***Project Title****:* Enable and Manage more Beneficial Civil Society Environment - EMBRACE

***Project (Award) Number:*** BIH10/00120690

***Implementing Partner:*** United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Bosnia and Herzegovina

***Start Date:*** *November 1, 2019* ***End Date:*** *October 31, 2020* ***LPAC Meeting date:*** *August 9, 2019*

***Implementation modality:*** Direct Implementation Modality

|  |
| --- |
| ***Brief Description*** |
| The overall objective of EMBRACE project is to support social development through improved civil society organisations (CSO) service delivery. The project will work along two tracks: i) enhancing CSO’s organisational capacities for service provision and ii) creation of an enabling environment through interventions in the regulatory framework.CSO capacities will be supported through a grant scheme for CSOs as well as technical assistance to improve CSO capacities for management, PR, accountability, etc. at least 20 CSO projects, selected through a competitive and open call for CSOs, will provide support across the areas of social services for the most vulnerable, inclusion, youth, activism and volunteerism, gender equality, environmental protection and human rights. In parallel, the project will work with entity authorities (Federation of BiH and Republika Srpska) as well as with state authorities with purpose to create improvements to the policy environment governing CSO funding. Direct project beneficiaries include 3,100 citizens directly benefiting from awarded CSO projects in minimum10 localities in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). Project partners: CSOs, central and entity ministries (BiH Ministry of Justice, FBiH Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government of Republika Srpska). |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Linkage with SDGs:*** SDG 16***Linkage with EU accession agenda:***Direct contribution to strengthening public administration and institutional building at subnational government levels***Linkage with UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021:***Signature solution 2: Strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance. Strategic Plan Outcome 1: Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions***Contributing Outcome (UNDAF/CPD):****UNDAF outcome 4.* By 2019, economic, social and territorial disparities are decreased through coordinated approach by national and subnational actors.***Output/s ID (with gender marker):*** *Output 4.* Frameworks and dialogue processes in place for effective civil society engagement in development/***GEN2***  |  | ***Total resources required:*** | *586,716.73 USD* |
|  | *(5,000,000.00 NOK)* |
|  | ***Total resources allocated:*** | ***UNDP TRAC:*** | *0* |
|  | ***The Norwegian ministry of foreign affairs- Royal Norwegian Embassy Sarajevo***  | *586,716.73 USD**(5,000,000.00 NOK)* |
|  | ***Donor:*** | *0* |
|  | ***Government:*** | *0* |
|  | ***In-Kind:*** | *0* |
|  | ***Unfunded:*** | *0* |

*Agreed by (signatures):*

|  |
| --- |
| *UNDP* |
| *Print Name:* ***Steliana Nedera, Resident Representative*** |
| *Date: October 17, 2019* |
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# *1. Development Challenge*

## 1.1 Wider country context and sector specific analysis

Bosnia and Herzegovina have been experiencing challenges in establishing institutional mechanisms for cooperation with CSOs and ensuring transparent mechanisms for CSO funding. Transparency limitations related to the funding mechanisms (public funds) are direct result of inadequate financial and legal regulations. Also, CSOs reporting on received funding is poor and often not properly monitored. Also, grassroots’ CSOs still need to enhance their capacities in order to sufficiently answer to local needs.

Still, considerable changes have been introduced by previous **LOD intervention**[[1]](#footnote-2) and subsequently **ReLOaD[[2]](#footnote-3) programme** on the local level in a last decade. *Bosnia and Herzegovina 2018 Report* (2018 Communication on EU Enlargement Policy) recognizes that “regarding civil society, there was some progress in establishing institutional mechanisms for cooperation between governments and civil society organisations (CSOs), as well as in public financing of CSOs.” Same document highlights need for continuation of addressing transparency in public funding: “public funding calls and, in some cases, results of selections were publicly available, but some funding mechanisms for distribution of funds remained non-legally binding and were not fully implemented. Transparency remained weak due to lack of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.” [[3]](#footnote-4)

Both LOD and ReLOaD interventions contributed to opening space for CSOs to be recognized as service providers in their local communities demonstrating to local governments how to outsource services to CSOs. Improvement of cooperation between local governments and CSOs continued to be part of the agenda. A need for capacity development of CSO, especially grassroot CSOs, remain and is related to the capacity of civil society to better respond to citizens’ needs by properly articulating ideas within their project proposals.

## 1.2 Target groups and their specific needs

The project will focus on the following main beneficiaries:

* 20 CSOs in minimum of 10 localities across Bosnia and Herzegovina;
* Ministry of Justice of Bosnia and Herzegovina;
* Ministry of Justice of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina;
* Ministry of Administration and Local Self Government of Republika Srpska;
* 3,100 citizens in 10 local communities across BiH.

## 1.3 Lessons learnt from previous experiences

Through the implementation of four consecutive phases of the LOD project and a regional ReLOaD programme in the western Balkans, UNDP BiH has built extended knowledge related to capacity development of civil society. Same is related to the understanding of the obstacles related to regulatory and institutional framework of public funding of civil society.

The project will require adjusting existing tools for transparent funds disbursement (grant scheme) utilised in the ReLOaD programme. Previous experience shows that additional support to CSOs that would include training in Project Cycle Management (PCM), mentoring of CSO and regular monitoring missions in the field significantly increase performance of CSOs. This is desirable in order to ensure efficiency and maximise impact.

Considering lessons learnt from the past, grant scheme for CSOs will prioritize support to interventions across the areas: social services for the most vulnerable, inclusion, youth, activism and volunteerism, gender equality, environmental protection, and human rights.

In that regard, the Project will assist in reinforcing local service delivery and community wellbeing, especially in areas where local governments fail to outreach specific population groups and their interests with adequate services and support.

# *2. Strategy*

## 2.1 Impact hypothesis/theory of change

Under the assumption that CSOs pro-actively participate in the project, and that a sufficient number of CSO project proposals is submitted, then they will contribute to fulfilment of the **project outcome:** *reducing public service delivery gaps in local communities.*

This will be achieved through:

1. **Provided services for 3,100 citizens in no fewer than 10 local communities across BiH**

This output envisions the design and implementation of a grant scheme delivered in two cohorts: 1) small scale grants for grassroot CSOs in the amount up to BAM 20.000 BAM (up to 10 CSO projects); and 2) grants for more advanced CSOs in the amount of BAM 20,000-60,000 (up to 10 CSO projects).

1. **Gaps Identified and addressed in the policy enabling environment for the public funding of CSOs**

This output envisions a process of policy realignment across both entities and relevant state level institutions, designed at bringing the CSO funding practices in line with principles of openness, accountability and transparency.

