



2014:19

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Pier Giorgio Ardeni
Andrej Kveder

Mid-term Review of Support to Partnership in Statistics in BiH Phase 3

Final Report

Mid-term Review of Support to Partnership in Statistics in BiH Phase 3

**Final Report
March 2014**

**Pier Giorgio Ardeni
Andrej Kveder**

Authors: Pier Giorgio Ardeni and Andrej Kveder

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2014:19

Commissioned by Sida, Swedish Embassy in Sarajevo

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: March 2014

Published by Citat 2014

Art. no. Sida61722en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61722en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of contents

Table of contents	6
Abbreviations and Acronyms	7
Executive Summary	8
1 Introduction.....	16
2 Rationale and purpose of the evaluation.....	19
3 Methodology	24
4 Findings.....	25
5 Conclusions	53
6 Recommendations.....	59
Annex 1 – ToR.....	61
Annex 2 - List of documents	66
Annex 3 – List of interviewees.....	68
Annex 4 – The Evaluation Responses	70

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BiH	Bosnia & Herzegovina
BHAS	Bosnia & Herzegovina State Agency for Statistics
EE	Environment Expenditure
ES	Department for Environmental Statistics
FIS	Institute for Statistics of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina
GSI	Governmental Statistical Institutes
GGE	Green-house Gas Emissions
HRM	Human Resource Management
LFS	Labour Force Survey
LCS	Labour Cost Survey
PAF	Performance Assessment Framework
PIS-3	Partnership in Statistics in BiH, Phase 3
RSIS	Republika Srpska Institute of Statistics
RBM	Results-Based Management
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation agency
SCB	Statistics Sweden
SM	Statistical Methodology

Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

Overall assessment

The purpose of the evaluation was to undertake a results-based – i.e. based on outputs and outcomes – mid-term review of the PIS-3 project. The specific project objective was set as to continue to support a number of prioritized statistical areas, to build statistical and institutional capacity in the three Statistical Institutes, and to make statistics correspond to the country needs, EU and international regulations and standards in statistics.

The over-arching goals, the desired outcomes and expected outputs were defined together with the activities aimed at their achievement and the indicators of progress. However, as we will see below (in the Findings Section), in several cases the logic of the intervention was not clearly spelled out, as the link between planned activities, expected outputs and desired outcomes – the results chains – were somehow vaguely described, and the indicators of progress often blurred or not clearly identified.

Main findings

1. The wording and structure of objectives does not indicate the nature of change expected in the statistics institutes as a result of the project. The project objectives look more like activities. Obviously, the lack of clarity and the extent to which the objectives adequately set out outcomes is bound to have an impact on the effectiveness of the project.
2. As for the specific objectives, the wording is not adequate either, as they look more like activities rather than outcomes. Besides, no targets are set for them and no indicators are defined for measuring progress towards those targets. As it stands, it is difficult to evaluate the degree of progress in those areas. Additionally, the potential achievement of these activities is not under the direct control of neither the donor (Sida) nor the lead consultant (SCB) but rather at the mercy of the political will in BiH. Similarly to the overall objective, outcomes in the various areas should be defined along similar lines (to be discussed with the partners) and the wording should be changed (see below the Recommendation Section for an example).
3. Desired outcomes (objectives) for each component are not properly identified and they need to be re-worded. No targets are set for them and no indicators are defined

for measuring progress towards those targets. Hence, it is difficult to evaluate the degree of progress in those areas.

4. Properly defined indicators were seldom identified for outcomes and impact – and the lack thereof obviously has a bearing on what this evaluation can achieve and how. When defined, indicators appear to be end-of-project indicators (targets), rather than progress indicators.

5. As a general criterion and for each component, one key evaluation tool is to assess to what degree has each indicator been achieved and how much of the outputs has been obtained to achieve the desired outcomes. For this, quantitative outputs indicators are generally needed to assess progress. However, it is not clear from the Project Plan how and what indicator tracking system has been envisaged. As it turns out, indicators are mainly about activities and outputs and do not provide suitable information to demonstrate progress towards outcomes and the overall objective. This implies that more thought will be needed as to how to measure the progress towards outcomes.

6. Our assessment is that most of the indicators listed are end-of-project indicators and it is therefore difficult to assess how much progress has been made until now. In order to measure short term progress of each component, mid-term or intermediate indicators are needed. Such indicators would reflect more tangibly the achievements at the end of the current project term and they would give an indication for future course of the project, enabling the project implementers to achieve the end indicator stated in the project plan. Moreover, the matrix should have elaborated on a theory of change how these end-of-project indicators can be reached. The theory of change specification would further assist the process evaluation as different paths of reaching the goals could be investigated.

7. The goals for the project implementer (SCB) as they are defined in the RBM matrix and the TOR are actually not directly the responsibility of SCB, but rather largely dependent on the political will of the recipient country to implement the set changes. It is difficult to assess the effectiveness and impact of the programme, whereby the main trigger for successful implementation of the final result is out of scope and control of the intervention itself. The key outcome indicators would be better defined as emanating from the activities of the SCB rather than the overarching goals as specified in the current work plan. *The lack of an adequate budget reporting by SCB (e.g. by activity, output and according to a delivery plan) coupled with a certain lack of good financial planning, including backstopping from SCB Sweden and its regional office, make the whole project planning and implementation rather weak. This is a fundamental organisational issue at SCB that affects the project and makes its monitoring cumbersome beyond the difficulties of operating in an uncertain environment such as BiH.*

8. If the First Project Progress Report – covering the period from February to June 2012 – did not include any change in the Results Matrix, neither the Second nor the Third Progress Report – one covering the period July to December 2012 and the other covering the period from January to June 2013 – appear to have accounted for any more accurate definition of intermediate and final indicators and expected results.

9. We believe that a more careful consideration of the actual risks facing the project would have been advisable, with particular attention to the Population Census. Having assumed that the personnel, the management and the whole plan of activities could take place with no potential effect coming from other activities was a serious shortcoming of the design, as it exposed the project to a source of failure mostly due to external factors outside the control of the project managers.

10. All the components follow the statistical plan and the recommendations in the Eurostat Global Assessment. They also appear to be in line with the Strategic Plans of the three GSI.

11. The overall objective for LFS – Prepare for the transition from annual LFS to the continuous one in order to meet international standards and EU requirements – looks poorly defined, as it does not describe a high-level goal and indeed reads more like an activity. What is not clear in this case is what the outcome is and what it might be. The way the objective is (not) specified in the project documents would require a need to recreate it somehow, preferably through a participatory discussion with the project partners in BiH [an outcome is a behavioural or performance change as a results of the outputs]. Also, an indicator measuring progress towards this output (a quantitative target) is needed, together with an indicator measuring progress in achieving the outcome. Those defined in the Project Plan appear to be vague and only end-of-project ones (see below the Recommendation Section for an example).

12. The objective for LCS – To prepare and implement the LCS 2013 for the reference year 2012 in line with international standards and EU requirements – is misspecified and should be reworded, as the outcome of this component should be that BiH complies with international standards and the up-to-date and timely implementation of LCS. The key output for this outcome has to be re-defined accordingly. As for the progress indicators, there is no outcome indicator specified. In the Project Plan, some of the expected outputs appear to be more like outcomes (e.g. "Improved abilities of subject matter experts"), while their indicators are missing.

13. As for Components 3, 4, 5, and 6, there is confusion all through the Project Plan among activities, outputs, outcomes and indicators. Outputs and their target indicators are in some cases missing. These need reformulating through discussion with the partners.

14. The overall objective for these three components – Development of a sustainable statistical system in Bosnia-Herzegovina that facilitates decision-making based on relevant and reliable statistical information that meets domestic demands and EU re-

quirements – looks more like an objective for the overall project and should be reworded. The outcomes for Component 7 – "Improvement of the treatment of specific problems" and "Calculated and explained quality indicators" – are poorly defined. Some of the outputs look more like outcomes while their target indicators are not specified ("number of trained staff": what number?; Trained in which methodological aspects?).

15. In our opinion we may say that the implementation plan, the list and time-line of activities, the deadlines for delivering the outputs, the reporting, the monitoring and the cross-checks, the accounting and the financial reporting were somehow loose and not strictly defined.

16. Both senior technical staff and the top management in all three statistical institutions are very satisfied with Sida support to development of Labour statistics both with the content of the study visits as well as with the expertise of the Swedish experts. Participation of technical staff, instead of the top management in study visits relating to labour statistics is greatly appreciated and has a very positive effect on capacity building with the organizations.

17. Labour Cost Survey (LCS) has been upgraded to the standards required by the Eurostat and is being carried out every 4 years. The first LCS was carried out in 2010, while the second survey is currently in progress.

18. The Labour Force Survey (LFS) has been upgraded to the Eurostat standards set for yearly LFS surveys. The transition to a continuous LFS is currently not progressing according to plan and is facing a couple of major challenges before it can be put in practice. Major organizational challenges are (a) securing the funding across all three GSI and (b) ensuring adequate numbers of adequately trained staff, especially in light of the restrictive employment policies lately. Major technical challenges remain (a) logistics of running continuous fieldwork, (b) ensuring a rotating sampling scheme and (c) ensuring adequate and secure IT and data processing procedures.

19. As the continuous LFS implementation is severely lagging behind the scheduled work-plan, an extension of the current support is advocated by the GSI.

20. All the GSI are in general satisfied with the Sida support in developing the Environmental statistics (ES) in BiH. Most of the progress could not have been made without Sida's support. Two (water and waste statistics) of the four sub-components are more or less on track with the project work-plan in terms of delivery.

21. The main challenge in developing and delivering the environmental statistics is in the lack of legislation on environmental issues at the central state level. Due to the political arrangements based on Dayton accords, environmental issues are considered to be a jurisdiction of the entities and not the state. Such a decentralized system has severe implications for delivery national statistics as there is no central coordinating

authority. There is no state level environmental agency. The ES departments are understaffed as the FIS and RSIS have only one staff member, while the ES department BHAS is better staffed (with 3 staff members) it lacks the authority to coordinate the activities.

22. Collection and reporting on the water statistics has been successfully upgraded to the standards required by the Eurostat. Due to political impediments mentioned in the first paragraph, the methodology of data collection is not centralized and the responsibilities for reporting to Eurostat are not completely clear.

23. Development of waste statistics is well under way, however, it is not considered to be on schedule. Waste statistics micro-data are being collected for mining and quarry, manufacturing and electricity production and supply in both Entities. Pilot studies have been started for data collection in agriculture and construction, while the development of waste statistics in services has not been started yet.

24. There has been no progress on Green-house Gas Emissions (GGE) statistics in any of the Entities nor at the State level.

25. There has also been no progress on Environment Expenditure (EE) statistics in neither FIS nor RSIS. The prevalent belief at BHAS is that the scope of the EE statistics is too narrow and should be developed in a broader context of Environmental National Accounts Statistics.

26. In general the GSI are satisfied with the Sida support in statistical methodology (SM) capacity building. As the result of the Sida initiated SM training the cooperation on the SM issues among the GSI has improved greatly. However, there are a number of identified shortcomings in delivery. The training courses are too general and broad, there are not enough training courses organized and the numbers of participants are too restrictive.

27. Capacity building in SM is progressing well, although the pace of progress is slower than planned. There is scope to organize more training courses or study visits, however for a number of reasons the realization of the training course has been lagging behind the expressed demand (although one similar training activity was organised within SCB regional project). Furthermore, the number of provided spaces in the training events is well below the demand as expressed by the GSI. There is considerably more demand for methodological training than there is on offer.

28. There is also a need for more focused training on specific methodological topics both for methodological specialists as well as for staff from substantive statistical teams. Among the identified topics are: outlier analysis, sampling and data editing.

29. There is also an unmet demand to provide the training for the within-institutional team of trainers. SM experts from the GSI could provide cascaded training of their

own staff, however, in order to accomplish this they would require additional training in training and teaching techniques.

30. There has been very limited progress in the capacity building for management component. As the component it has received the lowest priority among all the project activities. However, there is a subcomponent, which has had a profound impact on overall project satisfaction among all the GSI – the Sida sponsored trainee programme. All the GSI are extremely satisfied with the trainee programme and deem it is a vital part of their staff development.

31. The GSI would very much like the trainee part of the Sida support to continue in the future starting with the extension of the support to the current contingent of the trainees. The absorption of the trainees into the employee structures is slow and currently heavily impaired by the ban of employment in civil services. Any extension of their support would enable the GIS to find vacancies within their structures that could potentially absorb the trainees.

32. There is absolutely no progress on the general management subcomponent. In any case, despite no progress within the project on these particular goals, the top management of the three GSI has adopted a document on Strategy for Development of Statistics of BiH 2020.

33. There is very limited progress on the Human Resource Management (HRM) sub-component. There is no proper HRM department in any of the GSIs currently, thus any development in this sub-component would require profound changes in the organizational structure of any given GSI. A work-plan for the remainder of the project duration stipulates that organizational plan and assessment for the transition to the Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) will be carried out. Any further developments of the HRM are seen only in the context of the PAF. There is currently no plan for PAF implementation within the scope of the Sida supported project, although the PAF implementation does have the highest priority for implementation in the future.

34. Evaluation questions. Summarise results.

35. Effectiveness. Overall, it appears that activities are generally well targeted to the expected output in some cases (components 1, 2, 3, 4, 7) and yet the slow progress toward desired outcomes in some cases is due to lack of engagement and understanding (components 5, 6, 8, 9) and low capacity (all the others). Overall, the desired outcomes may be difficult to reach within project time horizon.

Conclusion

The development of a sustainable statistical system in Bosnia and Herzegovina continued to progress certainly partly thanks to the assistance of Sida through SCB. The project has achieved a certain number of results and is still quite far from the initial objectives. Progress has been made in a number of areas but it is short of the desired achievements.

The speed and depth of development varies among project components. The most evident achievements were probably in those areas where activities had already been started in previous phases.

The partners appreciate the cooperation with SCB and Sida, their flexibility on project implementation and the possibility of tailoring activities to the partners' needs even in due course.

The traineeship programme has been a success, as it has allowed the training of future staff on the job for a long period before their hiring as employees.

Only part of the planned activities has been implemented and some of the outcomes are definitely not within reach. Preparations for the Population Census are certainly the most relevant factor, as they captured the full attention of the whole system at crucial times, calling for the full involvement of most of the personnel in almost all departments.

Some sub-components have been perceived as less crucial to the success of the project delivery. It is the partners' sense of ownership that seems to be lacking for some sub-components.

The choice of objectives in some cases appears to have been unrealistic.

The Project Plan for the various components was drafted with full awareness of the complexity of the cooperation arrangements among the three GSI. Long-term objectives generally appear out of reach for a three-year project to be implemented during a pending Population Census.

Recommendations

A new and appropriate results-based framework should be defined for the next phase including defined activities, expected outputs and desired outcomes, together with the relative theory of change.

Further support of Sida and SCB, as the capacity building action is still to be completed, training and coaching of the staff are still necessary and several staff members still lack technical experience and self-confidence, particularly in a few selected areas.

The volunteer/trainee programme to be extended.

That the management and personnel services are provided with know-how and best practices examples as how to integrate new staff in the existing employment schemes in adverse conditions.

A local assistant attached to the long-term project coordinator to increase efficiency in delivery and a smoother relationship with the partners.

Budgeting and accounting should be contractually defined in stricter terms.

A re-planning workshop should be held to deal with the remainder of this phase.

The results matrix should be refined, including objectives and progress indicators.

Since the various project components are not yet completed and the final outcomes are not yet in sight, a request for an extension is highly recommended.

1 Introduction

1.1 BACKGROUND

SIPU International AB has been commissioned by Sida to carry out a Mid-Term Review of the project “Partnership in Statistics in BiH, Phase 3” (PIS-3) implemented by Statistics Sweden (SCB) in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). The current PIS-3 three-year project officially began on 1 February 2012 and will come to an end on 31 January 2015. The project original budget is 15 751 000 SEK.

The PIS-3 project was originally planned to be implemented within the period of the *Sida Strategy for Development Cooperation with BiH* January 2011 – December 2014. That Country Strategy has now been cut short by one year, and it is therefore coming to an end. In 2013, the Swedish government has begun to work on a new regional *Result Strategy* for the period 2014-2020 for the whole Balkan area, which includes activities and projects to be implemented at the country level. The focus will be on increased regional cooperation, measuring results and achievements, and the political progress of the region in relation to EU-accession.

The SCB partners in PIS-3 are the three Governmental Statistical Institutes (GSI) in BiH: the BH State Agency for Statistics (BHAS) – which is also responsible for Brcko District – and two Entity statistics institutes: the Institute for Statistics of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FIS) and the Republika Srpska Institute of Statistics (RSIS).

A mid-term review had been planned since the beginning of PIS-3 and all partners are aware that it would be carried out by Sida. The timing of the review has been under some deliberation and has been difficult to define in advance due to the Population Census 2013 in BiH. As the Census field operations finally took place in October 2013, the review has been launched, although beyond the mid-term and at about two thirds of the project planned schedule.

This Report discusses the results of that review. The field visit by the Team of Evaluators took place between December 8th and December 18th, 2013. This Report is thus based on the results and findings of that field visit, together with the review of all the project documents and reports.

The Report presents an overall review of the progress of the various project components realized by SCB with the three GSI since the start of the project. Information in this report was obtained from interviews with Sida representatives in Sarajevo, SCB project managers, officials at the three GSI and with the stakeholders. The main find-

ings indicate that the progress achieved in implementing the projects differ by project component and by partner. While a number of components have progressed well and on schedule – most notably sub-components 2 (Labour Cost Survey), 3 (Water Statistics) –, a few have made only some progress - subcomponent 4 (Waste Statistics) and 1 (Labour Force Survey) – the others have been delayed or have not been implemented as planned.

