Review of the project

Democratic Society Promotion (DSP) – Kosovo

Patta Scott-Villiers and Besim Nebiu

August 2012

1. Executive Summary

The Democratic Society Promotion Project of the Swiss Cooperation Office Kosovo aims to add value to the ongoing democratic transition in the country, with a focus on participation, gender equality and inter-ethnic co-operation. This short review takes place one year into the project. We begin by summarising our answers to the questions raised by the SCO in the terms of reference for this review. The report is then structured in four sections covering the added value of the project, its potential for expansion to the regions and our appraisal of the management procedures. Each section contains recommendations for amendments where appropriate.

1.1. *Project Value:* We find that the design and practice of DSP is highly appropriate to making an original contribution to the democratic transition in Kosovo, and is complementary to other Swiss programmes in its domain of democratic governance and decentralisation.

1.2. *Institutional Grants:* By making medium-sized Institutional Grants to capable organisations that allow their talented staff flexibility to develop and achieve their strategic (rather than project) goals, the DSP's first funding instrument offers a uniquely useful service to Kosovo's democracy. We find that institutional grants offer the greatest potential for supporting innovation and originality within the democratic framework. This is because they underwrite organisations' capability to scan, analyse, take initiative and learn; all of which are necessary for effective and creative action on the essentially political agenda of democratic change. We recognise that there are not so many obvious organisations that qualify, but we find that outside Pristina there is potential, even among quite small organisations.

1.3. **Project Grants:** With its second instrument, Project grants, the DSP has more of a mixed experience. Some of the projects are concrete, coherent and make a clear democratic contribution. Others make a less clear contribution, though all of them are worthy and have potential. Project grants ideally give organisations space to implement innovative democratic interventions, but we note that applicants tend to submit projects that they believe will *attract funds* (i.e. less innovative), rather than imaginative projects. We believe that the process of application could be enhanced so that the imaginative potential could be realised.

1.4. **Awards:** The third instrument, awards for excellence, has not yet been used. In an effort to counteract any donor-driven effects of project selection, it was foreseen as an instrument not for the granted initiatives, but for others. We suspect that there may not be enough clarity as to what the awards are *for* to generate nominations. We propose that by putting additional effort into learning between grantees (including members of their constituencies), *definitions of democratic success* would emerge. The award system would then take off.

1.5. **DSP Management:** Implementation of granting procedures by the team at KCSF is efficient, energetic, transparent and systematic. Financial control appears to be effective. Support to impact assessment, learning and communication of the most interesting (democratic) issues raised by DSP remains to be developed, however.

1.6. **Coherence with Swiss Co-operation Strategy 2013-16**: In the domain of democratic governance and decentralisation the DSP focuses on citizen power with regard to socially inclusive governance and service provision. It also, importantly, allows citizens the space to define their own version of democracy and social progress. To increase the degree of coherence, we recommend increased efforts to give grants to projects outside Pristina, especially in the 9 municipalities covered by the Swiss LOGOS project and also in other regions covered by similar local governance projects. There is scope for co-operation between LOGOS and DSP and no great obstacles to expansion.

1.7. **Donor driven or demand driven**? To avoid being donor driven, the project has avoided excessive clarification of criteria to applicants, which paradoxically leaves them guessing at what is most likely to achieve funding

success. This tends to make the applications more normative than innovative. We propose that well-publicized criteria that emphasize the principles for achieving citizen-based democratic intervention in the Kosovo context could resolve this problem. The criteria should be included in the project document and project guidelines. Such criteria would not specify what the projects should consist of, but would indicate under what principles they should operate to achieve success. We offer some suggestions in the main body of this report.

1.8. *Threshold Levels*: in order to make the grants realistic for smaller but democratically important organisations outside Pristina we agree with KSCF that the grants should have a lower minimum threshold level of €12,000 (from the existing minimum of €35,000).

1.9. *Grants & Awards Board*: the board is well admired for its range of knowledge and scrupulous fairness. It has an enormous load of project documents to assess and, so far, little time to engage in other questions. The GAB would benefit from clarifying its own perspectives on democracy and criteria for successful interventions – perhaps through reviewing and revising the criteria suggested in this report.

1.10. *Steering:* We agree with GAB members that the board already works at a level of strategic overview. A steering mechanism that calls the DSP to account for its democratic contribution and assesses any grievances or issues identified by tasked evaluators would still be of importance, however. Thus we suggest that a useful steering mechanism might be a board made up of professional Kosovars with an interest in the democracy of their state, or alternatively a group of like-minded donors. Such a group would be mandated to focus on questions of impact.

1.11. *The north:* We have agreed with SCO Kosovo that it is not possible for the consultants to comment on the applicability of extending the DSP to northern Kosovo at this moment, given their short mission.

2. Introduction & Context

This section outlines the purpose of this document, the method employed and the context in which the DSP is operational.

2.1. The Review

The Democratic Society programme defines its aims as "… support to initiatives, projects or activities coming from civil society, but also from academic institutions and professional organizations, which have the potential to contribute to significant changes in society at national, regional and local level…" In the context of democratisation and state-building, two processes that are running in parallel in the current Kosovar context, DSP looks to support increasing civic participation, transparency and accountability of institutions, improving interethnic coexistence and inclusion of minorities and gender equality. Together these achievements will, it is hoped, contribute to the development of democracy in Kosovo.

Two consultants, one international and one from the region, spent 8 days in Kosovo in July 2012. The team interviewed 30 persons in 14 organisations including SCO officials, DSP managers, board members, grantees of DSP and other similar grant programmes, LOGOS representatives (SDC local governance project), and donors with similar grant programmes (see Annex A). Interviews focused on the procedures and use of grants and the theories of democratic change guiding the grantees and grantors. In addition the team reviewed project documentation and wider literature including monitoring reports, reviews, governance and civil society studies etc.

This review takes place after one year of project operation. It offers insight into progress towards project objectives, suggests minor amendments to the project approach and explores possibilities for expansion. As outlined in the terms of reference (Annex A), this report

- analyses the design of the DSP scheme, the experience during the first year of implementation and assess the feasibility to effectively promote change leading towards democratic society in Kosovo's given context, as strived for in the project document.

- makes recommendations on the future of DSP scheme and / or its implementation, aiming at effectiveness of DSP contribution that goes beyond financial-institutional support of individual CSOs and their project initiatives, thus leading towards promotion of democratic society.

- makes recommendations on how to adapt the DSP scheme to make it more synergetic with other Swiss interventions on local governance and decentralization.

2.2. Context

Kosovo is currently moving through a political, economic and social transition. Its state-building and democratisation process, which has been heavily influenced by international players (EU, US and UN), involves considerable new legislation, much of it relating to decentralization and local governance. While a great deal of progress has been made, fiscal decentralization remains limited and a number of key powers, including over property, remain with the central government (Shultz-Krafte & Morina 2012). Growth is slow and official unemployment figures are around 45%, of which 73% are youth. Foreign direct investment is very low, a problem ascribed to unresolved property issues and weak rule of law (ibid 5). Corruption and organized crime are seen as major obstacles to development (EU 2011). In their assessment of SDC support to decentralization in Kosovo, Shultz-Krafte and Morina concur with SCO Kosovo that 'social peace, full ethnic integration and socioeconomic development are dependent on strengthened financial and economic decentralization, improved local governance and satisfactory service provision at the local level' (ibid 23).