## 2.2 Hierarchy of objectives (including a visual snapshot)



## 2.2.1 Relevance to international and national policies/strategies and frameworks

The Project has direct linkages to the Guidelines for EU support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020 and their specific objective 2: an enabling financial environment, which supports sustainability of CSOs).[[4]](#footnote-5)

Furthermore, the Project supports the **EU 2020**[[5]](#footnote-6) that first summons for partnerships national, local and regional authorities as well as civil society and other social partners to get involved in delivering the vision, and secondly recognizes that civil society as a social partner must be empowered to participate and support the EU social dialogue processes. This project is linked with Norwegian strategy relevant for Bosnia and Herzegovina as it contributes to two fields of intervention within the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation – Norad, namely: Democracy and Good Governance; Civil Society.

## 2.2.2 Linkage with the Agenda 2030 and the SDGs

EMBRACE will clearly contribute to the Bosnia and Herzegovina to achieve the targets set within the Goal 16: Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies. Thus, advocating for the cooperation between local governments and civil society is relevant for building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

# *3. Results and Partnerships*

## 3.1 Detailed description of output[[6]](#footnote-7), activities and expected results, project duration

The project will support the development of civil society in BiH. Project output is **promoted inclusion and reduced public service delivery gaps via stronger CSO engagement.**

Under **Activity 1**, the Project will **provide services for the citizens in no fewer than 10 local communities across BiH.** For that purposes, a CSO grant scheme will be developed based on the LOD Methodology for Transparent Funds Disbursement, with focus on CSO projects that enhance the quality of services needed by the citizens in local communities.

Grants will be awarded to CSOs based on a competitive process, with selected projects addressing issues in the following thematic areas: social services for the most vulnerable; inclusion; youth; activism and volunteerism; gender equality; environmental protection; and human rights. The grant scheme will be implemented across two windows. The first window will target small scale grants to grassroot CSOs in the amount of up to BAM 20,000 BAM (up to 10 CSO projects). The second window will support CSOs with projects ranging from BAM 20,000-60,000 (up to 10 CSO projects). It is expected that overall 3,100 citizens will benefit from the implementation of awarded CSO projects.

To effectively execute the grant scheme, the project will support all interested CSOs, both prior and during the public call. Prior to the public call CSOs will be invited to a 2-day Project Cycle Management training focused on proposal writing. The training will be held in three (3) locations (Banja Luka, Mostar and Sarajevo). During the public call, an info session will be organized to explain propositions of the public call, reduce common mistakes and ensure highest possible quality of project proposals. Evaluation of the CSO project proposals will be performed by UNDP in close cooperation with the representatives of the donor – The Norwegian ministry of foreign affairs- Royal Norwegian Embassy Sarajevo. Selected and awarded CSOs will, in addition to receiving grant funds, be assisted in improving their capacities in management, PR, accountability, etc. Also, during the implementation of each supported project, UNDP will provide guidance in implementation through regular monitoring (on-the job-coaching) as a mechanism to ensure the best output for each implemented CSO project under the grant scheme.

Under **Activity 2**, the project will focus on **identifying and addressing gaps in the policy enabling environment for the public funding of CSOs.** The project will work with institutional counterparts to improve the funding environment for CSOs at entity and state levels through promoting principles of transparency and accountability in the relevant policy framework. Assistance will be provided to entity and state line level ministries to identify weaknesses in the public funding regulatory framework with key domestic partners (BiH Ministry of Justice, FBiH Ministry of Justice and RS Ministry of Administration and Local Self-Government) supported in developing policy recommendations. The project is expected to generate at least one concrete policy action for the improvement of CSO funding at state and/or entity level.

The whole process will be executed through following sub-activities relevant for each of above-mentioned outputs:

**Sub-activity 1.1 Launch grant scheme for CSOs.**

* Develop clear priorities and criteria for Public Call for CSOs,
* Launch Public Calls for CSO Proposals, selection and contracting of CSOs.

**Sub-activity 1.2 Capacity development of CSOs in Project Cycle Management and proposal writing**

* Prepare curricula and execute three customized training (project proposal writing, logical framework, visibility, procurement, reporting, etc.) to raise the capacities of CSOs to better respond to the Public call for CSO (trainings to be organised in Banja Luka, Mostar and Sarajevo),
* Execute open days for CSOs in three localities in Bosnia and Herzegovina during Public Call for CSOs.

**Sub-activity 1.3 Monitoring and support to CSO projects’ implementation**

* Monitoring of awarded CSO projects, including on-the-job mentoring (management capacities, procurement, transparent procedures, reporting, etc.),
* Supporting CSOs to ensure alignment of their actions with implementation rules and increase their capacities through on-the-job coaching,
* Promotion of CSO project results.

**Sub-activity 2.1 Identify gaps within the regulatory framework for transparent funding of CSOs from public sources**

* Mapping key stakeholders and facilitating the process (for transparent funding of CSOs),
* Analysis of gaps in existing regulations and development of a regulatory impact assessment related to transparent funding of CSO.

**Sub-activity 2.2 Development of policy recommendations for improvement of regulatory framework**

* Identification of the key institutional representatives and formalisation of the working group for policy recommendations
* Technical assistance - organising and facilitation of working group meetings (participation of all relevant national and entity stakeholders (ministries)) to define policy recommendations for improvement of regulatory framework for more transparent funding of CSOs,
* Public consultations for validation of policy recommendations,
* Promotion of policy recommendations and results of the working group.

Expected project duration is 12 months - November 1, 2019 until October 31, 2020.

## 3.2 Methodological approach

The methodology is based on the model previously developed and tested in the ReLOaD project, taking into consideration the specifics of EMBRACE project and the size of foreseen grants.

The Project will create conditions to motivate CSOs to professionalize and become better service providers when competing for these funds. In the same time project will work on mainstreaming the principles of transparency and inclusiveness, it will support processes to improve existing regulations related to grant schemes and CSO funding from public budgets. CSOs and especially those that are medium or small often cannot answer to local challenges although are in the same time most aware of the actual needs. Capacity development for civil society will be steered towards enhancing CSOs technical skills with regard to planning and implementation of projects at the local level.

Also, EMBRACE will seek to establish sound linkages and partnerships with higher government levels that deal with CSOs. Partnerships that will involve central authorities, respective offices for collaboration with civil society, as well as authorities on the entity level in order to assess the current framework and suggest changes that would lead towards further promotion of more transparent allocation of public funds to CSOs. Finally, to increase the impact of the Project, close synergies will be ensured with other UNDP-implemented interventions in the field of local governance and local development such as ReLOaD programme.

## 3.3 Target groups, beneficiaries

**CSOs are key target group.** It is expected that the Project will support directly at least 20 CSOs from not fewer than 10 localities across the country. The Project will directly support strengthening of project capacity of total 50 CSOs, thus improve their overall absorption capacity regarding various funding opportunities.

**Final beneficiaries** are grass-root CSOs, citizens and local communities who will benefit from improved and diversified local service delivery. Having in mind that the Project will support implementation of CSO projects in not fewer than 10 localities, it is expected that the outreach to direct beneficiaries will be approximately 3.100 citizens, including, socially excluded population groups.