1.2 THE PARTNERSHIP IN STATISTICS PROJECTS

Support to statistics through SCB has been given to the BiH GSI at least since 2007, with Phase 1 and 2 of the *Partnership in Statistics* (PIS) programme. PIS-1 was a 3-year project, from beginning of 2007 to the end of 2009, covering: agriculture, environment, energy, labour, forestry, fishery and gender statistics, together with statistical methodology. General capacity building was also addressed, including, among other things, English language training, project work, report writing, presentation techniques and efficient mass media relations. Twenty-six trainees were contracted in 2007 and 2008 and twenty-three of them were employed after the completion of their traineeships. Three new components were added to the project during the year 2009 so as to bridge assistance between two existing EC-funded projects: statistical business register, agro-monetary and business statistics.

Phase-1 was reviewed in the spring of 2009. The review was on the whole satisfactory, though some critical comments were made concerning goal setting and indicators on target achievement, though for that phase an RBM approach had not yet adopted. In any case, the review made a few recommendations including a clearer definition of goals and the project logic, a more structured organisation of the long-term coordination team and a continuation of Sida's support beyond the year 2009. As we will see below, all of those recommendations do not seem to have been fully taken on board.

A new project phase with a much smaller budget thus started in 2010. PIS-2 covered the period January 2010 to December 2011 and it built on the previous PIS-1 3-year intervention, thus continuing the support in the same areas as in the previous phase. On request by the cooperation partners, a component on short-term economic statistics was added to the project. Taking this and the overall project budget into account, it was therefore necessary to prioritize: energy and forestry statistics were thus excluded from this phase, which continued to cover assistance in the areas of agriculture, environment, labour, fishery, gender statistics, statistical methodology and general capacity building. PIS-2 also had a long-term advisor (LTA) for about half of the project period. The project also included a trainee-programme component.

In addition to the PIS programme, BiH Statistical Institutes also participated in a Sida-financed regional project which is still on-going .

1.3 RATIONALE FOR PIS-PHASE 3

Statistics plays a central role when it comes to decision-making and monitoring. In order to decide how to efficiently allocate the resources of a country it is therefore important to monitor the undergoing social and economic conditions. Relevant and reliable statistical information that meets domestic needs, that supports the monitoring of the Country Development Strategy, and the EU Stabilisation and Association process is an important tool for sustainable development. Sustainable development and improved conditions for EU integration are also key issues in Sweden's country strategy towards Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The partners of the cooperation in statistics for this PIS-3 project are again the three GSI --- BHAS, FIS, RSIS --- and SCB. The current project budget covers the period February 2012 – January 2015.

The rationale for the current phase was illustrated in the Project Plan, which we may consider for the purpose of this evaluation the Master Document. As a matter of fact, no other project design document is available. As it turns out, all project components and objectives were discussed and agreed with the partners during Phase 2, as declared by SCB officials.

When it was designed, the **specific project objective** was set as to continue to support a number of prioritized statistical areas, to build statistical and institutional capacity in the three Statistical Institutes, and to make statistics correspond to the country needs, EU and international regulations and standards in statistics. [we will see below more on the project objectives and purposes].

The **effectiveness** of the project, as stated in the Project Plan, was to be ensured by adaptation of the support to the changing needs and to the absorption capacity of the Institutes, in coordination with other on-going projects so as to prevent overlaps and to make use of possible synergies.

2 Rationale and purpose of the evaluation

2.1 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The **purpose** of the evaluation is to undertake a results-based – i.e. based on outputs and outcomes – mid-term **review** of the PIS-3 project (as introduced above). The **specific objective** is the overall outcome/output-based review of the progress of the various project components during Phase 3, taking into account both the results of the previous phases 1 and 2 since the beginning of the Sida-financed SCB support to statistics in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2007 and the new priorities that might have arisen from the 2013 Population Census field operations. A **secondary objective** of this evaluation is to assess the needs and possibilities of extension of the current PIS-3 to include future cooperation on social statistics with emphasis on population statistics/demographic analysis and its compatibility with Sida Regional Result Strategy. The primary readership of the evaluation will include Sida and the project partners, SCB and the GSI. The results of the evaluation will be used by Sida as an external input for adjusting the programme as necessary. The project partners are also interested in this external input so as to appropriately change the project objectives and adjust its components and activity plans to possible new national priorities and areas of intervention as a result of the Population Census 2013. The Population Census – which had been in the planning for a number of years – was finally implemented in 2013, with the field data collection now completed. The results of the Census will have relevant implications in a number of areas, from demographic statistics to all the household and individual surveys based a population sample frame, to a number of more extended areas.

The implementation of the first phases of the Census involved the whole statistical system of the country and its institutions in a fully-fledged way, which completely absorbed the personnel and the structure for the entire duration of the preparation and execution of the field work. The second Census phase of data analysis and dissemination has now started, and the pressure on the staff has slowly been released. Thus, the Census has already had an effect of slowing down the implementation of any activity not strictly related to its operations, including those targeted by the PIS-3 project. The Census 2013 is also expected to have a resounding effect on the development context of BiH, by providing for new information and base references in a number of policy areas, as well as new bases for sampling and survey implementation at the statistical office levels. Therefore, as for the specific objectives of the evaluation, the review will cursorily look into the possible effects of the Census on demographic statistics, household-based surveys and all other areas that might be affected by the new census data.

2.2 EVALUATION OBJECT AND SCOPE

The specific **object** of the evaluation are the PIS-3 project activities and results. The evaluation was conducted through a review of all the current project documents as well as previous PIS documents, a 10-day field visit whereby information was obtained from interviews with officials at the three statistical offices and with the stakeholders, and a subsequent report drafting.

The **scope** of the review is primarily to review progress in the four areas (components) covered by the PIS-3 project, now in its second year of activity, to be done in accordance with standard Sida/DAC criteria. The review will also try to identify discrepancies between the planned and actual implementation of the project and to propose possible amendments to the project plan in light of the priorities arising out of the Census 2013 and from Sida Regional Result Strategy on cooperation in social statistics.

The Project Plan presents four components and a few more sub-components for a total of nine groups of activities, together with a number of expected results by the end of the project and their corresponding indicators of achievement/progress. Up until now, during the period of project implementation three semi-annual progress reports have been issued covering successive periods (See Annex 1). Each of the reports published the achieved results by the end of the period covered and related achieved indicators by the end of concerned period.

As we are aiming at an output/outcome-based review, we need to examine how well the delivered outputs have or are stimulating behavioural change to achieve outcomes and thus contribute towards the intended impact. A first step is to examine the project logic and see how well the project documents specify the intervention logic from activities to outputs to outcomes and to impact.

2.3 THE PROJECT LOGIC

The project was set up so as to provide continuity to Sida's assistance to the establishment of a sustainable statistical system in BiH. The intervention was defined so as to focus on a number of areas: labour force statistics, environmental statistics, statistical methods and management. The over-arching goals, the desired outcomes and expected outputs were defined together with the activities aimed at their achievement and the indicators of progress. However, as we will see below (in the Findings Section), in several cases the logic of the intervention was not clearly spelled out, as the link between planned activities, expected outputs and desired outcomes – the results chains – were somehow vaguely described, and the indicators of progress often blurred or not clearly identified. For clarity of reading, we are hereby reporting the

various elements of the project logic framework as they were originally defined, leaving the critique of their formulation to the Findings Sections.

In the four areas (components) a number of overall goals were defined, so as to target all activities towards the relative objectives: development of labour market statistics in line with international standards (component 1); development of environmental statistics in line with international standards and national needs (component 2); training of staff in statistical methods (component 3); increase of general capacity in management, including human resource management, and training of young volunteers with a traineeship programme targeted to permanent hiring with the Statistical Offices (component 4).

The first component was articulated into two sub-components: support to Labour Force Survey (LFS) and support to Labour Cost Survey (LCS). For the first sub-component, three specific outcomes were outlined: i) Fully harmonised LFS questionnaire according to ILO and EU standards; ii) Quality Report for LFS; iii) Conducted pilot survey. As for the second sub-component, four outcomes were outlined: i) Fully harmonised LCS according to EU requirements and standards; ii) Quality Report for LCS; iii) Indicators in accordance with EU requirements; iv) Conducted survey LCS 2012.

The second component was articulated into four sub-components: support to development of water statistics; support to development of waste statistics; support to development of greenhouse-emission gas statistics; support to development of environmental protection expenditures statistics. A number of desired outcomes were outlined for the four sub-components, albeit vaguely and quite generically in most cases. For water statistics, the (only) outcome was defined as "necessary indicators according to EU legislation". For waste statistics, the outcomes was defined as "Amount and type of waste in the service activities according to EU regulation 2150/2002/EC on waste statistics." For greenhouse-emission gas statistics, the outcome was outlined again simply as "necessary indicators according to EU legislation." For environmental protection expenditures statistics, the outcome was outlined as "to conduct a pilot study on *Annual report on investments, expenditures and revenues for environmental protection*, sectors B, C and D NACE Rev.2 (for 10 or more employees)."

The third component was basically devoted to training activities. Its outcomes were defined as "Improvement of the treatment of specific problems" and "Calculated and explained quality indicators". As for the fourth component, in the original Project Plan the outcomes were not even specified.

A number of expected outputs and activities were then listed for each of the sub-components and their outcomes. As we said above, the project logic appears to have been only vaguely designed as it seems sketchy and undetermined in several instances. As we will argue below, this points to a certain lack of direction for what the pro-

ject aimed to achieve on the ground and makes its effectiveness rather difficult to assess in the light of too generic a results chain and a poor intervention logic.

2.4 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

In line with the TOR and the Sida/DAC criteria, the objectives of the evaluation are hereby translated into relevant and specific evaluation questions. Yet, not all questions are addressed in the review, as explained in the next Section below (Methodology).

The following are the questions that the review addresses with respect to each criterion. Responses to the questions are summarized in the Evaluation Framework in the Table below and in the Findings Section.

2.4.1 Relevance.

- Q1.1. To what extent was the PIS-3 project relevant to the BiH parties' needs and change processes/plans?

This question also addresses the issue of whether the current Phase 3 has managed to avoid the limitations of the previous phases and whether the objectives and the expected results of the project are too ambitious.

2.4.2 Effectiveness.

- Q2.1. Is the PIS-3 project achieving its objectives and its planned results and to what extent?
- Q2.1. Are the right activities carried out to bring about the desired outcomes?
- Q2.3. With respect to the programme context concerning the uncertainty surrounding Census preparations, and elapsed time, is the PIS-3 project on track to achieve its stated objectives, both for various components and as a whole?
- Q2.4. If not, are there immediate lessons learned to be applied?

The four questions allow to evaluate whether the planned results – both in terms of outputs and outcomes – are being achieved and will try to identify the reasons for not doing so, even in those cases in which the achieved outputs still contribute to the development of statistics in BiH.

2.4.3 Impact

Given that the Partnership in Statistics has a history dating back to year 2007, something could possibly be said about impact with respect to:

- Q3.1. Are the long-term effects of the PIS-3 project on society as a whole, planned and unplanned, positive and negative?
- Q3.2. What observable measures or indicators can be identified (to evaluate impact)?
- Q3.3. What has been the quality of the statistics produced and how has it been used?

To evaluate impact, particular attention should be given to the change from a simple Logical Framework tracking system for project implementation to an RBM one.

2.4.4 Sustainability

- Q4.1. Are the PIS-3 project outcomes and activities targeted to those outcomes likely to continue after the program has finished?
- Q4.2. Are the Statistics Offices able to continue develop their organisations and their activities?

Questions about sustainability concern two related aspects: capacity and staffing, on one hand, and allocated financial resources, on the other hand.

2.4.5 Organizational learning.

- Q5.1. What lessons could be learned for the current and future programs?
- a) For the current PIS-3 project:
- Q5.2. Which aspects could be adjusted or dropped?
 - Q5.3. Should new components be considered (e.g. dissemination regarding Census, etc.) and if so can the project still remain within its stated overall objectives?
- b) For a future programme:
- Q5.4. Should a future program focussing on social statistics/demographic analysis be considered by Sida if the new Strategy gives room for it?
 - Q5.5. Can SCB continue as a long term partner to national statistics in this respect?

All questions about organisational learning also relate to how is the actual project planning and implementation able to incorporate the results of the evaluation. Learning mechanisms and procedures should be envisaged in order to make the assessment exercise effective and useful.

Evidence on the evaluation questions is presented below in the Findings Section.

3 Methodology

3.1 SELECTION AND APPLICATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

As indicated above, following the TOR, this evaluation looks at the three main criteria of:

- **effectiveness** – Were the right activities carried out giving rise to the right outputs aimed at the desired outcomes?
- **sustainability** – Are the activities and their outcomes likely to be in place after the end of the project?
- **organisational learning** – organisational and practical lessons learned.

The effectiveness, sustainability and organisational learning of the PIS-3 project are assessed both globally and at the level of each specific component and sub-component.

As for **relevance** and **impact**, this being a mid-term review, a generalised assessment will be sought as to the overall effect of all the PIS project phases. As for **efficiency**, an assessment criterion for "cost efficiency" is not requested in the TOR and therefore will be left out from the review of each component.

The three evaluation criteria of effectiveness, sustainability and organisational learning are assessed by a review of the sources of data and information which includes: all the project documentation, including periodic reports and mission reports; the three GSI planning documents, annual work-plans and strategic documents; the BiH government policy documents concerning statistics and the main socio-economic strategic documents; Sida strategic policy documents in the area of statistics and covering BiH.

A thorough, detailed and in-depth assessment of effectiveness, sustainability and organisational learning would require a careful analysis of the statistics produced by the partners as a result of the project as well as a comparison with a baseline assessment carried out before the start of the project. As the time and scope allocated for this review are limited and as no baseline assessment is available, the documented review will thus have to rely on a more participatory approach, in which interviews with key informants provide the contextual background for the assessment.

The assessment of the documentation is thus integrated by the information gathered through interviews with key informants. The key informants identified are: the Heads of the three GSI; the Heads of Departments within the three GSI directly involved in the project as well as the GSI senior office staff; officials dealing with EU accession

and application of EU requirements; stakeholders and data users (see the complete list in Annex 3)

3.2 LIMITATIONS

Impact is difficult to evaluate, even considering three phases, as it goes beyond the actual scope of the review. Impact will be indirectly inferred from the partners' perception as well as the stakeholder opinions.

Also, although efficiency is explicitly ruled out as an evaluation criterion – it would imply taking into account costs and financial data for the project – the actual budget utilisation and spending patterns should be over-viewed, as an indicator of progress in activity implementation. Yet, the limitations of looking at cost data from this perspective only, are evident, as a thorough financial examination should be made to assess efficiency.

As for effectiveness, a detailed analysis would have to take a detailed look at the statistics produced as an effect of project activities and see if they have improved or changed and their quality has shown any visible enhancement.

Following the recommendations in the ToR this review focused on a participatory approach with beneficiary interviews and focus groups interviews in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This focus together with time and budget constraints did not give any room for visiting SCB in Sweden and little time for following up with head office interviews.

A final limitation of the review to keep in mind is that the management of the field visit – given the short notice, the short time allowed and the various difficulties on the ground in having meetings – will necessarily affect the depth of the review main conclusions.

4 Findings

This Section is organized as follows. In the first part, we briefly illustrate our findings with regards to the project design, plan, organisation, management and implementation to date. In the second part, we present the responses to the evaluation questions introduced above in Section 1.4. We first discuss how the project was designed, planned and organised (4.1), reviewing and criticising the project objectives and scope (4.1.1), how it was structured into its main areas of intervention (four compo-

nents) (4.1.2), how it was managed and implemented from the point of view of the contractor (4.1.3) and the partners and the stakeholders (4.1.4). Then we review the main findings in light of the evaluation questions set above (3.2). In substance, while sub-section 4.1 summarises the main findings of the review of the project documents as well as the results of our appraisal on the ground, section 4.2 frames the findings more formally in terms of evaluation criteria. In evaluating a project of support of this nature, it is always important to weigh formal evaluation criteria against more practical features of convenience and relevance – like political support and the continuity of technical assistance – that might go beyond the strict objectives of the intervention.

In what follows, each of the main points will be discussed in depth, while leaving a summary of the main findings to highlighted boxed, for clarity of reading.

4.1 ON THE PROJECT DESIGN, PLAN AND ORGANIZATION

The documentation we were able to collect to assess the project is actually limited. There is no written documentation of the project design phase and there is only one document, called the Project Plan, dated 9 February 2012.¹ As it turns out, according to our interviews with the current and former project managers at SCB, the whole design of the project was accomplished through coordinated discussions with the partners during Phase 2. Yet, the Project Plan document appears to be rather rough and incomplete and the results-based matrix outlining desired outcomes, expected outputs and planned activities seems to be still rather sketchy.

4.1.1 The project objectives and scope

For each component, the Project Plan had an **Overall Objective** – how the component contributes to the overall project objective – and a **Key Relationship Output-to-Outcome** – how does output contribute to the desired outcome –. In principle, two types of outputs were listed for each component: those corresponding to the so-called *individual objectives* (referred to as **learning**) and those called *institutional outputs* (referred to as *products*). Indicators were generally listed for the outputs. As for the outcomes, three types of outcomes were listed: one relating to *institutional change*, one related to *institutional effectiveness* and one related to the *achievement of institutional goals*.

¹ The document is entitled *Partnership in Statistics in Bosnia and Herzegovina – Project plan for the 3 phase: February 2012 – January 2015*, Final Document, 9 February 2012.

In line with the RBM approach, all the project planned activities, expected outputs, desired outcomes and specific objectives, the existing (baseline) conditions and the end-of-project desired achievements (targets), including the relative progress indicators, should have been defined in the so-called **Results Performance Framework Matrix** (Results Matrix, in short). Here below, we discuss these various facets of the approach, and the way they were presented in the Project Plan. In the Recommendation Section, we elaborate more on the re-definition of objectives, outcomes and outputs.

