



UNIT FOR DONOR COORDINATION, FINANCE, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

# REPORT ON EVALUATION

of the project

Draft of Administrative Decision making in BiH Quality Improvement Programme

## The Logical Framework Matrix



July 2012



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. PROJECT SYNOPSIS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. FRAMEWORK OF EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>6</b>
A. QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DOCUMENTATION.....	6
B. EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTATION.....	6
C. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT .....	12
D. IMPACT .....	12
E. SUSTAINABILITY.....	13
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6. RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7. LEARNED LESSONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT

<b>NO. OF THE CONTRACT:</b>	<b>01-07-160-49/09</b>
<b>Title of the Project:</b>	<b>DRAFT OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION MAKING IN BIH QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME</b>
<b>Implementer:</b>	<b>ZAMM MEDIA CONSULTING D.O.O. SARAJEVO</b>
<b>Start Date:</b>	<b>DECEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2009</b>
<b>Duration of the Contract:</b>	<b>10 MONTHS</b>
<b>Date of Completion:</b>	<b>OCTOBER 17, 2010</b>
<b>Extension Duration:</b>	<b>2 MONTHS</b>
<b>Changed Date of Completion:</b>	<b>DECEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2010</b>
<b>Status of the Project:</b>	<b>COMPLETED</b>

### FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Table 1 – Overview of the budget<sup>1</sup>

<b>CONTRACTED BUDGET in BAM</b>	<b>BAM 444,600.00</b>		
<b>SPENT FUNDS in BAM</b>	<b>BAM 404,580.84</b>		
<b>SPENT FUNDS in %</b>	<b>91 %</b>		
	planned	spent	%
<i>Work Days of the Expert 1 (Mensur Hadžimusić)</i>	134	134	100 %
<i>Work Days of the Expert 2 (Sead Dizdarević)</i>	77	77	100 %
<b>TOTAL</b>	211	211	100 %
<i>Expenses of Per Diems of the Experts</i>	BAM 327,600.00	BAM 327,600.00	<b>100 %</b>
<i>Incidental Expenses</i>	BAM 117,000.00	BAM 76,980.84	<b>66 %</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>BAM 444,600.00</b>	<b>BAM 404,580.84</b>	<b>91 %</b>

<sup>1</sup> all values in the table are shown with the VAT included

## 1. SUMMARY

This Report is intended for the financiers of the project, the contracting and the supervisory authority and the implementer of the contract. The aim is to assess the success of implementation of the project after its completion, to determine its appropriateness and implications of project activities on achievement of the project objective by following the intervention logic and justification for expenditure of funds. Evaluation is essential for drawing lessons learned based on experiences from the process of implementation of the project, and using them in the process of planning of other projects.

Evaluation is based on the Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation of the projects financed from the Public Administration Reform Fund (PARF), adopted by the Joint Management Board of the PARF (PARF JMB). It should give assessment of quality of project documentation, of efficiency and of effectiveness of implementation, of impact and of project sustainability. In order to give as realistic as possible assessment of the said criteria, interviews were conducted with representatives of the implementer of the contract, the contracting authority and beneficiaries.

General evaluation of the Project is positive. Although there was a room for improvement of quality of the project documentation, the project was successfully implemented and a quality project result has been achieved. The proposed measures are a good basis for improvement of quality of administrative decision making in BiH. The impact of the project is not yet on an expected level, but its more significant impact on the levels of the CoM BiH, the RS and the BD BiH is expected in 2012 and 2013. Also, sustainability of the project on these levels is not questionable. Failure to adopt the Programme at the level of the FBiH brings uncertainty on the issue of impact and sustainability of the project results and the issue of justification of the invested funds at this administrative level. Therefore, it is necessary to initiate, as soon as possible, the procedure of adoption of the Programme at the level of the Federation of BiH as well, and then its implementation in practice.