## 3.4 Geographical area of intervention and territorial demarcation with other relevant interventions

The project will be implemented in Bosnia and Herzegovina and awarded CSO projects selected will be dispersed in more than 10 localities.

Close coordination with other UNDP projects supporting CSOs (e.g. ReLOaD) and service provision will be executed, and any possible duplication will be avoided

## 3.5 Resources Required to Achieve the Expected Results

The total budget of the Project is USD 580,907.65 (5,000,000 NOK) where requested from The Norwegian ministry of foreign affairs- Royal Norwegian Embassy Sarajevo.

 Direct eligible costs of the Project are at USD 532,551.94 (4,583,791.70 NOK)or 91.68% while indirect costs (including coordination levy) amount to USD 48,355.71 (416,208.29 NOK) or 8.32 %

Financial resources allocated for programmatic activities amount to approximately 65.17% of the Project budget at USD 378,574.45 (3,258,473.55 NOK) with following distribution along the two project outputs:

* Activity 1 – approximately 95.19%
* Activity 2 – approximately 4.81%

The remaining 34.83% of the Project’s budget amounting to USD 202,333.20 (1,741,526.44 NOK) is distributed on: Personnel costs, Operating Costs and Purchase of including indirect cost.

Detailed budget of the Project is enclosed in **Annex II.**

## 3.6 Partnerships (stakeholders’ engagement)

UNDP will assume full responsibility for the management of the Project, including achieving of the outputs and outcome, the efficient and effective use of resources, as well as implementation monitoring.

Direct Implementation Modality will be applied.

## 3.7 Transversal themes: gender equality, social inclusion, human rights, disaster risk reduction

In general, and as a corporative standard, the Project will ensure gender equality perspective across all activities. Special attention will be given to equal participation of men and women in all capacity development activities (trainings, workshops). In addition, special attention will be given to **women empowerment** through supported CSO projects. Importantly, women and their organisations will be encouraged to engage and participate in the all project activities.

Considering lessons learnt from the implementation of the ReLOaD project in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Western Balkans region, the Project will directly **support socially excluded population groups**. Social services for the most vulnerable, social inclusion, gender equality, environmental protection, human rights, etc. will be favoured where applicable through awarded CSO projects. In that regard, the Project will assist in reinforcing local service delivery and community wellbeing, especially in areas where local governments fail to outreach specific population groups and their interests with adequate services and support.

## 3.8 Synergies with other on-going or planned interventions

The project strongly leans on Regional Programme on Local Democracy in the Western Balkans (ReLOaD) and its component implemented in Bosnia and Herzegovina. ReLOaD improves cooperation between local governments and CSOs, while strengthening capacities of all relevant stakeholders to engage more productively in such partnerships. In that regard, experiences and lessons learned under ReLOaD project will be utilised within EMBRACE project. This especially related to maintaining the grant scheme and lessons learned related institutional barriers set for civils society. ReLOaD project by its design does not allow high involvement in institutional and framework improvement but has gather a lot of inputs in that regard which will be used by EMBRACE.

## 3.9 South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC/TrC)

EMBRACE is designed to ensure broader understanding of the benefits from CSO cooperation with government and especially in relation to bridging the gaps where governmental assistance is not efficient or effective. The project will initiate discussion among institutions and execute the grant scheme with transparent CSO financing mechanisms according to most urgent priorities across Bosnia and Herzegovina. These actions strongly relate to ReLOaD intervention and fit into positive practices already initiated on the local level.

## 3.10 Knowledge management

EMBRACE will further support long term actions of UNDP to introduce a model of transparent and project-based funding of CSOs by governments recognising the local needs and embracing a project-based approach. Furthermore, the Project will serve as a starting point for **piloting of dialogue among key institutional partners** in order to improve the framework for funding of civil society and direct the efforts towards identifying obstacles and developing suggestion for their removal. Furthermore, to increase the impact of the Action, close synergies will be ensured with other UNDP-implemented interventions in the field of local governance and local development.

## 3.11 Use of existing country systems, mechanisms and frameworks

EMBRACE is fully aligned with the LOD methodology that is institutionalised in many local governments in BiH. In this context, the Project will utilise the existing local strategic frameworks, as well as, legitimate institutions and their resources.

## 3.12 Sustainability and Scaling Up

The Project will rely on institutional partners to assume ownership, thus providing for outcome sustainability. The positive effects of the projects supported through grant scheme for CSOs will be exploited as a successful practice showcasing to decision makers how the assistance provided by CSOs can fill in the gaps created by lack of service provision by responsible institutions. The events organized by partner CSOs will also serve as an opportunity to promote benefits of cooperation and benefits that upgraded institutional framework could bring in relation to the existing demand in the field. It is of the utmost importance that improvements to the regulatory framework continue past the Project’s lifetime in order to fully meet objectives, considering the projects’ short lifespan. Therefore, the project will rely heavily on stakeholders in this regard, that are expected to spearhead the reform process. With such a network in place, the processes initiated under the auspices of this intervention are expected to continue even once the project has ended.

# *4. Project Management*

## 4.1 Project Management

UNDP in BIH will assume full responsibility and accountability for the overall management of the project, including achieving of the output, the efficient and effective use of resources, as well as implementation monitoring. The Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) will be applied, premised on the fact that institutional and administrative capacities within national stakeholders are still not sufficient to undertake core functions and activities, also having in mind its high potential for maximum cost-effectiveness and tailored flexible capacity development of institutional partners.

The institutional structure of UNDP interventions includes the Project Board, Project Assurance and the Project Team, interacting in a broader context with partners and all interested stakeholders. The Project Board (PB) is responsible for making cooperative, advising and support role and therefore assists to proper decision making executed by the project team. It will meet no fewer than twice a year and its scope of work will include project oversight, as well as regular review of work plans, progress reports and relevant procedures submitted by the Project Team. It also provides strategic guidance, as well as gives final approval to milestone strategic and operational matters. Members of the Project Board include representatives of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Royal Norwegian Embassy Sarajevo and UNDP. Independent of the Project Manager, the Project Assurance role will support the Project Board by carrying out objective and independent Project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures Project milestones are managed and completed. It will be performed by the UNDP Rural and Regional Development Sector Leader.

The Project Team comprises of two full time posts (Project Officer and Project Associate) and Quality control by Program manager on a part time basis (30%).

**Project Board**

UNDP

Embassy of the Kingdom of Norway

**Project Assurance**

**Project Manager**

**Admin/ Finance Associate**

**Project Officer**

## 4.2 Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness

The Project will deploy measures to achieve cost effectiveness. In terms of procurement, outsourcing of services will be based on a transparent and competitive process, as well as on the value-for-money principle. All training and capacity development assistance will be delivered observing locality and timing, to ensure economy of scale. For further cost efficiency, the Project will make use of existing relevant training curricula’s, thus reduce cost for training. Also, the Project will constantly seek to pair up its effort and activities with other UNDP implemented intervention to increase efficiency and achieve better results.

