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I. **Executive Summary of the Evaluation**

a. **Evaluation Process**

The external evaluation is conducted as one of the activities planned by the project for the end of the third phase (2013-2014) in order to achieve an independent, external assessment of the performance as well as to present findings and to provide recommendations for the next phase of the project for the period 2015 – 2017 reflected against the objectives of the project and the goals set for the Finland’s development cooperation as well as the development needs and priorities of Macedonia in the context of multiculturalism and democracy.

This evaluation represents participative process of selecting external evaluator and creation of Terms of Reference for the evaluation involving all relevant stakeholders.

The evaluation was conducted in the period March – July 2015 with applied participatory approach including series document review, key informant interviews, group interviews, and surveys with implementers, project participants and other relevant stakeholders. Progres Institute for Social Democracy provided complete technical and logistical support in planning and implementation of activities of this evaluation.

b. **Achievement of objectives**

For the period of implementation covered with this evaluation report the project managed to:

- Contributed to the *strengthening multiethnic democracy and stability in Macedonia*;
- Increased self-motivated inter-ethnic cooperation between political and NGO activists to a high level;
- Changed knowledge and skills of beneficiaries and change of attitude was achieved to high extent with the Junior Trainers attending the ToT training series whereas for the others although the level of tolerance is relatively high there was no baseline data that allows objective attribution of the findings to the evaluated intervention;
  - Empowered and encouraged, to a high extent, civil society actors of different ethnicity on local and national level to cooperate;
  - Disseminated knowledge and raised awareness about inter-ethnic relations to a high extent;
  - Founded the Platform for Multiculturalism consisted of youth clubs of political parties and civil society organizations (11 entities) as a hub that will lead the process of institutionalizing the efforts to achieve the project and overall objectives.

c. **Relevance of the project idea**

This new phase of the project, capitalizing on the experience and on lessons learnt from the previous phase of implementation in the period 2010 - 2012, targets the need for strengthening the multiculturalism and the democratic processes in multiethnic Macedonia which is a deeply politicized and divided society. Also, the project is in line with the overall Finland’s Development Policy Program and the specific Development policy Program for the Western Balkans. With Macedonia facing its biggest political crisis since the conflict in 2001
and with stalled EU and NATO integrations the project is even more relevant then during its beginnings.

d. Sustainability and complementary approach

The applied re-design, allowing more long-term interventions and focused and institutionalized approach of the intervention, have significantly increased the sustainability prospects of the evaluated project intervention. The revised selection process have increased the ownership and dedication of beneficiaries, however the chronic lack of funding and high level of donor dependence are significant threat for the upcoming period both for the Platform for Multiculturalism and for PI as well.

e. Lessons Learnt

The mistrust amongst civil society organizations and political parties have further increased and aiming at obtaining representative and inclusive Platform, these relations amongst the two key stakeholders needs careful management that will effectively transform this relation from competition to cooperation for the benefit of all. Small success stories originating from the project may be the best possible motivating factor.

Support of systematic and more long-term processes provides larger impact of the interventions as well as increased possibilities to sustain the achievements. As well, one-off events proved to be more beneficial in raising awareness and establishing adequate links and communication but their effects are fading out as the time of intervention is further away.

f. Key Recommendations

► To focus on continued strengthening and promotion of the Platform for Multiculturalism;
► To continue the promotion and engagement of in-house capacities for support and for implementation of activities under the project. That would include both increasing capacities of Progres Institute for Social Democracy to provide backstopping support to the Platform for Multiculturalism and for the project to provide opportunities for further development of the human resources developed through previous phases;
► Additional financial and technical support for the projects and initiatives that are product of the training sessions and workshops;
► Ensure adequate representation of smaller ethnic communities in all events through promotional activities that will increase the interest of targeted ethnic groups and through proactive recruitment processes;
► Investigate possibilities for more long-term multiethnic initiatives through support of initiatives for new or existing formal (i.e. Committees on Inter – Community Relations) and informal bodies that promote political and intercultural dialogue on all levels (Youth Councils on municipal level);
► Consider inclusion of other relevant political parties in activities related to intercultural and political dialogue (including the new political parties and movements emerging from the ongoing political crisis);
► Establish cooperation with similar networks in the region;
► To continue to provide support to variety of concrete inter-ethnic activities; and
► Provide possibilities for interested alumni to further develop their capacity for the benefit of all.
1. Introduction

1.1 Implementing Organisations/Partners

The project Supporting Democracy in Multi-Ethnic Macedonia – Dialogue and Cooperation was coordinated and monitored by Kalevi Sorsa Foundation. The project was implemented in close cooperation and dialogue with the main implementing partner the Progres Institute for Social Democracy and support provided by Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Office Macedonia.

*Kalevi Sorsa Foundation*

The Kalevi Sorsa Foundation is a Finnish independent and open social democratic think tank. The Foundation’s aim is to encourage public debate that promotes equality and democracy as well as produce its own research and publications. It aims to offer relevant information for public debate, policy preparations and political decision-making.

*Progres Institute for Social Democracy*

The Progress Institute is a political institute, established as a think tank, promoting social-democratic values in Macedonia by helping the local social-democratic parties to create, implement and promote their policies. The institute offers trainings, organizes seminars and conferences, creates policy papers and conducts research. The aim of these activities is to strengthen the capacity of the Macedonian social democrats to create, implement and promote their programs and policies. The Progress Institute is encouraging the international cooperation among the fellow foreign organizations and parties by exchanging experience, knowledge and experts.

*Friedrich Ebert Stiftung*

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung is a German private, independent association, which was founded in 1925 to support political education in the spirit of democracy and pluralism, to assist gifted young persons to perform their academic career independent from their parent’s income, to contribute to international rapprochement and cooperation. Today, worldwide support to Democracy and Development, to contribute to peace and security, to make globalization more solidary and to foster the enlargement and deepening of the European Union – these are the guidelines of FES’ international engagement. FES maintains offices 70 countries of Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. Another 33 FES-offices do exist in countries of Western Europe, Central and South-East Europe, the CIS countries and also in the USA and Japan. In the reform states in the eastern part of Europe, the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung is involved in supporting the process of democratization, the transition to a market economy and the establishment of a civil society, in particular in the fields of labour market, social, environmental and media policies. It supports these countries in the process of accession to the EU. It cooperates in this process with partners from various societal groups and organizations, such as trade unions, political parties, educational and research institutions, public administrations, and also city and local governments.

More details are available at the attached Annex 1 – Project Partners.

1.2 Project Background

Macedonia became an independent state following the referendum for independence from former Yugoslavia in 1991. Since then, Macedonia went through numerous challenges and
several crises that required active involvement of the international community in order to be solved. After 24 years from Macedonia declared independence, solid majority (64% of the population) claims that their life was better in Yugoslavia.

In October 1992 the Republic of Macedonia appoints its representative in Brussels. Following the Interim Accord related to the name dispute with Greece, Macedonia established diplomatic relations with EU in December 1995 under the temporary name: The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The interethnic conflicts in former Yugoslavia that started in the early 90's continued in 1998 in the southern Serbian province of Kosovo and Metohija with the conflict between the Serbian security forces and Albanian guerilla from Kosovo. Intensified clashes in 1999 and NATO intervention resulted with close to 400,000 refugees from Kosovo that found shelter in Macedonia. Nearing 20% of the total population of Macedonia this refugee crisis was managed with large support from the international community. Following the entrance of NATO forces in Kosovo, vast majority of the refugees returned to Kosovo with exception of couple of thousands Roma refugees that refused to return due to security reasons.

Macedonia is a multiethnic society. The interethnic relations were stabile and the country was referred to as the “Oasis of Peace” in the 90's. However, only two years after the war in Kosovo, Macedonia experienced a conflict that brought the country at the brink of civil war. The armed conflict between the Macedonian security forces and the so-called National Liberation Army (consisted of ethnic Albanians) that began in March 2001 was prevented by the western-backed peace agreement (Ohrid Framework Agreement – OFA) signed in Ohrid in August 2001. The third basic principle of OFA was: The multi-ethnic character of Macedonia’s society must be preserved and reflected in public life. Essentially, aside from preventing the large scale civil war, OFA mechanisms that prevent majorization (outvoting) on central and local levels if governance. However, 14 years after signing of the OFA, critics over some of the solutions (now embedded in the Constitution) offered as well as different views on its implementation and effects are across the political party and ethnic spectrums.

Macedonia continues to pursue membership and EU (European Union) and NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization). Thus far, due to effective blockage by Greece over the name dispute, all efforts are unsuccessful. In February 2004 the “Declaration on the Application for EU membership" was signed by the Macedonian parliament and on 17 December 2005 the European Council in Brussels approved the candidate status. In October 2009 the European Commission has recommended start of the accession negotiations for full-fledged membership of the Republic of Macedonia. On 10 October 2012, in its report, the Commission recommended the opening of accession negotiations to accelerate reforms in the country in favor to a quick resolution of the dispute over the name with Greece under the auspices of the Commission.

The accession of Republic of Macedonia to NATO is, as well, pending. NATO’s invitation for Macedonia to become member was blocked by Greece at the NATO Bucharest Summit in 2008. As result Macedonia in November 2008 instituted proceedings against Greece infront of the International Court of Justice for "a flagrant violation of Greece’s obligations under Article 11 of the Interim Accord signed by the Parties on 13 September 1995". The alleged violation was referring to the Macedonia’s bid for NATO membership. The Court delivered its judgement on 5 December 2011 In its judgment, which is final, without possibility for appeal, and binding on the parties, the ICJ found that: the Hellenic Republic, by objecting to the admission of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to NATO, has breached its obligation under Article 11, paragraph 1, of the Interim Accord of 13 September 1995.

1 Survey of Macedonian Public Opinion, June 06-15 conducted by Brima on behalf of IRI
However, both EU and NATO remained on their positions that Macedonia will be granted membership once a mutually acceptable solution for the name dispute is fined and accepted by both Macedonia and Greece. This effective stalemate creates challenges on multiple levels. The support for EU and NATO membership, declined but according to relevant polls it is still above 80%. The economic growth is limited and direct foreign investments were on lowest level in the region in 2013 and further decreased in the first half of 2014. Lastly, the accession stalemate results with increased ethnic tensions amongst two largest ethnic communities (Macedonian and Albanian) due to the fact the Albanians in Macedonia almost unanimously support EU and NATO accession whereas the support amongst Macedonians after 2008 is in significant decline.