## 2. PROJECT SYNOPSIS

**CONTRIBUTION TO THE AREA / AP 1:** This project covers the reform area of Administrative Procedure from the Action Plan 1 of the Strategy of Public Administration Reform in BiH. To be exact, it is related with the reform measures from the following chapters in the said area:

AP. 1. Strategy of Simplification of Administrative Procedure

AP. 4. Simplification of Administrative Procedure (Redesigning Process)

AP. 5. Organisation and Sources

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this project is establishment of more quality, more efficient and simpler practice of administrative decision making in accordance with the modern European standards at all the levels of authority in Bosnia and Herzegovina, oriented to the users of the services by application of the Administrative Decision Making in BiH Quality Improvement Programme, which contains legislative, organisational, IT, and measures for strengthening human resources.

**OBJECTIVE:** General objective of this project is improvement of the quality of administrative decision making at all the levels of authority in Bosnia and Herzegovina in order

to create functional, reliable, efficient, accountable, transparent, with European standards harmonised, public administration, oriented to users of the services.

**RESULTS:** The expected result of implementation of this project is drafted Administrative Decision Making in BiH Quality Improvement Programme (hereinafter: the Programme), in accordance with the modern European standards of administrative decision making, which contains legislative, organisational, IT, and measures for strengthening human resources.

**LOCATION:** Geographical area covered by the project is Bosnia and Herzegovina (including the entities and the Brčko District of BiH).

**BENEFICIARIES:** The main beneficiaries of the project are: the Ministry of Justice of Bosnia and Herzegovina (MJ BiH), the Ministry of Administration and Local Self-Governance of the Republic of Srpska (MALSG RS), the Ministry of Justice of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (MJ FBiH) and the Office of the Mayor of the Brčko District of Bosnia and Herzegovina – Sector for Legal Affairs (BD Sector for Legal Affairs). The final beneficiaries of the project are: the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina (CoM BiH), the Government of the Republic of Srpska (Government of the RS), the Government of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Government of the FBiH) and the Government of the Brčko District of BiH (BD Government), and all the bodies of administration at all the administrative levels in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as institutions which have public authorities, when acting in administrative matters, deciding on the rights, obligations or legal interests of the citizens, legal entities, or other parties, as well as all the citizens in all of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**SOURCES OF FUNDS:** The Project, in the whole amount, was financed by the funds of the PARF.

### **3. FRAMEWORK OF EVALUATION**

Evaluation was implemented in the period May – June 2012, related to the period of implementation of the project from December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009 to December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2010, as well as to the period after the completion of implementation, through information on project impact and its sustainability. During the evaluation, all the available project documentation (the Contract, the Terms of Reference, the Inception Report, the Interim Reports and the Final Report of the Implementer, including all the annexes) has been thoroughly reviewed, as well as the Draft Administrative Decision Making in BiH Quality Improvement Programme. Additionally, there were interviews with the representatives of the Implementer, the Contracting Authority and the ST, and the beneficiaries of the project from the government levels of the state, the entities and the BD BiH. In total, 8 persons have been interviewed, and the list of interlocutors is in the annex 1 to this Report.

The Report is intended for the decision makers, financiers, and originators and implementers of the Project. The objective is that all the aforementioned actors become familiar with the problems and difficulties noted through evaluation and to react in accordance with the proposed recommendations.

## 4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION

### a. Quality of the Project Documentation

The terms of reference has been written relatively long time ago (adopted on July 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2008) and by the start of implementation of the project, there were no significant changes in the needs of the beneficiaries in relation to those described and covered by the terms of reference. From the aspect of its quality, it can be said, although certain quality of intervention logic has been achieved in a way that the activities directly contribute to achievement of the results, that the activities were not organised in such a manner that the results are achieved in an efficient and effective manner. Several related activities could have been grouped in one, which would allocate resources more effectively and more efficiently. These are the activities of gathering and analysis of data, which have been implemented in the inception phase of the project.