## 4.3 Project Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

The project will be monitored and evaluated in line with UNDP corporate standards. Project monitoring will be characterised by a gender-sensitive approach. The main tools for organising the monitoring system encompass: the gender-sensitive Results Framework and its indicators as described in section 5 of the Project Document; and the project risk analysis.

Evaluations:

* A detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan will be developed to map all essential steps and tools in assessing and reporting progress towards achieving project objectives.
* On a quarterly basis, a quality assessment shall record progress towards the completion of key results.
* Based on the initial risk analysis, a risk log shall regularly be updated by reviewing the external environment that may affect the project implementation.
* A project Lesson-learned log shall be activated and regularly updated to ensure on-going learning and adaptation within the organization, and to facilitate the preparation of the Lessons-learned Report at the end of the project.

Reporting:

* **Final/Annual Narrative and Financial Reports** shall be prepared by the Project Manager and shared with the Project Board.

## 4.4 Visibility and communication

EMBRACE will ensure visibility according to the UNDP standards and requirements of the donor.The visibility activities will be executed in close cooperation between the UNDP and the Norwegian ministry of foreign affairs- Royal Norwegian Embassy Sarajevofocusing on outputs and the impact of the Project’s results. Visibility and communication plan will be basis for promoting project objectives and results.

In addition to the direct effects of the Project, as described above, a number of added-value benefits are expected. The Action also affirms and raises awareness on the importance of project-based delivery of public financial tools and incentives.

# *5. Results Framework*

## 5.1 Results framework (format by the Government of the Kingdom of Norway)

| ***EMBRACE - Enable and Manage more Beneficial Civil Society Environment – RESULTS FRAMEWORK***  |
| --- |
| **Level** | **Goal****(expected result)** | **Indicator and Source Reference** | **Indicator Values** | **Comments** |
| **Baseline(2018)**  | **Milestone (target) Year 1** | **Milestone (target)** **Final**  |
| **Impact** | **To support social development through capacitating civil society actors to better address the needs in local communities** | * Project will aim to improve Transparency Internationals’ Corruption Perceptions Index for BiH as it ranks BiH on 88th place (index score 38/100)[[7]](#footnote-8) in 2018
* The project will contribute to improvement of USAIDs’ CSO sustainability index – that assessed BiH with 3.7 (out of 7) in 2018.
 | 38 | 37 | 37 |  |
| **Outcome**  | **Promoted inclusion and reduced public service delivery gaps via stronger CSO engagement.**  | * Comprehensive grant management scheme developed including clear selection criteria, based on UNDPs standard LOD Methodology (mechanism for funds disbursement for CSOs)

 Source: Model materials, media recordings and published documents | n/a | Yes/No | Yes/No |  |
| * Number of citizens benefiting from implemented CSO projects

Source: Project reports, project monitoring reports, media | 13,818 | 16,918(equal participation of women) | 16,918(equal participation of women) | Target value includes baseline |
| **Output 1** | **Provided services for 3,100 citizens in no fewer than 10 local communities across BiH** | * Number of CSOs projects supported for the benefit of citizens within defined priority areas

Source: Project reports, training reports | 93 | 113 | 113 | Up to 10 CSO projects (20-60.000 BAM)Up to 10 CSO projects (10-20.000 BAM) |
| * Number of CSOs trained in Project Cycle Management with focus on proposal writing
* Source: Project reports, training materials, evaluation of trainings (feedback from beneficiaries), media
 | 360 | At least 410 CSOs within the country | At least 410 CSOs within the country | Target value includes baseline |
| **Output 2** | **Gaps identified and addressed in the policy enabling environment for the public funding of CSOs** | * Number of initiatives for improvement of regulatory framework related to transparent funds disbursement for CSOs prepared
* Source: Project reports, partner government decisions and reports
 | 0  | 1 | 1 |  |
| * Number of entity and state institutions involved in the improvement of regulatory framework
* Source: Project reports, partner government decisions and reports
 | 0 | 2 | 2 |  |
| **Activity 1.1 Launch grant scheme for CSOs.*** Develop clear priorities and criteria for Public Call for CSOs,
* Launch Public Calls for CSO Proposals, selection and contracting of CSOs.
 |
| **Activity 1.2 Capacity development of CSOs in Project Cycle Management and proposal writing*** Prepare curricula and execute three customized training (project proposal writing, logical framework, visibility, procurement, reporting, etc.) to raise the capacities of CSOs to better respond to the Public call for CSO (trainings to be organised in Banjaluka, Mostar and Sarajevo),
* Execute open days for CSOs in three localities in Bosnia and Herzegovina during Public Call for CSOs.
 |
| **Activity 1.3 Monitoring and support to CSO projects’ implementation** * Monitoring of awarded CSO projects, including on-the-job mentoring (management capacities, procurement, transparent procedures, reporting, etc.),
* Supporting CSOs to ensure alignment of their actions with implementation rules and increase their capacities through on-the-job coaching,
* Promotion of CSO project results.
 |
| **Activity 2.1 Identify gaps within the regulatory framework for transparent funding of CSOs from public sources*** Mapping key stakeholders and facilitating the process,
* Analysis of gaps in existing regulations and development of a regulatory impact assessment related to transparent funding of CSO.
 |
| **Activity 2.2 Development of policy recommendations for improvement of regulatory framework*** Identification of the key institutional representatives and formalisation of the working group for policy recommendations
* Technical assistance - organising and facilitation of working group meetings (participation of all relevant national and entity stakeholders (ministries)) to define policy recommendations for improvement of regulatory framework for more transparent funding of CSOs,
* Public consultations for validation of policy recommendations,
* Promotion of policy recommendations and results of the working group.
 |

