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I. SUMMARY

The Project will strengthen resilience of municipalities in Serbia to cope with the migration crisis. Two solution pathways were designed to respond to identified problems within the Theory of Change: 1. Develop capacities of local institutions for better delivery of services, and 2. Prevent deterioration in the community cohesion.

The Project will help local administrations plan and prioritize local services which need improvement, and then provide concrete support to the implementation of these services. It will provide designs and implement small scale community infrastructure works in Presevo, Sid, Bujanovac, Dimitrovgrad and Belgrade, etc.). Therefore, the Project will create and implement designs for at least four infrastructure works, purchase at least one waste removal truck and other waste management equipment to improve waste management in local municipalities.

The Project will also provide knowledge and human resource support. Currently, there is a nation-wide ban on state employment, due to austerity measures. At the same time, municipality administrations suffer from increased workload due to the migration crisis. The Project will help municipalities’ staffing both for experts and ordinary labour and provide experts on waste management, water, sewage transport infrastructure etc. to the municipalities. It will also provide skilled labour to local public utility companies.

Community cohesion is fragile in migration affected municipalities due to lack of information and open-ended nature of the crisis. The Project will help avoid ethnic or religious radicalization at the local level by providing information and exchange through the involvement of civil society and mobilizing volunteers to help communities. Four grants will be awarded to NGOs/community based organizations on awareness on human rights of the migrants, women, and the vulnerable in host communities. Also, the Project will award five grants to mobilize volunteerism on the local level and help response, but also reinvigorate community participation in the decision making on the local level.

The Project activities will be implemented in parallel with the humanitarian response activities, coordinated by UNHCR. The United Nations Country Team in Serbia has a mandate structure (explained below) which enables structured and targeted response activities. Also, the Project activities will be coordinated closely with JICA, through cooperation modalities established at UNDP – JICA regional workshop in Belgrade, on 1 December 2015.

Project outputs are geared towards avoiding radicalization at the local level in the future and preventing the negative impact by the migrant crisis on the host communities, which suffer from the capacity gaps and depreciation of municipal assets. All activities under this Project will be coordinated with all regional initiatives spearheaded by UNDP, UNHCR and other international partners and coordinated closely with the Embassy of Japan in the Republic of Serbia. Modest funds in the Project are allocated for coordination activities. All activates will be implemented in a flexible manner, to enable response to evolving nature of the crisis.
II. **SITUATION ANALYSIS**

**Introduction**

The number of migrants crossing the Republic of Serbia surged in 2015.

![No of Asylum Seekers Transiting Serbia](image1)

**UNDP compilation of data from UNHCR and Serbian authorities;**

Globally, the UNDP has identified four key root causes that give rise to the increased levels of migration and displacement that we are witnessing today: (1) Improved but insufficient development gains; (2) Protracted conflicts and violent extremism; (3) Poor governance; (4) Climate change and weak natural resources management.

In the Western Balkans region, the crisis caused by migration of people from the Middle East, North Africa and other countries has put a tremendous burden on the limited municipal capacities in the Republic of Serbia. According to UNHCR data, in 2015 alone, it is estimated that over 750,000 people have transited through the Republic of Serbia, while over 540,000 have expressed an intention to apply for asylum before continuing to Western Europe.

On average, 4,000 – 5,000 people crossed Serbia’s north-west corridor in the October – November 2015 period, which is a sharp increase from the 1,500 average during the June-August period. At times, this number increases to almost 10,000, while it seldom went below 3,000. Only late 2015 brought a decrease, primarily due to cold weather and transportation problems between Turkey and Greece.

![Average Number of People Transiting per month](image2)
The year 2016 brought decreased numbers, but increased volatility of the situation. The decrease in numbers can be viewed through the prism of strengthened border protection in EU countries (Austria, Slovenia and Croatia and Hungary) and through the prism of the Agreement between the European Union and Turkey, by which Turkey agrees to accept back people which arrive to Greek islands, while the EU resettles the exact number of refugees from Turkey. This Agreement also carries additional EU accession benefits for Turkey. At present, there are more than 10,000 people in northern Greece (Idomeni) and several thousand elsewhere in Greece, awaiting processing.

While the flow which existed in 2015 was significantly reduced, the irregular flow of refugees and migrant through Bulgaria and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (hereinafter: “Macedonia”) increased. UNHCR reports of daily arrivals, up to 50 irregular migrants arriving from Bulgaria and Macedonia, which are processed in accordance with the Serbian legislation. Also, there is an increase in the number of people granted asylum in Serbia, which implies that they will not be able to continue their journey towards the EU legally. Furthermore, people who found themselves in Serbia after the western Balkans route was closed are now in a precarious position because they have little means to continue their journey towards the EU and have difficulties staying in Serbia.

III. BASELINE

From the very beginning of the refugee/migration crisis, humanitarian agencies have supported the Serbian Government’s response to the needs emerging from fast growing numbers of arrivals. Humanitarian partners have been deployed to key locations along the borders and in Belgrade to establish humanitarian aid services.

The initial Government response strategy to the refugee emergency was developed under the leadership of the Ministry of Labour Social Policy and Veterans (MOL), in close coordination with various authorities, the UN Country Team, civil society and local authorities. Most services and distribution of aid have been concentrated in and around the “one-stop shop” reception centre that was established by the Serbian
Government in the southern border town of Presevo and later expanded to northern border towns and Belgrade. Currently, the Refugee Aid Point (RAP) in Miratovac, Reception Centre in Presevo and RAPs in the Sid area (Adasevci, Principovac, Sid railway station) are being upgraded in order to provide all necessary services to the beneficiaries.

At the same time, other reception centres along the migrant route, are being upgraded to host migrants. The operational assumption of the UN Country Team in Serbia was that 1,000,000 migrants will cross Serbia in 2016. At the same time, the Republic of Serbia agreed to host up to 6,000 people for prolonged periods of time, however, in the case of challenges connected to cold weather, interruptions of services, and border closure, this number can be increased to 12,000.

These reception centres are located in Vranje, Vladin Han, Aleksinac, Bujanovac, Obrenovac and Subotica, but locations have been identified in other municipalities also. The adaptation of these shelters is ongoing and, depending on the complexity of works needed, it will go into 2016. However, all these municipalities will face similar challenges with capacity gaps, depreciation of municipal assets and community cohesion.

The migrant flow and ensuing challenges with protracted displacement are likely to remain fluid, depending on the situation in countries of origin, transport conditions, and weather, as well as on measures by countries in the region to manage the refugee/migration crisis.

In November 2015, there was a widely reported incident that a person connected to Paris attacks in November 2015 had been registered in Presevo, Serbia. This has captured the attention of the Serbian population. Throughout 2015, there were rumours in the public that because some men travelled alone, there was a danger of terrorism. However, these rumours, although doing some damage to the perceptions of migrants at the local level, have not been proven, as there has been no direct linkage to the increase of terrorism connected to the migration flow.