A great shortcoming, on the matter of the quality of the project documentation, is the fact that during the whole implementation of the project no Logical Framework has been used, although, according to the generally accepted standards and practices adopted in the PARCO, the logical framework is an unavoidable part of the project documentation. The reasons for failure to use it are a lack of experience of the Contracting Authority and the Implementer in implementation of similar projects. This has greatly aggravated management, monitoring and evaluation of the project.

Additionally, although it is recommendable, for the reasons of better visibility of the flow of implementation and interdependence of the activities, a Gantt Chart<sup>2</sup> was not used in this case.

Reporting on implementation of the project activities was designed in such a manner that the implementer was obligated to submit one interim report after completion of each project activity (which was being adopted by the PARF JMB, after the Supervisory Team gave agreement to it). In practice, such manner of reporting has been shown as inadequate, considering that the reporting took place too often (on average, one report each month).

Assumptions and risks have been well anticipated, and in that segment, the project documentation was prepared in a quality manner. Improvements were possible in a part related to success indicators.

### b. Efficiency of Implementation

#### b. 1 Evaluation of the Implementer's Work:

##### Engagement of the Project Management

The project management, in spite the lack of experience in maintenance and implementation of the projects, successfully managed the project and directed implementation of the project activities to achievement of the planned result. Aggravating circumstance for the Implementer presents the fact that the manager of the project on behalf of the Contracting Authority, for the reasons of a sick leave, was insufficiently available to the Implementer and to the Implementation Team in the inception phase. The problem was solved by replacement of the

---

<sup>2</sup> Gantt Chart – visually, very visible and associative manner of presenting planned project activities

manager of the project, which established a normal communication and cooperation on relation Implementer – Contracting Authority. Here, it is also significant to mention a lack of experience of the Implementer and the Contracting Authority in implementation of the project. That is, it was one of the first projects implemented by both the Implementer and the Contracting Authority, so certain procedures (e.g. reporting) took more time than usual. This caused the first 5 interim reports to be adopted with postponement in relation to the plan. Additionally, both the Contracting Authority and the Implementer faced certain situations for the first time (e.g. being late in the manner of payment of daily allowances to the members of the Implementation Team), which affected the dynamics of implementation of the activities, i.e. reporting on them.

### Administrative-Technical Capacities

Technical capacities of the project were adequate and sufficient for successful implementation of the project activities. During the reporting period, there have been no changes in the engagement of the key experts. However, the evaluation team, based on the conducted interviews, noted that the presence of the expert, Mr. Sead Dizdarević, in the field was not in accordance with the expectations of the beneficiaries. With the engagement of the second expert, Mr. Mesud Hadžimusić, the beneficiaries and the project partners were very satisfied.

### Reporting and Procedures

The concept of reporting, which was applied on this project, has been shown as inadequate. After completion of each activity, an interim report was requested from the Implementer. Taking into account that the foreseen duration of the project was 10 months<sup>3</sup>, and that 8 activities were supposed to be implemented, and that after each activity one interim report was foreseen, and that additionally the inception and final report were supposed to be submitted, one can derive that the Implementer was obligated to submit 10 reports within 10 months, i.e. one report each month on average. This frequent reporting required constant engagement of the members of the ST, the Implementation Team and the representatives of the Contracting Authority on reading the reports and giving suggestions and opinions to them, so finally the reports would receive agreement to be sent to the PARF JMB in the procedure of approval. Based on the aforementioned, it is clear that the required dynamics of reporting did not give an expected result and that it contributed to an inefficient division of resources engaged by the state as a support and supervision in implementation of the project.

Inadequate form of the reports, initially submitted by the Implementer, the need for frequent reporting and unclear matters in financial procedures, directly contributed to postponements in adoption of the reports in relation to the plan.