## 5.2 Results and resources framework (UNDP format)

| ***Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/Country [or Global/Regional] Programme Results and Resource Framework:*** *UNDAF outcome 4.* By 2019, economic, social and territorial disparities are decreased through coordinated approach by national and subnational actors. |
| --- |
| ***Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:******CPD 2015-2019:*** *Number of CSOs providing social services. Baseline: 37 (2016); Target: 50 (2019)**UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021: 1.1.2.1 Number of people accessing basic services, disaggregated by target groups (women, men, marginalized). Baseline:* *1,472,996 (2017), Target:* *1,672,996 (2021).*  |
| ***Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan:*** *Output 1.2.1:* Capacities at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive local economic development and deliver basic services including HIV and related services |
| ***Project title and Atlas Project Number:*** Enable and Manage more Beneficial Civil Society – EMBRACE; BIH10/00120690 |
| ***EXPECTED OUTPUT***  | ***OUTPUT INDICATORS[[8]](#footnote-9)*** | ***DATA SOURCE*** | ***BASELINE*** | **TARGETS (by frequency of data collection)** | **DATA COLLECTION METHODS & RISKS** |
| ***Value*** | ***Year*** | ***Year1*** | ***Year2*** | ***Year3*** | ***Year4*** | ***Year…*** | **FINAL** |
| **Promoted inclusion and reduced public service delivery gaps via stronger CSO engagement.** | ***1.1*** Comprehensive grant management scheme developed including clear selection criteria, based on UNDPs standard LOD Methodology (mechanism for funds disbursement for CSOs) | *Model materials, media recordings and published documents* | *No* | *2019* | *No* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *yes* | Field visits and CSO reportsLow interest of CSOs for capacity building activities (PCM, open days, etc.).Low utilization of grants due to low CSO capacity to develop good projects.Inadequate response of national partners in identifying gaps in regulations.  |
| ***1.2*** Number of citizens benefiting from implemented CSO projects (disaggregated for man, women and marginalized). | *Project reports, project monitoring reports, media* | *13,818* | *2018* | *16,918* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *16,918* |
| ***1.3*** Number of CSOs projects supported for the benefit of citizens within defined priority areas | *Project reports, training reports* | *93* | *2018* | *113* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *113* |
| ***1.4*** Number of CSOs trained in Project Cycle Management with focus on proposal writing  | *Project reports, training materials, evaluation of trainings (feedback from beneficiaries), media* | *360* | *2018* | *410* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *410* |
| ***1.5*** Number of initiatives for improvement of regulatory framework related to transparent funds disbursement for CSOs prepared | *Project reports, partner government decisions and reports* | *0* | *2018* | *1* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *1* |
| ***1.6*** Number of entity and state institutions involved in the improvement of regulatory framework | *Project reports, partner government decisions and reports* | *0* | *2018* | *2* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *2* |
| *\** Baseline values are related to relevant achievements within ReLOaD program until December 2018.  |

# *6. Monitoring And Evaluation*

*In accordance with UNDP’s programming policies and procedures, the project will be monitored through the following monitoring and evaluation plans: [Note: monitoring and evaluation plans should be adapted to project context, as needed]*

***Monitoring Plan***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Monitoring Activity*** | ***Purpose*** | ***Frequency*** | ***Expected Action*** | ***Partners*** ***(if joint)*** | ***Cost*** ***(if any)*** |
| ***Track results progress*** | *Progress data against the results indicators in the RRF will be collected and analysed to assess the progress of the project in achieving the agreed outputs.* | *Quarterly, or in the frequency required for each indicator.* | *Slower than expected progress will be addressed by project management.[[9]](#footnote-10)* | *UNDP* |  |
| ***Verify progress***  | *Verify output progress and/or completion*  | *Quarterly, or in the frequency of the Project Board review*  | *Slower than expected progress will be addressed by project management. [[10]](#footnote-11)* | *UNDP* |  |
| ***Monitor and Manage Risk*** | *Identify specific risks that may threaten achievement of intended results. Identify and monitor risk management actions using a risk log. This includes monitoring measures and plans that may have been required as per UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards. Audits will be conducted in accordance with UNDP’s audit policy to manage financial risk.* | *Annually*  | *Risks are identified by project management and actions are taken to manage risk. The risk log is actively maintained to keep track of identified risks and actions taken.[[11]](#footnote-12)* | *UNDP* |  |
| ***Learn***  | *Knowledge, good practices and lessons will be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners and integrated back into the project.* | *At least annually* | *Relevant lessons are captured by the project team and used to inform management decisions.[[12]](#footnote-13)* | *UNDP* |  |
| ***Annual Project Quality Assurance***  | *The quality of the project will be assessed against UNDP's quality standards to identify project strengths and weaknesses and to inform management decision making to improve the project.* | *Every other year* | *Areas of strength and**weakness will be reviewed by project management and used to inform decisions to improve project performance.*  | *UNDP* |  |
| ***Review and Make Course Corrections*** | *Internal review of data and evidence from all monitoring actions to inform decision making.* | *At least annually* | *Performance data, risks, lessons and quality will be discussed by the project board and used to make course corrections.* | *UNDP* |  |
| ***Project Report*** | *A progress report will be presented to the Project Board and key stakeholders, consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project quality rating summary, an updated risk long with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared over the period.*  | *At the end of the project (final report)* |  | *UNDP* |  |
| ***Project Review (Project Board)*** | *The project’s governance mechanism (i.e., project board) will hold regular project reviews to assess the performance of the project and review the Multi-Year Work Plan to ensure realistic budgeting over the life of the project. In the project’s final year, the Project Board shall hold an end-of project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to socialize project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences.* | *Quarterly, or in the frequency of the Project Board review* | *Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress should be discussed by the project board and management actions agreed to address the issues identified.*  | *UNDP* |  |
| *Total costs for regular project monitoring activities are already included in the overall budget of the Project (3 % of**total budget)* | *14,025.13 USD* |

# *7. Multi-Year Work Plan*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***EXPECTED OUTPUT*** | ***ACTIVITIES*** | ***PLANNED SUB-ACTIVITIES*** | ***Planned Budget by Year*** | ***RESPONSIBLE PARTY*** | ***PLANNED BUDGET*** |
| ***Y1*** | ***Y2*** | ***Y3*** | ***Y4*** | ***Funding Source*** | ***Budget Description*** | ***Amount*** |
| ***OUTPUT:*****Promoted inclusion and reduced public service delivery gaps via stronger CSO engagement.*****Gender marker:*** ***GEN2*** | *1. Develop a grant scheme based on the LOD Methodology for Transparent Funds Disbursement to CSOs, to support CSO projects that enhance the quality of services needed by the citizens in local communities.* | * 1. *Launch grant scheme for CSOs.*
 |  *USD 340,576.98*  | *0* | *0* | *0* | *UNDP* | *The Norwegian ministry of foreign affairs- Royal Norwegian Embassy Sarajevo* |  |  *USD 340,576.98*  |
| *1.2 Capacity development of CSOs in Project Cycle Management and proposal writing* |  *USD 9,350.09*  | *0* | *0* | *0* | *UNDP* |  |  *USD 9,350.09*  |
| *1.3 Monitoring and support to CSO projects’ implementation* |  *USD 14,025.13*  | *0* | *0* | *0* | *UNDP* |  |  *USD 14,025.13*  |
| ***Sub-Total for Activity 1*** | ***USD 363,952.20***  |
| *2. Support institutional counterparts to improve the public funding regulatory framework for CSOs, at entity and state levels.*  | *2.1 Identify gaps within the regulatory framework for transparent funding of CSOs from public sources* | *7,304.76 USD* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *UNDP* | *The Norwegian ministry of foreign affairs- Royal Norwegian Embassy Sarajevo* |  | *7,304.76 USD* |
| *2.2 Development of policy recommendations and improvement of regulatory framework* | *11,106.59 USD* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *UNDP* |  | *11,106.59 USD* |
| ***Sub-Total for Activity 2*** | ***18,411.35 USD*** |
| ***Evaluation*** *(as relevant)* |  | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* | *n/a* |
|  | ***General Management Support*** |  | *155,513.63 USD* |  |  |  |  | *The Norwegian ministry of foreign affairs- Royal Norwegian Embassy Sarajevo* |  | *155,513.63 USD* |
|  | ***Indirect costs*** |  | *43,030.47 USD* |  |  |  |  |  | *43,030.47 USD* |
|  | ***Standard Coordination Levy (1%)*** |  | *5,809.08 USD* |  |  |  |  |  | *5,809.08 USD* |
|  | ***TOTAL*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ***USD 586,716.73***  |

# *8. Legal Context*

This project document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article 1 of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina and UNDP, signed on 07 December 1995. All references in the SBAA to “Executing Agency” shall be deemed to refer to “Implementing Partner.”