On the overall objective, the specific objective and the scope of the project

The PIS-3 **overall objective** is "to contribute to the development of a sustainable statistical system in Bosnia-Herzegovina that facilitates decision-making based on relevant and reliable statistical information that meets domestic demands, supports the monitoring of the Sector development Strategy process and complies with EU requirements." The achievement of such objective is to be measured by the "use of statistics as the foundation for planning and monitoring political policy decisions and business decisions." The PIS-3 **specific objective** is to continue the support to develop prioritized statistics, to build statistical and institutional capacity in the three statistical offices, and to make statistics correspond to national needs and EU and international regulations and standards in statistics".

The wording and structure of objectives does not indicate the nature of change expected in the statistics institutes as a result of the project. The project *objectives* look more like *activities*. Obviously, the lack of clarity and the extent to which the objectives adequately set out outcomes is bound to have an impact on the effectiveness of the project.

The **scope** of the PIS-3 project is defined in the Project Plan around five points (under *project purpose*), whereby one specific objective has been set for each component:

- Develop labour market statistics in line with international and national needs.
- Develop environmental statistics in line with international and national needs
- Train staff in statistical methodology
- Increase the general capacity in management and human resources management.
- Keep trainees through a continuation of the previous trainee scheme, so they when the financial situation changes could be hired by the statistical offices.

Again, the wording is not adequate, as these look more like *activities* rather than *outcomes*. Besides, no targets are set for them and no indicators are defined for measuring progress towards those targets. As it stands, it is difficult to evaluate the degree of progress in those areas. Additionally, the potential achievement of these activities is not under the direct control of neither the donor (Sida) nor the lead consultant (SCB) but rather at the mercy of the political will in BiH. Similarly to the overall objective, outcomes in the various areas should be defined along similar lines

(to be discussed with the partners) and the wording should be changed (see below the Recommendation Section for an example).

Desired outcomes (objectives) for each component are not properly identified and they need to be re-worded. No targets are set for them and no indicators are defined for measuring progress towards those targets. Hence, it is difficult to evaluate the degree of progress in those areas.

On the indicators (in context of RBM)

Properly defined indicators were seldom identified for outcomes and impact – and the lack thereof obviously has a bearing on what this evaluation can achieve and how. When defined, indicators appear to be end-of-project indicators (targets), rather than progress indicators.

As a general criterion and for each component, one key evaluation tool is to assess to what degree has each indicator been achieved and how much of the outputs has been obtained to achieve the desired outcomes. For this, quantitative outputs indicators are generally needed to assess progress. However, it is not clear from the Project Plan how and what indicator tracking system has been envisaged. As it turns out, indicators are mainly about activities and outputs and do not provide suitable information to demonstrate progress towards outcomes and the overall objective. This implies that more thought will be needed as to how to measure the progress towards outcomes.

As an example, consider the indicator for the LFS sub-component: "Be prepared to conduct continuous LFS (to calculate indicators in accordance with EU regulation)". Apart from the lack of precision – which EU regulations are defining how to calculate indicators? – it is obvious that this is not an end-of-project (target) indicator nor a progress indicator. This looks more like an outcome. A proper indicator for the outcome *"Reliable and timely labour force statistics produced on a continuous basis and in line with international and national needs available in BiH."* would be a certain qualified number of statistical tables, indicators, indices for LFS in line with Eurostat's standards and produced according to the continuous data collection methodology. Another indicator could refer to the preparation and finalisation of the statistical software necessary to produce continuous-data labour-force statistics.

In sum, our assessment is that most of the indicators listed are *end-of-project indicators* and it is therefore difficult to assess how much progress has been made until now. In order to measure short term progress of each component, mid-term or intermediate indicators are needed. Such indicators would reflect more tangibly the achievements at the end of the current project term and they would give an indication for future course of the project, enabling the project implementers to achieve the end indicator stated in the project plan. Moreover, the matrix should have elaborated on a theory of change how these end-of-project indicators can be reached. The theory of change specification would further assist the process evaluation as different paths of reaching the goals could be investigated.

On the contractual relationships

An important aspect of understanding how the partnership programme PIS-3 could reach its final goals is also the chain of responsibility for the delivery of results. The contractual relationships for delivery of outcomes against the payment supplied by the donor are one aspect of this chain. In the case of this project, a tripartite contractual relationship was put into place: one between Sida and SCB, the other between SCB and the partners in BiH, and the third between Sida and the BiH partners. While the latter was more an Agreement in the form of a *Memorandum of Understanding*, the former were true contractual stipulations. In our opinion, however, the observed contractual relationships between Sida, SCB and GSI are not well defined. The contractual obligations in this respect are vague and the chain of responsibility for the deliverables is not clearly outlined. Relative vagueness of the obligations can be partly attributed to the nature of the partnership and the type of support action in comparison to the more common goal-oriented project work.

The goals for the project implementer (SCB) as they are defined in the RBM matrix and the TOR are actually not directly the responsibility of SCB, but rather largely dependent on the political will of the recipient country to implement the set changes. It is difficult to assess the effectiveness and impact of the programme, whereby the main trigger for successful implementation of the final result is out of scope and control of the intervention itself. The key outcome indicators would be better defined as emanating from the activities of the SCB rather than the overarching goals as specified in the current work plan.

In most cases, the success of the intervention seems to be based on the actual production of standardised statistics of quality, in line with given standards. This, obviously, does not depend on SCB (Sida's contractor) but rather on the partners in BiH. The project might be well delivering on its objectives and according to the plans and yet the statistics to be produced as a result of those project activities, which depend on other factors beyond the project, might not be up to the expected standards. Take, for instance, the example of the continuous LFS: as it appears, a lot of the planned activities took place and yet, according to many of the staff members involved and the stakeholders consulted, labour-force statistics on a continuous basis may be a long way ahead. The lack of an adequate budget reporting by SCB (e.g. by activity, output and according to a delivery plan) coupled with a certain lack of good financial planning, including backstopping from SCB Sweden and its regional office, make the whole project planning and implementation rather weak. This is a fundamental organisational issue – remarked by Sida – that affects the project and makes its monitoring cumbersome beyond the difficulties of operating in an uncertain environment such as BiH.

On the RBM seminar

SCB organized a Results-Based Management (RBM) seminar five months after the beginning of the project, to address the design of both the specific objectives and the ways to achieve them. The seminar was held in June 2012 with all the partners involved and was seen as an opportunity to revise activities, expected outputs and desired outcomes as well as all the performance indicators to measure progress. Consequently, the Results Matrix should have been refined. As it turns out, very little changes were introduced. There was no follow-up to the seminar and the results

matrices indicating the results chains from activities to outputs to outcomes were left unchanged.

If the First Project Progress Report – covering the period from February to June 2012 – did not include any change in the Results Matrix, neither the Second nor the Third Progress Report – one covering the period July to December 2012 and the other covering the period from January to June 2013 – appear to have accounted for any more accurate definition of intermediate and final indicators and expected results.

SCB had also planned to undertake a Results-Based Management (RBM) seminar following the completion of the field operations for the census. The seminar was held in November 2013 with all the partners involved and was taken as an opportunity to look at the PIS-3 project priorities and to revise them in light of the delays caused by the census operations as well as the new statistical information that the census results might bring to light. Two months after, a draft final report of the RBM seminar has been circulated, but it seems that the issue of the proper design of intermediate and final indicators has not been addressed.

A revised list of activities came out of the seminar and, yet, no attempt was made at a different definition of intermediate and final indicators and expected results.

On the identified risks and assumptions

In the Project Plan the listed risks and assumptions facing the project were: a) Budget constraints; b) Allocation of sufficient financial resources; c) Political decisions; d) Coordination of donor support; e) Dedicated staff members with relevant competence; f) Managerial and organisational constraints; g) Absorption capacity.

In our opinion, the list of the identified risks is not too accurate and the assumptions for a successful implementation are somehow generic. Those listed are the usual risks facing any technical assistance project: a more careful assessment would have given the project a higher degree of realism and precision. Risks and underlying assumptions for success have to be carefully assessed as a "yardstick" against which measuring whether an objective has not been reached because of some "internal" project reason – shortcomings or delays in project implementation – or because of some external constraint. Failure to properly assess risks and assumptions results in the impossibility to understand why a project might fail to reach the desired objectives.

One important risk that was clearly overlooked in the design of the project appears to be the incoming Population Census. This is usually a big endeavour for any statistical institute. All the more so for the three institutes of BiH – where the last Census had been done in 1991, at the times of Yugoslavia – which never had the experience of doing one. In the case of BiH, in particular, it is well known how politically charged the issue has always been, with all the implications that such a delicate situation has on the actual implementation of something so complex in ordinary conditions. The Census had been requested for years by the EU as part of the SAA and had been "in the planning" for some time. In the recent years, it had been announced as "imminent" several times, and it was thought that "sooner or later" it would materialise. It would have been wise then, at least, even if the actual operations had not started yet, to take it into account as a real potential risk, as its preparation would

have taken all the attention of the three institutes and, as a consequence, would have drawn on all the human and technical resources available. The Census per se could be organised and implemented without necessarily interrupt all other activities. But it would have been wise to consider its potentially disrupting effects on all other activities.

In sum, we believe that a more careful consideration of the actual risks facing the project would have been advisable, with particular attention to the Population Census. Having assumed that the personnel, the management and the whole plan of activities could take place with no potential effect coming from other activities was a serious shortcoming of the design, as it exposed the project to a source of failure mostly due to external factors outside the control of the project managers.

4.1.2 The project main areas of intervention

The project covers **four main components**, including various sub-components, for a total of **nine sub-components**. In line with the scope and purpose, the components are:

1. Labour statistics: 1. Labour Force Survey (LFS); 2. Labour Cost Survey (LCS);
2. Environment statistics: 1. Water statistics; 2. Waste statistics; 3. Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GGE) statistics; 4. Environmental Protection Expenditure (EPE);
3. Statistical methodology;
4. General Capacity building: 1. General Management; 2. Human resource management.

All the components follow the statistical plan and the recommendations in the Eurostat Global Assessment. They also appear to be in line with the Strategic Plans of the three GSI.

Here below, the main findings in terms of the various components and subcomponents are highlighted in terms of:

- how much the activities contribute to the attainment of the expected outputs towards the achievement of the desired outcomes
- how well and specifically defined are the activities in the various components
- how encompassing are the components in terms of the scope of the project and its objectives
- overall assessment

Component 1: Labour statistics - subcomponent Labour Force Survey (LFS)

- Overall Objective: Prepare for the transition from annual LFS to the continuous one in order to meet international standards and EU requirements.
- Key Relationship Output-To-Outcome: Reorganisation in the working process in all three statistical offices in BiH, i.e. in its IT and Labour Market departments.

As an overall objective this looks poorly defined because it does not describe a high-level goal and indeed reads more like an activity. What is not clear in this case is what the outcome is and what it might be. The way the objective is (not) specified in the project documents would require a need to recreate it somehow, preferably through a participatory discussion with the project partners in BiH [an outcome is a behavioural or performance change as a results of the outputs]. Also, an indicator measuring progress towards this output (a quantitative target) is needed, together with an indicator measuring progress in achieving the outcome. Those defined in the Project Plan appear to be vague and only end-of-project ones (see below the Recommendation Section for an example).

Component 2: Labour statistics – subcomponent Labour Cost Survey (LCS)

- Overall Objective: To prepare and implement the LCS 2013 for the reference year 2012 in line with international standards and EU requirements.
- Key Relationship Output-To-Outcome: Statistical Business Register based on NACE Rev 2 has to be updated; a good support of Swedish experts provided.

The objective is misspecified and should be reworded, as the outcome of this component should be that BiH complies with international standards and the up-to-date and timely implementation of LCS. The key output for this outcome has to be re-defined accordingly. As for the progress indicators, there is no outcome indicator specified. In the Project Plan, some of the expected outputs appear to be more like outcomes (e.g. "Improved abilities of subject matter experts"), while their indicators are missing.

Component 3, 4, 5, 6: Environmental statistics

- Overall Objective: To improve the existing methodology and develop guidelines, as well as to increase the quality and produce new indicators in on water statistics in accordance with EU and national requirements and to contribute to the sustainable development of the statistical system in B&H

Component 3: Environmental statistics – subcomponent Water statistics

- Key Relationship Output-To-Outcome: Software application for water statistics updated.

Component 4: Environmental statistics – subcomponent Waste statistics

- Key Relationship Output-To-Outcome: missing.

Component 5: Environmental statistics – subcomponent Green House Gases (GHG)

- Key Relationship Output-To-Outcome: Coordination among and cooperation with administrative and other data sources for GHG emissions from waste (the medium- and long-term outcomes for GHG emissions might be achieved beyond the project period).

Component 6: Environmental Protection Expenditures (EPE)

- Key Relationship Output-To-Outcome: Staff availability for work on EPE statistics.

In the case of Components 3, 4, 5, and 6, there is confusion all through the Project Plan among activities, outputs, outcomes and indicators. Outputs and their target indicators are in some cases missing. These need reformulating through discussion with the partners.

Component 7, 8, 9: Statistical methodology and general capacity

- Overall Objective: Development of a sustainable statistical system in Bosnia-Herzegovina that facilitates decision-making based on relevant and reliable statistical information that meets domestic demands and EU requirements.

Component 7: Statistical methodology

- Key Relationship Output-To-Outcome: recruitment of subject matter specialists and methodologists to facilitate improved implementation of regular and specific survey tasks.

Component 8: General capacity building – subcomponent Management

- Key Relationship Output-To-Outcome: Trained, skilled, modern management that has the capacity to deal with all challenges of improvement. Agreed clear plan for implementation of activities

Component 9: General capacity building – subcomponent Human Resources (HR)

- Key Relationship Output-To-Outcome: Appropriate personnel capable to cope with challenges of improvement and development of statistics. Plan for following of the development of HR.

The overall objective for these three components looks more like an objective for the overall project and should be reworded. The outcomes for Component 7 – "Improvement of the treatment of specific problems" and "Calculated and explained quality indicators" – are poorly defined. Some of the outputs look more like outcomes while their target indicators are not specified ("number of trained staff": what number?; Trained in which methodological aspects?).

4.1.3 The project organisation and management and the client-implementer-beneficiary contractual relationship

The management of the project is rather loose and lacks a systematic structure. As mentioned above, the contractual relationship between Sida, SCB and the partners in BiH appears to have been defined only in broad terms. Thus, it seems that a lot of the actual and effective implementation of the activities was left to the initiative of the coordinators and on the response of the partners. From our partial point of view, resulting from our inquiry and review of the project documents and reports, together with the quick mission on the ground, there seems to have been a certain degree of improvised, common-sense, factual follow-up of coordinators and counterparts on the actual roll-out of activities, rather than a punctual and scrupulous adhesion to the agreed work-plan, with its deadlines and expected deliverables.

In our opinion we may say that the implementation plan, the list and time-line of activities, the deadlines for delivering the outputs, the reporting, the monitoring and the cross-checks, the accounting and the financial reporting were somehow loose and not strictly defined. The lack of strict terms for the management and the implementation – which in a way contributes to make Sida's cooperation vis-à-vis the partners look "flexible", "accommodating" and "understanding" – has made the overall development of the project appear variable and improvised, if we may say so.

True, the whole project Phase 3, almost since the very beginning, was heavily influenced and always under the pressure of the incoming Population Census which would so swallow all available human and organisational resources. Also, the lack of a well-defined Results-based Framework – with proper intermediate indicators and clearly defined outputs, with milestones and benchmarks – has made it possible for the project to develop as it did basically adapting to the circumstances and following the wandering path resulting from outside events. The whole project was a sequence of stops-and-go, long waiting for the availability of experts and the availability of internal resources on the partners side, coordination issues among the three partners and the project management (particularly when Census activities were involved), need to re-focus and start again against all odds. It took 5 months – from the beginning of the project in February 2012 to June 2012 – for the project team – the long-term coordinator and the counterparts – to have a seminar organised for the proper definition of the objectives, the desired outcomes, the expected outputs and the activities – the Results-based Framework –. And yet, this led to no real change in behaviour, from either sides: the project framework remained as vaguely defined as it had been and no change in practices was to be seen. Then it took months to have activities organised and when the project had achieved a bit of steam going, it was the time for the Population Census. At that point, the long-term coordinator was replaced. The change had been somehow foreseen – although it was never mentioned in the Project Plan but, according to what we were able to gather from our interviews, it had been planned since the beginning – and, yet, this only aggravated this state of affairs and it was the overall combination of factors that, in the end, led to the faltering shape of the pattern shown by the calendar of activities.

To evaluate how and what the project delivered is made difficult by these shortcomings and by the way things developed on the ground. The project did deliver and – given the difficulties brought by external constraints and events – it delivered somehow positively. The beneficiaries were satisfied in the end. And yet, the management has been too loose to deserve a completely positive mark. The budgeting

and the accounting reflect this. Expenses are not divided by component nor by activity or output but simply by administrative type – fees, reimburses, etc. There is no tracking of actual expenses versus their planned forecast, no use of budget as a programming tool. It is true that on the issue of financial accounting there was a general agreement between Sida and SCB which was considered as satisfactory. As a matter of fact, for a technical assistance project, what counts is that objectives are achieved and beneficiaries are satisfied. However, it is also of utmost importance how those objectives are reached, whether the planned resources are being utilised the way they were supposed to, whether activities are taking more or less resources than planned, and so forth. The financial monitoring of activities has been inadequate and, from Sida's perspective, it has been quite difficult to keep track.