Macedonia is a deeply politicized and partisan society where there is no tradition of political tolerance and dialogue even amongst coalition partners. The unsuccessful Census from 2011 is one of the indicators in support of this statement. According to relevant polls, discrimination based on political party affiliation is the most frequent form of discrimination. During the project period there were elections on all levels. In 2013, the local elections took place whereas in 2014 Macedonia went on yet another early parliamentary elections and regular Presidential elections. All three elections were won by the governmental parties (VMRO DPMNE and DUI). However, the results from the last Parliamentary elections were not recognized by the opposition which refused to accept their mandates in the Parliaments till date accusing ruling parties for widespread irregularities. From the beginning of 2015, the opposition started to publish audio materials of alleged fraudulent and criminal behaviour of high governmental officials including the Prime Minister. This together with some unpopular legislative solutions passed by the Parliament caused series of protests against the government but also rallies that were in favour of the Governmental policies. It is interesting that for the first time there was a widespread civic mobilization across ethnic lines which resulted with significant relaxation of the inter-ethnic relations. The policy intervention against the insurgents in Kumanovo with casualties on both sides threatened to deteriorate the positive trend in the interethnic relations, however that proved not to be the case. The opposition required immediate resignations and temporary Government that will organize yet another early Parliamentary election, whereas the ruling party accused SDSM and their leader Zaev for attempted Coup. The agreement between the position and opposition was brokered with facilitation provided by EU and USA representatives and includes election of special prosecutor that will prosecute the allegations published by the opposition, technical Government from the beginning of 2016 and early Parliamentary elections on 24 April 2016.

1.3 Project Objectives

The project operated nationally to achieve a Hierarchy of objectives that are shown in the diagram below.
1.4 Financial Overview of the Project

The total spending during the project period was 231,429.13EUR provided as follows:

- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland: 189,691 EUR
- Kalevi Sorsa Foundation: 33,474 EUR
- Fridrich Ebert Stiftung: 8,263.13 EUR

1.5 Purpose of the Evaluation Report

The purpose of the evaluation is to achieve an independent and external assessment of the performance of the project Supporting Democracy in Multi-ethnic Macedonia – Dialogue and cooperation, reflected against the objectives of the project and the goals set for the Finland’s development cooperation as well as the development needs and priorities of Macedonia in the context of multiculturalism and democracy.

The intended clients of the evaluation are Progres Institute for Social Democracy and Kalevi Sorsa Foundation.

1.6 Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation was focused on the project level and therefore it assessed the performance of the project.

The two-year project Supporting Democracy in Multi-ethnic Macedonia – Dialogue and Cooperation is evaluated in full including all the project activities organised in the period 2013-2014. The evaluation studies the purpose, objectives, implemented activities, achievements and resources of the project, and assess the findings in the contexts of 1) logical framework of the project, 2) policy framework (Finland, Macedonia) as well as 3) similar projects focusing on democracy support and multiculturalism in Macedonia.

Material of the evaluation consists of the documents produced in the framework of the project, including project and action plans, reports, concepts of activities, training material and other relevant documents as well as interviews of organisers and participants of the
project and other relevant stakeholders.

The evaluation covered the period March – July 2015 and included:

- Finalization of the Terms of Reference for the evaluation;
- Review of relevant project documentation;
- Interviews with key project personnel;
- Preparation of Inception Report;
- Group Interview with alumni trainers (founders of CSO Equal);
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with stakeholders;
- Development of questionnaires for surveys;
- Survey with participants of events organized by the project;
- Survey with trainers, trained through the ToT programs in 2010 and 2013;
- Analysis of other relevant documentation (legislation, strategy papers, surveys, reports etc.);
- Preparation of Draft Report; and
- Preparation of Final Report.
2. Evaluation Profile - Evaluation Methods and Tools

2.1 Reasons for the Evaluation

The external evaluation of the project Supporting Democracy in Multi-Ethnic Macedonia – Dialogue and Cooperation is planned with the project document for the end of the project phase, aiming at providing analysis of the project implementation and to be able to develop durable plans for the following activities aimed at increasing the sustainability of the interventions to date. The results of the evaluations may as well be utilized as lessons learnt by project partners in development of future programs and initiatives.

2.2 Objectives of the Evaluation

The main objective of the evaluation is to achieve understanding of the value and validity of concept and results of the project. The evaluation will help implementing organisations to:

- identify lessons learnt;
- improve the approach and implementation of the activities in terms of responding to the needs of beneficiaries effectively;
- improve follow-up actions of the project activities and measurement of achieved objectives; and
- gain tools for future planning.

2.3 Evaluation Issues

The project is evaluated against the following criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability.

The evaluation also reflects, respectively, to the following questions: How the project has addressed the cross-cutting issues of the Finnish development policy, i.e. gender equality, most vulnerable groups and human rights and democracy?

2.4 Evaluation Plan

Please find the detailed evaluation plan as part of the Inception Report attached as Annex 3. Due to the political developments the process of gathering data was prolonged which consequently delayed the preparation of the draft and final reports.

2.5 Evaluation Methods

The Evaluator applied participatory, gender-sensitive, ethnically balanced and result-oriented approach.

The proposed methodology of the evaluation is designed to meet the requirements set for this particular evaluation. This approach is considered appropriate for identifying results attributable to the evaluated project and for achieving all objectives of the evaluation.

Participatory Approach

Following measures were undertaken to ensure a optimum level of stakeholder involvement in the evaluation:
Key Informant Interviews with: Project Coordinators, President of Progress Institute have provided first hand information about the project planning, implementation and institutional perspectives on the evaluated intervention;

- Individual interviews with participants, trainers and consultants;
- Interview with Friedrich Ebert Stiftung representative;
- Survey with Trainers from the Training of Trainers program in 2013 and alumni Trainers from 2010.
- Survey with participants of multicultural events and initiatives.

Gender-sensitive Approach
In all of the undertaken activities maximum efforts were made to provide gender balance that is shown with the breakdown provided below:

Key Informant Interviews: 4 Female and 9 Male
Group Interview with Trainers: 1 Female and 1 Male
Survey with Trainers: 9 Female and 7 Male
Survey with participants at multicultural events and initiatives: 22 Female and 36 Male

Ethnic Balance
Biggest challenge of the project at this phase of the implementation was to provide continued participation of ethnic groups other then Macedonians. Having that in mind effort was made to include participants from different ethnic groups, in the process of data gathering, as many as possible.

In the KIIs, 2 Albanians and 1 Bosniac were interviewed.
In survey 1 (multicultural events and initiatives), 28.07% feedback was provided from participants from ethnic groups other then Macedonian (Albanian, Turkish, Roma, Vlach and Bosniac).
In Survey 2 (participants at ToT training series 2013 and 2010), 18.75% of trainers providing feedback were Roma and Bosniac.

Result-oriented Approach
The evaluation examined the achievements of the project, the relevance of the activities undertaken, the appropriateness of the design as well as sustainability of the interventions and possibility for replicating the applied model.

The conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation focus on program level, particularly on the objectives and the future possibilities for intervention in the same field of work.

Methodology
The methodology of the evaluation was designed to meet the requirements set out in terms of reference. The approach is considered appropriate for identifying results attributable to the project Supporting Democracy in Multi-Ethnic Macedonia – Dialogue and Cooperation.

The evaluation includes following methods of data collection:
- Document review and analysis
  Project documentation from the application period as well as complete documentation developed during the implementation of the activities of the project (including: activity reports, annual reports, financial and audit reports, action plans, concept of the activities, training material etc.);
- Analysis of relevant documentation (strategy papers, reports, legislation, action plans, surveys, researches etc.);

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):
- Project Coordinators (4 Interviews);
- Representatives from Progres Institute for Social Democracy and Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Office in Skopje (3 Interviews).
- Key projects stakeholders (9 Interviews) with:
  o Members of the multicultural platform (political parties and CSOs);
  o Trainers;

Group interview with founders of CSO Equal (members of the alumni ToT 2010)

Surveys with direct beneficiaries using a structured questionnaire (with predominantly closed-ended questions):

- Participants of the activities organized by Trainers trained through the ToT component of the project and Participants of the Workshop series Power and Responsibility – Democracy and Civic Activism; and
- Trainers that participated the ToT programs in 2013 and 2010.
3. Summary of Results

Achievements analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations

3.1 Objectives

The overall objective of the project was:

*To strengthen multiethnic democracy and stability in Macedonia*

With successfully implemented activities together with achieved immediate objectives and achievement of project objective to a high level, implementers contributed to the overall objective of the project.

The two project (specific) objectives were set as follows:

*Project Objective 1: Increased self-motivated inter-ethnic cooperation between political and NGO activists*

*Indicator: Number and form of interethnic activities*

**Findings of the evaluation:**

In the period covered with the evaluation and following the adjustments made in the design of the intervention, the project managed to implement, support and motivate numerous inter-ethnic activities enabling direct cooperation between political and NGO activists as well as interested individuals. More specifically the portfolio included the following activities with participants from different ethnic background:

- Workshop series (4 weekend trainings)
- Study Circles (5 study circles on local level)
- Follow up workshop for interested participants from the workshop series (1 workshop)
- Interethic trainings organized by Junior Trainers (5 trainings)
- Workshop on civic activism organized by the alumni of workshop series 2013 (1 workshop)
- Roundtable discussions organized by Junior Trainers (3 roundtables)
- Capacity Building Trainings for Coordinators of the Platform for Multiculturalism (2 trainings)
- Interethic trainings organized by the Platform for Multiculturalism (4 trainings)
- Training of Trainers series for the trainees from 2013 (5 trainings)
- Advanced Training for the Junior Trainers from 2010 and 2013 (1 training)

In total, 31 activities in 8 different forms were conducted directly involving 375 participants from different ethnic background (Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, Roma, Bosniaks and Vlach). The only exception was the ToT 2013 that didn’t manage to obtain ethnic diversity amongst trainees. The project, as well, obtained gender balance and balanced representation of members of political parties and CSOs.