The design of "Democratic Society Promotion" (DSP) is based on this context and is in line with the Swiss Cooperation Strategy for Kosovo 2009-2012 that states that SDC "will explore and establish instruments to support organizations, activities and processes that contribute to enhanced democratic control and transparency, to foster the integration of the different communities, and to mainstream gender issues". The DSP links well with the transversal themes – gender and governance – that are constituent elements of Swiss Cooperation in Kosovo.

DSP is an essential addition in a cooperation programme where infrastructure, state and local institutions and (increasingly) the private sector receive the bulk of the funding. In 2011 document analysis, stakeholder interviews, and an extensive stock-taking of all other relevant donor instruments revealed a clear need for supporting medium-sized projects and organisations with flexible instruments that can respond to emerging needs in the areas of *minority integration*, *gender equality* and *citizen participation* in the dynamic context of Kosovo.

2.3. Status of the DSP

The Kosovo Civil Society Foundation, a highly professional NGO based in Pristina, won the tender for management of DSP in 2011. To begin the project, KCSF organized information sessions throughout Kosovo regions/municipalities (7 Albanian and 1 Serbian) in June 2011, where 122 NGOs participated. The application eligibility

and guidelines, application forms and other criteria were explained and discussed with potential DSP applicants/beneficiaries. Upon request by SCO-K, no further publicity was made, although the details of the project are available on a website in Albanian, Serbian and English languages.

A Grants and Awards Board (GAB) was established in June, 2011. Its function is to decide on which projects to fund and to have a strategic overview of the entire project. During this first meeting GAB adopted the proposed procedures of application and evaluation. Starting from its second meeting in September 2011, during 2011 GAB assessed 112 applications and granted 12 grants in the amount of € 697,992 (3 institutional grants and 9 project grants). By mid 2012 the number of assessed applications had reached 142 and the number of granted applications had reached 16.

An envisaged 'multi-stakeholder' steering committee to provide strategic oversight has not (yet) been appointed. The design specifies a committee acting as a strategic orientation, coordination and monitoring body that meets bi-annually to review program implementation progress, advise on program direction, assesses any grievances or issues identified by tasked evaluators and advises on procedures to ensure a smooth, efficient and transparent implementation of the project. The Steering Committee would also identify synergies with other donor and SCO-K partner program objectives.

Taking into consideration the Kosovar context in which there is still considerable donor funding available to civil society organisations, GAB and SCO follow a two-pronged approach in grant selection:

- Via the **project** grants instrument, DSP supports democratic society by capturing endeavours of CSOs by selecting *good ideas*, which for a variety of reasons could not be supported by other of Civil society/Democracy Strengthening/Good Governance funds available to the Kosovar Civil Society.

- Through **institutional** grants, DSP extends support to CSOs which for *strategic reasons* play a pivotal role in democratising the Kosovar society, by effectively granting them flexibility, which would help them forward their agendas and achieve their mission.

- A third approach – **awards** to excellent civil society organisations, has not been made use of at this point.

3. Added Value of DSP

In this section we focus on the overall DSP objective, identify what added value should look like, and make an outline assessment of the potential for such value to be achieved.

3.1. Democratic Model

Before we can say how the project is adding value to Kosovo's democratic progression, we need to ascertain what is valuable in this context. Among different civil society and international community actors working towards democratic ends in Kosovo, there exists a range of different understandings of and approaches to democracy. As a country in transition, Kosovo is developing its own model, influenced by international and regional interests, local pressures and elite concerns. The system under development has its foundations in Kosovar culture and history of different forms of governance and social co-existence. A history of civic solidarity in voicing dissent to the state was followed by a struggle for independence and a decade of civic self-help. This history appears to have left Kosovo with a relatively widespread habit of civic activism compared to some of its neighbours. Today government interference in the CSO sector is light, giving CSOs no reason to stay away from contentious topics as they might do elsewhere. Spaces and places for informal and formal debate, though not ubiquitous, are present. In the current atmosphere of nation-building, people seem to be willing to speak out and to make the relevant spaces and places in the media, local government, arts and public conversation.

Strongly influenced now by the European accession process, the direction is from a communist system towards a market-oriented liberal representative system. This new system will, it is hoped, generate economic growth, provide services and guarantee individual and group rights by rule of law. As different members of society and different pressures pull and push the process of institution-building and value clarification, a unique democratic model is being formed. The strategic purpose of the DSP is to add value to this development.

During this review mission the consultants encountered three broad democratic ideas among development actors in civil society and the international community:

    a)   representative (liberal) democracy

    b)   deliberative (social) democracy

    c)   contentious (direct) democracy,

Those actors who favour the representative, liberal model put their emphasis on building state institutions and rule of law. They support to the work of state structures and representatives (including civil society representatives) who provide checks and balances aiming to guarantee equal rights, freedoms and capabilities to citizens (Tocqueville 2003, Dahl 1991). This model is widely pursued by the larger NGOs and the bilateral donor agencies. Successful projects under this rubric will demonstrate that they have introduced improvements to the quality and quantity of representation and the systematic nature of accountability of the state to its citizens. They will be able to point to some progress in rights, freedoms or capability for disadvantaged members of society.

The actors favouring the social deliberative democracy model emphasize the development of society as a whole (Cohen, 1997). These actors tend to work on social capital, promoting free flow of information, connecting diverse people in debates and aiming for consensus governance (Putnam, 2001). Successful projects under this rubric will demonstrate that they have thickened social networks especially for the disadvantaged, increased public access to information on social issues, and built or contributed to institutions that take account of diverse perspectives. They will be able to point to progress in the legitimacy of government as a part of society.

A third set of actors favour forms of contentious democracy (Mouffe, 2000). This model involves groups of citizens not coming to consensus, but *contending* in the nation-building project. This model believes that citizens can and should play a direct part in government, including making and changing laws. This is achieved through a well-informed citizenry systematically involved in the competitive arguments that generate decisions. This model uses antagonism to deliver values of fairness and justice. It is a model commonly underlying the rise of social movements. Successful projects under this rubric will demonstrate that they have promoted contention and challenge to the powerful by the less advantaged. They will be able to point to progress in fair government and a just society.

These three kinds of democracy (and no doubt others) are being enacted in Kosovo as part of its transition. The DSP grants demonstrate a mix of these three models, with a proportion of grantees in each category. As such the DSP as a whole may seem to contain contradictory elements and lack focus, but it reflects the process of democratic construction that is currently under way. Within the DSP objectives – civic participation, inter-ethnic cooperation and gender rights there is also a mix of the three different democratic forms. The DSP sends out a message that it does not wish

to define democracy for Kosovars, but to make it possible for the people of Kosovo to do so for themselves.

The differences between the models are reflected in the diversity of claims for impact and a range of different focus areas, strategies, tactics and activities. This diversity gives an element of vagueness to the DSP. It accounts for the difficulty noted by members of the GAB and management of articulating substantive (rather than administrative) criteria for what should be funded and for the lack of clarity in how impact should be assessed.