If part of the responsibility for this lies with the implementer – SCB – it is also true that it was the Project Plan with its Results-based framework that contributed to it, together with a lack of a stricter contractual framework between Sida and SCB. That at this point in time, with two-thirds of the project well gone by, we do not have a clear and detailed idea of how the budget was allocated and spent is not acceptable. The budget is a management tool, an indicator of how the project is faring, a monitoring tool, and it should be used as such. Without it, even the possibility to properly evaluate the project, here and now, is impaired.

4.2 ON THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION TO DATE – THE PARTNERS AND STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES

Here below, we present the main findings and issues that have arisen in the review for the various components and subcomponents through the interviews with the project partners and the main stakeholders, by highlighting and separating, for the sake of clarity, overall issues, statistical implementation issues and project implementation issues.

The findings as presented in this section are the result of interviews with the representatives of the top management and senior technical staff of the three GSI. The majority of the interviews was conducted one-on-one with the selected key informants. On rare occasions the interview was conducted in the presence of others, which were without exception of the same rank (either top management or senior technical staff) as the interviewee. Top management represented all three directors as well as all deputy directors with a selection of the senior advisers to the director. The senior technical staff was represented by the heads of departments or leaders of major statistical programmes within departments.

4.2.1 Component 3. Statistical methodology

Under the Labour Statistics (LS) component there are two sub-components: Labour Force Survey (LFS) and Labour Cost Survey (LCS).

4.2.2 Component 2. Environmental statistics

There are four sub-components: Water Statistics, Waste Statistics, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GGE) and Environmental Protection Expenditures (EPE).

Environmental statistics – particularly those related to water consumption, waste production disposal and green-house gas emissions – are usually based on several data sources, one being lists and samples of enterprises. While in the case of industry, construction and services, those are generally based on various business registers (which should be updated on a regular basis by some Census of Economic Units and Establishments), in the case of agriculture they depend on listings usually coming from an Agricultural Census. Agricultural statistics in BiH are still based on some very outdated data base, although there have been improvements in the recent times. The Agricultural Census is the most commonly used sampling frame for surveying agricultural enterprises as a basis for information on the use of water or on the management of waste. Without a census, it is quite challenging to construct high quality samples of agricultural units, which form such a large component of the overall sample for various environmental statistics. A draft methodology for conducting an agricultural census has been developed, and it has been complemented with draft State level legislation, which will be discussed at the political level in the near future [as all census-related decisions have to be harmonized between the State and the Entity levels]. Up to this date, one pilot study of agricultural census using the draft methodology has been conducted a couple of years ago.

i. Overall issues

The department for Environmental Statistics (ES) at the BHAS was created in 2006 and has one head and 3 staff. Currently there is no State-level law on environment and, therefore, no State Environmental Agency. The legislation only exists at the Entity level. Entity ministries are in charge of waste (and water) data collection. The lack of progress in the development of environmental statistics can also be attributed to lack of willingness to cooperate from the Entity GSI. Currently there is only one person in each statistical institute at the Entity level in charge of environmental statistics.

Both Entities are looking into establishing environmental agencies at the Entity level, however, there is no option yet to establish anything at the State level [environment was deemed an Entity-level political issue in the Dayton accords]. However, there is an Environment Protection Fund in BiH (attached to MoFTER) that could tackle some of the environmental issues. The fund has produced a report on Climate change for UNDP, however, no statistics are included in the report.

ES were already covered by PIS-1, particularly on water statistics, starting in year 2007. The initial emphasis was on regional collaboration between BiH, Serbia, Montenegro, Macedonia, Albania and Kosovo. In 2008, emphasis switched at the

national level. The support provided by Sida in this area is seen as essential for the progress of statistics in BiH in general and of environmental statistics in particular.

At BHAS, the main problem with lack of progress in development of ES lies in the top management not understanding the use of new statistics, which include environmental ones [according to the opinion of the ES department staff].

At FIS, the main challenge for further development of ES is the general awareness about environmental issues at the political level and in society at large. Without the involvement of external experts such as those provided by the PIS project, no real development would be possible. At FIS, all activities in this area/component are proceeding very well.

Cooperation between three GSI in ES is working well, according to the opinions of all stakeholder interviewed. Cooperation between FIS and RSIS, according to FIS staff, is going particularly well. More working meetings would be beneficial for even better cooperation. Lack of State-level legislation is not deterring the actual development of statistics, but it is slowing it down. High-level reporting on ES goes from FIS and RSIS supplying data to BHAS, which reports to Eurostat. The main ES data users are the Agency for Water and the Ministries for environment and tourism, the Directorate for European integration and the Ministry for Foreign Trade and Economic Relations (MoFTER), which has an Office for Environmental Protection (OEP) issues, which is responsible for reporting on green-house gas emissions, as BiH is a signatory country of the Kyoto protocol. Yet, it seems that all Government offices are mostly relying on the data coming from the Agency for Water for any information they need on water use and do not get much information on any other issue. The OEP prepares an annual report on environmental issues in BiH, provides information for UNDP and UNEP and other international agencies and, yet, it does not make much use of the data coming from the Statistical Institutes. As it turns out, the activities of the three GSI on environmental statistics are not known at OEP.

As far as ES, the RSIS staff appears to be generally satisfied with the current PIS-3 project. Actually, as it turns out, all the recent progress on ES development is due to the project. All three GSI are included as equals in the activities, which is a unique trait of this project. In this area, the RSIS has actively participated in the development of the project plan. The plan was agreed among the three institutes, however, the RSIS staff was of the opinion that the plan was too ambitious for the current project. As far as the RSIS was concerned, the main priorities were to improve the existing statistics especially on water and waste (sub-components 1 and 2), and not so much the Gas Emissions and EPE (sub-components 3 and 4).

There is an Environmental Agency in the RS, but currently they do not have any data requests and they do not participate in data collection and reporting. All the data collected are reported to the BHAS which in turn reports to Eurostat.

In RSIS, there is only one staff member in the RSIS ES department. No consideration is given to the agricultural issues at this time. There is also no preparations for agricultural census yet.

ii. Statistical implementation issues

The main problem in environmental statistics is the lack of micro-data. The lack of data is especially problematic for waste statistics, particularly hazardous waste. The BHAS ES department benefited greatly from the PIS-3 project by further developing the two pilot waste surveys and by improve the quality of existing data. Three sectors are currently covered by waste survey data collection: mining, energy and supply. In 2013, a pilot study was carried out on waste from construction-sector activities. In the coming years, a pilot survey is also planned for service-sector waste.

Another problem, at BHAS, is the quality of data. It is very challenging to upkeep the quality of data due to personnel changes in the offices – the ES department has been established only recently and the staff has been moved around –. Changing personnel also means need of training for the newly hired staff. As a result, lower quality or even erroneous statistics are being published some times.

It is the view of BHAS ES staff that the project should continue as is. It would be beneficial if it expanded so as to fully cover National Environment Accounts. The environmental expenditure is only a part of full environmental accounting, so the expenditure would be put in full perspective. More technical support is needed and BHAS would be able to absorb the amount of activities needed with the staff they already have.

At FIS, the first questionnaire to be developed was a water-statistics instrument, which was developed with assistance from the PIS project. The first data collection on water statistics was carried using old Yugoslavian forms. It was then followed by the first pilot survey. The data was collected within an already organized census of businesses, which was based on the existing business register. Currently three different questionnaires are used to collect water statistics raw data: water use in industry, public water supply and public sewerage system. The development of the questionnaires was done through an interactive process between the three GSI and experts from SCB. The questionnaires were validated in joint meetings with representatives of industries that need to use the questionnaire for reporting. Up to date, the development of water statistics are deemed completed. Water statistics are collected regularly, on an annual basis, in autumn each year. Water statistics are considered to be well developed at FIS as they comply with all Eurostat's required statistics. It should be noted in passing that, in spite of all the references to Eurostat's requirements, no Eurostat office has been approached on these issues, neither by the three BiH institutes nor by the PIS project.

In the meantime, developments in waste statistics are going on with the pilot studies already carried out. The most prominent was the implementation of the waste pilot survey. In line with Eurostat requirements, waste statistics will need to be expanded to include waste from the service sector. This expansion is being looked into. When the waste statistics coverage is fully developed, it will be a bi-yearly data collection.

At FIS, there has been no progress on GGE statistics development (sub-component 3). BHAS ES department believes that the GGE statistics should be collected and analysed at the State level, however, both FIS and RSIS think that the GGE statistics should be collected at the Entity level. Current jurisdiction for collection and publishing of the GGE statistics lies with the Hydro-meteorological Services at the Entity level.

As for EPE, in FIS activities have not started and will only start some preliminary work in 2014.

In the opinion of FIS staff and management, the remaining time until the end of the project should be devoted to the compliance procedures to the standards for reporting to Eurostat at the Entity level. Mechanisms need to be developed to cooperate with the State Environmental Agency (SEA), whenever that will be established. Currently there is no possibility that a SEA be established, due to political considerations about the division of responsibilities between State and Entities. Currently, therefore, FIS collects raw data from industry and submits the data to BHAS which in turn sends them to Eurostat.

So, by the end of the project, FIS staff anticipates that both water and waste statistics components will be completed, there will be some progress on EPE statistics, but it is expected there will be no output regarding the GGE statistics.

In RSIS, work has been done to upgrade statistics according to Eurostat standards. Four different questionnaires are being worked out, and there currently are three surveys for the collection of water statistics: public water supply (the first was done in 2003), public sewerage system (first done in 2003) and water use in industry (first done in 2009).

In RSIS, waste statistics are also being developed in line with Eurostat requirements. Two separate enterprise survey are carried out for water and waste data collection. Some of the data provided by enterprises are estimated and some are based on administrative records [records are usually not complete]. Waste data are collected in the following sectors: Mining and quarry, manufacturing, electricity production and supply. Three sectors are still missing: agriculture, construction and services. Some preliminary consideration has been made for the inclusion of the construction sector waste data collection [a pilot study has been carried out but the analysis is still pending]. Decisions about the inclusion of this sector will be made based on the quality of the data. The waste-related surveys cover all enterprises with 10 and more employees, as per Eurostat regulations. The PIS-3 project is seen as very useful for the development of waste statistics in RSIS.

With regard to water and waste statistics, it should be mentioned that in BiH – both in FIS and in RSIS – data are collected from all enterprises regularly enlisted in the business register. Part of the data come from administrative records and part are elicited through the surveys. So, surveys are not based on any representative sample and tend to suffer from the usual biases that affect business registers, in terms of coverage and representativeness.

In RSIS, no progress is being made on EPE statistics (sub-component 4). EPE statistics are not collected and compiled by RSIS, as they need to be part of broader environment accounts, which implies completely new regular survey system. In the past, pilot surveys were done, problems were encountered. RSIS made requests to SCB to assist in the development of EPE statistics, but none could be provided. So, attempts were made to continue on their own capacity, but they were mostly unsuccessful.

GGE statistics need to be developed in collaboration with the Hydro-Meteorological Agency (HMA), as that has the mandate to produce GGE statistics. RSIS sees its own role as the main collector of data and provider of raw data to HMA [an MOU between RSIS and HMA has been signed and some preliminary data were already exchanged]. RSIS is currently waiting for the decision on the allocation of responsibilities on GGE statistics collection and production to continue with the development.

It is common opinion in all three GSI that in the area of GGE statistics any future Sida-funded project needs to include broader institutional cooperation to include other relevant institutions beside the statistical institutes.

iii. Project implementation issues

In general, activities in the ES area have been somehow limited. In the opinion of BHAS staff, a reason for the slow pace in activities in this area is to be attributed to the change in the PIS-3 project coordinator.

The BHAS staff working on ES did not participate in the latest RBM seminar, except Mirza Agic the component leader, as people were busy with census activities. FI and RSIS staff did have a chance to participate. One of the outcomes of the recent RBM, according to FIS staff, was to continue activities in waste statistics. The RSIS ES department was satisfied with the outcome of the RBM seminar.

Altogether, four missions were organized in this area with data providers and users, largely dedicated to the use of ES data as one problem, in the case of ES, seems to be the mismatch between data providers and data users on the provision of ES, both for water and waste statistics.

All the GSI are in general satisfied with the Sida support in developing the Environmental statistics (ES) in BiH. Most of the progress could not have been made without Sida's support. Two (water and waste statistics) of the four sub-components are more or less on track with the project work-plan in terms of delivery.

The main challenge in developing and delivering the environmental statistics is in the lack of legislation on environmental issues at the central state level. Due to the political arrangements based on Dayton accords, environmental issues are considered to be a jurisdiction of the entities and not the state. Such a decentralized system has severe implications for delivery national statistics as there is no central coordinating authority. There is no state level environmental agency. The ES departments are understaffed as the FIS and RSIS have only one staff member, while the ES department BHAS is better staffed (with 3 staff members) it lacks the authority to coordinate the activities.

Collection and reporting on the water statistics has been successfully upgraded to the standards required by the Eurostat. Due to political impediments mentioned in the first paragraph, the methodology of data collection is not centralized and the responsibilities for reporting to Eurostat are not completely clear.

Development of waste statistics is well under way, however, it is not considered to be on schedule. Waste statistics micro-data are being collected for mining and quarry, manufacturing and electricity production and supply in both Entities. Pilot studies

have been started for data collection in agriculture and construction, while the development of waste statistics in services has not been started yet.

There has been no progress on Green-house Gas Emissions (GGE) statistics in any of the Entities nor at the State level.

There has also been no progress on Environment Expenditure (EE) statistics in neither FIS nor RSIS. The prevalent belief at BHAS is that the scope of the EE statistics is too narrow and should be developed in a broader context of Environmental National Accounts Statistics.

4.2.3 Component 3. Statistical methodology

iv. Overall issues

Currently, in each of the three GSI partners, one staff member is responsible for survey and sampling methodology, thus covering most of the needs in terms of SM.

The staff in the three partner institutions participated in the design of the SM project component and the design – at least in principle – took their needs into account. It is recognised that the survey methodologists from the three partners gained valuable experience, considerable technical knowledge and skills from the project. As a result of the project, cooperation and harmonisation among the three institutes has improved on data editing and other issues and efficiency of work has greatly benefited.

Yet, activities in this area have been limited, both for organisational and coordination issues between SCB and the partners. These issues have to be resolved.

Also, more cooperation among the SM component members and the other component members are needed, so as to strengthen the overall efficiency of the statistical work. In the SM area, more cooperation with the university in the future could be very beneficial.

Some of the programme activities had to be postponed due to census activities, but activities are proceeding according to plan, albeit at a low pace.

v. Statistical implementation issues

It has been pointed out that there is a large demand for training among all staff in SM issues, not just among those in charge of methodological issues but also among those dealing with surveys, data collection and data treatment in the various departments. However, most training activities are usually reserved to a limited number of staff – mostly due to the costs related to the participation of Sarajevo-based staff in the training organised off-site in Banja Luka and vice-versa –. The usual restriction is 5 participants per institution. So, a potentially larger pool of participants cannot be involved in the activities as needed.

Also, it has been pointed out, training in SM is generally provided on general overarching topics. However, there is need to deepen the training on specific, specialised topics. In the future it will be very important to build up the methodological capacity of the staff working on specific issues in specific departments. With the additional

methodological knowledge they would be able to take over some of the survey specific tasks, such as data editing and outlier analysis, within their departments, thus freeing the experts in methodology of the more routinely tasks. Such additional training would also raise general awareness of different survey related activities such as importance of sampling. In order to implement this in practice it would be very important to organize train-the-trainers activities. The methodological experts currently working in the three GSI would thus be trained as trainers by the experts from SCB.

It is therefore important to continue with the training missions of both methodological and specialised experts in methodological training.

vi. Project implementation issues

In the three GSI, the staff and the management are generally moderately satisfied with the progress in the Statistical Methodology (SM) and Capacity-Building (CB) component. However, the PIS project in Phase 3 is perceived as not being as successful as the previous Phases were and complaints in this regard have been recorded with the staff members interviewed. Some of the planned missions in the SM area did not take place. On this, the common and shared opinion of the staff in the three institutes was particularly strong. The main reason – according to that opinion – was that the previous SCB project coordinator was ineffective in organising the missions [it took 6 to 8 months to organize one of the mission]. In addition to the long preparation, some of the experts recruited for the training activities were not as experienced as expected. [One of the experts had only one year of work experience in a Statistical office and in the relevant field]. Even when all preparations by the BiH partners had been completed, the missions were not realized. With the appointment of the new project coordinator, things appear to have changed in this respect, as the organization is being expedited [this is, at least, the staff's perception]. However, it should be noticed that the change of project coordinator was initiated by SCB as the regular rotation of personnel and it was not instigated at the request of the partners nor was it due to perceived poor performance by SCB.

The SM department of FIS – which included three staff members – is regularly working with one trainee supported by the project. The performance of the trainees has been very satisfactory and the trainee would need to continue as there is severe lack of human resources in the methodology section. Currently and including the trainee there are only 4 people working on the methodological issues at FIS.

In RSIS, there is only one staff member responsible for survey methodology and sampling. One of the current trainees supported by the project is attached to the SM department, and the trainee's contribution is very much appreciated.

The list of training activities was made taking into account the needs of the three institutions. However, given that the plan remains largely incomplete, it would be useful to extend the project. Also, more activities should take place in Banja Luka – as pointed out by RSIS staff members – as currently it the cost of organising the missions that has priority over a more equitable balance of partners' involvement.

In general the GSI are satisfied with SCB support in statistical methodology (SM) capacity building. As the result of the Sida funded SM training the cooperation on the

SM issues among the GSI has improved greatly. However, there are a number of identified shortcomings in delivery. The training courses are too general and broad, there are not enough training courses organized and the numbers of participants are too restrictive.

Capacity building in SM is progressing well, although the pace of progress is slower than planned. There is scope to organize more training courses or study visits, however for a number of reasons the realization of the training course has been lagging behind the expressed demand. Furthermore, the number of provided spaces in the training events is well below the demand as expressed by the GSI. There is considerably more demand for methodological training than there is on offer.