The refugee/migrant situation in March – April 2016 period does not point to the conclusion that the position of local municipalities shall significantly improve after the closure of the western Balkans route. There is an increased number of irregular arrivals and genuine concerns of people trafficking, which are likely to result in a number of people staying for prolonged periods in the accommodations centres in Serbia. From the development perspective, the difference between the large flow of people and prolonged stay is in the need to strengthen activities on community cohesion, which the project activities envisage.
The recent data\(^1\) showed that majority of citizens would support the Government in perusing more strict migration policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think Serbia should do then?</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To offer asylum those wishing to stay in the country</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To, like Hungary, Bulgaria and others erect barriers at the border and not allow entry into the country</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know / I do not have a view</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Capacities and Main Challenges**

In spite support provided by the international community to the Government in overcoming the migration crisis, the municipalities are still struggling to cope with the growing needs for basic services including waste management, water, shelter and transportation. The current infrastructure of the existing temporary centres is able to respond to only the most basic necessities of the migrants and only for a short period of time.

The level and the scope of response is diverse between municipalities, and this is mostly due to the different migrant situation within each municipality as well as the differences in municipal capacities.

Presevo has the population of (35,000 inhabitants) predominantly of ethnic Albanian origin. The community has a legacy of interethnic strife (even an open conflict in 2001) and continuous population outflow ever since. Presevo has the largest migrant population influx and the capacities of public service delivery both for temporary centres and host communities have been seriously strained. Located in the already least developed region of the Republic of Serbia, the Presevo municipality is unable to manage the approximately 30,000 kg of additional waste produced per day or 174 cubic meters, with the current resources available.\(^2\) The inability to manage the waste alone is having substantial impacts on the quality of life of the migrants and of the host community, and poses potential longer term health and environmental concerns. The UNDP preliminary assessment which was conducted in September-November 2015 showed

---


2. Presevo is categorized by the “Devastated” municipality, according to the Government of Serbia, [http://www.regionalnirazvoj.gov.rs/Pages/Default.aspx](http://www.regionalnirazvoj.gov.rs/Pages/Default.aspx). UNDP waste assessment from October 2015 testified that PUC “Moravica” employs 50 people where 15 of them work on waste management collection (4 drivers, and 11 workers working on waste loading and cleaning of public surfaces). All the activities of waste management sector are conducted ad hoc, without any predetermined work or development plans as well as a plan for increase of service coverage.
that Presevo municipality's waste issues are in the following areas: a) lack of equipment; b) insufficient staffing; and c) weak management capacities. There is a similar situation with the water supply service. The local water supply system in Presevo is over-stretched even in regular circumstances, but with additional use of water it is prone to system failure. One such failure happened on 25 November when Presevo’s water pump broke down. With UNDP’s support the new pump was provided but a municipality still needs a durable solution for a sustainable water management. Waste and sewage issues represent a significant environmental concern for the residents of Presevo. According to the Mayor of municipality of Presevo, the contribution of the international community and the national government is insufficient with complete focus on Migrants Aid and One Stop Points, hence the municipality is not able to meet the expectations of the community with the current influx of migrants.

The challenges are similar in other municipalities in Serbia affected by migration, in particular Sid and Dimitrovgrad and Pirot, which are transit municipalities on the entry point to Croatia (Sid) and entry into Serbia from Bulgaria (Dimitrovgrad). Also, as Serbia prepares to host a certain number of refugees and migrants for a prolonged period of time (6,000), similar challenges will be replicated elsewhere. At present, the Government has approved 7 prioritized hard shelter locations (Tobacco Factory in Presevo, State facility in Bujanovac, Motel in Vranje, facility in Surdulica/Vladičin Han, Military Barracks in Aleksinac, Hotel in Obrenovac, and Sartid Steel factory facility in Smederevo). Having in mind the development level of these municipalities, it is reasonable to assume that these challenges will be replicated in other municipalities which would either host temporarily or for extended period of time large number of migrants.

![Graph: Burden on Local Self-Governments (June - December 2015)](image)

**UNDP Serbia’s baseline assessments**

The baseline assessment, conducted by UNDP in Serbia and UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub in August-September 2015, revealed the following problems:

1. **Pressures on public finance** — Serbia's public administration is operating under austerity measures, where no additional staff and finances are available for public administration and technical services. The expenditures of public utility companies (that are in charge with the essential public services in municipalities) increased by 30-50% in more affected areas such as Preševo. Currently, waste management, water and wastewater services cannot function properly without external support, their quality is lower, and capacity is stretched.

2. **Increased depreciation of municipal assets** — the necessity to serve the needs of a large and continuous flux of people with the same capacities means an exponential depreciation of assets, as there have been very little capital investments in communal infrastructure in the last twenty years. Whatever development gains had been achieved, are currently at risk of being eroded and, if not carefully managed, some of the local areas will be left with a development deficit from the migration crisis.

---

3 Pravi se plan za smestaj 6,000 izbeglica [a plan for accommodation of 6,000 refugees is being made], available at: [http://rs.ni.info.com/a133108/Vesti/Pravi-se-plan-za-smestaj-oko-6-000-izbeglica.html](http://rs.ni.info.com/a133108/Vesti/Pravi-se-plan-za-smestaj-oko-6-000-izbeglica.html)
3. **Exposure of capacity gaps** – it is clear that some municipalities have limited capacities to deal with the issues that the flux of migrants brings. Lack of people, skills, and underperforming legal and planning frameworks are apparent.

4. **Risk of decreasing social cohesion, particularly in multi-ethnic municipalities** – Serbia has many municipalities, particularly in border areas that have a majority non-Serbian population (Albanian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, etc.). The lack of support to deal with the pressures from the migration flow, and the perception that the local population is receiving less and worse municipal service, may give way to increased dissatisfaction and tension, particularly in municipalities with a legacy of inter-ethnic tension. In the municipalities of South Serbia (Bujanovac, Preševo and Medvedja) a Coordination Body was established in 2000 by the government to restore peace and livelihoods. The Coordination Body (CB) promoted ethnic reconciliation by improving the security situation, the formation of multi-ethnic police, addressing human rights abuses and assistance for return of IDPs from Kosovo. These developmental gains are still fragile and may be easily lost.

5. **Social and environmental impacts** – the human elements cannot be separated in local settings and there is a need to focus on social welfare and gender issues for migrants and local communities. The UNDP will take a human rights-based approach to our support to migrants and returnees and increase the capacity of local stakeholders accordingly. When it comes to environmental impacts, it is important that communities are not left with legacy issues from inappropriate solid and liquid waste management. Increasing vermin in highly populated areas and increasing illegal disposal of waste threaten to become environmental legacies of the migration influx.