3.2. Case Studies

As far as the consultants can tell at this early stage, and with a short exposure, the DSP is making a useful contribution to Kosovar democracy in two ways. First it is supporting some potentially successful projects within each model. Second, it is supporting a range of different models, which contributes to keeping options open for the kind of democracy that Kosovar citizens would like to develop. This section will consider the different projects and how they add value.

Most DSP grantees have the potential to/ or are already significantly impacting in one or more of the following three general areas:

- Implementation of ignored or imperfectly implemented laws and by-laws

- Raising public opinion on controversial issues

- Attention to the situation of people in difficult circumstances

Dividing the DSP and other projects encountered by the consultants into the three categories of democracy, based on their stated objectives, we can specify what added value should look like:

Liberal representative	Social deliberative	Contentious democracy
Norma –women's legal rights	Integra	Levizja Fol
Atta - Roma representation	D4D	
KADC – Anti-smoking lobby	Radio Premiera (LOGOS)	
KYC – youth council	Centre for Depolitzation of Kosovar Society (LOGOS)	
FHK – Health ombudsman	Press Council (DSP applicant)	
Handicapped Society (DSP applicant) – disability rights		
GLPS – civil service probity		

3.2.1   For the *liberal representative category*, a democratic achievement would include improvements to the quality and quantity of representation and the systematic nature of accountability. Grantees will be able to point to some progress in rights, freedoms or capability for otherwise disadvantaged members of society. A review of the six projects listed under this category indicates that most have the potential to achieve at least one of these objectives. Ironically the group that represents people with disability (Handicap Kosovo), who were not awarded a grant, presented a project that promised to realise the rights of disabled women to salaried work. Other projects have less tangible outputs – seeking to raise awareness about rights.

One example of effective liberal democracy building is the work of ATTA, a small NGO working to improve the quality and quantity of Roma representation inside government. In its project document the group explains the problem and its approach: a pathway of skills and confidence building (capabilities) for young Roma, leading to supported engagement in political arenas (representation) and increasing membership of their movement by graduates of their programme (constituency). Two criteria for success become apparent from this example:

a)   The projects most likely to succeed have a clear theory of change – they understand the kind of democracy they are targeting and they can say simply and clearly how their work engages with it and what changes they expect to achieve.

b)   Successful projects are most likely to have a clear constituency made up of citizens with a drive and interest in maintaining the gains achieved during the project life.

3.2.2   These same two criteria for success are visible in the projects that work in the *social deliberation category*. Here the focus is on the development of social capital. Integra provides a good example. Integra is a DSP grantee making film documentaries about past atrocities, aiming to heal divisions between Serbs and Albanians by creating understanding that wrongdoing was not confined to one group. The process in which they are engaged involves a passionate constituency of ordinary Kosovars, most of them young. Their theory of change is specified and relatively coherent and complete – films on national and local TV showing distressing aspects of the past create

10

discussions in society, laying the foundation for a reconciliation process including a truth commission. This group argues that the approach has worked in similar situations around the world. Achievement of improved social relations will be a long struggle and whether Integra is right in its theory of change will need to be carefully watched. Nonetheless, the group is already making a contribution to some aspects of deliberative democracy: increased public access to accurate information on social issues and media institutions taking account of diverse perspectives.

Another example is D4D. D4D produces first class statistics about contentious social issues, runs a weekly open salon for debating issues, and investigates and publicizes corruption. Its constituency is specified, albeit narrow (middle class democrats) and its theory of change involves the role of well-informed argument in creating a vibrant democracy. The D4D contribution to information exchange and active social debate is in tune with the deliberative democratic model. It can give account of achievements in terms of an increasing constituency taking part in the salons, and the changing of the electoral poll station management system as a result of its public criticism.

3.2.3 Finally the *contentious democrats* play a radical but important role. Levizja Fol is an anti-corruption movement with hundreds of members who expose corruption by making a noise about it. Their theory of change is based on the idea that the government will improve if properly held accountable by the citizenry (holding government accountable through public pressure). Levizja Fol therefore mobilizes large numbers of citizens in protests, petitions and various acts that strongly voice and channel public dissatisfaction and critique against what it deems to be government corruption and lack of transparency. Support to this kind of social movement challenges state complacency and offers meaningful participation for ordinary citizens in the nation-building process.

3.3 Criteria for Added Value

We find that many, but not all the DSP projects, are contributing to democracy in one of the three forms. In addition to a clear theory of democratic change and a constituency of interested citizens, we find that those projects that tackle *difficult* subjects, matters that those in power would rather ignore or avoid, make a vital

contribution. This is valuable because these difficult issues are not being tackled by other players in the government or the private sector.

The more successful projects and organisations achieve success by a combination of five practices, as follows:

- **Having a constituency –** most of the grantees of DSP can demonstrate a constituency, as a body of people involved in and/or served by an organization, which may include membership or affiliation in the CSO, participation or lead in a network of other NGOs, level of support from the public opinion for a specific position or initiative. This constituency should be capable of *growth*.

- **Having a clear democratic impact –** a clearly and explicitly defined raison d'être in relation to democracy. The organisation should be able to question and refine its raison d'être.

- **Having a clear focus, and using effective tactics to achieve social change** - defining change in concrete terms and outlining a method/tactic to achieve it either through mobilization of citizens and public, or of affecting public opinion on that particular focus area. These tactics should be continuously reviewed for effectiveness.

- **Creating politically informed civil organisation –** developing evidence-based, well-researched arguments for their position, being successful in defending the arguments and increasing the level of support for their position.

- **Being brave and uncompromising** – addressing issues that may have less than majority support in the public and the media, being willing and prepared to taking up on controversial subjects and working to develop new socially-progressive narratives via informing/educating various segments of the society.

There seems to be reluctance among some donors to support what we have called "**brave projects"** i.e. initiatives that have clear democratisation value for the society, but are controversial either because they have low current levels of public support (e.g. dealing with KLA crimes), or clearly run against vested interests of the political elites, (e.g. electoral fraud by the ruling party). DSP has done good work in capturing these actions in the first year, and it is our recommendation that some more focus, attention and resources are committed to identifying and supporting these types of

actions. One way of doing this would be to work closely with those grantees already engaged in brave projects to locate others similarly courageous.

Some projects, notwithstanding the important topics on which they work, like gender, do not look like they are going to be effective. They may have an incomplete theory of change, for example assuming that awareness-raising is enough to get a law implemented fairly. For example, Norma, a committed group of female legal professionals, is working on awareness-raising to municipal clerks regarding women's rights. The theory of change is that clerks are a) unaware, and b) once aware will be able to contribute to women achieving their rights. This may not prove to be what happens in practice, since the clerks may already be aware and be doing nothing for other, often political, economic or social reasons. For law to *rule* it needs more than awareness of legislation or empathy with women's difficulties. It needs political clout perhaps, or moral suasion, or both. The project may be failing to analyse the democratic logic of which it is a part, thus its identification of the key points of potential engagement may be flawed and its actions may not make a concrete and systematic difference.