There is also a need for more focused training on specific methodological topics both for methodological specialists as well as for staff from substantive statistical teams. Among the identified topics are: outlier analysis, sampling and data editing.

There is also an unmet demand to provide the training for the within-institutional team of trainers. SM experts from the GSI could provide cascaded training of their own staff, however, in order to accomplish this they would require additional training in training and teaching techniques.

4.2.4 Component 4. Capacity building for management

vii. Overall issues

At the general level, very little was done in this area as a result of specific project activities. A protocol for the exchange of data among the three GSI was prepared – as planned – and a number of study visits related to Census was organised, beyond the project scope.

A fact-finding mission on management issues was held in April 2013, which highlighted the need for prioritization in strategic planning and coordination among the three GSI. Improvements concerning the statistical law, incorporating user needs and foremost strengthening of cooperation and coordination were also suggested.

As for the Human Resource management (HRM) sub-component, apart from some vaguely defined "participation in various meetings, summer schools, working groups, missions within Statistics Sweden and other international projects" – as resulting from the Project Reports, there has been little progress and no activities took place.

In this respect, it should be mentioned that none of the three GSI currently have a proper HRM department. There is no proper *human-resource management* practised in the three GSI and what can be associated with HRM is currently carried out by the personnel offices (*kadrovska sluzba*), which are part of the broader legal and administrative services.

The CB component – including HRM – was introduced into the project at the request of the partner institutions of BiH. However, this component shows the lowest achievement levels of all the project components. The work on the component has been carried out in collaboration of the top management of the three partners, but very few inputs have been provided by SCB on this component. Only one mission

was done in this area. There are two possible explanations for the lack of progress in this component. One is the recent census activities, which required the full involvement of the top management. The other may be that both activities and objectives were not clearly defined in the Project Plan. It should also be noted that, according to the perception of this evaluation, the SCB may not be the best-suited consultant to provide assistance for capacity building in management and HRM due to the complexity and intertwined nature of the management and politics in the case of BiH.

The Project Plan for this component was drafted with full awareness of the complexity of the cooperation arrangements among the three GSI. However, outputs and goals were not operationalised well enough to be translated into effective project activities.

viii. Statistical implementation issues

The three GSI actively participated in Eurostat's *Global Assessment*. The three GSI have been preparing a new strategic plan and a new multi-annual work plan up to 2020. Within the strategic document, specific references were made to cooperation with Sida and its PIS project.

Yet, it appears that the contribution of the project to the building of management capacity and strategic planning at the top level has been limited.

As for the HRM sub-component, there has been some talk about the introduction of personnel performance assessment practices, and advancements in that regard have been made at the latest RBM seminar in November 2013. Yet, progress in this area appear to be far to materialise.

ix. Project implementation issues

The desired project outcomes for the management sub-component – improved cooperation and organisational changes in methods – difficult as they are to measure, seem to be only vaguely been approached. Indicators defined for the two sub-components appear to be difficult to measure, no baseline was defined and no target indicated at the start.

During the most recent RBM seminar suggestions were made for revision of the activities. Particular suggestions were made for the introduction of a personnel performance assessment framework (PAF) and PAF-related activities. However, as a PAF system would require a substantively longer period for full implementation than that available within the current project time-frame, it appears that all partners agreed to develop a strategy for introducing a PAF within the scope of the next Sida-supported programme. It was thus decided to focus on the first subcomponent (Management) and that the activities related to HRM should be discontinued.

Activities related to the CB and HRM components were initiated before the start of the PIS projects. Sida's support enabled progress in relation to these activities, even though the progress is slower than anticipated. The plan for PAF and related activities has been inserted into Strategy for Development of Statistics of BiH 2020 document. It is deemed that PAF would be very important for planning of future activities, and

within this activity, further development of HRM is an integral element. Implementation of PAF would enable regular updating of the Strategy plan especially in relation to planning with the HR requirements. The plan is to have a sustainable statistical system by 2020. Therefore the development and preparations for the implementation of the PAF activities are higher priority at this very moment while HR activities are considered to be a long term goal.

x. *The volunteer/trainee programme*

All three GSI both at the top management level as well as senior staff levels, consider the trainee programme as a very important part of the general capacity building component. The selection of trainees was competence-based and it was fully coordinated and managed by the SCB long-term project coordinator. The project coordinator, in the opinion of all staff interviewed, was very effective in the selection process and everybody was pleased with the final outcomes. As it turned out, the selection was quite strict and the GSI management is now very thankful for the rigorous procedure that was followed, as the best possible candidates were selected. The trainee recruitment was carried through a public call. All in all there were 75 applicants for the BHAS and FIS together. RSIS held a separate recruitment call. The trainees are paid by the project for the duration of one year contract. There are currently 3 trainees in each of the three partners and contracts expire at end of March 2014. Given the ongoing ban on new employment in civil service in BiH, there is currently no possibility to hire the trainees as employees. A lot has been invested into the training of the trainees over the course of traineeship and it would be important to keep the trainees as employees beyond the end of the current contract. It would be very beneficial for the partners if the contracts could be extended until new provisions for new employment could be made. Tentative planning is being made against the planned retirement schedule.

There has been limited progress in the capacity building for management component. As the component it has received the lowest priority among all the project activities. However, there is a subcomponent, which has had a profound impact on overall project satisfaction among all the GSI – the Sida sponsored trainee programme. All the GSI are extremely satisfied with the trainee programme and deem it is a vital part of their staff development.

The GSI would very much like the trainee part of the Sida support to continue in the future starting with the extension of the support to the current contingent of the trainees. The absorption of the trainees into the employee structures is slow and currently heavily impaired by the ban of employment in civil services. Any extension of their support would enable the GIS to find vacancies within their structures that could potentially absorb the trainees.

There is absolutely no progress on the general management subcomponent. In any case, despite no progress has been made within the project on these goals, the top management of the three GSI has adopted a document on Strategy for Development of Statistics of BiH 2020 [a separate activity].

There is very limited progress on the Human Resource Management (HRM) sub-component. There is no proper HRM department in any of the GSIs currently, thus

any development in this sub-component would require profound changes in the organizational structure of any given GSI. A work-plan for the remainder of the project duration stipulates that organizational plan and assessment for the transition to the Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) will be carried out. Any further developments of the HRM are seen only in the context of the PAF. There is currently no plan for PAF implementation within the scope of the Sida supported project, although the PAF implementation does have the highest priority for implementation in the future.

4.2.5 The volunteer/trainee programme

All three GSI both at the top management level as well as senior staff levels, consider the trainee programme as a very important part of the general capacity building component. The selection of trainees was competence-based and it was fully coordinated and managed by the SCB long-term project coordinator. The project coordinator, in the opinion of all staff interviewed, was very effective in the selection process and everybody was pleased with the final outcomes. As it turned out, the selection was quite strict and the GSI management is now very thankful for the rigorous procedure that was followed, as the best possible candidates were selected. The trainee recruitment was carried through a public call. All in all there were 75 applicants for the BHAS and FIS together. RSIS held a separate recruitment call. The trainees are paid by the project for the duration of one year contract. There are currently 3 trainees in each of the three partners and contracts expire at end of March 2014. Given the ongoing ban on new employment in civil service in BiH, there is currently no possibility to hire the trainees as employees. A lot has been invested into the training of the trainees over the course of traineeship and it would be important to keep the trainees as employees beyond the end of the current contract. It would be very beneficial for the partners if the contracts could be extended until new provisions for new employment could be made. Tentative planning is being made against the planned retirement schedule.

There has been limited progress in the capacity building for management component. As the component it has received the lowest priority among all the project activities. However, there is a subcomponent, which has had a profound impact on overall project satisfaction among all the GSI – the Sida sponsored trainee programme. All the GSI are extremely satisfied with the trainee programme and deem it is a vital part of their staff development.

The GSI would very much like the trainee part of the Sida support to continue in the future starting with the extension of the support to the current contingent of the trainees. The absorption of the trainees into the employee structures is slow and currently heavily impaired by the ban of employment in civil services. Any extension of their support would enable the GIS to find vacancies within their structures that could potentially absorb the trainees.

There is absolutely no progress on the general management subcomponent. In any case, despite no progress has been made within the project on these goals, the top management of the three GSI has adopted a document on Strategy for Development of Statistics of BiH 2020 [a separate activity].

There is very limited progress on the Human Resource Management (HRM) sub-component. There is no proper HRM department in any of the GSIs currently, thus any development in this sub-component would require profound changes in the organizational structure of any given GSI. A work-plan for the remainder of the project duration stipulates that organizational plan and assessment for the transition to the Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) will be carried out. Any further developments of the HRM are seen only in the context of the PAF. There is currently no plan for PAF implementation within the scope of the Sida supported project, although the PAF implementation does have the highest priority for implementation in the future.

4.3 RESPONSES TO THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

As discussed above, the evaluation questions formulated with the regard to the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and organisational learning could only be addressed – properly speaking – if desired outcomes and expected outputs, i.e. the project results, had been correctly formulated and the progress indicators accordingly defined. As it turns out, results have not always been properly formulated, baseline values for the indicators have not been measured, intermediate indicator values have not been defined and progress has generally not been tracked by the project management system. In most cases, the overall objectives and the key output-to-outcome relationships have to be properly reworded.

In what follows, we will thus present whatever assessment was made possible by the existing project monitoring system – with the activities, outputs and outcomes whereby listed –, underlining once more how the lack of properly measurable indicators and the poor project monitoring system make the evaluation exercise weakly founded. For each component, we will use the monitoring system and terminology that has been adopted by the project and we will thus refer to the *two types of outputs* that have been identified – one concerning *individual objectives (learning)*, the other regarding *institutional outputs (production)* – and the *three levels of outcomes* – one related to the immediate *institutional change*, the second related to *institutional effectiveness* and the third related to long-term ***institutional goals*** –. We will use a simple rating such as the following, to summarise each of the sets of blue bullet points.

1. No, unlikely to achieve
2. Not achieving but scope to improve
3. Achieving behind target but progress being made
4. Likely to achieve in full or close to fully

In various cases, it appears that indicators are misleading or poorly defined, outputs are missing or vaguely defined, and outcomes are too general. What is mostly important for this evaluation is that in very few cases **objectively verifiable indicators** have been specified and measured. Some propositions and suggestions on how to improve the results framework and the indicator system are presented in the Recommendations Section below.

The detailed responses to the evaluation questions are presented in Annex 4. Here below we can summarise our assessment as follows.

1. **Relevance.** In terms of fit with BiH partners' national policies and statistical strategies, it appears that the PIS-3 project was generally relevant. Specifically, it appears that it was very relevant for components 1 (LFS), component 2 (LCS), component 3 (Water statistics), component 4 (waste statistics), component 7 (SM); it was moderately relevant for component 8 (Management CB); it was not relevant for component 5 (GGE statistics), component 6 (EPE statistics) and component 9 (HRM). In terms of fit with Sida's policies, it appears that the PIS-3 project was in line with Sida BiH Country Strategy.

2. Effectiveness.

2.1. Component 1 (Switch to continuous LFS).

A) **Expected outputs:** i) Some training has been conducted – but difficult to judge whether staff is skilled and operational; ii) Survey on a continuous basis far from being implemented; iii) Questionnaires not ready yet. Annual LFS was already in place before Phase 3, it is the switch to a continuous survey that is behind schedule.

Overall assessment grade: 3 (Achieving behind target but progress being made).

B) **Outcomes for Institutional change:** i) Procedures for switch to continuous surveys on-going but far from being fully adopted; ii) Reorganisation not yet implemented; iii) Switch to quarterly publication not done yet.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

C) **Outcomes for institutional effectiveness:** i) Annual LFS results are possibly up to international standards; ii) Annual LFS results are timely transmitted to Eurostat but future prospects uncertain. So, as far as the annual LFS is concerned, things seem to be working. Of course to give a proper assessment of quality, an in-depth study of the data would need to be conducted. In order to understand this component even better, Eurostat would need to be contacted, but this out of scope of this evaluation.

Overall assessment grade: 3 (Achieving behind target but progress being made).

D) **Reaching institutional goal:** i) No new sampling frame yet; ii) No information on whether LFS quality has improved or not. Things are moving in the right direction, but goal is still far away.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

2.2. Component 2 (LCS).

- A) **Expected outputs:** i) Some training has been conducted – but difficult to judge whether staff is skilled and operational; ii) No publication on LCS ready yet Data collection done in Oct/Nov and probable publication in mid-2014; iii) Not clear what improved survey instrument means (survey is new) – difficult to judge – Indicator cannot be the same as output: it should be a target value measuring progress towards that output.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- B) **Outcomes for Institutional change:** i) One LCS conducted, second survey is under way; ii) Difficult to judge quality of statistics compared to Eurostat standards – Data quality reports not available yet; iii) Survey results not yet published.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- C) **Outcomes for institutional effectiveness:** i) LCS results are possibly up to international standards – an assessment of this indicator would require in depth data quality review which is beyond the scope of the current evaluation; ii) LCS results not yet published – difficult to judge about timeliness for a 4-year survey; iii) LCS results have possibly been transmitted to Eurostat but future prospects uncertain.

Overall assessment grade: 3 (Achieving behind target but progress being made).

- D) **Reaching institutional goal:** i) No possibility to assess whether utility of LS has improved vis-à-vis data users and policy makers; ii) Data users involved in discussions – difficult to assess whether this will lead to closer cooperation.

Overall assessment grade: 3 (Achieving behind target but progress being made).

2.3. Component 3 (Water statistics).

- A) **Expected outputs:** i) Some training has been conducted – but difficult to judge whether staff is skilled and operational [considering that only a few staff members are dedicated to this]. Currently only one staff member per Entity institution is trained and operational. At BHAS a larger team is operational; ii) New questionnaire adopted – difficult to assess quality; iii) Indicator for 'revised questionnaire' cannot be 'improved questionnaire'.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- B) **Outcomes for Institutional change:** i) 'Improved and better understood survey tools' cannot be measured by 'Improved tools adopted and put in use'; ii) Improvement in quality difficult to assess; it would require in-depth analysis of the new data sets, which is beyond the scope of the current evaluation.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- C) **Outcomes for institutional effectiveness:** i) Improvement in quality difficult to assess; it would require in-depth analysis of the new data sets, which is beyond the scope of the current evaluation.

Overall assessment grade: No assessment possible.

- D) **Reaching institutional goal:** i) Indicator for better environmental data is misleading; more data does not imply better data; ii) Improvement in quality difficult to assess.

Overall assessment grade: No assessment possible.

2.4. Component 4 (Waste-related statistics).

- A) **Expected outputs:** i) New questionnaire adopted – difficult to assess quality; ii) Indicator cannot be the same as output: it should be a target value measuring progress towards that output.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- B) **Outcomes for Institutional change:** i) Some data on waste statistics have been published – difficult to assess quality [considering that only a few staff members are dedicated to this]

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- C) **Outcomes for institutional effectiveness:** i) Improvement in quality difficult to assess; ii) Indicator for quality cannot be that data are included in 'joint' publications (unclear whom it refers to); iii) No state level publications on waste statistics exist.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- D) **Reaching institutional goal:** i) No possibility to assess whether data are considered useful – Environment report published by MoFTER environmental unit did not take into account statistical data on waste management; ii) There is no state level governmental body on environment issues who would utilize these data; iii) Improvement in quality of environmental data difficult to assess.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

2.5. Component 5 (GGE statistics).

- A) **Expected outputs:** i) No training has been conducted; ii) One study visit – difficult to assess knowledge transfer.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- B) **Outcomes for Institutional change:** i) Some data on GGE have been produced but not published yet; ii) 'Number of indicators produced' is not an indicator of progress.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- C) **Outcomes for institutional effectiveness:** i) No result achieved yet.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- D) **Reaching institutional goal:** i) No result achieved yet.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

2.6. Component 6 (EPE statistics).

- A) **Expected outputs:** i) No training has been conducted; ii) One pilot survey conducted without project assistance – assistance was requested and never provided.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- B) **Outcomes for Institutional change:** i) Pilot survey implemented; ii) Survey analysis made; iii) Difficult to assess quality as no report of the pilot survey is accessible.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- C) **Outcomes for institutional effectiveness:** i) No result achieved yet.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- D) **Reaching institutional goal:** i) No result achieved yet.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

2.7. Component 7 (Statistical methods).

- A) **Expected outputs:** i) Some training has been conducted – but difficult to judge whether staff is skilled and operational; ii) 'Number of' is not an indicator: a number must be specified to measure progress! Iii) Difficult to assess whether knowledge is now broader as a result of intervention – self-assessment by beneficiaries is positive.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- B) **Outcomes for Institutional change:** i) New methods are being introduced as a result of intervention – difficult to assess quality; ii) No quality indicators available to judge quality of statistics.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- C) **Outcomes for institutional effectiveness:** i) Difficult to assess – self-assessment of beneficiaries is positive; ii) No less dependence on international assistance yet.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

- D) Reaching institutional goal:** i) If indicator of comparability refers to international standards, it should provide a target measure of improvement; ii) Self-assessment by beneficiaries on responses to user's requests not positive yet.

Overall assessment grade: 2 (Not achieving but scope to improve).

2.8. Component 8 (Capacity building for management).

- A) Expected outputs:** i) Management plan not produced yet – strategic and annual work-plans produced but not as result of project; ii) 'Number of' is not an indicator: a number must be specified to measure progress! iii) Difficult to assess whether management capacity was built as a result of intervention – self-assessment by beneficiaries is uncertain.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- B) Outcomes for Institutional change:** i) Cooperation among three GSI has improved, according to self-assessment by beneficiaries; ii) Meetings of directors per se is not an indicator of improvement in cooperation or management practices; iii) 'Number of' is not an indicator: a number must be specified to measure progress!

