovo

Final Report

1. Executive Summary

This is the TPM report commissioned by GCERF on two of its five programmes operating in Kosovo - Consortium A operating in regions A and B with the Project 1 and Project 2 programmes; and the Consortium B operating in the regions of B, C, D, E and F. The report assesses the extent to which the programmes have achieved their objectives in line with the GCERF intervention logic of the action and the extent to which the projects have contributed to the overall GCERF programme goal.

The assessment was conducted by Conflict Management Consulting and is based on data gathered from the communities where GCERF-funded activities have been implemented. Data-gathering occurred during the months of October and November 2019. The cut-off date for the report is October 31.

The evaluation finds that both programmes are highly relevant to the Kosovo context and are well in line with the National Strategy for Prevention of Radicalisation as well as GCERF's strategic goals in the country. The relevance of interventions will continue to grow in the medium term especially for reintegration of returnees, following the second wave of returnees being repatriated and increased willingness of national authorities to tackle their reintegration with civil society support. Prevention of youth radicalisation through media awareness and youth empowerment activities is another priority in the medium term.

Data indicates achievement of outputs in line with the agreed workplans. Stakeholders highly appreciate activities, which have focused on a combined approach of awareness raising events, capacity building activities, activities aiming at strengthening community resilience as well as a national media campaign. The sequence of activities was quite ambitious in terms of the broad range of stakeholders to be targeted and the limited time allowed to build relationships with authorities. Longer-term sustainability elements are present but should have been better incorporated at the core of the programme.

The following recommendations, on the basis of the findings presented in Section 6, are made:

1. Continue to work on awareness and capacity building activities for institutional actors at the municipal level, who are increasingly going to have to deal with issues of reintegration. Interventions should however be **more targeted and focused**. The outreach strategy has so far been very broad, engaging different types of governmental institutions, at different levels, and even other stakeholders and has been limited (in the case of at least one of the two programmes) to one-off activities with no follow-up. In future programming it could be more effective to use the programme's resources to target a relatively more contained number of stakeholders and possibly aspire to achieve a multiplier effect towards the programmatic and logistic coordination of activities, which may have different, but complementary focus.
2. Consider channelling awareness raising and education activities for children and youth **through the institutional mechanisms: schools and teachers** themselves in order to increase local ownership and create better prospects for sustainability. This may require targeted capacity building activities for education managers and teaching staff as well to prepare them for replication of activities once the GCERF programmes phase out.
3. Design **tailored support programmes for families of returnees**, including parenting courses, homework support for children, vocational training courses and leisure activities. Integrating

families of returnees in larger groups settings (of not only returnees) has been indicated to be received more openly.

4. Design **appropriate income support grants for out - of school youth** and adults. These may take the form of subsidized on the job-training, or employment, start-up grants, etc. The mechanism itself has been proved to be successful in other programmes but it needs to be tailored to the specific needs and priorities of the recipients.
5. Continue the youth engagement activities (clubs) developed by the projects 1 and 2 for at least another year – either in the same cities or elsewhere. However, it is advisable that support to schools and youth is made **conditional upon communal co-funding** of activities as well as more direct teacher engagement in the actual delivery is gradually fostered (as per Rec. 2) to ensure some degree of sustainability.
6. CVE and PVE are relatively new subjects in Kosovo and there are only a limited number of organisations and experts who have developed some degree of familiarity. It is advisable for GCERF to build on such capacities that have been created, in part also thanks to its funding. It is advisable that project implementers, at least at PR level, as well as any lecturers on CVE, **receive adequate training** on how to tackle issues of religious ideology without risk of alienating the audience.
7. Relationship forging between authorities and direct beneficiaries is an important prerequisite for achieving results. Trust is important in all relationships and even more so in sensitive subjects such as PVE. For any future activities, it will be important for the PRs and GCERF to consider a programme that supports stakeholders more closely with a sequence of activities to build more open relationships and create the grounds for better programme results. These should include monitoring and evaluation, to understand the contribution and attribution of programme results.
8. Continue the **media awareness campaign** and make it more inclusive – for instance through announcing a periodic competition for best articles around the issues for young journalists and students.