Similarly, KADC, the anti-smoking lobby does not appear to have developed an effective theory of democratic change. Among other activities, the NGO holds events at parliament and makes data available to politicians to press for legislative change. But there is no specific analysis of why politicians would feel any obligation to legislate, nor what would make implementation secure. Neither of these organisations have a substantial constituency among Kosovar citizens. They have assumed a representative function without having been mandated. Both of these projects work on important issues and are well-meaning, but neither is very clear about how it will succeed within the political-institutional system. Given that both organizations are very professional and committed, the issues of clarity and constituency would not be hard to remedy.

Having noted these weaknesses we reaffirm that the majority of DSP grantees are doing excellent work, as well as being competent in handling DSP funds effectively with KCSF's able support.

3.4 Recommendations

Our brief survey confirms that the mechanism used by the DSP to attract, select and support grantees can deliver added democratic value. *This suggests that DSP fills an important gap in democratic development in Kosovo.* It also suggests that DSP could

do more to hone its level of success, make best use of limited human and financial resources and expand its coverage.

3.4.1 *Criteria:*

To improve the quality of applications and the coverage of the DSP, we recommend that the DSP create, incorporate into the project document, publicize and use clear criteria for selection of grantees and assessment of impact that are in line with a) the overall democratic objective and b) take account of the five success factors listed above. This would help the GAB in selection, KCSF in promotion and monitoring activities, and grantees in implementation, monitoring and learning.

Example Questions in relation to Critera:

Criterion	*Questions that a concept note should answer*
Constituency	*Who is your constituency and how are you building it up?*
Democratic Impact	*What is democratic about what you are proposing? [Does it: improve representation, systematically establish rights, create social capital, expand access to information on socially important issues etc?]*
Concrete Results	*What exactly are you trying to achieve? Where can we expect to see change?*
Tactics	*What do you need to do to achieve your goal? Who are you influencing or making alliance with and in what way?*
Political analytical	*What is your evidence? Who supports your position? Who is opposed to your position? How are you using your evidence?*
Bravery	*How much opposition do you face and what keeps you going?*

3.4.2 *Beneficiaries:*

Although DSP is in theory open to project ideas from academic, professional organizations, informal groups or state agencies, in practice due to a variety of practical reasons, the GAB has made no decision to award a grant to anyone other than to classic civil society organizations. Most of the obstacles relate to accounting:

- private sector organisations tend not to have the kind of monitoring and evaluation systems that grantors expect;
- government bodies are unable to receive and account for direct grants, all monies going through the central treasury;

- the public universities have similarly centralised financial systems;
- informal groups tend not have systems to account for substantial financial contributions;
- private sector organisations are also subject to value added tax (VAT).

While these practical (bureaucratic, legal or financial) impediments apply to working with state institutions (and state universities) as well as un-chartered groups, the barriers may not be unsurmountable when it comes to professional associations, self-help groups, companies or other forms of formally registered entity. For as long as their work is in line with the aim of DSP to capture *good ideas that advance democracy through increased civic participation, and/or ethnic cohesion and gender equality,* and the applicant can fulfil the application criteria, there seems to be space for some of the grant awards to support these initiatives. Based on the CIVICUS Kosovo Index for 2011, professional associations and self-help groups enjoy greater public trust than civil society organizations that deal with "advocacy and democratization".

In our opinion it would constitute an interesting new path for DSP, to target "non-conventional" grantees for DSP in promotional work, i.e. one or more of the sectors of professional or special interest organizations or self-help groups – groups currently underserved due to declining donor funding, but with potential to advance social causes or public attitudes. To overcome the difficulties, the DSP would need to review strictures on which systems of monitoring, financial accounting and legal status are considered adequate to secure against risk. It would also maintain its commitment to supporting organisations to develop suitable (but not overly complex) systems. Finally it would target this kind of organisation, as well as NGOs and CBOs in its promotional efforts.

3.4.3 *Transversal Themes*

Each of the three transversal themes of the program is value-based (governance, inter-ethnic cohesion, gender equality). Because all the three are values, to set them as objectives creates vagueness and idealism in short projects.

Instead of presenting DSP as a funding mechanism that consists of three thematic pillars, DSP might want to assess them as principles, with which all DSP grantees should comply. This can be done using a 'principles assessment tool' similar to the one SCO is using when assessing its CIVICA MOBILITAS grantees in Macedonia or any other tool that holds the grantees accountable to advancing the principles of

good governance, gender equality and equal opportunity (at application, monitoring, and evaluation stages using SDC assessment tools).

In addition the three transversal themes form a useful framework for learning between beneficiaries of the DSP, indeed between all the involved actors. An annual learning event, and visits between different grantees could be designed around the three principles.

4 Getting out to the Regions and Municipalities

In this section we consider the virtues of out-of-Pristina projects in terms of adding more value and offering potential for expansion of the DSP.

The majority of project and institutional grantees are based in the capital Pristina and have a national focus. Their change theories are centred on a representation model, and are based on the idea that in a significantly centralized political and social climate where most of the political power rests with the central government, impacting societal change is most effective when achieved centrally. The national approach often assumes that small local gains in advancing local democracy, social causes or quality of life do not necessarily have a multiplying effect, and therefore being isolated and marginal, are not worth pursuing.

DSP, especially its promotional and application aspects, is managed in a way that information reaches and is most appropriate to the middle-sized or larger CSOs based in Pristina. A deciding issue for awarding the grants was the ability to perform administration – and since decisions were largely comparative, the Pristina organisations, which are better at administration, came out on top. During our field visit, however, we had the opportunity to meet two smaller organizations/community groups (not grantees of DSP), with whom LOGOS project is interacting in its community development work in the municipality of Kamenica, Eastern Kosovo. These two organisations demonstrate the very great potential for finding and supporting suitable grantees in the regions and municipalities. At the end of the section we explore how DSP might expand its coverage to organisations such as these.

4.1 Case studies of two local community groups

4.1.1 Radio Premiera – Kamenica is a community radio station, which produces information content and aims to affect local opinion on public matters. The CEO of Radio Premiera considers himself a community activist, whose job is

to serve the public through providing relevant, accurate and fair information on the work of the municipality and also through influencing public opinion on controversial subjects. He uses the radio as a means to promote "worthy causes" in the community. One such cause is the local tradition of non-inheritance by women. It is a widely-reported problem that most women in Kamenica (as in the rest of Kosovo), defer their legally-guaranteed inheritance rights mostly to male siblings due to public pressure and fear of being ostracized. This local tradition, according to Radio Premiera, is the single most important cause of gender inequality – women own no property/assets and as such are extremely vulnerable and economically dependent on their husbands. Divorced women often end up rejected from their families, and end up in the street. To break this vicious circle of discrimination, Radio Premiera is constantly keeping the topic on the public radar, by discussing it frequently, expertly and at length on the radio waves, in order to influence the public discourse. The programmes both encourage women to break the tradition, and try to influence the male society on the unjustness of the tradition. In RP's assessment change is slow, but will inevitably come, as more women and men develop appropriate sensitivity on the subject, and change their attitudes regarding the issue. In terms of immediate impact, the CEO describes that one can hear discussions about the issue in coffee bars and offices after every weekly broadcast. He also checks for deeper impact, going along to the land registry to check for change in women's ownership patterns.