Indirectly, the project had wider impact. The surveys conducted with participants at the organized events have shown that over 50% of the participants talked often and very often
about event topics with their family members and over 70% with their friends.

Furthermore, close to 58% of participants have discussed event’s topics with their colleagues and over 62% did the same with people of different religious and/or ethnic background.

In terms of the extended outreach, 66% of the respondents stated that they have talked to more than 5 people about the topics covered on the respective event/s they attended.

Interviewed members from CSOs are confident that they can influence and prioritize in their organizations the values and objective promoted by the project. On the other side the responses of interviewees from the political parties asked to position their level on influence (on a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 is no influence and 10 is joint decision making) over the policies of their respective parties varied from 4 to 7, but were overall optimistic in their lobbying capacities.

There were 9 Facebook groups created to enhance the communication and cooperation.

Conclusions:

- Project Objective 1 was achieved to a high level.
- The Project implemented various types of activities and managed to directly involve high number of participants from different ethnic groups.
- The cooperation was self-motivated which was provided with the establishment of selection criteria for participants as well as with the organized and mentored follow
Participants have significantly increased the outreach through communication with their families, friends and colleagues.
The events motivated participants to discuss the topics with citizens from other ethnic or religious background.

Recommendations:

► To continue to provide support to variety of concrete inter-ethnic activities.
► Whenever possible activities to be conducted by the alumni of the project or by members of the Platform.
► To ensure adequate ethnic representation through proactive approach in recruitment of participants.3
► Establish mechanisms for coordination and consultations with trainers and experts engaged in these activities. Inclusion of joint introductory and coordinative meetings with trainers/consultants prior beginning of the training/workshop series with presentation of the objectives and plans for the entire program, in addition to the already established mechanisms for reporting and consultation, is expected further improve their input and the effectiveness of the entire intervention.
► Explore possibilities for establishing systemic, institutionally4 supported mechanisms for promoting inter-ethnic cooperation. Some of these may include:
  o inclusion of multiculturalism as non-formal education in the primary and secondary schools;
  o implementation of multicultural activities and events in kindergartens;
  o establishing cooperation on program level with:
    ▪ established Committees on Inter-Community Relations in multiethnic municipalities; and
    ▪ established Youth Councils in municipalities throughout Macedonia.

Project Objective 2: Changed attitudes of participants
Indicator: Reduced prejudices and social distance

Findings of the evaluation:

Project Objective 2 is very difficult to be measured. The indicator is set on an impact level and with this performance evaluation it was possible to identify trends in the attitude of participants at events and amongst Junior Trainers and to provide objective analysis of the data provided through conducted surveys.

The limitation of this analysis is in the absence of matching group (to the treated group) that would have been analyzed in order for the eventual differences to be attributed to the evaluated intervention with higher degree of certainty.

Questionnaire that serves as a tool to measure change in attitudes of participants of the

3 For example: promotional activities amongst students in SEE university and State University of Tetovo to increase the interest amongst students with Albanian ethnic background; inclusion of CSOs in the recruitment process; field campaign in municipalities of interest (Shuto Orizari for Roma participants; Gostivar, Radovis and Vrapiče for Turkish, Kumanovo for Serbian); free media coverage; new media etc.
4 For example: Ministry of education/bureau for development of education (schools); Ministry of Labor and Social Policy (kindergartens); Municipalities (Committees for Inter-Community Relations – CICR and Youth Councils), etc.
project activities was developed by the project in cooperation with Petar Atanasov, Professor of Multiculturalism at the Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje. The respondents (Junior Trainers) have responded twice, in 2013 and 2014. Although it is very short period to measure the change of attitude on the question the project reported the following:

“As indicator of real tolerance the opinion regarding acceptance of inter-ethnic marriages was taken. When first time measured (before TOT modules began), 80 % of the participants agreed with the statement The husband and wife need to be from same ethnicity, and 20 % didn't have opinion on this. After 12 months the answers more or less the same, when 70 % agreed with the statement and 30 % disagreed.
The reason why there were only slight changes of attitudes are related to the fact that group of participants wasn't intercultural due to the lack of minority participants. There was not really inter-ethnic communication, and getting to know - element with people from different ethnic groups.”

The evaluator repeated the question to the ToT attendees (Junior Trainers) and participants at initiatives and got the following results:

There is huge positive difference amongst Junior Trainers (from the survey in 2014) and also high percentage amongst participants at different initiatives.

The surveys included question regarding communication with other ethnic and religious groups and for the following results.

These results, together with charts 9 and 10 related to opinions on marriages where spouses belong to different religion, can be used as baseline for the next phase of the project.
Conclusions:

- The project intervention has made positive changes in the attitudes of participants.
- Through combining the results of this evaluation and of the questionnaire developed by the implementers it can be concluded with high probability that changes of the attitude amongst ToT participants (Junior Trainers) have been significantly influenced by the project.
- The respondents in the survey have shown high level of awareness and tolerance for other ethnic and religious groups.
- Participants that have been involved for a longer period and in multiple actions are more tolerant than others.

Recommendations

- The implementers should pose this question (related to mix marriages) to the same participants in 2016 and they should be also part of the evaluation in 2018. This would enable identification of trends that can be objectively attributable to project.
- Practice should be established for inclusion of the alumni from previous phases of the project implementation. This may include providing opportunities for further capacity building; providing support to them in development and implementation of specific activities targeting multicultural issues; participation at events organized by the Platform and by PI; study visits etc.
- Results presented in this evaluation should be used as baseline for further monitoring of eventual change of attitudes of participants and their level of tolerance.
- The survey of the treatment group should allow in-depth analysis of not only the level of social tolerance for other groups but also specific attitudes towards them. The results of those can be used by the Platform and by the implementers in planning future activities tackling specific findings of the survey.

Following Intermediate Objectives (results) were set for achievement of the objectives:

**Intermediate Objective 1:** Empower and encourage civil society actors of different ethnicity on local and national level to cooperate.

Planned activities:
- Capacity building workshops for young political and NGO activists from different ethnic groups.
Study circles were the main planned activities contributing to the achievement of this Immediate Objective.

Findings of the evaluation:

In 2013 an interactive workshop series titled Influence and Responsibility – Democracy and Civic Activism took place. The total of 4 workshops (2 weekend workshops conducted twice) was attended by 45 participants selected through an open and transparent selection process. The number of participants was bigger than initially planned 40 participants, due to the high level of interest for participation at the workshop series. From the selected participants from both youth clubs of political parties and NGOs 26.66% were representatives from ethnic groups other than Macedonians (Albanians 24.44% and Turks 2.22%) whereas the gender balance was almost completely achieved with 53.33% female and 46.67% male participants.

Between the two workshops, groups were created with appointed coordinators to implement the study circles. In total 6 groups were formed, of which, 4 reported activities through meetings of the group whereas one group managed to meet online and only one of the groups have not conducted the planned activity. Experiences amongst participants at the study circles are different and vary from proactive individuals through less active to those that did not partook in the study circles. The appointed coordinators of each study circle as well as other members were encouraged to expand the group to those interested to participate but have not participated in the first workshop. This opportunity was utilized and eventually resulted with increased number of participants in the implemented study circles.

Although significantly decreased from the previous phase of the project implementation there were isolated cases of dropouts between the workshops and also, the implementers were able to take on board new participants that have not participated in the first workshop but were included in the respective study circles.

Aimed at providing further assistance and motivate participant a 3rd meeting was organized in September 2013 which was focused on follow up of the activities implemented earlier (May – June 2013) and to explore prospects for future increased civic activism and cooperation with PI. Unfortunately, from the 12 registered participants only 3 attended the meeting.

Following the lessons learnt from the previous phase of the implementation (2010 – 2012), adjustments were made for 2014. Instead of multicultural trainings organized by the project, support was provided for multicultural initiatives and small scale projects conducted by young activists (ToT and Workshop alumni from 2013 and 2010).

This cluster of events titled Multicultural Initiatives of Young Activists have included 5 local level trainings in multiculturalism, 3 round table discussions and activities conducted by the Alumni from the ToT programs 2010 and 2013 as well as the workshop implemented by the alumni from the workshop series Influence and Responsibility – Democracy and Civic Activism in 2013.

These 9 events have involved total of 182 participants:

Gender: 48.35% female; 51.65 male
Ethnicity: 81.32% Macedonians; 14.29% Albanians; 3.30% Roma and 0.55% Turks and Vlachs
Membership: 50.00% political parties; 42.86% CSO; 7.14% Individuals.

The survey posed questions related to the implemented training and initiatives and the
results are as follows:

![Chart 11: Initiatives](chart11.png)
![Chart 12: Junior Trainers](chart12.png)

![Chart 13: Initiatives](chart13.png)
![Chart 14: Junior Trainers](chart14.png)

Participant at events marked them as interactive, with good to excellent trainers and moderators. In terms of increased knowledge they resulted with the following:

![Chart 15: Junior Trainers](chart15.png)
![Chart 16: Initiatives](chart16.png)

Conclusions
The applied selection process has increased the level of interest amongst young civil society actors and commitment amongst selected participants.

Committed participants and careful preparation led to increased level of activities and effectiveness of the established study circles.

The appointed coordinators of the study circles were their driving force. However, the contribution of other members could have been better.

The applied changes in the design and the introduced new set of activities implemented in 2014 have significantly expanded the outreach.

Over 92% of participants have increased their knowledge either partially or substantially.

Conducted events have provided venue for vast majority participants to express their views and concerns on the selected topics.

The events have increased the motivation of participants to further increase their knowledge and skills in the areas of multiculturalism, democracy and civic activism.

Implemented activities, especially with the revised approach and design in year 2 have contributed to the achievement of the objective to high extent, however bigger participation of ethnic groups other than Macedonians would have further enhanced the effects.