UNDP Serbia has also undertaken assessments on waste management, for Presevo, Sid and Kanjiza, as well as water and sewage assessment for Presevo and Sid. On 10 November 2015, jointly with the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, UNDP has organized a meeting with mayors and deputy mayors of affected municipalities, to ascertain their real and perceived needs.

**Urgency of the need to stabilize local communities**

Throughout 2015 and in early 2016, there was urgent need to stabilize local communities, who were experiencing difficulties in waste management, road maintenance and other infrastructure, which began to depreciate at a much faster pace. Public services were under strain and not appropriately tackled in the areas/paths which the migrants are using in order to reach these specific sites. At the 10 November meeting which UNDP organized together with the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, the mayors and deputy mayors stressed lack of information and the uncertain prospect for this crisis as a major factor of concern at the local level. Furthermore, several participants at the meeting stressed how they are “not sharing information with their constituencies on how much this crisis is costing them”, in order to maintain the existing level of community cohesion and solidarity. However, visible challenges on the local level, which come as a result of the migrant crisis, such as depreciation of municipal infrastructure (waste collection, transport, water supply, and sewage), human resource challenges in local public utility infrastructure and administration are too visible to ignore.

There is no continuous direct support to local communities at present. Affected municipalities in Serbia have received some EUR 570,000 (RSD 65,000,000) in support from the Serbian Commissariat on Refugees and Migrants (SCRM), as well as several hundred thousand EUR from the central and provincial authorities. In December, the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government appropriated US$87,000 (RSD 10,000,000). As safe and dignified transit depends both on the central authorities and on local community support, urgent attention needs to be paid to the needs of the local communities to maintain the solidarity of the local population in the months to come.

The urgency to stabilize local communities persists. The transit flow has exposed capacity gaps of local communities and imposed financial burden which has not been compensated. Therefore, there needs to be a continuous engagement with local municipalities to deliver visible infrastructure improvements and strengthen capacities for public service delivery to retain the level of solidarity which has been displayed during the height of the crisis. Also, with uncertain prospects, the repetition of the crisis is quite possible, as well as the challenges which stem from the irregular migration flow. Finally, the community cohesion on the local level has been strained. For instance, the 13 November 2015 terrorist attack in Paris, contributed
to uncertainty and anti-migration sentiment. UNDP – Gallup survey from February – March 2016 suggests that over 80% of people believes there might be terrorists among migrants, while 70% state they fear for their safety. UNDP shall repeat this survey at the end of 2016 as well as in 2017. Any radicalization of host communities would lead to further stretching of the already strained capacity of police services in host communities and also pose additional challenge to protracted displacement in Serbia.

The international community support in the current crisis

The international community mobilized resources and provided support to alleviate suffering by focusing almost exclusively on the humanitarian needs of the transiting population, with very little tangible benefits for the host communities. The largest donor is the European Union, followed by Germany, Norway, Japan, Switzerland and others.

The UN Country Team in Serbia has developed a strategy for providing coordinated assistance for addressing the migration crisis in Serbia whereas UNHCR is supporting the response activities. UN delivered more than USD 10 million worth of humanitarian support.

Bearing the humanitarian-development nexus in mind, the UN agencies have coordinated their work throughout the crisis. In addition to UN agencies, other NGOs present in the region, such as Save the Children, World Vision, CARE, Caritas, HELP, and others, which are augmenting the capacities of central and local government and liaising closely to the UNHCR and other UN actors in providing support to the migrants.

UNDP Current Response

For over a decade, UNDP has been supporting the peace building and local development in Serbia. So far, UNDP delivered ⅓ of its own resources of USD 235,000, mobilized for planning of the development response to the current crisis. UNDP utilized these funds for the assessments of waste management in Presevo, Sid, Dimitrovgrad and Kanjiza – and identified priority areas for further donor. As a result of these assessment, UNDP has already procured equipment and winter uniforms for the Public Utility Companies in Sid, Belgrade and Presevo and engaged a garbage truck from neighbouring Vranje to clean Presevo and employ additional workforce in Presevo until the end of January 2016; also, it procured some 200 containers of 120l and 14 of 1.1m³ for Sid and 500 containers of 120l for Presevo to improve the waste collection in these towns. Also, UNDP is developing long-term response plans for waste management and planning of the local community support in Sid. Concrete measures of UNDP support include improvement of Presevo water billing system and continuing assessments of community infrastructure – water and sewage in Presevo and Sid. In November 2015, UNDP procured a water pump for Presevo to retain the regular water supply in the town and increase the yield of existing wells. In 2016, UNDP regenerated two water wells in Sid, increasing the yield for 50% in both.

UNDP is also undertaking public opinion surveys, as well as focus group research, which should measure the impact of the migration crisis on local self-governments and local communities in Serbia.

IV. Strategy

The following four key elements underpin the UNDP global development approach to migration and displacement:

1. Prevention and mitigation of involuntary migration and human trafficking:
2. Legal frameworks and legal empowerment and protection of migrants:
3. Resilience of host, transit and origin countries and communities:
4. Reintegration of returnees:

When mismanaged or poorly planned, migration and displacement can have significant human costs for
migrants, the communities that receive them and those left behind. Similarly, the risk of social tensions or conflict is higher in contexts where politicians use populist rhetoric to make foreigners “scapegoats” for economic and political challenges.

Therefore, the current Project shall focus on the third element of the development approach and built upon the premise that if institutions are not capacitated urgently, they will be overwhelmed and incapable of coping with the current flow of migrants and refugees. Resilience is dependent on the level of support provided to communities to further integration processes in a conflict-sensitive manner. This approach, therefore, focuses on enhancing the ability of institutions to absorb and adapt to provide critical services to deal with the current surge of migrants and displaced people on the one hand and on the ability of communities to integrate migrants and/or deal with the effects of transiting or departing migrants, especially of women and children who are disproportionately left behind. This “development response” would happen in parallel to the humanitarian response and be geared towards the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals.

The UNDP will address the gaps and complement the actions of other actors working on migration and displacement and provide fruitful grounds for the continuation of support by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA).

Crisis Response in Serbia: Humanitarian – Development Collaboration Nexus

The current migration crisis in Serbia is unique in terms that all development actors are responding to the crisis, whilst trying to maintain the existing development gains. Activities on crisis response are planned in parallel to the development ones. For instance, renting garbage trucks and procuring equipment and waste bins is accompanied by a long term waste-management plan. Also, purchasing of a water pump is accompanied by plans to repair the water supply system and reduce losses in the water system.