4.1.2 *The Centre for Depoliticization of Kosovar Society* is a Serbian local organisation, which works to promote inter-ethnic reconciliation as a way of improving the living conditions of the Serbian community in Kamenica and neighbouring municipalities. The leader of the CSO has been active in the process of post-war trust-building and inter-ethnic cooperation between Serb and Albanian communities. CDKS runs projects that link public services and the Serbian community. Given that there are still high levels of distrust of Kosovar institutions among Serbian minority, CDKS often mediates, represents or advocates on behalf of Serbs in front of the municipal authorities. CDKS deems that political differences and the history of conflict should not be an obstacle for Serbs and Albanians to co-exist and interact in peace, and having built good personal relationship with the Albanian local leaders, CDKS thinks that focusing on "practical matters", i.e. day-to-day

problems such as infrastructure, employment, quality health services, education is the most effective way to bridge gaps between Albanians and Serbs in Kamenica. Therefore, CDKS acts by initiating projects that find the two sides working together to achieve common aims. It is also working on the development of a language school to enhance co-operation.

4.1.3 To assess the level of potential effectiveness of focusing on advancing local democratic strategy to complement work at the national level approach, we applied the criteria for success noted on page 11. Both these organizations have clearly identifiable constituencies, definition of causes and ownership of the problem their trying to address.   Both of the topics addressed are controversial, with majority public opinion, currently swinging against their cause, but are nevertheless brave in making their cases and clear in their concrete objectives. In that respect, they can demonstrate success, although in small steps. Each organisation adds value to the democratic progress of Kosovo, both working on social consensus, the first by promoting public debate and the second by promoting inter-ethnic co-operation in practice.

4.2 **Recommendations**

There seems to be a lot of positive energy, potential and achievements at the local level that go unregistered by DSP and the other civil society donors in Pristina. These local organizations may not be the most sophisticated when it comes to technical capability (writing a good project proposal or designing a budget) but still they are in a position to achieve the democratic change that DSP strives to bring to Kosovar society. It would appear that the project could triple the number of grantees with little difficulty, if it extended its reach more actively to the regions and municipalities. While grant levels would by necessity be lower (in the €12-35,000 range), the democratic value added could possibly be as high, if not higher than national or Pristina-centred projects. Therefore, it is our recommendation to extend to smaller communities via focused promotion, as well as adjusting the procedures in a way that these type of initiatives are noticed and supported through DSP, and especially in municipalities where other SCO programmes (such as LOGOS) or similar local governance programmes are being implemented.

LOGOS offers the potential for considerable synergy between two different SCO programmes in Kosovo, one state, the other civil. LOGOS can offer information and guidance to KCSF in regional issues so that KSCF may develop promotion, grant selection and grant management in the 9 municipalities in which LOGOS is

operational. Similar backing may be possible from other donor-funded programmes in the regions, such as that run by USAID. LOGOS and similar projects can potentially field a person to sit on the GAB when applications from the relevant municipalities are being considered. Further details of how the DSP procedures could expand more effectively into the regions is given in the next section.

5 Management Procedures

5.1 The Grant Management Cycle

DSP uses three methods: project grants, institutional grants and awards. Awards have not yet been used. Although, GAB continues to see potential promotional function in DSP Award, it yet remains to be precisely formulated and managed.

The grant management cycle, in which KCSF (the implementer of DSP), the GAB and SCO participate, consists of the following:

- Promotion

- Application Process

- Approval (by a Grants and Awards Board, to which KCSF serves as a secretariat and has no vote)

- Support and Mentoring

- Monitoring and Evaluation

- Learning

Each of these phases is applicable both for institutional and project grants. In the case of project grants organizations may apply through submitting a concept note - an abbreviated version of the project grants application form containing a clearly articulated outline of the concrete effects of the proposed project, contribution to democracy, constituency and budget. KCSF is now proposing that in order to increase the accessibility of the DSP to less professionalised organisations, including those outside Pristina, applications should *all* be made by concept note. Once a project has been accepted KCSF should be mandated to work with the grantee to develop the detailed project plan. Once a concept note has been selected by competition, the opportunity then presents for working with applicants on being imaginative, innovative and thorough in their project designs. This is similar to an approach used by the Kosovo Open Society Foundation with some apparent success.

In line with the intention of DSP, project grants underwrite focused initiatives for specific impacts, while institutional grants release strategic capability (e.g D4D scenario setting and response capability) or free ability to act on core objectives and values (e.g. FOL ability to act quickly).

There is no application deadline or special advertisements, other than published dates of the next GAB review meetings for grant applications (published on the KCSF website). There was an initial promotion effort in Pristina and the regions, but no events since then. There is no continuously running public advertisement regarding DSP, other than information on the KCSF website. This light-touch approach to promotion is the outcome of efforts to avoid the project being donor-driven, specifying too much of what was expected. However the consultants note that the project cannot avoid being donor driven, since applicants second-guess the best language and kinds of projects to propose, and the GAB, essentially a donor, decides which projects to select, thus demonstrating what it approves and does not approve.

KCSF has a budget for 1.5 man/days to support DSP, which is quite limiting. Indeed it appears that KCSF has often contributed more, in a range of inputs from administrative, financial and programme staff. Most of the effort of KCSF focuses on application and approval, with very little time left for support to monitoring, evaluation and learning and exchange.

Given that the minimum size of project is 35.000 EUR, smaller and less experienced organizations have less chance of success. In addition, the application procedure is lengthy and technical for short projects, thus possibly excluding excellent small initiatives.

The GAB receives a large number of project and institutional applications at each meeting, which takes a lot of effort reading and deciding (according to some GAB members an average 400-500 pages per meeting), which is burdensome. These factors constitute a hindrance to the proper consideration of all applications, and capturing properly and fully the objectives of DSP. The Open Society Foundation has found a way around this problem by asking only for concept notes, the board then decides which projects offer potential. Candidates are invited for a two-day workshop to develop their proposals with the support of a skilled facilitator. This approach of supporting the development of the written version of a good idea is also being used by the Norwegian Entrepreneurship fund.

KCSF is effective in support capability for concept note to project document development (especially financial and administrative aspects) and in mentoring organisations to streamline procedures. This leaves insufficient time and human resources however to systematize the impact assessment and learning elements of the DSP. Monitoring is done mostly on the level of activities and outputs and does not focus on theory of change or impact, making it difficult for the organisations, KCSF and SCO to capture, document, share and critique impact stories.

Although DSP grantees have visible commonalities of purpose and potential to engage in learning and debate about the democratic process in which they are involved, there are no mechanisms of coordination, networking or systematic effort on learning lessons from and with each other within DSP.