Recommendations

► Continue with implementation of variety of activities and events led by alumni participants in the program under the auspices of the Platform for Multiculturalism.
► Focus on workshops and concrete initiatives rather than trainings.
► Provide small scale funding for local level initiatives.
► Provide mentoring and technical support to coordinators of local events.
► Proactive recruitment aimed at adequate outreach to different ethnic groups.
► Use the Platform for Multiculturalism as resource hub for backstopping support and timely information sharing.
► Provide materials to participants for further distribution aimed at increasing the outreach.
► Include participants at the events (alumni and new) in survey regarding their awareness, knowledge and skills, and attitudes related to multiculturalism.

Intermediate Objective 2: Disseminate knowledge and raise awareness about inter-ethnic relations

Planned Activities:
- Organise training and provide tools for 15 CSO activists to conduct multiplication and advocacy on inter-ethnic relations.
- Organise inter-ethnic training sessions for young CSO-activists.
- Gather network of activists and of CSOs to provide platform for mutual support and learning, cooperation on dissemination of knowledge and advocacy.
- Use social media to raise awareness and speak out against prejudice, stereotypes and violence.

Findings of the evaluation:

Aimed at increasing and transferring individual knowledge and skills as well as Progres’ institutional capacities for dialogue and cooperation in multi-ethnic society new generation of trainers was trained through this phase of the project.
Based on the experiences from the previous phase of the project, aside from again applying open and transparent procedure for selection of candidates, the implementer introduced strict criteria for obligatory participation throughout the process which resulted with 3 of the selected 14 candidates withdrawing from the program.

The selection process have resulted with significant balance in terms of gender (6 female and 5 male) representation and participation of members of political parties (3), NGOs (7) and 1 trainee participating as individual. However, there was only one trainee from ethnic group other than Macedonian (Turkish).

Selected trainees went through a training series of 4 modules (Module 1 – Training design, Module 2 – Multiculturalism (theory) Module 3 – Multiculturalism (practise), Module 4 – Advocacy and Lobbying and a practical final exam (delivery of training). Only one of the trainees has not completed the course, which reduced the number of Trainers from the second generation to 10.

According to the survey the knowledge (68%) and skills (75%) have been increased significantly. The overall level of satisfaction from the training program is very satisfied (87.5%).

Aimed at increasing the sustainability and efficiency of the intervention, the implementers have included the alumni trainers from the first generation (2010) and organized joint meeting and advanced training with the trainers from the 2013 ToT program. The advanced training was designed following the needs identification of the trainers aimed at strengthening their skills and capacities in designing and delivering an effective and comprehensive training course.

During the project period the alumni trainees have delivered 5 trainings and 3 round table discussions elaborated under previous immediate objective (intermediate objective 1).

In terms of their own satisfaction the responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>Partially satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solid 81.25% from the respondents in the survey has a plan or concrete possibility to continue delivering trainings in multiculturalism.

Conclusions:

➢ Structured and transparent selection process for trainees in the ToT program
resulted with informed and motivated participants in the program.

- The program did not ensure more diverse ethnic participation.
- The training series have extended the knowledge and skills of future Junior Trainers.
- Inclusion of alumni Junior Trainers (generation 2010) was beneficial for all stakeholders of the project (end beneficiaries, trainers and PI).
- Possibilities for organizing and delivering trainings and roundtable discussions were highly beneficial for Junior Trainers.
- There is need and motivation among trainers for further capacity building.
- The activities undertaken have contributed to achievement of this immediate objective to a high extent.

Recommendations

- Continue with capacity building support to Junior Trainers under the Platform for Multiculturalism. This would include both possibilities for attending and delivering trainings, as well as sharing materials and information.
- From the Junior Trainers, based on defined criteria, select individuals interested in becoming Senior Trainers and conduct tailor-made capacity building during 2015 and 2016 based on in-depth capacity and needs assessments.
- Training of Trainers modules in 2017 to be delivered predominantly by Senior Trainers developed through the program.
- Include both Junior and Senior Trainers in survey regarding their awareness, knowledge and skills, and attitudes related to multiculturalism.

Immediate Objective 3: Build network of civil society organisations and network of activists for inter-cultural dialogue.

Planned activities:
- Organise network meetings to exchange experiences and plan common awareness raising activities.
- Organise meetings for the members of the network of activists.
- Establish platform in social media where activists can easily discuss, exchange information and ideas.

Findings of the evaluation:

Originally, the implementers planned to create a network of CSOs that are actively working on inter-ethnic issues. However, due to lack of activism on their behalf the project in the initial stage focused on collaboration with youth clubs of political parties that are able to stimulate civic activism amongst the target group of the project. An assessment was made that establishment of such a platform for multiculturalism (the Platform) would be more beneficial for achievement of the overall and specific project objectives.

The Platform was created aiming at bringing together young members of different political parties and NGOs to discuss, to find common interests and to cooperate.

The founding members of the assembly are 7 youth clubs of the following political parties: SDSM (Social Democratic Union of Macedonia), NSDP (New Social Democratic Party), LDP (Liberal Democratic Party), DNET (Movement for National Unity of Turks), PEI (Party for European Future), PCER (Party for Complete Emancipation of Roma), Movement for Bosniacs in Macedonia. However, due to internal struggles and capacity issues most of the parties of ethnic minorities have not provided active participation. As well, in 2013 DUI failed
to provide participation at coordination meetings whereas VMRO DPMNE was not responding to the contacts related to possibilities for their involvement in the Platform.

The success and the sustainability of the Platform depend on its ability to attract different civil society actors and to be able to deliver to the target groups and to the Macedonian society in general. As such, the Platform in 2014 included 8 new organizations including active participation of DUI.

The platform members have agreed on operating mode of the Platform and during the project period have organized 2 capacity building workshops and 4 interethnic workshops with total of 122 participants. Implementers managed to obtain participation of close to 25% of ethnic groups other then Macedonians, almost balanced representation of political party and CSO representatives and close to 30% female participants. PI organized training in policy development for members of the Platform following which 3 policy papers were developed (by SDUM, NSDP and LDP) that brought additional quality to the platform aside from the original networking and cooperation component.

The Platform represents the biggest potential of the evaluated project intervention. As such, it has huge opportunities and significant threats. The Platform is foreseen as the hub for all of the activities generated through this project. However there are different views and expectations even amongst the founding members about how the entity should be structured in the future and what are the types of interventions the Platform should be involved into. Some members see the fast registration of legal entity is a key step forward supporting the sustainability by being eligible to apply for existing funding mechanisms and utilizing the fact that there is no such a representative body on national level working in the area of multiculturalism. Others (mainly representatives from political parties), highlighting the negative experiences of functioning of the National Youth Council of Macedonia are skeptical over the political agenda and domination of some CSOs represented in the Platform and as such are more prone to the informal existence and functioning. Also, during interviews some concerns were expressed that the Platform may overlap on municipal level with the Youth Councils that are either already created or are in the process of creation.

In addition to the unfavorable operating context including party animosities and nonexistent political dialogue, creating a joint vision and harmonizing the cooperation of political parties and CSOs within the Platform are the biggest challenges to be considered in the next phase of the project.

Conclusions:

- Implementers moved from the plan for creating a Network of CSOs towards establishment of the Platform for Multiculturalism that will include representatives of political party youth clubs and CSOs.
- The entire intervention is rightfully reshaped, positioning the Platform as the umbrella or the hub for the future initiatives and actions in the area of multiculturalism. This will potentially enable focused and sustainable interventions.
- There are joint interests but not yet joint vision on the future of the Platform.
- Both representatives from political parties and CSOs see challenges in their future cooperation but are positive that with careful planning and mutual respect they will overcome the challenges.
- The establishment of the Platform increases the advocacy potential and possibilities of members to influence policy creation and decision-making on all levels.
- The next phase of the project is critical for the sustainability of the platform and the entire intervention to date.
Recommendations

► Invite members to a one-day visioning session that will define the joint vision and scope of work as well as to develop the vision and the mission statements of the Platform. It is expected that this will increase the ownership amongst members and their motivation to actively contribute in this crucial phase for the development of the Platform.

► Development of inclusive criteria that will enable diverse membership, both from youth clubs of political parties and CSOs, aimed at strengthening the legitimacy and credibility of the Platform. Amongst other, the criteria may include support and adherence to the vision, mission and values of the Platform as well as their incorporation in member’s organizational and program documents.

► Development of flexible structure that will support transparent and participatory decision-making based on the principles of good governance and values of the Platform.

► Conduct in-depth capacity assessments for sustainable development of the Platform that will be followed by comprehensive and resourced capacity building plan. This could be incorporated in the transitional strategy for the period until the end of 2017 that will define PI’s roles and responsibilities in this process.

► Explore the establishment and functioning of the Committees on Inter-Community Relations (CICR\(^5\)) in targeted municipalities and create plan for cooperation. CICR are one of the institutional mechanisms potentially available to the Platform for affecting change at municipal level. In 2017, develop Strategic Plan for the Platform for the period 2018 – 2021 and separate Advocacy Strategy for the period 2018 – 2022.

► Develop integrated system for monitoring and evaluation of the Platform’s work based on objectives, results and indicators at strategic level. The system includes concrete methods used to measure the impact of the intervention and to incorporate the findings in the future planning processes (both on strategic and project level).

► Initiate regional cooperation with similar network aimed at exchange of experience, increased credibility as well as access to regional funding mechanisms.

\(^5\) The law on local self-government from 2002 obliges multiethnic municipalities with more than 20% of the population belonging to ethnic group other than majority to create the CICR in order to enhance the inter-ethnic cooperation and to improve the interethnic relations in general.
4. Overall Evaluation Issues
Relevance, Efficiency, Sustainability, Crosscutting Issues

4.1 Relevance

Macedonia is democracy in lasting transition, facing various and increasing problems in development of its democratic capacities and processes. Since declaring independence in 1991 Macedonia witnesses increasing political confrontations as well as intra and interethnic tensions and incidents of different proportions.