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- C) Outcomes for institutional effectiveness:** i) Difficult to assess – self-assessment of beneficiaries is variable depending on area; iii) Guidelines on exchanges of data or information have not been agreed and produced.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- D) Reaching institutional goal:** i) Goals far from being achieved yet; ii) Reports and documentation per se do not show progress – difficult to assess.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

2.9. Component 9 (Capacity building for HRM).

- A) Expected outputs:** i) Management plan not produced yet – some discussions held as result of project; ii) No 'plan for improvement of knowledge' created; iii) No guidelines created; iv) Very little activity in this sub-component overall – very little progress; v) Self-assessment by beneficiaries in this areas is negative.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- B) Outcomes for Institutional change:** i) No new HRM method introduced yet as result of the project; ii) New HRM development postponed beyond the scope of the current project; iii) 'Number of' is not an indicator: a number must be specified to measure progress!

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- C) **Outcomes for institutional effectiveness:** i) Difficult to assess – self-assessment of beneficiaries is still negative; Indicators for the desired outcomes in this case are misleading.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

- D) **Reaching institutional goal:** i) Goals difficult to assess; ii) Goals are far from being achieved yet, according to self-assessment by beneficiaries; iii) Indicators for the goals are misleading.

Overall assessment grade: 1 (No, unlikely to achieve).

Overall, it appears that activities are generally well targeted to the expected output in some cases (components 1, 2, 3, 4, 7) and yet the slow progress toward desired outcomes in some cases is due to lack of engagement and understanding (components 5, 6, 8, 9) and low capacity (all the others). Overall, the desired outcomes may be difficult to reach within project time horizon.

3. **Impact.** In this respect, the self-assessment by beneficiaries and feedback from stakeholders and international donor community is positive. A good indicator of impact will be the perceived utility of labour statistics and environmental statistics by data users. Unfortunately, no baseline data available to measure impact. As for the quality of the statistics produced and how has it been used, this is difficult to assess.
4. **Sustainability.** Whether the PIS-3 project outcomes and activities targeted to those outcomes likely to continue after the program has finished depends on the component:
 - The switch to continuous LFS (component 1) will need more assistance;
 - The stable implementation of LCS (component 2) may be sustainable;
 - Components 3 and 4 (water and waste statistics) may be sustainable;
 - Components 5 and 6 (GGE and EPE) will definitely need more assistance;
 - Improvements in statistical methods may be sustainable but will need more assistance in specialised topics;
 - Components 8 and 9 will certainly need more assistance.

5 Conclusions

The development of a sustainable statistical system in Bosnia and Herzegovina continued to progress certainly partly thanks to the assistance of SIDA through SCB,

although the desired outcomes of the current project will not be entirely achieved by the planned end of the project, 31 January 2015.

Although the project has achieved a certain number of results, all in all, we may say that it is quite far from the initial objectives. Progress has been made in a number of areas but it is short of the desired achievements. The progress on each individual project component was fair, considering the concurrent Population Census implementation and the insufficient number of trained and qualified personnel available for project activities. However, the risk posed by the Population Census to the delivery of the planned outcomes should have been addressed in the plan and mitigation strategies proposed.

The speed and depth of development varies among project components. The most evident achievements were probably in those areas where activities had already been started in previous phases. Differences prevailed in the progress of subject fields between statistical offices. In any case, the training of staff members as part of the capacity building and their assignment to different departments has contributed considerably to the development of the project components. This demonstrates the relevance of the intervention, namely the improvement and accumulation of knowledge of the staff, and the effectiveness of it. The progress of the different components was stimulated by the dedication of the staff involved and by the improved coordination and communication between the partners.

The volunteer trainee's programme was much appreciated as volunteers are seen as an appropriate option to meet the high demand for newly trained personnel. As it turns out, the former volunteers which were later employed have contributed considerably to the development of statistics in the different departments. Also, the overall appreciation of the three GSI can be seen as indication for ownership of the project.

Since the various project components are not yet completed and the final outcomes are not yet in sight, a request for an extension is highly recommended.

As for the impact, we may say that in this respect, the self-assessment by the beneficiaries and feedback from some of the stakeholders and the international donor community is positive. A good indicator of impact will be the perceived utility of labour statistics and environmental statistics by data users. Even though there is no baseline data available to measure impact, we may say that eventually it will be positive. As for the quality of the statistics produced and how has it been used, this is difficult to assess.

As for sustainability, whether the project outcomes and activities targeted to those outcomes are likely to continue after the program has finished depends on the component. Generally, only very few areas seem sustainable at this stage – the LCS implementation, the publication of water and waste statistics (albeit incomplete) – while all other areas will definitely need more assistance.

5.1 FACTORS OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE

This is the third phase of a programme – Partnership in Statistics – that was initiated in 2007 between Sida and the three GSI in BiH and implemented by SCB. Phase 1 covered the years 2007-2009, Phase 2 the years 2010-2011 and Phase 3 covers the years 2012-2014. As such, the programme is thus a long-standing one. Among the factors of **success** we should list:

1. The partners appreciate the cooperation with SCB and Sida, their flexibility on project implementation and the possibility of tailoring activities to the partners' needs even in due course.
2. Most components and areas of intervention have been covered and addressed over the years, since Phase 1. In this sense, over the years a lot has been done, the knowledge transfer has been considerable and its effects are visible and can be seen in the improvement of statistical production in BiH – at least in terms of statistics reproduced by Eurostat for BiH and conforming to their standards –.
3. The presence of SCB experts funded by the PIS programme has provided a sense of continuity to the partners which has been appreciated the most.
4. Project experts have generally provided good expertise and assistance.
5. The traineeship programme has been a success, as it has allowed the training of future staff on the job for a long period before their hiring as employees. The success of this programme depends on the temporary ban on new employment by the Government – for budgetary reasons – that it is hoped will be soon lifted.

Yet, there are hindrances and drawbacks. The project – 23 months after its start date – is quite behind on most fronts, both in terms of **deliverables** and in terms of **budget** spent. Only part of the planned activities have been implemented and some of the outcomes are definitely not within reach. Among the most relevant factors of lack of success (rather than failure) we should mention:

1. Preparations for the Population Census are certainly the most relevant factor, as they captured the full attention of the whole system at crucial times, calling for the full involvement of most of the personnel in almost all departments. This is certainly the one factor that is responsible for the putting off of several activities. And yet, it was highly predictable that the Census would sooner or later occur, and this occurrence should have been taken into account in the planning.
2. The change in the long-term project coordinator was seen as an obstacle to the smooth development of the project. This was all the more seen as a drawback, as the first project coordinator did not integrated well within the work environment – that was the partners' perception – while the second one already took a few months to get acquainted. This was somehow predictable and yet it represents a major factor of uncertainty. The role and responsibilities of the long-term project coordinator, as currently defined in the ToRs, may be an

- impediment for effective programme implementation. It is not clear whether the long-term coordinator is a facilitator of project activities and coordinator in stricter sense or is the role of the long-term coordinator defined more broadly as an adviser to the high-level management or even as a technical expert in one of the related fields. Currently the responsibilities of the long-term coordinator are not clear enough and programme implementation would benefit from a more streamlined operationalisation of the role.
3. Some sub-components, albeit important, have been perceived as less crucial to the success of the project delivery. It is the partners' sense of ownership that seems to be lacking for some sub-components. This is particularly true for GGE statistics and EPE statistics, as well as the Management components. It could be that the design phase did not involve the partners enough – as a matter of fact we did not find any evidence of a proper design phase – or that the choice of topics was somehow imposed, in spite of the initial mutual agreement. In any case, the lack of progress in those areas is certainly to be attributed to this factor also.
 4. The choice of objectives in some cases appears to have been unrealistic, which takes us back to the poor design and planning highlighted above. This is the case, for instance, of sub-component 1: aiming at implementing a labour force survey on a continuous basis at the end of the current phase is clearly unrealistic, as it implies an organisational, economic and technical effort that is beyond the current means of the three partners. The same lack of realism can be attribute to the slow progress in all sub-components of component 2 (environmental statistics): without a national state-wide legislation on environmental issues – and the establishment of a State Environmental Agency – a lot of the issues concerning jurisdiction and responsibilities of the data collection appear to be unsolvable.
 5. The Project Plan for the various components was drafted with full awareness of the complexity of the cooperation arrangements among the three GSI. However, outputs and goals were not operationalised well enough to be translated into effective project activities. Long-term objectives generally appear out of reach for a three-year project to be implemented during a pending Population Census.
 6. The component on the general capacity building and management may have received too low priority in the project implementation and as such has not produced the targeted outputs. We do recognize the difficulties faced when performing a management level capacity building with intentions to change the management model, the inherent resistance to change in general and very specific difficulties in the BiH case with 3 separate statistical institutions. However, some of the drawbacks identified in this report can be attributed to the human resource challenges faced as well as to the management of the large-scale inter-organizational ventures such as national level data collections.

5.2 INTENDED AND UNINTENDED RESULTS AND IMPACTS

There are several intended results and impacts that should be mentioned, as there are a few unintended ones that we should underline. Among the **intended results and impacts** of the project we should mention:

1. Annual Labour Force statistics are now regularly produced by BiH statistical system and regularly fed into Eurostat statistics. The shift to survey data collected on a continuous basis should therefore rely on a well-established data collection system.
2. Knowledge of what it implies to go from an annual data collection to a continuous one for Labour Force statistics has now been transferred.
3. Labour cost statistics are going to be produced by BiH statistical system, albeit on a 4-year basis.
4. Capacity has been built in the areas of Water statistics and Waste-related statistics.
5. General survey and sampling techniques have now been acquired by a larger number of staff members.
6. Various trainees, over the years, have been trained on the job at a relatively low cost. The programme has been considered very successful.

Among the **unintended results and impacts** of the project we should mention:

1. The LFS is now implemented once a year, and there is no guarantee that it will always receive the necessary budget allocation from the (three) Governments (State and Entity). If not, BiH risks not to be able to provide labour statistics data to Eurostat on a constant basis. The international donor community will be thus requested to supplement the budget in this case.
2. Labour cost data are produced on a 4-year basis. Sustainability is not guaranteed in this case either.

5.3 OTHER STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The management of the project was conducted in a rather loose manner, which might have also due to the general agreement framework. Given that the contractual relationship between Sida, SCB and the partners in BiH appears to have been defined only in broad terms, the actual and effective implementation of the activities was left to the initiative of the coordinators and on the response of the partners. In this respect, according to SCB, one weakness lies in the set-up where all three BiH partners need to agree on common implementation of activities on a very detailed level in a very special political context.

The positive side of this was that a lot of the activities resulted from the good will and engagement of the coordinators and the counterparts. The negative side is that the whole project appears to have been rather improvised, subject to ups and downs and dependent on external events.

The implementation plan, the list and time-line of activities, the deadlines for delivering the outputs, the reporting, the monitoring and the cross-checks, the accounting and the financial reporting were somehow loose and not defined vis-à-vis activities, outputs and deliverables. This contributed to a certain generic budget implementation and accounting.

In short, the lack of strict terms of budgeting and accounting, together with a generic and somehow blurred results-based framework contributed, on one hand, to the strength of the project – its flexibility and adaptation to the circumstances – and on the other hand to its weakness – its slow delivery rate and lack of continuity.

5.4 LESSON LEARNT AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

In short, the most significant lessons learnt from the project can be summarised as follows.

1. The most evident lesson is that the poor planning (design), poor documentation and understanding of the underlying logic produce uncertainty on implementation, monitoring and evaluation
2. A certain lack of ownership among the partners on a number of focus areas – also due to the quite complicated context in BiH and the current agreement set-up – gives rise to low level of engagement.
3. The lack of a more careful consideration of the risks such as the effect of the Census, the status and role of the LT coordinator as outlined above, and the institutional relationships among the three agencies is bound to affect the effectiveness of the project. If there is to be a follow-on phase, these points should be addressed directly.
4. In an environment where the state of the statistical system is still relatively poor and the lack of (trained) personnel is still considerable, building capacity in diverse fields of statistics is still seen as of crucial and fundamental importance. The transfer of knowledge through training activities in various subject fields might have not been optimal, as result of the participants' poor level of the English language knowledge or other factors, but it has been effective.
5. Yet, capacity building is a long term investment. Taking into account the level of competence of the staff and the various difficulties, impediments and obstacles encountered, it would not be realistic to expect the achievement of the expected results at the end of the project.
6. The Population Census was somehow to be foreseen at the start of the project, with the slowing down of other activities that it implied. It would have been realistic to have that risk clearly indicated at the outset, so as not to impair the achievement of the final outcomes.
7. Sustainability in all areas of intervention is not guaranteed not only for budget reasons but also and most evidently for lack of dedicated personnel, even in "extraordinary" conditions (like the implementation of the Census).

8. The smooth implementation of the project has depended on the good relationship and supervision of the long-term project coordinator with the partners. Thus, the change of the designated expert, although anticipated, was somehow disruptive. Also, it appears that a good local assistant, with knowledge of the local language and the environment, would greatly improve the effectiveness of the long-term coordinator.
9. Capacity building in management should have received higher priority as some of the challenges could be overcome with more effective HRM and management approaches. Having said that, it also should be noted that management changes are a long-term process and might be well beyond the scope of the current partnership project.
10. Some areas of intervention could be dropped or left for future projects, like GGE and EPE statistics and HRM.
11. The Trainee programme should be extended in expectation of bridging employment status.

6 Recommendations

We can mention here a few recommendations:

1. A new and appropriate results-based framework should be defined for the next phases. This should define activities, expected outputs and desired outcomes, together with the relative "theory of change", i.e. how the expected outputs are supposed to lead to the desired outcomes and how these are supposed to contribute to the achievement of the project objectives. An appropriate results-based framework will also define intermediate and final objectively verifiable indicators of progress, as well as the time-line of activities, which will help monitor the project performance all along and correct planned activities according to the indicated time-line. Greater clarity about what the project is trying to achieve and greater ownership by all parties, rather than just Sida or SCB, will ensure a higher probability of success and impact. Careful attention should be given to the human and technical resources, to the turn-over of the staff available and to the actual needs of the partners involved, so as to ensure their full ownership. Also, in the planning, a careful choice of the areas of intervention should follow the effective needs and interests of the partners, not any external agenda simply complying with future EU requirements.
2. In light of the experience from Phase 3, further support of Sida and SCB is strongly recommended, as the capacity building action is still to be completed, training and coaching of the staff are still necessary and several staff members still lack technical experience and self-confidence, particularly in a few selected areas.
3. It is recommended that volunteer/trainee programme be extended due to its success and the current – albeit temporary – impossibility of that staff to be hired by the three GSI due to the current Government budget restrictions.
4. It is further recommended that the management and personnel services are provided with know-how and best practices examples as how to integrate new staff in the existing employment schemes in adverse conditions, such as ban on employment in civil services as part of the capacity building in management component. Especially in light of very positive reception and recognition of the trainee programme as it was implemented over the years.
5. It is recommended that a local assistant is attached to the long-term project coordinator, so as to increase efficiency in delivery and a smoother relationship with the partners. This recommendation was already included in the Review of PIS-1.
6. Budgeting and accounting should be contractually defined in stricter terms. Budget should be used as a management and monitoring tool. At the least the budget use and reporting should be organized by the components and sub-components.
7. There should be a re-planning workshop to deal with the remainder of this phase [this was not adequately addressed by the RBM seminar, as discussed above]. That would create an opening to raise these issues and maybe then re-structure the project as there is no point continuing to spend on some of these activities if there are policy obstacles or a lack of ownership. For the capacity building and the knowledge transfer to be really effective, in fact, the number of staff members dedicated to project activities must be increased, so as to en-

able the implementation of the various activities without interruptions, in so assuring the sustainability of the intervention. This would obviously require the full engagement of all partners (a policy issue). There is still time to set clearer objectives and indicators for the end of project. Not tackling it now just delays the difficulties until a new phase.

8. The results matrix should be refined, including objectives and progress indicators. Here below a few suggestions on how the outcomes and outputs could be re-worded, for a better definition of the progress indicators and a clearer setting of the project objectives. For each result -whether output or outcome – intermediate and final (target) objectively verifiable indicators should be defined. Components 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be redefined, Components 5, 6, 8 and 9 should be possibly dropped.

Component 1. LFS. Outcome: *Sustained production of a continuous LFS in line with international standards and EU requirements.* Output-to-Outcome: *IT and Labour Market departments implementing work processes to deliver a continuous LFS.*

Component 2. LCS. Outcome: *Sustained and timely implementation of the LCS in line with international standards and EU requirements.* Output-to-Outcome: *Revised and updated Statistical Business Register based on NACE Rev 2 to be used in the LCS*

Component 3. Water statistics. Outcome: *Improved methodology with guidelines developed, and increased quality of water statistics – with new indicators – in line with EU and national requirements, contributing to the sustainable development of the statistical system in B&H.*

Component 4. Waste statistics. Outcome: *Improved methodology with guidelines developed, and increased quality of waste statistics – with new indicators – in line with EU and national requirements, contributing to the sustainable development of the statistical system in B&H.*

Component 7. Statistical methodology (SM). Outcome: *A well trained, qualified and well managed statistical system able to provide relevant and reliable statistical information that meets domestic demands and EU requirements.* Output-to-Outcome: *recruitment of subject matter specialists and methodologists to facilitate improved implementation of regular and specific survey tasks.*

Annex 1 – ToR

Terms of Reference for the mid-term review of
Support to Partnership in Statistics in BiH Phase 3

Date: September 2013

Case number: UF2011/75641

1. Background

The project to be evaluated is called “Partnership in Statistics in BiH (phase 3)” (Project) implemented by Statistics Sweden (SCB). The activity period of the Project is from February 2012 until January 2015. The Project value is 15 751 000 SEK. The cooperation among the parties Sida, the national statistics institutes and SCB is governed by a Specific Agreement (attachment) and Service Purchase Agreement (attachment).