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework in Bosnia and Herzegovina for the period 2015-2019 (signed by the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina and UN on 15 June 2015), as well as the current UNDP Country Programme Document 2015-2019 represent the basis for the activities of UNDP in the country.

This project will be implemented by United Nations Development Programme - UNDP (“Implementing Partner”) in accordance with its financial regulations, rules, practices and procedures only to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP. Where the financial governance of an Implementing Partner does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition, the financial governance of UNDP shall apply.

# *9. RISK MANAGEMENT*

***Option b.*** ***UNDP (DIM)***

1. *UNDP as the Implementing Partner will comply with the policies, procedures and practices of the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS.)*
2. *UNDP as the Implementing Partner will undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the [project funds][[13]](#footnote-14) [UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document][[14]](#footnote-15) are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via* [*http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq\_sanctions\_list.shtml*](http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml)*. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.*
3. *Social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (http://www.undp.org/ses) and related Accountability Mechanism (*[*http://www.undp.org/secu-srm*](http://www.undp.org/secu-srm)*).*
4. *UNDP as the Implementing Partner will: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.*
5. *In the implementation of the activities under this Project Document, UNDP as the Implementing Partner will handle any sexual exploitation and abuse (“SEA”) and sexual harassment (“SH”) allegations in accordance with its regulations, rules, policies and procedures.*
6. *All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and documentation.*
7. *UNDP as the Implementing Partner will ensure that the following obligations are binding on each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient:*
	1. *Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA [or the Supplemental Provisions to the Project Document], the responsibility for the safety and security of each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient and its personnel and property, and of UNDP’s property in such responsible party’s, subcontractor’s and sub-recipient’s custody, rests with such responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient. To this end, each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient shall:*
		1. *put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;*
		2. *assume all risks and liabilities related to such responsible party’s, subcontractor’s and sub-recipient’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan.*
	2. *UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the responsible party’s, subcontractor’s and sub-recipient’s obligations under this Project Document.*
	3. *In the performance of the activities under this Project, UNDP as the Implementing Partner shall ensure, with respect to the activities of any of its responsible parties, sub-recipients and other entities engaged under the Project, either as contractors or subcontractors, their personnel and any individuals performing services for them, that those entities have in place adequate and proper procedures, processes and policies to prevent and/or address SEA and SH.*
	4. *Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will take appropriate steps to prevent misuse of funds, fraud or corruption, by its officials, consultants, subcontractors and sub-recipients in implementing the project or programme or using the UNDP funds. It will ensure that its financial management, anti-corruption and anti-fraud policies are in place and enforced for all funding received from or through UNDP.*
	5. *The requirements of the following documents, then in force at the time of signature of the Project Document, apply to each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient: (a)**UNDP Policy on Fraud and other Corrupt Practices and (b)**UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations Investigation Guidelines. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient agrees to the requirements of the above documents, which are an integral part of this Project Document and are available online at* [*www.undp.org*](http://www.undp.org)*.*
	6. *In the event that an investigation is required, UNDP will conduct investigations relating to any aspect of UNDP programmes and projects. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will provide its full cooperation, including making available personnel, relevant documentation, and granting access to its (and its consultants’, subcontractors’ and sub-recipients’) premises, for such purposes at reasonable times and on reasonable conditions as may be required for the purpose of an investigation. Should there be a limitation in meeting this obligation, UNDP shall consult with it to find a solution.*
	7. *Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will promptly inform UNDP as the Implementing Partner in case of any incidence of inappropriate use of funds, or credible allegation of fraud or corruption with due confidentiality.*

*Where it becomes aware that a UNDP project or activity, in whole or in part, is the focus of investigation for alleged fraud/corruption, each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will inform the UNDP Resident Representative/Head of Office, who will promptly inform UNDP’s Office of Audit and Investigations (OAI). It will provide regular updates to the head of UNDP in the country and OAI of the status of, and actions relating to, such investigation.*

* 1. *Choose one of the three following options:*

*Option 1:**UNDP will be entitled to a refund from the responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient of any funds provided that have been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Project Document. Such amount may be deducted by UNDP from any payment due to the responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient under this or any other agreement. Recovery of such amount by UNDP shall not diminish or curtail any responsible party’s, subcontractor’s or sub-recipient’s obligations under this Project Document.*

*Where such funds have not been refunded to UNDP, the responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient agrees that donors to UNDP (including the Government) whose funding is the source, in whole or in part, of the funds for the activities under this Project Document, may seek recourse to such responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient for the recovery of any funds determined by UNDP to have been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Project Document.*

*Note: The term “Project Document” as used in this clause shall be deemed to include any relevant subsidiary agreement further to the Project Document, including those with responsible parties, subcontractors and sub-recipients.*

* 1. *Each contract issued by the responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient in connection with this Project Document shall include a provision representing that no fees, gratuities, rebates, gifts, commissions or other payments, other than those shown in the proposal, have been given, received, or promised in connection with the selection process or in contract execution, and that the recipient of funds from it shall cooperate with any and all investigations and post-payment audits.*
	2. *Should UNDP refer to the relevant national authorities for appropriate legal action any alleged wrongdoing relating to the project or programme, the Government will ensure that the relevant national authorities shall actively investigate the same and take appropriate legal action against all individuals found to have participated in the wrongdoing, recover and return any recovered funds to UNDP.*
	3. *Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient shall ensure that all of its obligations set forth under this section entitled “Risk Management” are passed on to its subcontractors and sub-recipients and that all the clauses under this section entitled “Risk Management Standard Clauses” are adequately reflected, mutatis mutandis, in all its sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into further to this Project Document.*