The UNDP has undertaken actions which are complementary to the humanitarian support, provided by the international community and the Government of Serbia. As a part of the UN Country Team in Serbia, UNDP is operating under the coordination of the UNHCR in Serbia and IOM (within its mandate). While the Government of Serbia is in charge of the overall coordination of humanitarian and relief assistance, UNHCR is coordinating the UN Country Team and providing regular partner briefing to the humanitarian community in Serbia. In particular, since September 2015, the UN Country Team is streamlining coordination through the work of four working groups:

1. On refugee protection (co-chaired by the Ministry of Labor and UNHCR);
2. On Shelter, CRI, WASH (co-chaired by the Serbian Commissariat on Refugees and Migrants and UNHCR);
3. Health, Food and Nutrition (co-chaired by the Ministry of Health and the World Health Organization);
4. Local Community Support (co-chaired by the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government and UNDP);

Owing largely to the intervention of UNDP, the UN Country Team in Serbia introduced support to local communities in September 2015 as one of the humanitarian response priorities, to take place in parallel to humanitarian activities.

As a chair of the UN Country Team on Local Community Support, UNDP formulated its response activities in four objectives, which are currently part of the 2015 Regional Refugee and Migrant Response Plan (RRMRP):

1. Municipal administrations are capacitated to manage the impact of migration;
2. Better services are delivered to communities, including migrants;
3. Local community cohesion is maintained;

South and Southwest Serbia remain the most economically and socially deprived regions within the Republic of Serbia. 2014.
4. Advocacy, coordination and communication is strengthened;

UNDP will retain its role as a co-chair of the Working Group on local community support, and, under the coordination of the UNHCR, will liaise with Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and Government Working Group on Mixed Migration and Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, to ensure that the comprehensive support both for migrants and their host communities is provided by the international community.

UNDP aims to assist the local governments (municipalities), civil society, communities and migrants in the Republic of Serbia to strengthen robust and sustainable response mechanisms and capacities both for migrants and host communities. The project will focus on institutional strengthening, coordination and improved public service delivery. It will be structured through the following development areas, in line with objectives 2 (Better services are delivered to communities, including migrants) and 3 (Local community cohesion is maintained), in line with the RRMRP:

The project will primarily target migrants and host communities of the (at least 15) municipalities of the Republic of Serbia: Presevo, Sid, Belgrade, Dimitrovgrad, Zajecar, Bosilegrad, Negotin, Pirot, Bujanovac, Vranje, Surdulica and Vlačin Han, Aleksinac, Obrenovac, and Smederevo. While the project will target the aforementioned municipalities, as the ones most likely to be affected by the crisis, it will be flexible to respond to the evolving crisis on the local level.

In order to ensure that host and migrant communities benefit equally from the processes of improved basic service delivery, communities and individuals must be aware of their entitlements and have access to information regarding service delivery. Transparency about the equal rights of all groups, including gender equality, and the mechanisms that exist to ensure equality for all citizens are particularly important in the host communities where the influx of migrants can be perceived as a strain and become the source of social disputes and disturbances.

**UNHCR–UNDP Coordination and Collaboration**

The project will collaborate with UNHCR and partner organizations to provide information regarding human rights, gender equality and access to social services for all. UNDP will be able to support UNHCR-led interventions by targeting local communities which are the most affected by the migration crisis, in line with UNHCR-identified crisis evolution. Also, UNDP will be the first responder to support communities where migrants are hosted for prolonged periods according to UNHCR recommendations to the Government of Serbia.

UNHCR is, together with the UN Resident Coordinator, organizing regular weekly meetings of UN Country Team in Serbia with the purpose of a joint response. UNDP provides regular briefings on developments and activities in the field of support to local communities. Also, UNHCR is providing monthly partner briefings to the humanitarian community, co-chaired by the Ministry of Labour, Social and Veteran Affairs. UNDP is also providing regular updates on work of the working group on local community support in this forum. UNHCR and partner organizations are mandated to provide refugees and migrants with legal advice and human rights advocacy information.

All the activities and interventions will be linked with the existing UNDP programmes, utilizing already established mechanisms to support local planning, budgeting, and implementation of public development. The project will also closely work with the relevant technical departments of the Republic of Serbia and relevant UN agencies to ensure quality and technically sound implementation.

All outputs of the Project will bolster the humanitarian response. For instance, the areas around the reception centres will be cleaned and water supply will not be interrupted in these areas. UNDP in cooperation with UNHCR will provide support to central and local level coordination. Also, the priorities for any grant scheme will be coordinated with UNHCR. Finally, UNDP will coordinate with UNHCR to ensure that information sharing and strengthening service provision to both host community and refugees/migrants is provided.
Partnership and Regional Linkages

In addition to the already described Regional Refugee and Migrant Response Plan, which UNHCR is coordinating together with IOM, UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub is spearheading region-wide efforts to conduct a joint needs assessment of migration—affected municipalities (Turkey, Greece, FYROM, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia). This is done taking into account the gender differentiated dimensions and human-rights-based approach of the crisis response and building the foundation for sustainable recovery planning that serves the differentiated needs of vulnerable groups. Also, the work on the regional level is informed by national level assessments, which UNDP Serbia and other humanitarian and development actors are doing. The assessment would focus on the issues of ecological/environmental sustainability and the economic impact on the host/transit municipalities and communities, as well as the particular impact on the migrant communities transiting and/or staying. At the same time, the assessment would take into account the response from the point of view of community security and social cohesion, access to justice and protection of the most vulnerable, including victims of SGBV. This will directly feed into a recovery framework. In addition, the project will help coordinate the drafting and implementation of contingency plans which will enhance the capacity of municipalities to deal with the crisis. This initiative will benefit from UNDP core resources and shall aim at the increased cross-border coordination between municipalities and development of contingency and recovery planning and framework. It should also foster coordination between municipalities, and improve knowledge and information sharing through an online mechanism.

With the above-mentioned sub-regional level assessments, this project is a meaningful intervention together with other Japan-UNDP partnerships in Turkey (Southeast region—Anatolia) and FYR Macedonia (Kumanovo and Gevgelija) in a simultaneous manner to tackle the local needs in all the main routes in: (1) the Syria-Turkey border (Sanliurfa, Gaziantep, Hatay and Kilis), (2) the Greek-Macedonia border (Gevgelija), (3) the Macedonia-Serbia border (Kumanovo-Presovo) and (4) the Serbian-Croatian border (Sid).

Cooperation of UNDP Serbia with the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

On 1 December 2015 UNDP Serbia, together with the Japan—UNDP Japan Partnership Unit/Bureau of External Relations and Advocacy (BERA) from New York, organized a regional UNDP—JICA Cooperation Workshop in Belgrade. UNDP offices from Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina participated in the workshop, as well as UNHCR from Geneva and Serbia. Also, representatives of JICA offices from Belgrade and Vienna were also present. The Workshop was organized with a view to better coordinating activities and avoiding overlap in the discharge of support. This workshop was instrumental in introducing the work of UNDP and JICA to each other in 2015. However, UNDP Serbia and JICA have had history of information exchange on pertinent issues in the past. JICA's potential project for the flood risk management of the Sava river basin is complementary to the landmark activity: Flood Risk Management Study in the Kolubara River Basin, which UNDP is implementing with the Japanese Government Supplementary budget 2014 support.