The decision to enter into the project was made during the period of the Strategy for development cooperation with BiH January 2011- December 2014 (attachment).

Sida is currently operating at the end of the current Country Strategy which has been cut short by one year. In 2013, the Swedish government has initiated the definition of a new regional result strategy for the period 2014-2020. Sida has presented a proposal and content of a new strategy encompassing five areas: i) public central and local administration reform, ii) justice reform, iii) human rights /civil society and support to vulnerable groups, iv) environment and v) market development. Predicted volume for the region for the 7 years is approx. 400mEUR. The focus will increase on regional cooperation, measuring results and achievements, and the political progress of the region in relation to EU-accession.

The BiH partners in this project are the national statistics institutes (NSI), and there are three: BH Agency for Statistics at the State level and covering district Brcko and two entity statistics institutes: the Institute for Statistics of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska Institute of Statistics.

A review has been planned since the beginning of the Project to be undertaken at the mid-point, and the partners are aware that it will be done by Sida. The timing of the review has been under some deliberation and timing has been difficult to establish due to the Population Census 2013 in BiH, as well as field management change at SCB which happened in summer 2013.

The period after the Census, which is planned for first half of October 2013, has been selected to make the review. One month from the Census, the mid-term review of the project should take place, earliest week 46.

2. Review Purpose and Objective

The purpose is to undertake an output/outcome based mid-term review of the project “Partnership in Statistics Phase 3” implemented by SCB, in partnership with BH statistics (state and entity). The primary readership of the evaluation will include Sida, SCB and the national statistics project partners. The result of the evaluation will be used by Sida as external input into adjusting the programme as necessary. The project partners are also interested in external input so as to modify if appropriate the project and adjust it to possible new national priorities and areas of possible intervention coming out of the Census 2013.

Since the Census 2013 is expected to have a resounding effect on the development context of BiH, the review will additionally look into future cooperation ideas as they relate to the field of statistics, particularly demographic analysis.

3. Scope and Delimitations

The scope of the review is primarily the above mentioned project, in its current phase 3 activity period. Standard Sida criteria will be applied. The scope should allow looking into a possible amendment of

the project in order to respond to new priorities arising out of the Census 2013, if an amendment is possible, i.e. if it can be accommodated under the existing overall objectives of the project.

In response to the Census 2013, SCB is planning to undertake a “Result Based Management” RBM seminar following the completion of the Census 2013. The idea behind the RBM is to check on national priorities after the Census and adjust the program if possible. Therefore the scope of the review will include asking the question of how the SCB project fits into the new state of play as determined by the Census 2013. This may include participating in the RBM seminar by the review team, and/or focussing attention on the results of the RBM seminar.

As a secondary scope of the review, related to the conduct of the Census, the consultant should give input on opportunities/new ideas for potential future cooperation on social statistics with emphasis on population statistics/demographic analysis. This analysis should be limited, and provide initial analysis which can be used by Sida to decide whether to consider extending the support though SCB beyond the current project, if the new Regional Result Strategy allows for such consideration.

4. Organisation, Management and Stakeholders

The consultant is responsible for the organization and management of the evaluation as well as quality assurance. In an inception phase, the consultant is expected to present its methodology for organization of the assignment, including quality control. Participation by SCB representatives and national statistics institute representatives in the preparation of the evaluation is expected and encouraged, as well as in the commenting on the draft report. The readership is Sida/Embassy, and managements of SCB and national partners.

5. Review Questions and Criteria

It is proposed that an output/outcomes based review be undertaken for those components that have outcomes and for those that do not the review should look into outputs. Following the identification of main objectives and outcomes, the main questions that the review should answer include the following:

- 1) Effectiveness: Were the right program activities carried out to bring about the desired outcomes? With respect to the program context concerning the uncertainty surrounding Census preparations, and elapsed time, is the program on track to achieve its stated objectives, both for various components and as a whole? If not, are there immediate lessons learned to be applied?
- 2) Although not applicable for phase 3 specifically, it should be possible to make a generalized statement on Impact given that the cooperation has a history since 2007: Are the long-term effects of the program on society as a whole, planned and unplanned, positive and negative? What observable measures or indicators can be identified? What has been the quality of the statistics produced and how has it been used?
- 3) Sustainability: Are the program outcomes likely to continue after the program has finished? Are the Statistics offices able to continue develop their organisations and their activities?
- 4) Organizational learning: What lessons could be learned for the current and future programs?
 - a) For the current program: which aspects could be adjusted or dropped? Should new components be considered (e.g. dissemination regarding Census, etc.) and if so can the project still remain within its stated overall objectives?

- b) For a future program: should a future program focussing on social statistics/demographic analysis be considered by Sida if the new Strategy gives room for it? Can SCB continue as a long term partner to national statistics in this respect?

6. Approach and Methodology

The consultant is free to suggest an appropriate review method and approach in an inception report prior to the mission. However given the limited nature of the mid term review, the Embassy recommends a participatory approach to the review focussing on beneficiary interviews and focus groups as the main methods. Mixed methods are welcome but the consultant needs to provide a review approach/method that conforms to OECD/DAC quality standards,

7. Time Schedule

The assignment should be carried out September 2013- January 2014, and the field mission should be implemented during the latter half of November 2013. If possible the assignment should be coordinated to partially overlap with the SCB planned “Result Based Management” seminar in BiH which is planned tentatively week 46/47 so that relevant people are accessible.

The consultant, in an inception phase, shall make an initial research and propose a method and approach, further elaboration of review questions, time plan, etc.

As part of the inception report, the consultant should provide an overall time and work plan including dates for reports, field visits including on-going feedback in the process that the consultant is expected to deliver.

The inception report in draft shall be sent to the Embassy for approval by end September. The embassy will discuss the draft with partners and send comments by xx October. A final inception report should be agreed by end October.

8. Reporting and Communication

The consultant under this contract/assignment shall deliver the following:

- draft and final inception report
- draft and final review report
- presentation and/or workshop to be coordinated with the SCB “Result Based management” workshop planned for week 46/47

The consultant shall adhere to the terminology of the OECD/DAC Glossary on Evaluation and Result Based Management. The methodology used must be described and explained in the final report. All reports shall be written in English language.

The draft final report should be submitted before end of the year 2013. The assignment should be completed latest end January 2014.

9. Resources

The requested level of effort/ambition for the review is up to 5 man weeks level 1 consultant(s), and 1-2 weeks man of back office support. Furthermore, to facilitate a successful field mission, the consultant may engage a local/national assistant for logistical and interpretation purposes. This cost for this activity can be under reimbursables and should not exceed more than 10% of contract value. Embassy can recommend a local consultant if so requested.

10. Evaluation Team Qualification

The lead consultant, level 1, should have relevant academic background and evaluation competence. Professional competence in Statistics is required, and it is preferred to have experience in Census, particularly post Census activities in reform and developing country contexts. Knowledge of the region is also required. Fluency in the English language is also required.

A team of one lead consultant, an expert in subject area, and one expert in evaluation may be proposed if necessary but it is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complementary. The competence of the proposed consultants should correspond to the chosen evaluation approach.

Of course the proposed consultants must be independent of the project and have no stake in the outcome of the review.

11. References

The Embassy will provide the consultant with relevant documentation including project proposals, project reports, internal decision memos, past evaluations and, if possible to obtain other documentation on request.

Attached to the ToR is the standard Sida template for evaluation reports and standard Sida template for management response to be used as a general guides in the report formatting.

Annex 2 - List of documents

Andersson, Veronica & Mutavdzic, Ivana. 2012. *Partnership in Statistics in Bosnia And Herzegovina Phase 3*. Progress report July – December 2012.

Andersson, Veronica, Bood, Fredrik & Mutavdzic, Ivana. 2012. *Partnership in Statistics in Bosnia And Herzegovina Phase 3*. Progress report February – June 2012.

BHAS, FIS & RSIS. 2012. *Dissemination Strategy Bosnia & Herzegovina*. Final version.

BHAS, FIS & RSIS. 2013. *Strategija Razvoja Statistike Bosne i Hercegovine 2020*.

BHAS, FIS & RSIS. 2013. *Strategija Razvoja Sistema Metapodataka u Statističkom Sistemu BiH*.

BHAS, FIS & RSIS. 2013. *Strategy 2020 - Strategy for Development of Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina*.

BHAS. 2012. *Annual meeting with representatives of Sida and Statistics Sweden*. Meeting notes. Sarajevo, 05.12.2012.

Brood, Fredrik. 2012. *Partnership in statistics in Bosnia and Herzegovina, phase II*. Final report January 2010 – February 2012.

Bukvic, Nedim. 2012. *Support to partnership in statistics in BiH (phase III) Jan 2012- December 2014*. Assessment memo.

Byfuglien, Jan M. & Kopsch, Günter. 2011. *Adapted Global Assessment of the National Statistical System of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Final report.

Kjellson, Thomas. 2011. *Agenda for annual discussion 2011-12-15 between Sida and SCB in accordance with §7 in the framework agreement*.

Koesoebjono, Harsadja Santo I. 2009. *Review of the Sida financed, Statistics Sweden implemented project in BiH, "Statistics development in Bosnia Herzegovina" 2007-2009*. Review.

SCB. 2012. *Budget BiH 2012-2014 Final, Appendix 2*. Spreadsheet.

SCB. 2013. *Partnership in Statistics in Bosnia and Herzegovina Phase 3*. Progress report January – June 2013.

Schmidt, Martin. 2013. *Monitoring framework BiH/SCB project 2013-2014*. Spreadsheet.

Schmidt, Martin. 2013. *Results-Based Management Seminar - Report from a mission to Sarajevo Agency*. Draft.

Sida. 2012. *Partnership in statistics in Bosnia And Herzegovina. Project plan for the 3 phase February 2012 – January 2015*. Final Document

Sida. 2012. *Service Purchase Agreement*. Contract No. C55063; Registration No. UF2011/75641; Resolution No. BIH2012-03.

Sida. 2012. *Specific agreement between Sweden and the Bosnia and Herzegovina Agency for Statistics, the Institute for Statistics of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Republika Srpska Institute of Statistics*.

Voxmark, Nina. 2012. *Annual discussion 2012 between Sida and SCB / ICO following on framework agreement*. Meeting notes.

Annex 3 – List of interviewees

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
Ana Musević	Assistant	Directorate for Economic Planning	17 Dec 2013
Arijana Muhic	Head of Section for Statistical Methodologies and Coordination	FIS	10 Dec 2013
Azra Rogović-Grubić	Senior Advisor for International Cooperation, BiH Ozone Unit Manager, Focal point for Vienna Convention on Ozone Layer Protection and Montreal Protocol	MoFT BiH	18 Dec 2013
Bente Kofoed Dyrberg	Resident Advisor	Twinning project	11 Dec 2013
Biljana Vuklišević	International Cooperation, secretary	RSIS	12 Dec 2013
Carl-Magnus Jaensson	Chief Advisor	SCB	11 Dec 2013 16 Dec 2013
Darko Marinković	Senior Officer for Sampling Design and Data Analysis	RSIS	12 Dec 2013
Dijana Sikima	Programme Manager	EU Delegation	9 Dec 2013
Djemka Sahinpasić	RTA Assistant	Twinning project	11 Dec 2013
Fadil Fatic	Deputy director, Component leader General Capacity Building	BHAS	9 Dec 2013
Fehrija Mehić	Head of Department for Agriculture, Forestry, Fishery and Environment	FIS	10 Dec 2013
Fredrik Bood	former Project coordinator	SCB	
Galiba Karačić	Secretary General	FIS	10 Dec 2013
Hidajeta Bajramović	Director	FIS	10 Dec 2013
Ljerka Marić	Director	Directorate for Economic Planning	17 Dec 2013
Milenko Stojanović	Head of Department for Labour Market Statistics,	BHAS	10 Dec 2013

	Component leader		
Munira	Counsellor to the director	FIS	10 Dec 2013
Nedim Bukvić	National Programme Officer	Sida	9 Dec 2013
Nihada Lugušić	Senior Adviser for Coordination and Correspondence with International Institutions	FIS	10 Dec 2013
Nisveta Djevo	Assistant Director	FIS	10 Dec 2013
Pelle Persson	Counsellor	Sida	9 Dec 2013
Radmila Čičković	Director	RSIS	16 Dec 2013
Samka Avdić	Head of Department for Labour Market	FIS	10 Dec 2013
Selveta Hot	Coordinator in the Department for International Cooperation and EI	BHAS	9 Dec 2013
Ševala Korajčević	Head of Department for Environment, Energy, and Transport Statistics, Component leader Environment Statistics	BHAS	9 Dec 2013
Stana Kopranović	Senior Officer for Environmental Statistics	RSIS	12 Dec 2013
Veronica Andersson	former Chief Advisor	SCB	
Veronica Wikner	Project coordinator	SCB	
Vladimir Koprivica	Senior Officer for Labour Market Statistics	RSIS	12 Dec 2013
Zdenko Milinovic	Director	BHAS	

Annex 4 – The Evaluation Responses

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
Relevance	Response/Assessment			
Q1.1. To what extent was the PIS-3 project relevant to the BiH parties' needs and change processes and plans?	- In terms of fit with BiH partners national policies and statistical strategies, it appears that the PIS-3 project was generally relevant. Specifically, it appears that it was <u>very relevant</u> for components 1 (LFS), component 2 (LCS), component 3 (Water statistics), component 4 (waste statistics), component 7 (SM); it was <u>moderately relevant</u> for component 8 (Management CB); it was <u>not relevant</u> for component 5 (GGE statistics), component 6 (EPE statistics) and component 9 (HRM). - In terms of fit with Sida's policies, it appears that the PIS-3 project was in line with Sida BiH Country Strategy.			
Effectiveness				
Q2.1. Is the PIS-3 project achieving its objectives and its planned results and to what extent?	Listed OUTPUTS and their INDICATORS for each sub-component (our assessment in row below)	Listed OUTCOMES and their INDICATORS for each sub-component (our assessment in row below)		
Component 1. LFS.	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) Trained staff: LFS methodologists; enumerators and IT specialists INDICATORS:	2. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE - LFS harmonised with EU and ILO requirements - Move from annual to quarterly LFS	3. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - Three statistical offices properly prepared - Improved time and	4. REACHING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS Utility of the Labour Statistics data improved - data of better quality provided

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	- Survey instruments adjusted to continuous LFS; - Labour Force Survey improved - Approximately 40 enumerators, 3 methodologists, 3 IT specialists and 3 sample designers trained - Questionnaires, methodological guidelines and forms for monitoring fieldwork. 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - activity plan for conducting continuous LFS produced INDICATORS: - Activity plan operational	publications - Extension of the existing set of indicators INDICATORS: - Re-organisation in the working process of IT and Labour Market departments carried out. - New methodology for continuous LFS adopted and included in annual activity plans and mid-term statistical programmes for all the three statistical offices - Survey results published quarterly	cost efficiency INDICATORS: - Produced results comparable at the international level - Results published and transmitted to Eurostat timely	timely to the key users and decision-makers. Increased capacities for preparing various strategic documents. (E.g. Employment strategy plan developed) - Updated frame for sample selection. INDICATORS: - Established working process for updating sample frame - Better quality data on Labour market provided timely

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	ASSESSMENT • Some training has been conducted – but difficult to judge whether staff is skilled and operational • Continuous survey far from being implemented • Questionnaires not ready yet	ASSESSMENT • Procedures for switch to continuous surveys on-going but far from being fully adopted • Reorganisation not yet implemented • Switch to quarterly publication not done yet	ASSESSMENT • Annual LFS results are possibly up to international standards • Annual LFS results are timely transmitted to Eurostat but future prospects uncertain	ASSESSMENT • No new sampling frame yet • LFS quality not improved yet

Questions		Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
Component 2. LCS.	2.	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Trained LCS staff INDICATORS: 3 methodologists trained 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - Publications on LCS - Improved survey instruments (questionnaires, methodology, non-response treatment, etc.) INDICATORS: - Publications on LCS published - Improved Survey instruments (questionnaires, methodology, non-response treatment, etc.).	2. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE 4-year LCS conducted on regular basis - Existing set of indicators extended and improved INDICATORS: - New methodology for a regular 4-year LCS adopted and included in annual activity plans and mid-term statistical programmes of all the three statistical offices - Deliver data /tables (A, B, C) according to the EU Regulation latest June 2014 - Produce statistical information on average labour cost and other labour cost indicators - Produce quality reports on entity and state level by the end of 2014 - Produced and published data on average labour cost and other labour cost indicators	3. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - LCS harmonised with EU requirements - Improved time and cost efficiency - Information on labour cost (level and structure of labour cost per hour and per worker) available to investors INDICATORS: - Produced results comparable at the EU and international level - Results published and transmitted to Eurostat timely - All required tables delivered on time - Quality reports available for users	4. REACHING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS - Utility of Labour Statistics data improved for key users and decision-makers. - Increased capacities for preparing various strategic documents with regard to investments and competitiveness. INDICATORS: - Closer cooperation with users established

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	ASSESSMENT • Some training has been conducted – but difficult to judge whether staff is skilled and operational • No publication on LCS ready yet • Not clear what improved survey instrument means (survey is new) – difficult to judge – Indicator cannot be the same as output: it should be a target value measuring progress towards that output	ASSESSMENT • One LCS conducted, second survey is under way • Difficult to judge quality of statistics compared to Eurostat standards – Data quality reports not available yet • Survey results not yet published	ASSESSMENT • LCS results are possibly up to international standards – an assessment of this indicator would require in depth data quality review which is beyond the scope of the current evaluation • LCS results not yet published – difficult to judge about timeliness for a 4-year survey • LCS results have possibly been transmitted to Eurostat but future prospects uncertain	ASSESSMENT • No possibility to assess whether utility of LS has improved vis-à-vis data users and policy makers • Data users involved in discussions – difficult to assess whether this will lead to closer cooperation