5.2 Procedural Recommendations:

i **Institutional grants Instrument:** Differentiate it clearly, advertising it as funding available to supporting annual programs of effective organizations - fully separate from the project grants (which supports "good ideas"). Add a capacity building budget within the IG. Continue to award them to institutions that have a concrete contribution to democracy, clear strategy and good systems. KCSF should be enabled to spend extra time promoting the institutional grants at regional and municipal level. Consider offering some small sized institutional grants to excellent small operations outside Pristina.

ii **Classify project grants instrument:** Divide the project grants into medium and smaller grants, with smaller grants (€12-35,000) oriented towards community level and medium grants oriented towards interest groups working on democratic issues: civic movements, professional associations and self-help groups. This would fill a gap between the small project fund of the Swiss and other bilateral agencies which grant up to €12,000. Actively extend the grants to the municipal and regional level.

iii **Define DSP Awards**: Define democratic progress and award those who contribute to it. Consider holding a debate on criteria for democratic contribution, and publicize the search for awardees. Create an annual learning event for grantees and (some of) their constituencies and use it to interrogate what democracy is, and what excellence is in contributing to the democratic transition.

iv **Improve promotion**: KSCF could make the program more public, advertise the criteria and the achievements in newspapers and on TV, and provide clearer guidelines as to what is DSP for, and whom it aims to support. It should be mandated to put extra effort into promotion in the regions. KSCF can link with LOGOS and other programmes such as the USAID local governance program to work out how best to undertake effective promotional activities in targeted municipalities.

v **Create a Steering Committee** to hold the GAB to account and to promote questions about democratic impact. This committee could meet annually and be made up of fellow donors running similar grant programmes, or *alternatively* could be a panel of citizens interested in democracy, made up of professionals, business people, students, artists etc.

vi **Simplify and clarify the application procedure**: Consider moving to 100% concept note applications for project grants. Review application form for institutional grants to fully generate focus on strategy and principle rather than projects. Consider a filtering procedure by which a project officer is able to sift and reject concept notes that do not fulfill criteria, thus reducing overall numbers coming before the GAB.

vii **Clarify the selection procedure**: Consider adopting and publicizing criteria along the lines of those suggested above. Applicants should be clear in a concept note (or even an oral statement) about the concrete effects of their project, its political realism and its contribution to democracy, and be able to demonstrate a constituency. Consider including a member of LOGOS (or sister projects in other regions) as an *occasional* member of GAB, specifically invited to assist in reviewing proposals from the relevant region/municipalities.

viii **Strengthen the DSP Support and Monitoring process:** Dedicate more resources to monitoring results rather than activities, and supporting grantees to clarify theories of democratic change, to expand their constituencies through feedback and to learn from mistakes.

ix **Consider Peer-to-Peer Monitoring and Evaluation** (one grantee evaluates another). The approach, if adequately supported, can generate information about project impact while supporting grantee learning. SDC Quality Assurance Division can advise on this.

x **Establish a networking, sharing and learning function within DSP**: organize national networking of DSP grantees (e.g. annually) to learn from and with each

other. Introduce innovative learning approaches, including power analysis. Initiate regional sharing of state-of-the art practices between DSP grantees and those of complementary SDC-supported programmes in the region (Civica Mobilitas in Macedonia).

xi **Increase the KCSF budget and where necessary amend the contract to allow KCSF to spend more time on** promotion, coaching, support, monitoring and learning, including with grantees in the regions.

Table: Outline of a suggested Grant Management Cycle

	IG	Medium	Small
Promotion	(7-8) Website	Outreach, media workshops	
Application	Full format	Concept note	Concept note
Approval (including interviews)	GAB	GAB	GAB
Support and Mentoring		Concept note to full project document with log frame; e-sign-off by GAB	
M & E	M&E, a mix of internal, peer-to-peer and external		
Learning	Grantee networking, regional management meetings		

Annex A – Interviews and Meetings,

23 – 31 July, 2012

Petrit Zogaj, Executive Director Levizja Fol

Valbona Slaihu, Executive Director, Norma

Marie Marchand, Saranda Cana, Fetanete Kastrati (SCO)

Venera Hajrullahu, Taulant Hoxha, Fatmir Curri & Fidan Hallaqi, KCSF (DSP Management team)

Maria Melbing, Head of Cooperation, Embassy of Sweden

Jon Hansen, Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Norway

Amir Haxhikadrija, International Relief and Development (Member of GAB)

Kushtrim Koliqi, Executive Director, Integra (DSP Grantee)

Gezim Abazi, Ex.Director, Handicap Kosovo (unsuccessful DSP applicant)

Norbert Pijls, Project Coordinator, LOGOS Project

Fatmir Matoshi, Radio Premiera, Kamenica

Nebjosa Simic. – Centre for Depolitisation of Kosovo Society

Leon Malazogu – Executive Director, D4D

Sakibe Jashari- Program Officer, Embassy of Switzerland

Eli Gashi, Kosovo Women's Network

Luan Shllaku, Kosovo Foundation for Open Society

Annex B - Bibliography

Swiss Co-operation Strategy, Kosovo 2013 – 2016.

Schultze-Kraft, M and Morina, E., (2012) Supporting Kosovo's Transition: An assessment of SDC's support to decentralization, state building and democracy promotion in Kosovo, IDS.

Malazogu, L., Popovic, V. and Emini S., (2012) Boosting Prospects for Young Kosovo Serbs, Project on Ethic Relations Kosovo, D4D.

McGee, R., Nebiu, B. and Scott-Villiers, P. (2011) Civil Society Support Fund Macedonia, Consultancy report

Mihaijlovic, S. M, (2010) Citizen Participation in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Between tradition and transition.

Todoric, B. and Malazogu, L. (2011) Belgrade-Prishtina Dialogue: Transofrmation of self-interest reauired.

D4D (2012) An Impression of Reform: How to Restore Trust on Elections? Analysis of the work of the committee for electoral amendments and examination of the first set of amendments.

D4D (2011) Deconstructing Election Trends..

D4D (2011) State of the State: Indicators Based Performance, Prepared for the Forum 2015

ENCL (2009) Legal Environment Assessment Report Kosovo.

EU (2011) Progress Report on Kosovo

KCSF (2011) Citizen Participation, Best Practices in the Western Balkans and the European Union

KCSF (2011) Better Governance for a Greater Impact: A call for citizens, Analytical Country Report for Kosovo, Civicus Civil Society Index

KCSF (2011) "We and Them" Citizen Participation in Kosovo

KCSF (2009) Kosovo Civil Society Grant Fund Strategy

KCSF (2009) The State of Civil Dialogue, Country Situation 2009, Kosovo

OSCE (2011) Reference Book for Civil Society Organizations, Participation in the Legislative, Oversight and Budget Processes of the Assembly of Kosovo

TACSO (2011) Beyond Zero: Institutional arrangements for cooperation with civil society

TACSO (2011) Needs Assessment Report, Kosovo under UNSCR 1244/99

USAID (2010) Kosovo Civil Society Strengthening Project Evaluation

Tocqueville, Alexis de (2003). Democracy in America.

Cohen, J. (1997) "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy" (James Bohman & William Rehg eds.) *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics (Bohman, J. and Rehg, W. eds.).*

Fotopoulos, Takis, "Liberal and Socialist 'Democracies' versus Inclusive Democracy", *The International Journal of INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY*, vol.2, no.2, (January 2006).

Dahl, Robert A. (1991). *Democracy and its Critics.* Yale University Press.

Putnam, Robert. (2001). *Making Democracy Work.* Princeton University Press

Mouffe, C. (2000) The Democratic Paradox, Verso

Annex C

1. BACKGROUND

In the past two decades, Kosovar society has experienced everything from brutal repression to intensive assistance that has sometimes bordered on patronage. In February 2008, Kosovo unilaterally declared its independence. The young state faces many economic, social, and political challenges on its road to development, democracy and European integration.