There was a consensus among all of the participants on the fact that it is impossible to rely solely on the existing system and capacities of local governments to respond to the current influx of migrants and refugees. UNDP and JICA shared the view that the assistance which fits the current situation of the region is to support the host community with strengthening its solid waste management as well as its governance. On the other hand, UNHCR has been helping the host communities to increase and strengthen their reception capacities.

UNDP and JICA agreed at the workshop to bolster the information sharing and coordination of activities to avoid overlap and maximize the impact of Japanese funding. In this regard, UNDP Serbia committed to information sharing with JICA, whereby it will both share the results of its assessments and involve JICA into designing of significant activities. In this regard, the JICA Serbia office will have an opportunity to comment on the methodology of UNDP—Serbia research and assessments as well as to enjoy benefits of

---

the results of such research. Finally, UNDP Serbia will provide support to JICA-organized research through its expertise and partnership network.

Those activities in support to local communities which UNDP is not able to implement, UNDP will recommend to JICA for their support, with a purpose of enhancing their resilience.

**UNDP – Japan Collaboration and Visibility of Japan**

UNDP and Japan have a strong partnership. Japan is one of the largest UNDP donors globally. In Serbia, Japan has funded the Increased Resilience to Respond to Emergency Situations project from 2015 supplementary budget, to recover from the May 2014 floods and enhance resilience of local municipalities to natural disasters.

Mr. Naoki Nihei,⁶ UNDP-JICA/Japan Collaboration Advisor, Bureau of External Relations and Advocacy (BERA), UNDP Headquarters, is advising UNDP Serbia on issues of cooperation with Japan, which includes the submission of the current project proposal.

UNDP prioritizes the visibility of the donor. Following the successful example of the Increased Resilience to Respond to Emergency Situations project, UNDP shall establish the following visibility material, featuring Japan logo:

1. Letterhead of the Project;
2. Power Point slide of the Project;
3. Design Cover page – for all designs;
4. Infrastructure work board - for ongoing and completed infrastructure works;
6. Facebook page of individual activities, similar to: [https://www.facebook.com/bewareproject/?fref-ts](https://www.facebook.com/bewareproject/?fref-ts)
7. Partners page, similar to [http://studijakolubara.srbijavode.rs/home/](http://studijakolubara.srbijavode.rs/home/)
8. or [http://geoliss.mre.gov.rs/beware/](http://geoliss.mre.gov.rs/beware/)
9. Other materials produced (e.g. on grant activities) featuring donor visibility prominently.

Each activity under this Project will be adequately followed by central and local media.

Official Japanese logo to be used during the implementation of the Project:

UNDP Serbia does not envisage instances in which the visibility of the Government of Japan will not be possible. Should those appear, however, UNDP will consult immediately with the Embassy of Japan in the Republic of Serbia.

**Potential Cooperation with Japanese Non-Governmental Organizations**

UNDP will engage with any and all Japanese NGOs who become active in the field of migration in the near future. As of early 2016, there are no active Japanese NGOs dealing with the migration crisis in Serbia, but,

[naoki.nihei@undp.org](mailto:naoki.nihei@undp.org)
should any appear, UNDP will engage, establish communication, and seek modes of cooperation with them.

Cooperation with Japanese Companies, Enterprises and Businesses

UNDP established communication with the Japanese Business Club, in particular with its Chairman Mr. Goran Pekez. The parties agreed that UNDP will keep the Japanese Business Club aware of all UNDP tenders, but especially those which come out of the implementation of the current funding by the Government of Japan, but also other as well. Also, the parties agreed to explore avenues for cooperation and streamlining of efforts and combine resources to maximize impact of development interventions in Serbian municipalities.

V. OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Project outcome: Sustainable and robust response to urgent needs of local and migrant populations provided through reinforced resilience mechanisms and enhanced capacities of all key stakeholders for inclusive public service provision and social cohesion.

Outputs:
1. Local institutions strengthened and basic service provision improved;
2. Community cohesion maintained and strengthened;

Envisaged Activities:
The Project will contribute to increased resilience of municipalities and local communities, through enhanced capacities for local governments and host communities to develop and implement strategies to address the urgent and long-term needs of the populations affected by the current migrant influx. Local municipality institutions are the first level of service provisions in the Republic of Serbia, before regional or the national level. The inventory of their mandate entails delivery of services which are closest to lives of everyday population. For instance, waste management, provision of water supply, sewage system, local roads, maintenance of local public buildings (schools, primary healthcare units) etc. The activities shall focus on the strengthening institutions which deliver basic services so that they can cope with the increased pressure which the large number of arriving population poses before them, in order to ensure that both domestic and arriving population enjoy improved services at the local level.

In particular, the activities shall include:

Output 1: Local institutions strengthened and basic service provision improved
After project completion, the local institutions will be strengthened and more resilient to the crisis and will have improved service delivery for their constituency, because they will receive both knowledge and technical assistance, in parallel to small best-practice local improvements of community infrastructure from which the local population will benefit.

Local institutions will have better equipment, more knowledge and more information, which will come from bills of quantities which the infrastructure designs will provide, from expert assessments and sharing best practices with their peer institutions in the country and the region, and which face same difficulties.

1.1. Rapid prioritization of public services, based on UNDP Serbia and JICA assessments;
UNDP has already undertaken assessments on water supply, sewage and especially waste management in most affected municipalities. The remaining assessments will be quickly done for the other municipalities, along with the prioritization of public services. The prioritization will be done following an inclusive process with the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, the Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities, the Government Working Group on Mixed Migration Flows and the municipalities themselves and civil society in the affected municipalities;

1.2. Enhance capacities of the local governments to develop service delivery improvement plans for migrant response in a participatory and inclusive manner.

UNDP will assist municipalities to develop plans for asset/equipment needs including a replacement schedule, and a maintenance plan for the equipment which the municipality proposes to use for enhancing their response to the migrant crisis (i.e. procurement, maintenance, budget for maintenance, repair, servicing and consumable). Following this planning activity, UNDP will proceed with purchasing and handing over the equipment to municipalities;

1.3. Designing services for local community infrastructure works and construction and improvement of small local community infrastructure (water supply, sewage, transport infrastructure, landfill improvement etc.);

The designs are a necessary pre-requisite of any infrastructure improvement. Good designs save funds. UNDP will use existing municipality documentation, including construction layers, to create good-quality designs for the improvement of community infrastructure which is necessary to facilitate the lives of the local population and the transit of migrants. UNDP has long term agreements (LTA) for designing, technical control and supervision of works, which enables very fast contract awarding to the companies. Following the approved design and technical control of works, UNDP will tender for works, using UNDP procedures. In parallel, UNDP will award a LTA contract to a company for the supervision of works.