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
Component 3. Water statistics.	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Trained staff for water statistics development INDICATORS: - Two persons per institute trained 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - Revised questionnaire, guidelines and methodology on water statistics INDICATORS: - Improved questionnaire, guidelines and methodology for water statistics in use	2. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE - Improved and better understood survey tools (questionnaire, guidelines) for water statistics INDICATORS: - Improved tools for the survey on water statistics (questionnaire, guidelines) adopted and put in use.	3. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - Production of new indicators and quality improvement of the existing ones INDICATORS: - Increased quality of indicators on water statistics	4. REACHING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS - Better environmental data in line with requirements (Eurostat, UNFCCC) reported to international organisations and used for national policy making INDICATORS: - More data on water statistics in Eurostat/UN database; water statistics data considered useful for decision making by national authorities

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	ASSESSMENT - Some training has been conducted – but difficult to judge whether staff is skilled and operational. Currently only 1 staff member per entity institution is trained and operational. At the state level a larger team is operational. - New questionnaire adopted – difficult to assess quality - Indicator for 'revised questionnaire' cannot be 'improved questionnaire'	ASSESSMENT 'Improved and better understood survey tools' cannot be measured by 'Improved tools adopted a and put in use' - Improvement in quality difficult to assess; it would require in-depth analysis of the new data sets, which is beyond the scope of the current evaluation.	ASSESSMENT Improvement in quality difficult to assess; it would require in-depth analysis of the new data sets, which is beyond the scope of the current evaluation.	ASSESSMENT - Indicator for better environmental data is misleading; more data does not imply better data - Improvement in quality difficult to assess

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
Component 4. Waste statistics.	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - missing INDICATORS: - missing 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - Improved questionnaire and clarified guidelines for the survey on waste management INDICATORS: - Improved questionnaire and guidelines on waste management statistics put in use	2. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE - Regular survey on waste management improved and conducted INDICATORS: - Results of the survey on waste management produced	3. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - Production of new indicators and quality improvement of the existing ones INDICATORS: - Data on waste management incorporated in joint statistical publications	4. REACHING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS - Better environmental data in line with requirements (Eurostat, UNFCCC) reported to international organisations and used for national policy making INDICATORS: - Data on waste management considered useful by policy makers

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	ASSESSMENT • New questionnaire adopted – difficult to assess quality • Indicator cannot be the same as output: it should be a target value measuring progress towards that output	ASSESSMENT • Some data on waste statistics have been published – difficult to assess quality	ASSESSMENT • Improvement in quality difficult to assess • Indicator for quality cannot be that data are included in 'joint' publications (unclear whom it refers to) • No state level publications on waste statistics exist.	ASSESSMENT • No possibility to assess whether data are considered useful – Environment report published by MoFTER environmental unit did not take into account statistical data on waste management • There is no state level governmental body on environment issues who would utilize these data • Improvement in quality of environmental data difficult to assess

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
Component 5. Green-house Gas Emission (GGE) statistics.	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Knowledge on use of IPCC guidelines and software for calculating GGE from waste sector INDICATORS: - Two persons per institute trained in GGE statistics 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - missing INDICATORS: - missing	2. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE - Calculated indicators on GGE from waste sector INDICATORS: - Number of produced indicators on GGE	3. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - Production of new indicators and quality improvement of the existing ones - Publishing the first indicators on GGE from waste sector (CO2 equivalent (Gg)) INDICATORS: - First results on GGE published	4. REACHING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS - Better data on GGE in line with requirements (Eurostat, UNFCCC) reported to international organisations and used for national policy making INDICATORS: - First data on GGE from waste reported according to the UNFCCC and used for national needs

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	ASSESSMENT • No training has been conducted • One study visit – difficult to assess knowledge transfer	ASSESSMENT • Some data on GGE have been produced but not published yet • 'Number of indicators produced' is not an indicator of progress.	ASSESSMENT • No result achieved yet	ASSESSMENT • No result achieved yet

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
Component 6. Environment Protection Expenditures (EPE).	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Knowledge on analysis methods for the EPE statistics INDICATORS: - Two persons per stat. inst. trained in EPE statistics 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - missing INDICATORS: - missing	2. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE - Elaboration of the pilot survey results for EPE INDICATORS: - Analysis of the pilot survey on EPE made	3. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - Improved guidelines for conducting survey on EPE INDICATORS: - Guidelines for survey on EPE adopted	4. REACHING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS - Better environmental data in line with requirements (Eurostat, UNFCCC) reported to international organisations and used for national policies making - Final questionnaire on EPE designed and survey guidelines prepared for conducting the survey INDICATORS: - Final questionnaire on EPE created

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	ASSESSMENT • No training has been conducted • One pilot survey conducted without project assistance – assistance was requested and never provided	ASSESSMENT • Pilot survey implemented • Survey analysis made • Difficult to assess quality as no report of the pilot survey is accessible	ASSESSMENT • No result achieved yet	ASSESSMENT • No result achieved yet

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
Component 7. Statistical methodology (SM).	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Well trained staff on implementation of every single survey phase (methodology, sampling, collection, processing and checking data in new surveys); - Trained in-house trainers in statistical survey methodology INDICATORS: - Number of trained staff per BiH statistical institution; - Number of engaged subject matter specialists in whole statistical production process; - Number of competent in-house trainers in survey methodology 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - New survey methodology introduced and adopted ; - Cooperation and knowledge exchange within departments and	2. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE - Strengthening confidence in statistical “know-how” by newly recruited staff; - Organisation of internal trainings in survey methodology in accordance to the needs of the BiH statistical institutions - Survey methodology development and application in statistical surveys for high quality statistical data; - Revised methodologies for continuous surveys in line with EU standards; - Solutions to overcome identified problems on existing surveys and improved treatment of specific problems INDICATORS: - Improved existing methods and implementation of new ones based on best practices of other NSIs;	3. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - Following of modern trends in statistical software solutions and reduction of expenses; - Reduction of time on data collection, processing and publishing; - Better quality of data; - Less dependence on externally financed projects INDICATORS: - Relevant high-quality statistical data published on time; - Less time needed for treatment of specific problems; - Implementation of trainings regarded to the needs identified by BiH statistical institutes	4. REACHING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS - Implementation of new surveys according to EU standards; - Improved efficiency of work, considering growing demands for new surveys and at the same time reducing the burden of reporting units; - Increased credibility of BiH statistical institutions and user confidence INDICATORS: - Comparable published statistical data; - Increased number of responses to the users' requests.

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	ASSESSMENT • Some training has been conducted – but difficult to judge whether staff is skilled and operational • 'Number of' is not an indicator: a number must be specified to measure progress! • Difficult to assess whether knowledge is now broader as a result of intervention – self-assessment by beneficiaries is positive	ASSESSMENT • New methods are being introduced as a result of intervention – difficult to assess quality • No quality indicators available to judge quality of statistics	ASSESSMENT • Difficult to assess – self-assessment of beneficiaries is positive • No less dependence on international assistance yet	ASSESSMENT • If indicator of comparability refers to international standards, it should provide a target measure of improvement • Self-assessment by beneficiaries on responses to user's requests not positive yet

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
Component 8: General capacity building (CB): Management.	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - missing INDICATORS: - missing 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) • Institutional framework for cooperation between the three GSI set up; • Exchange of experience with similar statistical systems and acceptance of good practice. INDICATORS: • Management activity plan; • Number of study visits.	2. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE • Cooperation improved (plan for meetings made, new ways of communication established by using IT technologies); • Organisational change in terms of new methods, approaches, tools. INDICATORS: • Meetings of directors; • Number of new methods.	3. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS • Timely access to relevant information in all statistical institutions; • Guidelines for realisation of gained knowledge and good practice created. INDICATORS: • Report for directors meetings (minutes); • Guideline agreed.	4. REACHING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS • Comprehensiveness of the planning process (users needs within statistical system met, as well as needs of external users); • Faster and easier decision making. INDICATORS: • Annual reports; • Publications; • Releases; • Progress reports.

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	ASSESSMENT • Management plan not produced yet – strategic and annual work-plans produced but not as result of project • 'Number of' is not an indicator: a number must be specified to measure progress! • Difficult to assess whether management capacity was built as a result of intervention – self-assessment by beneficiaries is uncertain	ASSESSMENT • Cooperation among three GSI has improved, according to self-assessment by beneficiaries • Meetings of directors per se is not an indicator of improvement in cooperation or management practices • 'Number of' is not an indicator: a number must be specified to measure progress!	ASSESSMENT • Difficult to assess – self-assessment of beneficiaries is variable depending on area • Guidelines on exchanges of data or information have not been agreed and produced	ASSESSMENT • Goals far from being achieved yet • Reports and documentation per se do not show progress – difficult to assess

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
Component 9: General capacity building: Human Resources Management (HRM).	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) • A proposal (draft) of a document for improvement of knowledge and abilities in management (top and middle) created; • Guidelines for training and development of personnel in statistical offices prepared. INDICATORS: • Plan for improvement of knowledge and abilities in management (governing); • Guidelines available. 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - missing INDICATORS: - missing	2. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE • Modern and applicable methods for HRM applied ; • Better insight (following) of HRM development. INDICATORS: • New method; • Number of trained personnel.	3. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS • Managing of HR more efficiently and more quality; • Better motivation and utilisation of personnel potentials. INDICATORS: • Periodical performance assessment; • Report on new and on improved surveys.	4. REACHING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS • Better utilisation of HR (personnel) potentials; • New statistical products and greater satisfactory of users INDICATORS: • Percentage of plan realisation ; • New publications.

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria			
	ASSESSMENT • Management plan not produced yet – some discussions held as result of project • No 'plan for improvement of knowledge' created • No guidelines created • Very little activity in this sub-component overall – very little progress • Self-assessment by beneficiaries in this areas is negative	ASSESSMENT • No new HRM method introduced yet as result of the project. New HRM development postponed beyond the scope of the current project. • 'Number of' is not an indicator: a number must be specified to measure progress!	ASSESSMENT • Difficult to assess – self-assessment of beneficiaries is still negative • Indicators for the desired outcomes in this case are misleading	ASSESSMENT • Goals difficult to assess • Goals are far from being achieved yet, according to self-assessment by beneficiaries • Indicators for the goals are misleading
Q2.1. Are the right activities carried out to bring about the desired outcomes?	Listed OUTPUTS	Our assessment on ACTIVITIES listed in Project Progress Reports		

Questions		Indicators/ Judgement criteria
Component LFS.	1. 1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Trained staff: LFS methodologists; enumerators and IT specialists 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - Activity plan for conducting continuous LFS produced	- Activities are generally well targeted to the expected output - Slow pace of activities due to project management and intervening Population Census - Desired outcomes still difficult to reach within project time horizon
Component LCS.	2. 1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Trained LCS staff 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - Publications on LCS - Improved survey instruments (questionnaires, methodology, non-response treatment, etc.).	- Activities are generally well targeted to the expected output - Very slow pace of activities due to project management and intervening Population Census - Desired outcomes may be difficult to reach within project time horizon

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria	
Component 3. Water statistics.	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Trained staff for water statistics development 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - Revised questionnaire, guidelines and methodology on water statistics.	- Activities are generally well targeted to the expected output - Slow progress toward desired outcome due to lack of engagement and understanding and low capacity - Desired outcomes may be difficult to reach within project time horizon
Component 4. Waste statistics.	1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) Improved questionnaire and clarified guidelines for the survey on waste management	- Activities are generally well targeted to the expected output - Slow progress toward desired outcome due to lack of engagement and understanding and low capacity - Desired outcomes may be difficult to reach within project time horizon
Component 5. Green-house Gas Emission (GGE) statistics.	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) Knowledge on use of IPCC guidelines and software for calculating GGE from waste sector 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - missing	- Activities are somehow targeted to the expected output - Slow progress toward desired outcome due to lack of engagement and low capacity - Desired outcomes out of reach within project time horizon

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria	
Component 6. Environment Protection Expenditures (EPE).	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Knowledge on analysis methods for the EPE statistics 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - missing	- Activities are somehow targeted to the expected output - Slow progress toward desired outcome due to lack of engagement and low capacity - Desired outcomes out of reach within project time horizon

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria	
Component 7. Statistical methodology (SM).	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - Well trained staff on implementation of every single survey phase (methodology, sampling, collection, processing and checking data in new surveys); - Trained in-house trainers in statistical survey methodology 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - New survey methodology introduced and adopted ; - Cooperation and knowledge exchange within departments and between statistical institutions; - Broadened knowledge on treatment of specific issues relevant to surveys and/or to the BiH situation, like treatment of non-responses and data editing in business surveys, calculation of the quality indicators.	- Activities are generally well targeted to the expected output - Progress toward desired outcome slower than planned due to project management and intervening Population Census - Desired outcomes may be within reach within project time horizon

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria	
Component 8: General capacity building (CB): Management.	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) - missing 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) • Institutional framework for cooperation between the three GSI set up; • Exchange of experience with similar statistical systems and acceptance of good practice.	• Activities are not well targeted to the expected output • Slow progress toward desired outcome due to lack of engagement of beneficiaries • Desired outcomes may be difficult to reach within project time horizon.

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria	
Component 9: General capacity building: Human Resources Management (HRM).	1A. INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES (LEARNING) • A proposal (draft) of a document for improvement of knowledge and abilities in management (top and middle) created; • Guidelines for training and development of personnel in statistical offices prepared. 1B. INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS (PRODUCTION) - missing	• Activities are not well targeted to the expected output • Slow progress toward desired outcome due to lack of engagement of beneficiaries • Desired outcomes may be difficult to reach within project time horizon.
Q2.3. With respect to the programme context concerning the uncertainty surrounding Census preparations, and elapsed time, is the PIS-3 project on track to achieve its stated objectives, both for various components and as a whole?	[Indicate for each components whether on track]	
Component 1. LFS.	Not on track, for technical reasons independent of Census implementation as well as organizational and staff reasons due to Census implementation	
Component 2. LCS.	Somehow on track, for technical reasons independent of Census implementation	
Component 3. Water statistics.	Somehow on track, for technical and organisational reasons independent of Census implementation	
Component 4. Waste statistics.	Somehow on track, for technical and organisational reasons independent of Census implementation	

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria
Component 5. Green-house Gas Emission (GGE) statistics.	Not on track, for other reasons independent of Census implementation
Component 6. Environment Protection Expenditures (EPE).	Not on track, for other reasons independent of Census implementation
Component 7. Statistical methodology (SM).	Not on track, mostly due to Census implementation
Component 8: General capacity building (CB): Management.	Not on track, for various reasons, some of which independent of Census implementation
Component 9: General capacity building: Human Resources Management (HRM).	Not on track, for various reasons, some of which independent of Census implementation
Q2.4. If not, are there immediate lessons learned to be applied?	The project is generally behind on its work plan, mostly because: – switch to continuous LFS (component 1) is way behind for technical and financial reasons – need to revise final goals – stable implementation of LCS (component 2) will require time - goals may be within reach – Components 3 and 4 (water and waste statistics) are somehow in line with desired objectives – goals within reach – Components 5 and 6 (GGE and EPE) have not been completely owned by beneficiaries – need revise goals – activities on SM need to be better targeted in terms of beneficiary recipients – enhance goals – Components 8 and 9 have not been sufficiently engaging for beneficiaries – need revise goals
Impact	

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria
Q3.1. Are the long-term effects of the PIS-3 project on society as a whole, planned and unplanned, positive and negative?	Self-assessment by beneficiaries – staff members and management in the three GSI - and feedback from some stakeholders (e.g. Directorate for Economic Planning) and international donor community (Danish Statistics and EC) is positive
Q3.2. What observable measures or indicators can be identified (to evaluate impact)?	Good indicator of impact will be the perceived utility of labour statistics and environmental statistics by data users. Unfortunately, no baseline data available to measure impact.
Q3.3. What has been the quality of the statistics produced and how has it been used?	Difficult to assess. Need full-fledged review.
Sustainability	
Q4.1. Are the PIS-3 project outcomes and activities targeted to those outcomes likely to continue after the program has finished?	It depends on the component – switch to continuous LFS (component 1) will need more assistance; – stable implementation of LCS (component 2) may be sustainable; – Components 3 and 4 (water and waste statistics) may be sustainable; – Components 5 and 6 (GGE and EPE) will definitely need more assistance; – Improvements in SM may be sustainable but will need more assistance in specialised topics – Components 8 and 9 will need more assistance.
Q4.2. Are the Statistics Offices able to continue develop their organisations and their activities?	In some areas they are, in some others (see above) they are likely to request for more assistance.
Organizational learning	
Q5.1. What lessons could be learned for the current and future programs?	
a) For the current PIS-3 project:	

Questions	Indicators/ Judgement criteria
Q5.2. which aspects could be adjusted or dropped?	– Activities for Components 5 and 6 (GGE and EPE) could be dropped and left for future projects; – Activities for Component 9 (HRM) could be dropped and left for future projects. – Trainee programme should be extended in expectation of bridging employment status.
Q5.3. Should new components be considered (e.g. dissemination regarding Census, etc.) and if so can the project still remain within its stated overall objectives?	– There does not seem to be scope for new components – Project should be extended to comply with existing objectives.
b) For a future programme:	
Q5.4. should a future program focussing on social statistics/demographic analysis be considered by Sida if the new Strategy gives room for it?	Possibly, as that area has not been addressed neither by this PIS-3 nor by the previous project phases.
Q5.5. Can SCB continue as a long term partner to national statistics in this respect?	Possibly.





Mid-term Review of Support to Partnership in Statistics in BiH Phase 3

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