The society in Kosovo is in transition from a socialist past to a democratic society based on values of equal rights, freedom of speech, integration and participation of all communities. One of the prime paths for supporting this transition is to encourage *citizens to participate* in the establishment of a democratic society and a state that strives to serve its citizens. Such *citizen participation* is both a means (for achieving certain goals, for example transparency in the judiciary) and an end (embedding participation into the fabrics of society). An important element of working towards a democratic society is *transparency*. Whilst on paper the local authorities remain committed to deal with corruption, accountability and transparency, these are often found wanting. Civil society in Kosovo is vocal in addressing these issues, but the concrete results achieved have been at best mixed.

In the 1990th, when an increasing part of the Albanian speaking population in Kosovo was or felt excluded from public services such as health and schooling, countless citizens invested a lot of their time, energy and resources into initiatives such as home schooling, free of charge primary health care for school children, ... all provided by volunteers and self organised. Many of these past civic movement activists today are either retired, or feel disappointed from recent political developments in Kosovo and thus have discontinued their commitment to civil society. The Albanian speaking part of the Kosovo population thus has moved from a society with a very imbedded and well organized civil society (even though mostly informal) to a society that has to rebuild a new civil society, but also its attitude towards civil society, and its will to demand for accountability from its new democratically elected political leadership...

Kosovo is a multiethnic country with Albanians, Serbs. Turks, Goranis, Bosniaks, Montenegrins, Roma, Ashkali, Egyptians living in its territory. The integration of *non-majority communities* is a cornerstone of the "Comprehensive Proposal for Kosovo Status Settlement"[1] and thus the constitution. With the recent establishment of new Serb-majority municipalities and the adoption of a strategy and action-plan for the integration of Roma, Ashkali and Egyptians important steps have been made, but

---

[1] Also knwon as "Ahtisaari Plan"

many challenges remain: the history of the recent conflict and the non-recognition of Kosovo's independence by neighbouring countries; economic and social participation of non-majority groups, particularly the Serbs and the Roma.

In the face of the dwindling role of the Yugoslav state after 1989 many people reverted back not only to extended families but with that also to more traditional *gender* specific roles and social attitudes. As a result, the representation of women in public institutions is low; there is for example no female mayor in Kosovo. In addition, women are more prone to be unemployed than men and their level of education is lower.

The transition of Kosovo towards a democratic society based on equal rights, freedom of speech, integration and participation of all communities is a process that has barely started and requires substantial support. The strengthening of state institutions is not in itself sufficient.

1.1 Democratic Society Promotion (DSP), Phase 1 (June 2011 to July 2014)

The design of "Democratic Society Promotion" (DSP) is based on i) the context considerations as explained above, and ii) the Swiss Cooperation Strategy for Kosovo 2009-2012 that states that SDC "will explore and establish instruments to support organizations, activities and processes that contribute to enhanced democratic control and transparency, to foster the integration of the different communities, and to mainstream gender issues". The DSP links well with the transversal themes – gender and governance – that are constituent elements of Swiss Cooperation in Kosovo. DSP is an essential addition in a cooperation programme where infrastructure, state and local institutions and (increasingly) the private sector receive the bulk of the funding.

Furthermore, document analysis, stakeholder interviews, and an extensive stock-taking of all other relevant donor instruments revealed a clear need for supporting medium size projects and organisations with flexible instruments that can respond to emerging needs in the areas of *minority integration*, *gender equality* and *citizen participation* in the dynamic context of Kosovo.

Overall goal of DSP is to support the development of democratic society in Kosovo.

The project aims at supporting projects, initiatives or activities arising from civil society, but also from academic institutions, think tanks, professional organizations etc with a potential to contribute to significant changes in society at national, regional and local level.

The DSP will contribute to the following objectives/outcomes:

Outcome I	Increase citizen participation and improve transparency and accountability of Kosovar Institutions.
Outcome II	Improve inter-ethnic coexistence and the integration of non-majority communities in a multi-ethnic Kosovo.
Outcome III	Advance gender equality in Kosovo

Main **expected results** of DSP are:
- Projects supported and organisations strengthened by the DSP contribute to significant change in the themes of DSP intervention.

- Awards and award ceremony contribute to the public debate in the areas "citizen participation and transparency", "integration of non-majority groups", "gender equality".

Each supported project/organisation is expected to contribute to significant change in at least one of the areas. For illustration for each of the themes of the DSP one area of change is given below:

- Participatory democracy and citizen participation at all levels of administration
- Establishing and strengthening multi-ethnic organizations, companies, social organization, media and dialogue
- Promotion of gender equality and issues in parliament, legislation, administration and the judiciary

Implementation of DSP has been granted (through an open tendering process) to the Kosovar Civil Society Foundation (KCSF) which is an experienced and reputable grant giving organisation in Kosovo.

Overall budget for phase I of DSP project is 1'195'086 Euro.

1.2 DSP - Status of implementation

The contract between SCO-K and KCSF on implementation of DSP was signed on June 10th, 2011 and DSP project was officially launched in June 14th, 2011 with a project launch event which attracted great attention of media and tens of potential DSP beneficiaries from the civil society, academia and public administration. Simultaneously, KCSF developed and launched the website www.kcsfoundation.org/dsp where the entire project related information, documents and application are developed and uploaded in three languages (Alb, Serb and Eng). The launch event provided an important momentum to launch applications process and inform all interested parties for the opportunities provided by DSP. In parallel, during this period KCSF and SCO-K jointly coordinated the necessary contacts and agreements for establishing and functionalizing the DSP Grants and Awards Board (GAB). Finally, the first days of the project were used to design and agree on all application documents and forms, both for project grants and (PG) and institutional grants (IG).

During June 2011, KCSF organized 8 DSP information sessions throughout Kosovo regions/municipalities (7 Albanian and 1 Serbian) where 122 NGOs participated. The application eligibility and guidelines, application forms and other criteria were explained and discussed with potential DSP applicants/beneficiaries.

Subsequently, GAB was established and held its inauguration meeting on 29th June, 2011. During this meeting GAB adopted the proposed procedures of application and evaluation in order to prepare the entire application evaluation system of DSP. Starting from its second meeting in September 2011, during 2011 GAB assessed 112 applications and granted 12 grants in the amount of €697,992 EUR (3 institutional grants and 9 project grants).

2. OBJECTIVE OF THE MANDATE

The objective of the mandate is to review the DSP grant scheme based on the experience of the first year of implementation in order for SDC to be able to take informed decision on the remainder of the phase and in view of the new Swiss Cooperation Strategy with Kosovo from 2013 to 2016

The main task of the mission will be:

- To review the DSP project by analysing the design of the DSP scheme, the experience during the first year of implementation and assessing the feasibility to effectively promote change leading towards democratic society in Kosovo's given context, as strived for in the project document.

- To make recommendations on the future of DSP scheme and / or its implementation, aiming effectiveness of DSP contribution that goes beyond financial-institutional support of individual CSOs and their project initiatives, thus leading towards promotion of democratic society.