1.4. Provide necessary equipment and works, to municipalities and enhance service delivery.

Following the prioritization work, UNDP will purchase the necessary equipment to enhance service delivery at the local level (containers, water pumps, water supply networks, compactor trucks, excavators for maintaining landfill, etc.);

1.5. Facilitate peer to peer support and strengthen inter-municipal cooperation at the regional level, enhancing service provision for the affected municipalities (in line with UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub activities).

There is a need for exchange of best practices at the regional level. UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub is planning regional workshops involving affected municipalities at the regional level. UNDP Serbia intends to contribute to these workshops by including as many best practices at the regional level as possible to be showcased, with a view to improving support to local communities at the regional level.

1.6. Provide employment opportunities through technical assistance to municipalities to strengthen efficiency in service provision and coordination with the Government and other stakeholders at the local level.

Most of the affected municipalities suffer from high unemployment. The increased workload, due to the large number of arriving population, would be an opportunity for more employment, however, due to the existing ban on hiring, municipalities cannot employ additional staff. UNDP can provide funds to local municipal services, which could employ additional staff and thus assist in coping with the crisis. These staff can be hired from the National Employment Service database, thereby bolstering orderly employment and can range from unskilled labor assistance for simple works, to skilled labor, which would assist municipality services (economists, lawyers, social workers etc.). In the process of employment additional support staff, UNDP will pay special attention to employment of women, social and vulnerable groups as well as single parents.
Output 2: Community cohesion maintained and strengthened

Maintaining community cohesion in light of challenges will provide a long term effect on the stability and resilience of local municipalities geared towards the implementation of the sustainable development goals. UNDP will rely on the results of the Gallup - UNDP survey from February - March 2016 (under preparation) which testifies that citizens are most willing to provide food and clothing, and the less prepared to accept migrants as their guests or as their neighbors. Also, majority (70%) is against the establishment of an accommodation facility for migrants close to their home. Currently, the research shows that almost half of respondents (46%) are completely against admission of migrants permanently in Serbia, while 45% would accept some or all of them. The reason is mainly that the members of the arriving population is very different than the indigenous and that poverty in Serbia and cultural, religious and language differences are perceived as the biggest challenge to admitting migrants.

The result of the survey will be a baseline for detailed programming in the Annual Work Plan. Also, based on the Survey, UNDP shall, using its own crisis response funds, organize a series of focus groups to inform both its own, and the programming of its patterns.

The results of the survey and the focus groups will help focus coordination between the government and the local level (Act 2.1.) and inform the content of the call for proposals for the grant scheme (Act. 2.2.). The survey and focus groups are funded through UNDP own resources, thereby ensuring consistency of support.

2.1. Assist the government and the local level in strengthening coordination to integrate the priority needs of migrants and host communities into government strategies and to budget for their effective implementation.

UNDP has a good convening power in Serbia, as demonstrated during the Japanese funded “Increased Resilience to Respond to Emergency Situation” project when it facilitated the cross-sectorial activities. The coordination between central and local level is marred by lack of funding for coordination events and credible analysis which would strengthen support to local communities. UNDP will facilitate this coordination, in line with the practice which has started with Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government on 10 November 2015.

2.2. Establish a grant scheme for media, non-government, civil society and community based organizations to raise awareness on human rights of the migrants, women, and the vulnerable in host communities;

UNDP will assist local media, NGOs and community based organizations with support to create media content, and public activities which would bolster solidarity and bring the problem of migration closer to the citizens on the local level. It is expected that some 4-6 small scales grants (up to 10,000 USD) will be awarded to CSOs and Youth offices in migration affected municipalities that will implement different community empowerment activities related to youth and woman engagement, human rights based approach to inclusive and participative integration of migrants and local development.

2.3. Promote the concept of volunteering at the local level;

At present, the experience of NGOs testifies to the desirable effect of this action on the local level.

UNDP Serbia will support grass-root organizations in migration-affected municipalities to engage volunteers to:
- Engage volunteers to directly interact with the migration community and host community still in the temporary reception centers and promote understanding, sensitivity and to reduce social distance.

- Help bring to the migration response agenda those social issues which are of concern for the local community;

- Provide the reality check of local administration priorities from the standpoint of the local community and verify that measures proposed by the local administration are the most pressing in the local community;

- Provide practical support to local service provision and assistance in such issues as waste removal, organization of aid delivery, and prompt identification of changing needs connected to migration etc.

- Organize community campaigns at the local level focusing on women participation, youth engagement and cultural and sport events;

UNDP will assist NGOs and local grass roots organization (women, youth etc.) by providing expert support on volunteering and providing funds for covering the expenses of volunteering. The local level grassroots organizations will pay special focus on ensuring equal participation of both women and man in decision making as well as problem solving processes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTENDED OUTPUTS</th>
<th>INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Local institutions strengthened and basic service provision improved</td>
<td>1) Rapid prioritization of public services, based on UNDP Serbia and JICA assessments</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>A report on prioritization measures for public services in need of strengthening available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Enhance capacities of the local governments to develop service delivery improvement plans for migrant response in a participatory and inclusive manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The need for a % increase in local municipality to increase coverage of waste collection in affected municipalities (inception for Presveo, Sid and Kanjiza) available;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Designing services for local community infrastructure works and construction and improvement of small local community infrastructure (water supply, sewage, transport infrastructure, landfill improvement etc.);</td>
<td></td>
<td>A report on needs necessary to improve water supply in affected municipalities (inception reports for Presveo and Sid available);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Provide necessary equipment and works (containers, water pumps, water supply networks, compactor trucks, excavators for maintaining landfill, etc.), to municipalities and enhance service delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A report on depreciated infrastructure in affected municipalities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Facilitate peer to peer support and strengthen inter-municipal cooperation at the regional level, enhancing service provision for the affected municipalities (in line with UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub activities).</td>
<td></td>
<td>A report on environmental improvements/upgrades (e.g. waste water, illegal landfills) in affected municipalities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) Provide employment opportunities through technical assistance to municipalities to strengthen efficiency in service provision and coordination with the Government and other stakeholders at the local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A local municipality maintenance plan for the equipment which the municipality proposes to use for enhancing their response to the migrant crisis (i.e. procurement, maintenance, budget for maintenance, repair, servicing and consumable);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>List of necessary equipment for improvement of infrastructure works agreed upon with affected municipalities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experience exchange with municipalities from the region on the local improvement possibilities;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Output 2: Community cohesion maintained and strengthened | 1) Assist the government and the local level in strengthening coordination to integrate the priority needs of migrants and host communities into government strategies and to budget for their effective implementation.  
2) Establish a grant scheme for media, non-government, civil society and community based organizations to raise awareness on human rights of the migrants, women, and the vulnerable in host communities;  
3) Promote the concept of volunteering at the local level; | UNDP | Technical oversight/project team  
Monitoring  
An identification of skilled labor in local municipalities (in cooperation with the municipality and the National Employment Service (NES) suitable for support to the enhancement of the local service provision;  
Reports from regular meetings with between affected municipalities about the identified needs to supplement government actions and strategies;  
Social Survey on the impact of the migration crisis on local self-governments, funded by the UNDP TRAC III resources. |
VI. ANNUAL WORK PLAN