Macedonia is a multiethnic society. Following the failure of the Government to conduct the Census in 2011 the only relevant statistical data are the outdated ones from the controversial Census in 2002 according to which Macedonians are representing 64.2% of the population; Albanians 25.2% and other ethnic communities 10.6% (Turks, Roma, Serbian etc). Although being considered key in the stabilization of interethnic relations the critics of OFA are all over the place. Considerable number of Macedonians believes it discriminates Macedonians and leads towards dissolution of the country. Albanian opposition and some intellectuals are claiming that the privileges deriving from OFA are neither enough for Albanians nor are implemented after 12 years whereas smaller ethnic communities are unanimous in statements that the OFA made Macedonia more bi-ethnic (Macedonian/Albanian) than multiethnic society. Macedonia is a complex web of interethnic relations where the most of the tensions are between the two largest ethnic groups but there is also increasing intolerance which is not limited to the majority-minority scheme but affects relations among minorities themselves and also within the two largest ethnic communities (Macedonians and Albanians). Last couple of years the political confrontations starting with the forced expulsion of the opposition from the Parliament in December 2012 have moved on the intra-ethnic level. However, interethnic relations and the lack of general trust amongst Macedonians and Albanians represent continued threat for the peace and stability of Macedonia.

Since the beginning of the year with opposition publishing evidence for alleged criminal and unethical behaviour of high Government officials and introduction of several unpopular laws have mobilized citizens across ethnic lines. However, the tragic incident in Kumanovo in May this year when in armed conflict in downtown Kumanovo 8 policeman and 10 terrorists (mostly from Kosovo) were killed and close to 40 policeman were wounded. This incident and the attempt of newly established political parties of ethnic Albanians to mobilize support through mono-ethnic antigovernment protest have brought to surface the old divisions and fears.

In addition, the legal framework following the OFA promotes ethnic representation over universal values, criteria and cooperation.

Interviews, conducted as part of this evaluation, with stakeholders have underlined that the need for this type of interventions is huge and as additional strength is the more favourable environment for initiatives and actions across ethnic lines. The need for civic mobilization around universal values is more present than ever the fact that there are no other existing funding mechanisms that support such initiatives promoting dialogue and cooperation are further increasing the relevance and necessity of this intervention.

According to the Finish Government Programme, the aim of Finland's foreign policy is to strengthen international stability, security, peace, justice and sustainable development as
well as to promote the rule of law, democracy and human rights. Democratic countries that respect human rights are the most stable and are less prone to conflicts.

The evaluated project is in line with the Western Balkans - Finland's Development Policy Framework Programme 2009-2013 and falls under the first thematic priority (Stability and security). Furthermore the project specifically relates to the priority area 1: Democratic and accountable society that promotes human rights of the Finland's Development Policy Programme 2012. In addition, the project was implemented in accordance with the Development Cooperation of the Civil Society Organisations – Project Guidelines by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland – Department for Development Policy (February 2012).

Conclusions:

- This third phase of the project has been based on correctly identified needs of the end beneficiaries of this intervention.
- Although, relevant polls are showing relative improvement in the interethnic relations, they are mainly result of the ongoing political crisis that will culminate with yet another early Parliamentary election. Deep divisions and differences over key political issues are existing and can cause rapid deterioration of interethnic relations.
- Civic activism is on low level and projects promoting self-motivated interethnic cooperation in society deeply politicized and entrenched behind ethnic lines are of highest importance.

Recommendation:

- To continue with focused and strategic project intervention aimed at increasing the outreach, building on previous successes and establishing institutional mechanisms that will guarantee effectiveness and sustainability of the intervention.
  The Platform is the component that enhances the sustainability and the advocacy potentials of the entire intervention. As such, the project in the next phase should continue with supporting the efforts for strengthening Platform’s legitimacy and credibility in order to position it as credible partner in policy creation and decision making processes in the area of multiculturalism, both on local and national levels.
  In addition, the pool of trainers is arguable one of the key assets developed by the program. Hence, possibilities for their additional capacity building as well as for training delivery aimed at increasing the outreach of the intervention should be further supported.

4.2 Efficiency

The total budget spent under the project is in the period 01 January 2013 to 31 December 2014 is 231,429.13 EUR. The funding was provided as follows:

1. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland 81.97%
2. Kalevi Sorsa Foundation 14.46%
3. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung 03.57%

During the project period the number of direct beneficiaries was 375:
- Junior Trainers 11
- Workshop series 45
- Alumni training 15
- Events organized by alumni 182
- Platform events 122
Compared to previous project phase (335 participants for a period of three years) there is increase of 11.94% in direct beneficiaries for only two years of implementation period.

The conservative calculation of ratio funding per directly treated person 617.14EUR which is decrease of 44.34% from the previous phase. In addition, many of the beneficiaries have received multiple treatments which further improved the efficiency of the intervention:

- Junior Trainers: 6 workshops
- Workshop series participants (4 events: 2 workshops, study circle and follow up meeting)
- Coordinators of the Platform (2 capacity building trainings)

As well, as presented in Chapter 3, the indirect outreach to participants was several times larger and it made the intervention even more efficient. Having alumni organizing events and delivering trainings together with practical logistical solutions implemented by the main implementing partner were the major contributors to this end.

As in the previous phase, the flexibility in the project design that allowed midterm revision of strategy and redesign of the intervention have contributed to the ability of the implementers to significantly increase the overall efficiency of the project.

Conclusions:

- The project achieved high level of cost efficiency.
- The achievements are justifying the expenditures to a full extent.
- Utilization of in-house capacities (alumni of the project) was major contributor to the high level efficiency achieved by the project.
- The flexibility in the redesigning of the project has enabled more cost-efficient utilization of funding.

Recommendations:

- Continued funding for support of the initiatives developed by the treatment groups.
- Whenever possible, using the in-house capacities for events and activities organized by the project.

4.3 Sustainability

The applied re-design, allowing more long-term interventions and focused and institutionalized approach of the intervention, have significantly increased the sustainability prospects of the evaluated project intervention.

The implementation and networking capacities of Progress Institute have been further developed through implementation of this phase of the project. The in-house capacities made available through this projects have increased and are motivated to actively participate in PI activities as needs identified. All of the trainees in the ToT program expressed willingness to cooperate with Progres in the future. The local Project Coordinator remains to be an asset to the project and to the Progres Institute for Social Democracy as main implementing partner.

Commitment of beneficiaries.
Through inclusion of additional 10 Junior Trainers in the pool of trainers, PI has increased a resource that can be further developed and utilized on a regular basis in the future. The
survey with Junior Trainers showed that 81.25% of the respondents have concrete plans or would like to deliver trainings on the topics covered with the ToT series.

In addition all of the respondents stated that they would like to get minimal or significant support.

This can be used to provide additional capacity building opportunities for selected motivated Junior Trainers for them to become Senior Trainers. With that development they'll be in position to mentor the existing Junior Trainers and to lead on the new generations of trainees that will undergo a comprehensive ToT program.

The participants on the workshop series will as well contribute significantly to the sustainability especially through sharing experience and knowledge within their respective party youth branch or CSO and through organizing activities and initiatives on local level. However, they'll have much bigger effect in multiplying the effects of the intervention than to its sustainability.

The Platform for Multiculturalism, if planned, developed and resourced adequately is the hub of the entire intervention that has the potential to provide institutionalization of the achievements and sustainability of the effects as well as potential for proactive advocacy in creation and promotion of policies and practices that incorporate the multicultural values.

Independence from external support
The dependence on foreign donors and project funding remains critical sustainability issue of the entire civic sector. There is no established culture of individual donations and government funding is difficult to be accessed or insufficient for significant interventions. As result it's not to be expected that without substantial support PI will be in situation to implement planned activities and to effectively contribute to the achievement of the overall objective of the intervention. In such scenario it would be expected that only those intervention not requiring financial support (internal CSOs and Party workshops and trainings voluntarily delivered by Junior Trainers or sessions delivered by workshop attendees). Additional ToT or further development of the Platform for Multiculturalism would most likely not be implemented.

Surveys show that majority of beneficiaries have raised their knowledge and awareness to a large extent. On the organizational/party level the developed interventions and activities can be replicated in the future whereas developed policy papers can be incorporated in official party programs.

Another risk related to the sustainability of project intervention is the persistent political crisis.
This, together with the set date for yet another early Parliamentary election, can be a risk due to the focus being diverted to media attractive issues but at the same time it can be an opportunity to bring multiculturalism high on the political agenda.

4.4 Cross-cutting issues

**Gender equality.**
The project introduced gender balanced criteria on all levels of the project implementation (project team, trainers, and participants). Designing and conducting strict selection criteria the implementers were in position to influence high level of gender balance. The abovementioned can be verified through submitted breakdown of participants, from the total of 375 participants 42.4% were female and 57.6% male participants.

**Most vulnerable groups**
Through several segments, the project put an emphasis of the Roma participation as well as participation of other small ethnic minorities in Macedonia (other than Macedonians and Albanians). In this phase 2.4% of the participants on the events were Roma whereas 3.73% were Turks. In addition, in other activities participation of Bosniaks and Vlachs was secured.

**Human Rights and Democracy**
Within the scope of development cooperation practiced by Finland, no population group may be systematically discriminated against. The evaluated project intervention aims at eradicating or reducing prejudice and discrimination on ethnic or cultural basis. In addition, on a long term and through the Platform as main hub the project intends to influence the policy creation and decision making directed towards reducing inequalities and systematically challenging cases of discrimination.
5. Sources of information

Following sources were used during the preparation of the evaluation:

- Project Document;
- Annual Reports 2013, 2014;
- Final Report;
- Annual Financial Reports, 2013 and 2014;
- Audit Report 2013
- Various reports, instructions, designs and other materials produced by the project;
- Key Informant Interviews (KII) with
  - Project Coordinator, KSF – 2 interviews;
  - Local Project Coordinator, Progress Institute – 2;
  - Project Assistant, Progres Institute – 1;
  - Project Coordinator, FES Office Skopje – 1;
  - President, Progres Institute – 1;
  - Senior Trainers, Consultants (ToTs, Trainings, Workshops) – 2;
  - Participants, Trainings, Workshops – 1
  - Representatives from Youth Clubs of Political Parties – 4
  - Founders of Equal (CSO member of the Platform) – 2

- Surveys:
  - Junior Trainers (2013 and 2010)
  - Participants on Events

- Policy papers and documents.
  - Law on Local Self-Government
  - Study of Multiculturalism and Interethnic Relations in Education, UNICEF November 2009
  - Survey Trust in Macedonia, MCIC (December 2010)
  - Official report of the Census in Macedonia from 2002.
  - Western Balkans - Finland's Development Policy Framework Programme 2009-2013
  - Ethical Code of Conduct by the MFA of Finland for Government Supported Development Cooperation
  - Finland Developmet Policy Program (February 2012)
  - Development Cooperatition of the Civil Society Organisations – Project Guidelines by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (February 2012)
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ANNEX 1 – Project Partners

Kalevi Sorsa Foundation

The Kalevi Sorsa Foundation is an independent and open social democratic think tank. The Foundation was established in the summer of 2005 and strives to promote interaction between research and politics.