- To make recommendations on how to adapt DSP scheme to make it more synergetic with other Swiss interventions on local governance and decentralization.

The mission shall explicitly take into account the two studies that SDC recently has commissioned with IDS on civil society in Macedonia, as well as on local governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina including reflections on the role of civil society on local government level. While the context in Kosovo is different to both Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, SDC is interested to understand if problems identified in these two contexts to a certain degree also apply to the civil society sector in Kosovo, and consequently, to what degree and extent similar or other conclusions and recommendations need to be drawn in the context of Kosovo.

The IDS assessment of civil society in Macedonia concluded that a majority of all formal civil society organizations applying for support with the CSSF program (Civil Society Support Program funded by SDC in Macedonia) lack a constituency and the CSSF program thus failed short in contributing effectively to a vibrant domestic accountability relationship between citizens and government and consequently the objectives of good governance, democratization and state building. The assessment thus recommended SDC to primarily invest into Civil Society constituency building.

The IDS assessment of local governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina however identified a lack of spaces and places, where civil society can enter into a dialogue and ultimately accountability relationship with (local) government can develop. The assessment thus recommended to SDC to explore alternative spaces and places. This could e.g. include the institutionalisation of participation of civil society in local government processes, a wider focus not only on formal civil society organisations but also other informal civil society organisations operating in different spaces and places than usually known to donors etc.

3. KEY QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

The experts should provide answers to a set of key questions listed below around three major issues (i) does the ongoing project deliver the results as expected (ii) what amendments/adaptations make sense in view of the new Swiss Cooperation Strategy 2013 -2016 with a focus on local governance and (iii) how does the Civil Society assessment of IDS in Macedonia, and BiH (with a focus on local governance) relate to the assessment (analysis and conclusions) of Civil Society in Kosovo;

This is not an exhaustive list and the experts are invited to add new questions:

1. Is DSP project (in its design and implementation) on the right way to achieve the set project goals and objectives?

2. Which are the main findings at the level of single instruments of DSP: i) institutional grants, ii) project grants and iii) awards with regard to their relevance, impact potential and applied approach? Are there any modifications necessary, considering the experience made during the first year of implementation?

3. How could DSP be best suited into the new SDC Cooperation Strategy with Kosovo 2013 to 2016, and its main focus at the local governance and decentralisation level?

4. How could DSP be best complementary with the SCO K small projects fund?

5. Is DSP relevant and applicable for civil society organisations working in/being based in northern Kosovo, or initiatives covering northern Kosovo?

6. DSP is designed so as to address innovative initiatives. Is there any innovation that can be observed from the list of grants awarded so far?

7. DSP grants strive to be opportunistic/demand driven (vs. Donor driven). Considering the experience made so far, which are chances for DSP to be successful in this matter?

8. Are the threshold and limitations of DSP grants appropriate to address important initiatives of various actors at central and local level? Are the threshold and limitations of DSP grants in compliance with the targeted beneficiaries?

9. DSP is meant to be open not only to CSOs but also to other type of institutions (i.e. public institutions, research and academia, etc). However cooperation with non-CSOs has so far not realised. Why?

10. How is the project management and implementation generally assessed (communication and information to the public, transparency, monitoring, etc)?

11. Is GAB structure including its set procedures appropriate: relevant, efficient, effective, transparent and fair?

12. Which are International state-of-the-art practices and or elements (including SDC experience in the region, for e.g Macedonia, and Bosnia and

Herzegovina) that could be considered and applied in DSP, in view of their dynamics and applicability to the Kosovar context?

13. What steering mechanism can be proposed for DSP?

4. METHODOLOGY FOR CONDUCTING THE RESEARCH

- Desk study – mainly - on DSP project and the context of Kosovo; dialogue with SDC in-country to set up programme for the visit and ensure all relevant opportunities for learning and info-gathering are built into it;

- Mission to Kosovo: conducting individual and / or joint meetings with relevant actors, SCO K, KCSF, a selected number of grantees (of institutional and project grants) as well as a selected number of unsuccessful applicant both for institutional support and grants, GAB members, government actors, representatives of the international community and citizens in informal civil society, and in engagement with local government (to be organised with LOGOS project).

- Analysis and drafting at IDS

- Report finalization at IDS, considering the comments and remarks to the first draft report received by SCO K, SDC Berne and KCSF.

Besides proposing additional methods appropriate for conducting the research and producing the deliverables, the experts, prior to the mission, should submit a detailed methodology and assessment plan in time span how they intend to answer the above listed questions.

5. DELIVERABLES (Outputs)

The consultancy team shall present its final findings, conclusions and recommendations in a concise report written in English of max. 20 pages main text (size 12, single space), which includes following chapters:

- Executive summary;

- Analysis and conclusions about the current design of DSP (applicability, approach, impact hypothesis, etc) in relation to the current context.

- Assessment and conclusions on the first year of implementation (including major success and deficiencies);

- Main conclusions and Recommendations about the future.
  - General recommendations;
  - What should be changed/adapted, how and why?

6. TIMEFRAME

The mandate is foreseen to take place between July and September 2012. The draft report is expected by 30 August 2012. The final report shall be submitted by 15 September 2012.

Task	Days International Consultant	Days Regional Consultant	Comments
Desk Study	2 + 1 day research support	2	*Since SCO-K and KCSF teams (adding to other respondents of the interviews) can provide useful information on the local context, we would propose that no national expert should be assigned. Instead, those resources could be used for a regional expert (e.g. Macedonian), who could assist the international expert, in order to provide the first-hand information on other similar practices*
Methodology & interview plan	1	2	*Regional consultant will work with SDC office to organise interviews. International will prepare interview questions.*
First Mission	7	7	*Incl. travelling*
Analysis	3 + 2 days research support		
Report Drafting	4	2	
Final Report	0.5	0.5	*Incorporating amendments*
Total.	17.5 + 3 days research support	13.5	

Time Plan	Month:	July			August				September	
	week:	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2
Desk reading	International	2								
	Regional	2								
	Support	1								
Interview plan	International		1							
	Regional		2							
Kosovo Field Visit	International			7						
	Regional			7						
Best practice search	Support					2				
Analysis	International					3				
Report Draft	International						4			
	Regional						2			
Final report	International									0.5
	Regional									0.5

7. ORGANIZATION OF THE MANDATE

The consultancy team will be composed of two independent experts (one international and one regional). The leading role and overall responsibility for the outcome of the mission and reporting will be with the international expert.

The contacts with SDC Head Office and the Cooperation Office Prishtina should include a formal initial briefing as well as a debriefing at the end of the mission;

Close communication shall be maintained with of SCO K Deputy Director Marie Marchand and NPO Saranda Cana.

8. REFERENCE MATERIAL

- DSP Programme documents, such as Credit Proposal, Project Document, Guidelines for application, progress report, etc;

- Context reports;

- IG and PG beneficiaries short project infos

- Concept note - Cooperation strategy 2013 to 2016;

- IDS assessment on civil society in Macedonia, 2011

- IDS assessment on local governance in Bosnia and Herzegowina, 2012

- Relevant documents on civil society and democracy in Kosovo as available