Year: 2016 – 2017 (12 months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTED OUTPUTS</th>
<th>PLANNED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>RESP. PARTY</th>
<th>PLANNED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And baseline, associated indicators and annual targets</td>
<td>List activity results and associated actions</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Local institutions strengthened and basic service provision improved</td>
<td>1.1. Activity: Rapid prioritization of public services, based on UNDP Serbia and JICA assessments for the purpose of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: No of people benefiting (broken down by gender) from infrastructure improvement designs, community infrastructure works etc.) Increase in service improvement (e.g. in the number of people covered with managed waste collection);</td>
<td>i) Increase of % of waste collection in the local community; ii) needs necessary to improve water supply; iii) depreciated community infrastructure upgrade; iv) needed environmental improvements/upgrades;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2. Activity
Enhance capacities of the local governments to develop service delivery improvement plans for migrant response in a participatory and inclusive manner;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>National Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3. Activity
Designing services for local community infrastructure works and construction and improvement of small local community infrastructure (water supply, sewage, transport infrastructure, landfill improvement etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>Company Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company Contracts
- 4 designs and technical controls/verification of such designs for local community infrastructure $20,000/design=80,000
- 4 infrastructure works $85,000=$340,000
- 4 supervisions x $5,000 = $20,000

Travel
- 32 monitoring visits $100 = $3,200
- Other travel (car) $1,800

Sundries
- Visibility (lump sum) $5,000

Other travel expenses $1,000

Total: $20,000

Total: $450,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Company Contracts</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide necessary equipment and works (containers, water pumps, water supply networks, compactor trucks, excavators for maintaining landfill, etc.), to municipalities and enhance service delivery</td>
<td>1 waste removal trucks (Sid or Dimitrovgrad) = $97,500</td>
<td>2xVenue/translation/catering</td>
<td>2xlogging x $100 for 50ppts/2 days = $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate peer to peer support and strengthen inter-municipal cooperation at the regional level, enhancing service provision for the affected municipalities (in line with UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub activities)</td>
<td>2000 x 120L waste bins $30 = $60,000</td>
<td>50ppts $2,500x2days = $10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 waste containers 1.1-5m³ x $625 = $37,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lump sum $5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>Gov. of Japan</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2: Community cohesion maintained and strengthened;</th>
<th>1.6. Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide employment opportunities through technical assistance to municipalities to strengthen efficiency in service provision and coordination with the Government and other stakeholders at the local level</td>
<td>National Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 service implementation experts to work for local administrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$250/60days = $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Non-expert labour / 10 municipalities / 32 days x $25 = $40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 Local trips for experts and labor x $100 = $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sundries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication costs lump sum $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1. Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist the government and the local level in strengthening coordination to integrate the priority needs of migrants and host communities into government strategies and to budget for their effective implementation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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municipalities through grant-based work of media, NGOs and CBOs

**Baseline:**
- 37% surveyed view migrants negatively and 20% positively, majority is neutral;
- Half of the population in directly affected municipalities views migrants negatively

**Targets:**
- 10% decrease in the negative perception of migrants in general population and 10% in municipalities directly affected by the migration crisis;
- At least 5 grants implemented, with equal participation of women to produce content which would bolster the community cohesion;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2. Activity</th>
<th>National Consultants</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>Sundries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a grant scheme for media, non-government, civil society and community based organizations to raise awareness on human rights of the migrants, women, and the vulnerable in host communities</td>
<td>1 communication expert $250/20 days = $5,000</td>
<td>4 grants x $10,000 for awareness activities = $40,000</td>
<td>20 Field visits $100/2days = $4,000</td>
<td>Office, equipment and supplies lump sum $3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3. Promote the concept of volunteering at the local level</th>
<th>National Consultants</th>
<th>Company Contracts</th>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>Sundries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 local or UNDP expert on volunteering $250/20days = $5,000</td>
<td>5 grants for volunteering x $7,500 = $37,500</td>
<td>15 field visits $100/3days = $4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The project will be executed under the Direct Implementation Modality. The management arrangements will conform to the stipulations in the new Results Management Guide. UNDP will take overall responsibility of the project implementation. The Project Organization Structure is the following:

The Project Board is a group of representatives of institutions from the national level whose competence are relevant for the implementation of specific project activities and one representative of the Government of Japan as the donor. The Project Board is responsible for making (by consensus) management decisions for the project and guidance to the Project Manager, including recommendation for approval of project plans and revisions. The Project Board considers reports on the implementation of the project and directs its future course.

Project Board decisions should be made in accordance to standards\(^7\) that shall ensure best value to money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition.

Project reviews that are performed by the Project Board are made at designated decision points during the running of the project, or as necessary when raised by the Project Manager. The Project Board is consulted by the Project Manager for decisions, when tolerances (normally in terms of time and budget) have been exceeded. It ensures that required resources are committed and arbitrates on any conflicts within the project or negotiates a solution to any problems between the project and external bodies.

Project Assurance is the responsibility of each Project Board member. In accordance with the obligations and responsibilities that Project Board members have on the project, this role will be delegated to a UNDP Deputy Resident Representative. Project Board ensures the quality of the project by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. UNDP representatives participate in the Project

---

\(^7\) UNDP Financial Rules and Regulations: Chapter E, Regulation 16.05: a) The administration by executing entities or, under the harmonized operational modalities, implementing partners, of resources obtained from or through UNDP shall be carried out under their respective financial regulations, rules, practices and procedures only to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP. b) Where the financial governance of an executing entity or, under the harmonized operational modalities, implementing partner, does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition that of UNDP shall apply.
Board and ensure the quality of the project. Managerial and administrative accountability will be ensured through periodic field visits and spot checks.

The Executive role is taken by the UNDP RR/UNRC, as responsible party in the project, and the Senior Supplier is a representative of the Government of Japan and UNDP DRR. Senior beneficiaries are the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government (the Ministry) and the Commissariat on Refugees and Migrants. The Ministry will ensure coordination at the central and local level with other beneficiaries – the local municipalities affected by the crisis.