The Foundation's aim is to encourage public debate that promotes equality and democracy. It produces relevant information for public debate, policy preparations and political decision making, by organising debates, seminars and through its own research and publications.

The Foundation's research and development projects focus on a few topics that are topical and central to future challenges. Furthermore, the Foundation aims to promote public, ideological and political debate and exchange of ideas as well as bring forth new ideas and innovative solutions. The Kalevi Sorsa Foundation supports democratisation and promotes economic knowledge and fair economic development in young democracies through its own development projects, grants and by supporting research, information and education.

In Macedonia, KSF is active since 2008 where it works in partnership with the Progress Institute for social democracy and with FES. As of 2010, KSF has increased the level of activities in Macedonia and continuously contributes to the development of the democratic capacities and processes through work with CSOs and youth branches of political parties. Current pledge for support to Macedonia is till the end of 2017.

Progres Institute for Social Democracy

The Progress Institute is a political institute, established as a think tank, promoting social-democratic values in Macedonia by helping the local social-democratic parties to create, implement and promote their policies.

The institute offers trainings, organizes seminars and conferences, creates policy papers and conducts research. The aim of these activities is to strengthen the capacity of the Macedonian social democrats to create, implement and promote their programs and policies.

The Progress Institute is encouraging the international cooperation among the fellow foreign organizations and parties by exchanging experience, knowledge and experts.

Friedrich Ebert Stiftung

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung is a German private, independent association, which was founded in 1925 to support political education in the spirit of democracy and pluralism, to assist gifted young persons to perform their academic career independent from their parent's income, to contribute to international rapprochement and cooperation. Today, worldwide support to Democracy and Development, to contribute to peace and security, to make globalization more solidary and to foster the enlargement and deepening of the European Union – these are the guidelines of FES' international engagement. FES maintains offices 70 countries of Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. Another 33 FES-offices do exist in countries of Western Europe, Central and South-East Europe, the CIS countries and also in the USA and Japan. In the reform states in the eastern part of Europe, the Friedrich-
Ebert-Stiftung is involved in supporting the process of democratization, the transition to a market economy and the establishment of a civil society, in particular in the fields of labour market, social, environmental and media policies. It supports these countries in the process of accession to the EU. It cooperates in this process with partners from various societal groups and organizations, such as trade unions, political parties, educational and research institutions, public administrations, and also city and local governments.

Goals and Objectives of FES Macedonia.

The Friedrich Ebert Stiftung in Macedonia supports the transformation process of the state in the following areas:

• socio-political dialogue (democratization)
• implementation of the peace agreement
• conflict prevention
• minority policy
• Euro-Atlantic integration (EU and NATO)
• Regional and international cooperation
• Social dialogue and labor relations

The Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, in its work is guided by the basic values of social democracy: freedom, justice, solidarity and international cooperation. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung is also performing this task in the Republic of Macedonia where it has an office since 1996.
ANNEX 2 – Terms of Reference of the Evaluation

1. Background

1.1. Subject and objectives of the project

The evaluation covers the project Supporting Democracy in Multietnic Macedonia – Dialogue and Cooperation (2013-2014), which was conducted in cooperation between Progres Institute for Social Democracy, Kalevi Sorsa Foundation and Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Office Skopje in Macedonia 2013-2014.

The project seeks to strengthen multi-ethnic democracy and stability in Macedonia. The focus is on strengthening the capacities of young grass roots civil society activists. The immediate objectives are to increase self-motivated inter-ethnic cooperation, disseminate knowledge and increase awareness of inter-ethnic relations, and facilitate the formation of networks to forge contacts and cooperation between activists and relevant Civil Society Organisations (CSOs). The practical means to achieve the objectives are inter-ethnic capacity building workshops and study circles, training of trainers and training sessions on inter-ethnic relations, and building networks of activists and CSOs to increase impact. (Attached is Appendix I Project plan.)

1.2. Project activities

The project builds on the achievements and the needs that have been identified as well as the lessons learnt in previous projects and the evaluation conducted in 2013. During the project more and more emphasis has been put on support of more long term processes and institutionalised forms of cooperation between the young activists of civil society. The project activities include several single activities that can be included into three main operational entities: 1) Training of Trainers (TOT), 2) Workshop series: Influence and Democracy – Democracy and Civic Activism and 3) Youth Platform for Multiculturalism. Some of the activities form a continuum from the previous project (2010-2012), i.e. alumni activities of the participants of TOT 2010.

The activities and operational entities organised in Macedonia during the project period 2013-2014 are the following:

Training of trainers on multiculturalism

The skills and capacities of dialogue and cooperation in multi-ethnic society have been strengthened by training 11 new trainers on multiculturalism in 2013. The training series Training of Trainers (TOT) trained young people to promote multiculturalism, vibrant civil society and inter-ethnic dialogue and to fight prejudices and stereotypes as well as to build a common interest and cooperation among youth in Macedonia. The TOT series consisted of four training modules, a practical final exam and an advanced training. Out of 11 participants, 10 completed the course. The participants were selected through an open call.

Activities of the TOT alumni 2013

After the final exam, an application process for the support for multicultural initiatives of the new junior trainers was opened. The participants were offered the possibility to launch their own multicultural initiatives with support from the project. Three new trainers organised 2 weekend trainings on multiculturalism as alumni activities of the TOT 2013.
Activities of the TOT alumni 2010

The application process for multicultural initiatives was opened also for the junior trainers from the alumni of TOT 2010. As alumni activities 7 junior trainers organised 3 local level trainings on multiculturalism and 3 junior trainers organised 3 round table discussions on *Multiculturalism for better economic condition* in different municipalities of Macedonia.

**Workshop series *Influence and Responsibility – Democracy and Civic Activism***

Local level young activists of the political parties and NGOs from Macedonia participated in the interactive workshop series *Influence and Responsibility – Democracy and Civic Activism*. The workshop series aimed to empower the local level activists of different ethnicities to cooperate and develop activities, which aim to strengthen democracy. After the workshops a follow-up meeting was organised to encourage the participants to continue the work they started at the workshops. The participants for the two workshops series were selected through an open call.

The workshops (total 4 weekend workshops) were organized parallel on May 2013 and June 2013, and gathered activists of political parties and local level civil society organizations. In between the workshops participants organized study-circles to continue their own projects that they initiated in workshop I. In the second workshop the work and experience gathered during the first workshop and study-circles was evaluated. In September 2013 third meeting for follow-up was organized for the workshop participants.

**Outputs of the WS series**

In 2014, an application process for the support for multicultural initiatives was opened also for the workshop participants to support continuation of the projects they initiated during the workshops. As a result, workshop activists from Bitola organised a weekend workshop on civic activism for other young activists.

**Youth Platform for Multiculturalism**

The Youth Platform was established in December 2013 originally with seven political youth organisations representing different ethnic groups. The main goal of the Platform is to increase the influence of young people, to build capacities of grass root level activists, promote multiculturalism and advocate issues influencing the life of youth in all ethnic groups. The member organisations of the Platform appointed a coordinator and a deputy coordinator to represent their organisation in the Platform.

In 2014 two capacity building workshops for planning and developing activities of the Platform were organised for the coordinators. The Platform published three policy papers on multiculturalism and youth unemployment in November 2014. In addition a local training for grass-root level activists of the member organisation SDUM was organised in the framework of the Platform.

In the fall 2014, the members of the Platform participated in three workshops that gathered activists of political youth organisations and NGOs to discuss multiculturalism in the framework of civil activism and organizational activities. In the workshops the Youth Platform presented their work, recruited new member organisations and planned future activities of the Platform.

1.3. The roles of the partners of project
Planning of the activities has been carried out in cooperation with all the partners of the project, Progres Institute for Social Democracy, Kalevi Sorsa Foundation and Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Office Skopje. Common planning meetings between the partners have been held for planning the concepts and schedules of events. All the partners have also been involved on the stage of examination.

Progres Institute has been main organiser of the events (trainings, workshops and promotion of policy paper). Local project coordinator has planned activities, moderated discussions and mentored young activists. Coordinator has also been responsible for all the practical organisations, i.e. inviting participants, making reservations, contacts, preparing the budgets for the events, other practical organisations etc.

Apart from being involved on preparatory planning stage, the FES Skopje office has provided material and financial support.

The role and responsibility of Kalevi Sorsa Foundation and the Finnish project coordinator have been to take care of the overall management of the project; to coordinate the cooperation; to prepare concept and plan activities together with the local partners; and to provide guidance and support for the implementation. The project coordinator has been assisted in this work by the steering group, which consists of Finnish experts.

2. Purpose and objectives of evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to achieve an independent and external assessment of the performance of the project Supporting Democracy in Multi-ethnic Macedonia – Dialogue and cooperation reflected against the objectives of the project and the goals set for the Finland’s development cooperation as well as the development needs and priorities of Macedonia in the context of multiculturalism and democracy.

The objective of the evaluation is to achieve understanding of the value and validity of concept and results of the project. The evaluation will help implementing organisations to:

- identify lessons learnt;
- improve the approach and implementation of the activities in terms of responding to the needs of beneficiaries effectively;
- improve follow-up actions of the project activities and measurement of achieved objectives;
- gain tools for future planning.

The results of the evaluation will be published, and presented in different forms to the public. The purpose is also to make the results useful to organisations and people working on the field of democracy support and contribute to the debate of democracy work in Finland, Macedonia and possible other countries.