# *10. ANNEXES*

## Annex I: Project Quality Assurance Report

## Annex II: Project budget

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Budget description** | **Number** | **Unit** | **Unit cost (USD)** | **TOTAL (USD)** |
| **1** | **Personnel costs** |  |  | **8,265** | **99,175.92** |
| 1.1 | Project Manager (30%) | 12 | month | 1,975 | 23,702.47 |
| 1.2 | Project Officer (100%) | 12 | month | 2,606 | 31,276.05 |
| 1.3 | Project Associate (100%) | 12 | month | 2,450 | 29,403.69 |
| 1.4 | Sector Quality Assurance  | 12 | month | 616 | 7,396.86 |
| 1.5 | Programme Operations and Financial Support  | 12 | month | 616 | 7,396.86 |
| **2** | **Travel** |  |  | **89** | **6,225.69** |
| 2.1 | Travel (activities implementation) | 70 | lumpsum | 89 | 6,225.69 |
| **3** | **Programme Activities** |  |   | **22,356** | **382,360.19** |
| 3.1 | Capacity building of CSOs - Trainer/Mentor for CSOs | 10 | Expert day | 234 | 2,337.52 |
| 3.2 | Capacity building of CSOs - logistics (training venues, materials, accommodation, food, etc.) | 3 | per training | 2,338 | 7,012.57 |
| 3.3 | Monitoring and on-the-job training to CSOs | 80 | Expert day | 175 | 14,025.13 |
| 3.4 | Grants for CSOs | 20 | Per CSO | 17,029 | 340,576.98 |
| 3.5 | Technical Assistance - Regulatory Impact Assessment (2 RIAs) | 30 | Expert day | 243 | 7,304.76 |
| 3.6 | Technical assistance to working groups (facilitation) | 10 | Expert day | 292 | 2,921.90 |
| 3.7 | Technical assistance to development of policy recommendations | 10 | Expert day | 292 | 2,921.90 |
| 3.8 | Working group meetings | 3 | Lumpsum | 1,753 | 5,259.42 |
| **4** | **Operating Costs** |  |   | **3,851** | **46,211.76** |
| 4.1 | Operations costs (rent of offices, office furniture, etc.) | 12 | month | 1,344 | 16,128.90 |
| 4.2 | Vehicle cost | 12 | month | 403 | 4,837.62 |
| 4.3 | Other costs (translation, media ads, etc.) | 12 | month | 117 | 1,402.51 |
| 4.4 | Bank fees | 12 | month | 234 | 2,805.03 |
| 4.5 | Office supplies | 12 | month | 117 | 1,402.51 |
| 4.6 | Visibility | 12 | lumpsum | 1,636 | 19,635.19 |
| **5** | **Purchase of equipment** |  |  | **1,952** | **3,903.90** |
| 5.1 | ICT equipment (laptop, docking stat., monitor) | 2 | lumpsum | 1,952 | 3,903.90 |
|   | **SUBTOTAL** |   |   |   | **537,877.46** |
|   | **Indirect operating costs (8 %)** |  |  |   | 43,030.20 |
|   | **SUBTOTAL (incl. Indirect costs)** |  |  |   | 580,907.66 |
|   | **Standard Coordination Levy (1%)** |  |  |   | 5,809.08 |
|   | **TOTAL Project Costs** |  |  |  | **586,716.73** |

## Annex III: Social and Environmental Screening

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information***  |  |
| 1. Project title
 | Enable and Manage more Beneficial Civil Society Environment - EMBRACE |
| 1. Project number
 | 00120690 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country)
 | Bosnia and Herzegovina |

**Part A. Integrating Overarching Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability**

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?** |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach***  |
| The Project document does not explicitly elaborate on human rights it addresses nor it provides reference to the standards adhered to. However, it does provide evidence of genuine project's intention to foster progressive realization of social and economic rights of targeted groups through improved CSO service delivery that caters to citizens’ needs.  |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| The project addresses the issue of gender equality by fostering women empowerment through supported CSO projects |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability*** |
| The project does not have obvious impact to the environment. |

**Part B. Identifying and managing social and environmental risks**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?**  | **QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?***Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6* | **QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?** |
| ***Risk description*** | ***Impact and probability (1-5)*** | ***Significance******(Low, Moderate, High)*** | ***Comments*** | ***Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.*** |
| Risk 1: The success of the project depends heavily on the capacity of CSOs to absorb the funds.  | I = 5P =2 | **High** | The potential impact on project outcomes is deemed high and the project will consider, in close cooperation with the donor, repeated public calls for CSOs should there be insufficient interest. Further analysis and close watch of the situation in the field will be provided to ensure utilization of the funds awarded to CSOs. Adjustments in eligibility criteria will also be considered. |  |
| Risk 2: The sustainability of project results rests on the ability and willingness of national partners to address the deficiencies in regulations related to CSO sector.  | I = 5P = 2 | **Moderate** | The potential impact on the project is deemed moderate to high and mitigation opportunities include working closely with the partners from the outset to create a working group of national counterparts who will ensure rapid policy action and communication with decision makers. |  |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?**  |
| **Select one (see** [SESP](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-screening-procedure.html) **for guidance)** | **Comments** |
| ***Low Risk*** | **x** | The project is assessed as a low risk category, particularly from human rights aspect viewpoint. |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | **☐** |  |
| ***High Risk*** | **☐** |  |
|  | **QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?** |  |
| Check all that apply | **Comments** |
| ***Principle 1: Human Rights*** | **x** | N/A |
| ***Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **☐** | N/A |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management*** | **☐** | N/A |
| ***2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation*** | **☐** | N/A |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions*** | **☐** | N/A |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | **☐** | N/A |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | **☐** | N/A |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | **☐** | N/A |
| ***7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **☐** | N/A |

**Final Sign Off**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Signature*** | ***Date*** | ***Description*** |
| QA Assessor |  | Nedim Ćatović, Sector Associate |
| QA Approver |  | Adela Pozder-Čengić, Sector Leader, Rural and Regional Development Sector |
| PAC Chair |  |  |

**SESP Attachment 1. Social and environmental risk screening checklist**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks** |  |
| **Principles 1: Human Rights** | **Answer (Yes/No)** |
| 1. Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups? | No |
| 2. Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? [[15]](#footnote-16)  | No |
| 3. Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups? | No |
| 4. Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them? | No |
| 5. Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project? | Yes |
| 6. Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?  | No |
| 7. Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process? | No |
| 8. Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | No |
| **Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** |  |
| 1. Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?  | No |
| 2. Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | No |
| 3. Have women’s groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment? | No |
| 4. Would the Project potentially limit women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? *For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being* | No |
| **Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:** Screeningquestions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below |  |
|  |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** |  |
| 1.1 Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?*For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | No |
| 1.2 Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities? | No |
| 1.3 Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5) | No |
| 1.4 Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species? | No |
| 1.5 Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?  | No |
| 1.6 Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | No |
| 1.7 Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | No |
| 1.8 Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | No |
| 1.9 Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)  | No |
| 1.10 Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | No |
| 1.11 Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? *For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.* | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation** |  |
| 2.1 Will the proposed Project result in significant[[16]](#footnote-17) greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?  | No |
| 2.2 Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?  | No |
| 2.3 Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)?*For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population’s vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding* | No |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions** |  |
| 3.1 Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities? | No |
| 3.2 Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | No |
| 3.3 Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)? | No |
| 3.4 Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure) | No |
| 3.5 Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions? | No |
| 3.6 Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)? | No |
| 3.7 Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning? | No |
| 3.8 Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labour standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?  | No |
| 3.9 Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)? | No |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |
| 4.1 Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts) | No |
| 4.2 Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes? | No |
| **Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement** |  |
| 5.1 Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement? | No |
| 5.2 Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?  | No |
| 5.3 Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?[[17]](#footnote-18) | No |
| 5.4 Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?  | No |
| **Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples** |  |
| 6.1 Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)? | No |
| 6.2 Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.3 Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? *If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.* | No |
| 6.4 Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned? | No |
| 6.5 Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.6 Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources? | No |
| 6.7 Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | No |
| 6.8 Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.9 Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices? | No |
| **Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** |  |
| 7.1 Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or [transboundary impacts](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)?  | No |
| 7.2 Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | No |
| 7.3 Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?*For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol*  | No |
| 7.4 Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | No |
| 7.5 Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?  | No |