The Project Manager is representative of the UNDP that coordinates implementation of project activities in accordance with the Project document and revised project document (if appropriate), coordinates reporting and is responsible for achieving project results. The Project Manager has the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Project Board within the constraints laid down by the Committee. The Project Manager is responsible for day-to-day management and decision-making for the project. The Project Manager’s prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost.

The Project Support role provides project administration, management and technical support to the Project Manager as required by the needs of the individual Project Manager.

For more effective implementation of project activities and achievement of expected results of the project special working or focus groups can be set up, composed of representatives of UNDP, the implementing partners and relevant institutions.

Partnerships and relations with donor:

UNDP will, coordinate closely with Japan’s Embassy through meetings and field visits on a regular basis.

Moreover, full acknowledgement of the donor (Japan) will be given in all of communication products and other relevant materials through the display of the logo.

a) UNDP Country Office will submit a written request to the Government of Japan for the prior approval in case (1) the extension of the project is required, and/or (2) the re-deployment of funds between approved project budget components is required, if more than 20% increase or decrease is expected.

b) For any fund balances at the end of the project, the country office shall consult with the Government of Japan on its use.

c) The interest income should be treated in accordance with the Japan-UNDP agreement on Arrangement for the Interest Income derived from Japan-UNDP Partnership Fund.

UNDP will make efforts to ensure the visibility of the Government of Japan, where it provides support to partners’ activities.

- Workshop / official meeting invitations, agendas and related materials should contain the phrase this project is funded by the donor, the Government of Japan, and where possible, include the logos of respective institutions as well as those of the government.

- Publications/Reports utilized will reflect that this project is funded by the Government of Japan.

- Where appropriate, UNDP may provide display panels for ongoing activities, or other devices indicating donor as the Government of Japan.

Where appropriate, partners are requested to photograph events or actions supported by UNDP and share these with the organizations with information on the action being undertaken, and reflecting the Donor as the Government of Japan.
VIII. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

In accordance with UNDP's programming policies and procedures, the project will be monitored through the following monitoring and evaluation plans:

### Monitoring Plan

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Title</th>
<th>Partners (if joint)</th>
<th>Related Strategic Plan Output</th>
<th>UNDAF/CPD Outcome</th>
<th>Planned Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Stakeholders</th>
<th>Cost and Source of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>Project Board members</td>
<td>Project budget $10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Management for Project Activity Results

Replicate the table for each activity result of the AWP to provide information on monitoring actions based on quality criteria. To be completed during the process “Defining a Project” if the information is available. This table shall be further refined during the process “Initiating a Project”.

2. OUTPUT 1: Local institutions strengthened and basic service provision improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Result 1 (Atlas Activity ID)</th>
<th>Short title to be used for Atlas Activity ID</th>
<th>Start Date: March 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>What is the purpose of the activity?</td>
<td>End Date: March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To strengthen institutions and improve the service provisions at the local level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Planned actions to produce the activity result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List final activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1. Rapid prioritization of public services, based on UNDP Serbia and JICA assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Enhance capacities of the local governments to develop service delivery improvement plans for migrant response in a participatory and inclusive manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Designing services for local community infrastructure works and construction and improvement of small local community infrastructure (water supply, sewage, transport infrastructure, landfill improvement etc.);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. Provide necessary equipment and works (containers, water pumps, water supply networks, compactor trucks, excavators for maintaining landfill, etc.), to municipalities and enhance service delivery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5. Facilitate peer to peer support and strengthen inter-municipal cooperation at the regional level, enhancing service provision for the affected municipalities (in line with UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub activities).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6. Provide employment opportunities through technical assistance to municipalities to strengthen efficiency in service provision and coordination with the Government and other stakeholders at the local level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Criteria</td>
<td>Quality Method</td>
<td>Date of Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?</td>
<td>Means of verification. What method will be used to determine if quality criteria has been met?</td>
<td>When will the assessment of quality be performed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization Report for all migration affected municipalities;</td>
<td>Prioritization Report</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacities enhanced for affected municipalities;</td>
<td>Monthly Reports</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design services completed;</td>
<td>Transfer of Tiles of procured goods and works implemented</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment provided;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer to peer support provided;

3. OUTPUT 2: Community cohesion maintained and strengthened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Result 1 (Atlas Activity ID)</th>
<th>Short title to be used for Atlas Activity ID</th>
<th>Start Date: March 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>End Date: March 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose

What is the purpose of the activity?
To support the resilience of local communities to by maintaining community cohesion and preventing radicalization at the local level as a result of the migrant crisis;

Description

Planned actions to produce the activity result.

2.1. Assist the government at local levels in strengthening coordination to integrate the priority needs of migrants and host communities into government strategies and to budget for their effective implementation.

2.2. Establish a grant scheme for media, non-government, civil society and community based organizations to raise awareness on the human rights of the migrants, women, and the vulnerable in host communities;

2.3. Promote the concept of volunteering at the local level

Quality Criteria

How/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means of verification. What method will be used to determine if quality criteria has been met?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When will the assessment of quality be performed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of additional staff provided;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next of coordination events between central and local bodies having a stake in migration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of community cohesion contents disseminated in affected municipalities through grant-based work of media, NGOs and CBOs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of additional staff provided;
No. of coordination events between central and local bodies having a stake in migration;
No. of community cohesion contents disseminated in affected municipalities through grant-based work of media, NGOs and CBOs.

Media reports
Monthly reports
Employment statistics

July 2016
March 2017

IX. LEGAL CONTEXT

This project document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article 1 of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the SFR Yugoslavia and UNDP, signed on 24 March 1988.

All references in the SBAA to “Executing Agency” shall be deemed to refer to “Implementing Partner”, as such term is defined and used in this document.

UNDP agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the project funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with pariah regimes, as defined by the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2253 (2016).
terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Impact &amp; Probability</th>
<th>Countermeasures / Management response</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date Identified</th>
<th>Last Update</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prioritization of needs difficult due to many overlapping donor initiatives with different timeline</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Medium impact (3) Medium probability (1)</td>
<td>Careful planning and agreement with all stakeholders on priorities. Attention to donor coordination done by the Government working group on mixed migration flows and the Serbian EU Integration Office;</td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>Project developer</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Funds inadequate to meaningfully and visibly support migration affected municipalities</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>High impact (5) Low probability (2)</td>
<td>Careful planning and timely procurement and contracting. Coordination with all relevant stakeholders and careful selection and prioritization of support;</td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>Project developer</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of proper documentation and layers on the local level which hinder implementation of activities</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Low Impact (1) Medium probability (1)</td>
<td>Additional investing in documentation and layers to prepare for support;</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Project Developer</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local elections due in March/April 2016</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Medium impact (3) Medium probability (3)</td>
<td>Elections are expected in spring and constitution of governments at the local level take some time. This time will be used for planning and the project will make sure to work with all political parties in every municipality.</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Project Developer</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>