3. Scope of the evaluation

The two-year project Supporting Democracy in Multi-ethnic Macedonia – Dialogue and Cooperation will be evaluated in full including all the project activities organised in Macedonia 2013-2014.

The evaluation will study purpose, objectives, implemented activities, results and resources of the project, and assess the findings in the contexts of 1) logical framework of the project, 2) policy framework (Finland, Macedonia) as well as 3) similar projects focusing on democracy support and multiculturalism in Macedonia.

Material of the evaluation consists of the documents produced in the framework of the project, including project and action plans, reports, concepts of activities, training material and other relevant documents as well as interviews of organisers and participants of the project and other relevant stakeholders.
4. Evaluation issues

The project will be evaluated against the following criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

Relevance
Relevance concerns whether the project is in line with the needs of the beneficiaries and the policy environment. Are the results, purpose and overall objectives of the intervention consistent with the needs and aspirations of its target group? Does the project address the development needs and priorities of Macedonia in the context of multiculturalism and democracy? What is the relevance of the project in regard of the development policy programme of the Government of Finland? Has the situation changed since the approval of the intervention project document?

Efficiency
Efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities have transformed the available resources into intended results in terms of quantity, quality and time. Can the costs of the intervention be justified by the results? Has the project been managed and implemented in an efficient manner? Does the allocation of resources foster cost-efficient management and implementation of activities? Does the project design advance efficient achievement of the purpose and objectives of it?

Effectiveness
Effectiveness describes how well the objectives have been achieved. Has the intervention achieved (or to what degree has it achieved) its objectives (objectives and results) or will it do so in the future? An assessment of effectiveness should include description of change during the project by considering the context of initial situation. Are the results making contribution toward multicultural democracy and stability in Macedonia?

Sustainability
Sustainability refers to continuation and functionality of the results and benefits of the project after the external support has come to an end. Will the results and benefits produced by the project be maintained after the termination of external support? Assessment of sustainability should be analysed in terms of:
1) Capacities of institutions and personnel to carry on activities in the long-term,
2) Commitment of beneficiaries,
3) Maintenance of ownership (independence of external support),
4) Long-term social and cultural applicability of the developed concepts and activities in Macedonia and possible other contexts.

What are the possibilities and strengths that will enhance sustainability? What are the risks that can compromise sustainability?

5. Cross-cutting issues

How the project has addressed the cross-cutting issues of the Finnish development policy, i.e. gender equality, most vulnerable groups and, human rights and democracy?

6. Methodology

The evaluator will apply participatory, gender-sensitive, ethnically balanced and result-oriented approach.

The proposed methodology of the evaluation is designed to meet the requirements set for
this particular evaluation. This approach is considered appropriate for identifying results attributable to the evaluated project and for achieving all objectives of the evaluation.

The methodology includes:

- **Document analysis:**
  - Project documentation from the application period as well as complete documentation developed during the implementation of the activities of the project (including: activity reports, annual reports, financial reports, action plans, concept of the activities, training material etc.);
  - Analysis of relevant documentation (strategy papers, reports, legislation, action plans, researches);

Data collection will include:

- **Key Informant Interviews (KII) with:**
  - Project coordinators;
  - Representatives from Progres Institute and Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

- **Group interviews with participants/trainers/consultants**

- **Thematic focus groups with 6-10 participants.**

- **Survey with direct beneficiaries using a structured questionnaire (with predominantly closed-ended questions).**

7. **Reporting**

   Inception report will be prepared before the field work and research of the material of the evaluation. The inception report shall include approach, work methodology and work plan of the evaluation. The inception report shall explain preparatory arrangements accomplished before submitting the inception report, description of methodology and justification for choosing it, a detailed work plan and list of major meetings.

   The draft report will be submitted to the Kalevi Sorsa Foundation and Progres Insitute for Social Democracy within 3 weeks of the completion of the field work. The draft report follows the same outline as the final report (More detailed in attached Appendix II).

   Kalevi Sorsa Foundation and Progres Institute for Social Democracy will submit the comments on the draft evaluation report within 2 weeks after receiving the draft. The comments shall be included to the final evaluation report.

   The final evaluation will be submitted within 1 week of receiving the comments of the Kalevi Sorsa Foundation and Progres Institute for Social Democracy. The final report shall answer the questions put forward in ToR and further discussed in the inception report as well as during the rest of the evaluation process. The report shall fulfil the requirements as set out in Appendix II.

   Working language is English. All the evaluation reports, i.e. inception report, draft report and final report and comments to the reports shall be submitted in English. Summary of the evaluation included in final report should be provided in English and in Macedonia.

Length of the report: between 20-30 pages (without annexes).
ANNEX 3 – Inception Report

INCEPTION REPORT
for the Performance Evaluation of the project:
Supporting Democracy in Multiethnic Macedonia – Dialogue and Cooperation

Overview

In early 2015, the Kalevi Sorsa Foundation (KSF) and Progres Institute for Social Democracy (PI) have initiated process of conducting performance evaluation of the project Supporting Democracy in Multiethnic Macedonia – Dialogue and Cooperation, implemented in the period from 01 January 2013 to 31 December 2014. This Inception Report summarizes SMS’ preliminary performance evaluation design concepts for the evaluation based on original Project Document as well as on meetings and initial interviews with the Project Coordinator and the Local Project Assistant.

Project Overview and Performance Evaluation Focus
The project operated nationally to achieve a Hierarchy of objectives, elements of which are shown in the diagram below.

To achieve the project objectives (POs) stipulated above, as well as Immediate Objectives that support them, the project promoted inter-ethnic and inter-cultural dialogue by individuals, informal and formal citizen groups as well as by youth branches of political parties. It delivered trainings and a variety types of support to these societal actors with a focus on youth. In this context, the implementers noted that:

- Through the current project and its predecessors, implementers have tried a variety of approaches for stimulating inter-ethnic cooperation and inter-cultural dialogue including different stakeholders in Macedonia. However, effective participation of political party branches together with sufficient minority representation remained highly influenced by overall political context.
• Interethnic relations and political dialogue in Macedonia were at a relatively low level and has declined even further in recent years according to relevant reports and surveys.

While the current environment for Interethnic dialogue and cooperation appears to be particularly challenging, the implementers indicated that the most valuable thing they could learn from the performance evaluation would be which interventions for stimulating interethnic cooperation and intercultural dialogue – among those it has tried and is currently employing – are the most effective in Macedonia.

The purpose of the evaluation is to achieve an independent and external assessment of the performance of the project Supporting Democracy in Multi-ethnic Macedonia –Dialogue and cooperation reflected against the objectives of the project and the goals set for the Finland’s development cooperation as well as the development needs and priorities of Macedonia in the context of multiculturalism and democracy.

The objective of the evaluation is to achieve understanding of the value and validity of concept and results of the project. The evaluation will help implementing organisations to:
- identify lessons learnt;
- improve the approach and implementation of the activities in terms of responding to the needs of beneficiaries effectively;
- improve follow-up actions of the project activities and measurement of achieved objectives;
- gain tools for future planning.

The project will be evaluated against the following criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

*Relevance* concerns whether the project is in line with the needs of the beneficiaries and the policy environment.

*Efficiency* criterion concerns how well the various activities have transformed the available resources into intended results in terms of quantity, quality and time.

*Effectiveness* describes how well the objectives have been achieved. Has the intervention achieved (or to what degree has it achieved) its objectives (objectives and results) or will it do so in the future?

*Sustainability* refers to continuation and functionality of the results and benefits of the project after the external support has come to an end. Will the results and benefits produced by the project be maintained after the termination of external support?

**Approach and Methodology**

The evaluation will study purpose, objectives, implemented activities, results and resources of the project, and assess the findings in the contexts of 1) logical framework of the project, 2) policy framework (Finland, Macedonia) as well as 3) similar projects focusing on democracy support and multiculturalism in Macedonia.

The proposed approach is considered appropriate for identifying results attributable to the evaluated project and for achieving all objectives of the evaluation. The evaluator will apply participatory, gender-sensitive, ethnically balanced and
result-oriented approach which entails both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods as well as relevant document review and analysis. The evaluation will simultaneously employ a number of methods and sources of information in order to cross-validate data. Qualitative methods of data collection, will bring rich and in-depth analysis of the situation of the beneficiaries of project and new insights into peoples’ needs for project planning and implementation.

The proposed methodology is designed to meet the requirements set for this particular evaluation and the analysis is focused on the three main clusters of interventions:

1. Training of Trainers on dialogue and cooperation in multiethnic society;
2. Workshop series Influence and Democracy – Democracy and Civic Activism; and
3. Youth Platform.