## Annex IV: Risk Analysis

The following table indicates identified risks with their probability, impact and foreseen mitigation measures.

|  |
| --- |
| **Risk Probability Consequence Risk-reducing measures** |
| Low interest of CSOs for capacity building activities (PCM, open days, etc.). | Medium | Medium impact on number of successful project proposals | Based on the long-term experience of UNDP in grant management, interest of CSOs for capacity building is not high, despite their often disappointing performance when it comes to applying for funding through calls for proposals. The Project will accordingly target grassroot CSOs with special measures, encouraging their participation via UNDP channels, partners and CSO networks.  |
| Low utilization of grants due to low CSO capacity to develop good projects. | Medium | High impact on utilization of grant scheme.  | The project will consider, in close cooperation with the donor, repeated public calls for CSOs should there be insufficient interest. Further analysis and close watch of the situation in the field will be provided to ensure utilization of the funds awarded to CSOs. Adjustments in eligibility criteria will also be considered.  |
| Inadequate response of national partners in identifying gaps in regulations.  | Medium | High impact on making timely alterations within the regulatory framework | Procedural changes by governmental administration are time-consuming processes and, as such, may have an adverse effect on policy upgrades. The Project will thus work closely with partners from the outset to create a working group of national counterparts who will ensure rapid policy action and communication with decision makers. Ownership over the process will be equally distributed among all involved partners to ensure their support in introduction of proposed changes.  |
| Lack of political will might hamper implementation of policy recommendations and their embedding within the regulatory framework. improvements | high | High impact on timely changes in institutional framework | UNDP invests significant efforts to establish and nurture partnerships with higher levels of government and CSOs to advocate for the adoption of policies related to mechanisms for transparent funds disbursement for CSOs. This will be continued through this project. |

Main assumptions are the following:

* Ability and willingness of all stakeholders to actively participate in project activities.
* Sufficient number of CSOs willing to participate in interventions of the project.
* Continued political commitment to development of civil society. Relevant institutional partners responsible for coordination with civil society organisations engage pro-actively in the project.
* Governments’ leaderships are committed to accept and further develop suggestions for improvement in the legislative and institutional framework relevant for the CSO funding.

## Annex V: Project Board Terms of Reference

1. The Reinforcement of Local Democracy (LOD) project, funded by the European Union’s Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA), was initiated in 2009 to strengthen inclusiveness, participation and transparency in municipal funding, to emphasize the importance of the role of civil society in local communities and to create long-lasting partnerships between local governments and CSOs. The model creates the conditions for competitive project-based approaches to funding disbursement, motivating CSOs to professionalize and become better service providers, acting in accordance with local development strategies. The LOD project has been implemented in Bosnia and Herzegovina in four different phases in the period 2009-2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Regional Programme on Local Democracy in the Western Balkans – ReLOaD (2017-2020) is an EU funded initiative with specific objective to strengthen partnerships between local governments and civil society in the Western Balkans by scaling-up a successful model of transparent and project-based funding of CSOs from local government budgets towards greater civic engagement in decision-making and improvement of local service delivery. ReLOaD is implemented in in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia, Kosovo\*, Montenegro and Serbia. Details available at: <https://www.ba.undp.org/content/bosnia_and_herzegovina/en/home/operations/projects/poverty_reduction/regional-programme-on-local-democracy-in-the-western-balkans--re.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Bosnia and Herzegovina 2018 Report (2018 Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, Strasbourg, 17.4.2018, page 5, Document available at: <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20180417-bosnia-and-herzegovina-report.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Guidelines for EU support to civil society in enlargement countries, 2014, 2020. https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/doc\_guidelines\_cs\_support1.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Europa 2020 A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth available at: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index\_en.htm. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Note: there are terminological differences regarding UNDP and Norwegian (in this case donor) definitions of outcomes, outputs, results, etc. For clarification purposes, output in Norwegian terminology is the level of results/activities as per UNDP methodology. For clarify purposes, both RRFs (UNDP and Norwegian) are embedded within the Project Document. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. <https://www.transparency.org/cpi2018#results> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Projects should use output indicators from the Strategic Plan IRRF and from the Country Programme Document, as relevant, in addition to project-specific results indicators. Indicators should be disaggregated by sex or for other targeted groups where relevant. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Templates: [Results framework](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/overview-eng.pdf); [CO Project Monitoring Platform](https://undp.sharepoint.com/teams/BIH/MonitoringEvaluation/default.aspx?RootFolder=%2Fteams%2FBIH%2FMonitoringEvaluation%2FShared%20Documents%2FMONITORING%2FProject%20Detailed%20Monitoring%20Platform&FolderCTID=0x012000BF59C56A42ACDD4EB24ECC7D9F5AC753&View=%7B2C86AB77-E29B-48BA-96F3-803D5CD68352%7D); Atlas (Output, Targets and Results Log; Activity Log). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. [Field Visit Report Template.](https://undp.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/teams/BIH/MonitoringEvaluation/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7B98465535-C8FC-4AE5-B2F4-39D79C3C08EE%7D&file=Field%20Visit%20Report%20Template.dotx&action=default&mobileredirect=true&cid=6794141e-45b7-4640-ae80-a2a884af89a7) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. [Project Risk Log and Templates](https://undp.sharepoint.com/teams/BIH/MonitoringEvaluation/default.aspx?RootFolder=%2Fteams%2FBIH%2FMonitoringEvaluation%2FShared%20Documents%2FProject%20Risk%20Log%20and%20Templates&FolderCTID=0x012000BF59C56A42ACDD4EB24ECC7D9F5AC753&View=%7B2C86AB77-E29B-48BA-96F3-803D5CD68352%7D); [Social and Environmental Standards](https://popp.undp.org/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PPM_Programming%20Standards_Social%20and%20Environmental%20Standards.docx); [Enterprise Risk Management Policy](https://popp.undp.org/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/AC_Accountability_Enterprise%20Risk%20Management%20Policy%20%282016%29.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Template: [Lessons Learned Log](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PPM_Project%20Management_Lessons%20Learned%20Log%20Template.docx&action=default) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. To be used where UNDP is the Implementing Partner. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. To be used where the UN, a UN fund/programme or a specialized agency is the Implementing Partner. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to “women and men” or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. In regards to CO2, ‘significant emissions’ corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.] [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)