The evaluation includes following methods of data collection:

- Document review and analysis
  - Project documentation from the application period as well as complete documentation developed during the implementation of the activities of the project (including: activity reports, annual reports, financial and audit reports, action plans, concept of the activities, training material etc.);
  - Analysis of relevant documentation (strategy papers, reports, legislation, action plans, researches);

- Up to 16 Key Informant Interviews (KII) with:
  - Project Coordinators (4 interviews);
  - Representatives from Progres Institute and Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (2 Interviews);
  - Key stakeholders of Youth Platform (up to 10 Interviews)

- Up to 3 Group interviews with participants/trainers/consultants
  - Trainers of WS series: Power and Responsibility – Democracy and Civic Activism
  - Founders of Equal

- Up to 3 Focus groups with 6-10 participants.
  - Participants of ToT 2010
  - Participants of ToT 2013

- Surveys with direct beneficiaries using a structured questionnaire (with predominantly closed-ended questions).
  - Participants of the activities organized by Trainers trained through the ToT component of the project.
- Participants of the Workshop series Power and Responsibility – Democracy and Civic Activism
- Participants at the activities organized by the Youth Platform

Work plan

The timeframe for conducting the planned activities for the performance evaluation of the project is 01 March – 22 June 2015. More specifically the above-listed data collection activities are taking place in the period 01 April till 15 May 2015. Below in table 1: Timeframe, is the breakdown of activities for the abovementioned period.  
_N.B. Specific dates for each of the planned activities will be developed in coordination with the Local Project Assistant._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>April</th>
<th></th>
<th>May</th>
<th></th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the Inception Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of List and Timeframe KII and FG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of questionnaires for data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting KII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting FGDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires sent to participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on the Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing the Final Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Timeframe for implementation of the evaluation activities

For written comments please use the following email addresses:  
sms.dooel@gmail.com, or  
dimitarsp@yahoo.com

Skopje, 07 April 2015

Prepared by:
ANNEX 4 – Survey Questionnaire – ToT

1. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. Ethnic Background
   a. Macedonian
   b. Albanian
   c. Turkish
   d. Roma
   e. Serbian
   f. Vlach
   g. Bosniac
   h. Other (please specify)

3. Religion
   a. Orthodox
   b. Muslim
   c. Catholic
   d. Protestant
   e. Atheist
   f. Other (please specify)

4. Age

5. Level of education:
   a. Primary education
   b. Secondary education
   c. University degree
   d. Postgraduate education MS
   e. Postgraduate education PH.D

6. Place of living

7. You participated in the project “Support of the Democracy in Multiethnic Macedonia” implemented by Progres Institute for Social Democracy as:
   a. Representative of a political party
   b. Representative of a civil society organization
   c. Individual

8. In the Training of Trainers (ToT) program you participate since:
   a. 2010
   b. 2013

9. In the last month, how often you talked with someone who belongs to the other ethnic group?
a. Very often
b. Often
c. Rare
d. Never

10. In the last month, how often you talked with someone who lives in a town or neighbourhood different than yours?

a. Very often
b. Often
c. Rare
d. Never

11. In the last month, how often you talked with someone who belongs to religious group different than yours?

a. Very often
b. Often
c. Rare
d. Never

12. Did you have previous training experience prior applying to this ToT program?

a. Yes, through Progres/KSF/FES
b. Yes, though other organization
c. Yes, as freelance consultant
d. No

13. What is your opinion about selection of the topics within the modules that have been offered in the ToT program?

a. The topics have been appropriate to the training needs
b. The topics have been partially appropriate to the training needs
c. The topics haven't been appropriate to the training needs

14. What was the most impressive on the ToTs?

a. The training program
b. Trainers with their knowledge and skills
c. Socializing
d. Everything
e. Nothing

15. How much were you encouraged to express your attitudes during the modules?

a. Very much
b. Partially
c. Little
d. Not at all

16. The trainers during the modules presented the material:

a. Excellent
b. Very well

c. Well

d. Weak

17. After the completed ToT your knowledge about the addressed topics is:

a. Significantly increased
b. Partially increased
c. Insignificantly increased
d. Unchanged

18. After the completed ToT program have you gained the skills necessary for training delivery on the addressed topics?

a. Yes
b. Partially
c. No

19. In general, how satisfied are you with the modules you passed within this program?

a. Very satisfied
b. Partially satisfied
c. Little satisfied
d. Not satisfied

20. Have you had a possibility to deliver training on the topics you have been trained for after completion of the ToT program?

a. Yes
b. No

21. If you answered "yes" on the previous question (nr.20) how satisfied are you with your performance as trainer on a specific topic?

a. Very satisfied
b. Partially satisfied
c. Not satisfied

22. Have you had a possibility to deliver training on the topics you have been trained for, independently from the project after the completion of the ToT program?

a. Yes
b. No

23. Do you need additional support for building your capacities as trainer in the area of multiculturalism?

a. Yes, significant additional support is needed
b. Yes, minimal additional support is needed
c. No, there is no need for additional support

24. In the near future, do you have some plan or is there a possibility to deliver training on the topics you have been trained for?

a. Yes
b. No

25. With the next statement "The spouses should belong to the same ethnic group":

a. I completely agree
b. I partially agree
c. I don't agree
d. I don't know, I don't have opinion

26. With the next statement "The spouses should belong to the same religious group":

a. I completely agree
b. I partially agree
c. I don't agree
d. I don't know, I don't have opinion
ANNEX 5 – Survey Questionnaire – Initiatives

1. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. Ethnic Background
   a. Macedonian
   b. Albanian
   c. Turkish
   d. Roma
   e. Serbian
   f. Vlach
   g. Bosniac
   h. Other (please specify)

3. Religion
   a. Orthodox
   b. Muslim
   c. Catholic
   d. Protestant
   e. Atheist
   f. Other (please specify)

4. Age

5. Level of education
   a. Primary education
   b. Secondary education
   c. University degree
   d. Postgraduate education MS
   e. Postgraduate education PH.D

6. Place of living

7. You participated in the project "Support ot the Democracy in Multiethnici Macedonia" implemented by Progres Institute for Social Democracy as:
   a. Representative of a political party
   b. Representative of a civil society organization
   c. Individual

8. Please select the events which you participated in:
   a. Series of workshops: Power and responsibility - democracy and civic activism
   b. Training in multiculturalism
   c. Round table on topic: Multiculturalism for better economic state
   d. Workshop: Civic Activism
   e. Other
9. In the last month, how often you talked with someone who belongs to the other ethnic group?
   a. Very often  
   b. Often  
   c. Rare  
   d. Never  

10. In the last month, how often you talked with someone who lives in a town or neighbourhood different than yours?
   a. Very often  
   b. Often  
   c. Rare  
   d. Never  

11. In the last month, how often you talked with someone who belongs to religious group different than yours?
   a. Very often  
   b. Often  
   c. Rare  
   d. Never  

12. What is your opinion about selection of the topics in the framework of the event you participated in?
   a. The topics have been appropriate to the training needs  
   b. The topics have been partially appropriate to the training needs  
   c. The topics haven't been appropriate to the training needs  

13. What was the most impressive on the event you participated in?
   a. The training program  
   b. Trainers with their knowledge and skills  
   c. Socializing  
   d. Everything  
   e. Nothing  

14. How much were you encouraged to express your attitudes during the event?
   a. Very much  
   b. Partially  
   c. Little  
   d. Not at all  

15. The trainers/moderators during the modules presented the material:
   a. Excellent  
   b. Very well  
   c. Well  
   d. Weak
16. After the event your knowledge about the addressed topics is:
   a. Significantly increased
   b. Partially increased
   c. Insignificantly increased
   d. Unchanged

17. Did you received any materials (such as: leaflets, brochures, posters, books) to share with your friends, family members or neighbours?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don’t know

18. How often you talked about the event topics with your family members after the event?
   a. Very often
   b. Often
   c. Rare
   d. Never

19. How often you talked about the event topics with your friends after the event?
   a. Very often
   b. Often
   c. Rare
   d. Never

20. How often you talked about the event topics with your colleagues from work (faculty) after the event?
   a. Very often
   b. Often
   c. Rare
   d. Never

21. How often you talked about the event topics with other (ethnic and religious) groups different than yours after the event?
   a. Very often
   b. Often
   c. Rare
   d. Never

22. Would you say that in general the number of people you talked with about the event topics is?
   a. More than five
   b. Three to five
   c. One or two
   d. None

23. Would you say that the activities you participated in increased your motivation for additional strengthening of your knowledge on the topics addressed (multiculturalism, democracy, civic activism)?
a. Very much
b. Partially
c. Little
d. Not at all

24. With the next statement "The spouses should belong to the same ethnic group":

a. I completely agree
b. I partially agree
c. I don't agree
d. I don't know, I don't have opinion

25. With the next statement "The spouses should belong to the same religious group":

a. I completely agree
b. I partially agree
c. I don't agree
d. I don't know, I don't have opinion
ANNEX 6 – Evaluator

Dimitar Spasenoski is founder and Executive Director of Strategic Management Systems – SMS. He has been active in the Civil Society Sector in Macedonia over 17 years with extensive experience in management and evaluation of programs and projects. In addition, Mr. Spasenoski is Consultant on Advocacy and Capacity Assessments and has delivered numerous trainings in Macedonia and in the region.

In the past 15 years Dimitar Spasenoski has managed implementation of projects, for different international NGOs and Intergovernmental Organisations, funded by international donors including: USAID, DFID, UNDP, UNHCR, Danida, KfW, EAR, and SDC. More specifically Mr. Spasenoski managed the Civil Society Strengthening Project funded by the European Agency for Reconstruction (EAR) and implemented by the Danish Refugee Council (DRC). Within this project Mr. Spasenoski managed the assessment process of six national networks of CSOs and with a team of international and national consultants managed the implementation of capacity building plans of these organizations.

Also, Mr. Spasenoski managed programs and projects for Institute for Parliamentary Democracy, National Democratic Institute, Danish Refugee Council, UN OCHA and International NGO Council.

Furthermore, in the field of evaluation of projects, and programs and proposals his portfolio also includes:

- Evaluation of the project Access to Justice in Macedonia, funded be EU through EIDHR and implemented by Foundation Open Society Institute Macedonia July – September 2015
- Conducted Capacity Needs Assessment on 19 leading CSO in Bosnia and Herzegovina, project funded by USAID, May – November 2014
- Conducted External Evaluation of the project Political and Intercultural Dialogue – From Conflict to Common Interest funded by Kalevi Sorsa Foundation, 2013
- Conducted External Evaluation of the Project Youth Development through Non-formal Education, funded by PCF - 2010
- Contributed to the External Evaluation of the Project for Inclusion of Roma Children in kindergartens implemented by the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy of Republic of Macedonia and funded by the Roma Education Fund – August 2009;
- Conducted External Evaluation of the project Local Volunteer’s Services, implemented by Youth Cultural Centre from Bitola and funded by USAID, NED and FOSIM – May 2009;
- Member of the Evaluation Committee for the European Agency for Reconstruction – EAR (Civil Society and Social Cohesion Department) for proposals under the program Promotion of Interethnic Relations in Macedonia – December 2002

In the field of Advocacy, since 2005, Mr. Spasenoski delivered over 40 trainings on Advocacy for NGOs, MPs, Local Council Members, Youth Leaders and Young Politicians in Macedonia and in the region. As well, he delivered ToTs on Project Cycle Management, Youth Participation and Creation of Local Youth Strategies for NGOs and municipal representatives.