#### b. 2 Project Partners and Beneficiaries:

The Supervisory Team, as an intergovernmental body established, among other things, also for supervision over implementation of the public administration reform in the subject reform area, executed their function through monitoring of implementation of the project, regular information on its implementation and giving agreements to the reports and other materials

---

<sup>3</sup> Duration of the project was initially 10 months, and it has been extended for additional 2 months

drafted through implementation of the project activities. Cooperation and communication with the Contracting Authority and the Implementer was evaluated as very successful.

The Implementation Team, which was established on behalf of all four administration levels in BiH, in order to give support to implementation of the project, was engaged to the fullest extent on implementation of the project activities, wherever the need for that occurred. During the whole implementation of the project, especially during drafting of the Programme, the members of the Implementation Team from the Republic of Srpska were especially engaged.

b. 3 Implementation of the Activities:

Planned Activities	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Planned (yes/no)	Achieved (yes/no)	Comment
1. Collecting data on the administrative decision making process in the administration bodies at the level of BiH, entities and the Brčko District of BiH	1. The Inception Report accepted 2. Quantity of collected data (minutes from the workshop approved, number of surveys)	yes	yes	Activity has been successfully implemented. Collecting data was evaluated as successful, and the only problem was insufficient engagement of some civil servants in the process of collecting data, as well as inability of civil servants from the BiH level to participate in the workshop. This has been anticipated as a risk in the inception report. Duration of this activity in the inception report has been shortened from 45, as stipulated by the Terms of References, to 40 days, which has been explained as needed in order for deadlines to be harmonised with the 10 months of project duration. Even though the first draft of the report has been delivered on February 20, 2010, due to inadequate form and content, the report has been amended by the implementer several times, and the PAR JMB has adopted it on June 10, 2010, which affected further reporting dynamics by the activities (first 5 periodic reports have been adopted with postponement in relation to the plan).
2. Analysis of existing condition in administration in the area of administrative decision making at the level of BiH, the entities	Second Interim report and the document "Analysis of existing condition in the administrative decision making in	yes	yes	Activity has been successfully implemented. Duration of this activity in the inception report has been shortened from 45, as stipulated by the Terms of References, to 40 days, which has



and the Brčko District of BiH.	BiH” have been adopted by the Supervisory team and the Implementation team			been explained as needed in order for deadlines to be harmonised with the 10 months of project duration. Report, which encompasses the Analysis, has been adopted on July 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2010.
3. Collecting data on the administrative decision making process in at least two countries, the EU Members, which have a similar legal tradition and state system as BiH and a good practice of the administrative decision making.	1. The Third Interim Report accepted 2. Quantity of collected data (data collected in two EU countries) by the items according to which the comparison with the results of second phase “Analysis of the existing condition in administration in the area of administrative decision making at the level of BiH, the entities and the Brčko District of BiH” will be done.	yes	yes	Activity has been successfully implemented. Duration of this activity in the inception report has been shortened from 45, as stipulated by the Terms of References, to 40 days, which has been explained as needed in order for deadlines to be harmonised with the 10 months of project duration. At the request of the Contracting Authority, the study tour has been shifted to the next phase (phase 4), because it was not possible to provide a sufficient number of civil servants from the state level, who would be a part of this tour, if it would have been organized in this project phase. The Report was adopted on August 24, 2010. The quantity of the data collected in this phase has been evaluated as adequate for successful implementation of the next project activity.
4. Drafting comparative analysis of the administrative decision making process at the level of BiH, the entities and the Brčko District of BiH with the selected EU Member States and preparation of written proposal of the Programme elements.	The Supervisory and Implementation Teams adopted the Fourth Interim Report	yes	yes	Activity has been successfully implemented.  The study tour, which was, at the request of the Contracting Authority, postponed for this phase, has not been organized. It was organised in the next phase (phase 5).  The Report was adopted by the PARF JMB on September 10, 2010.
5. Preparation of document with the proposal of measures for improvement of the quality of administrative decision making in BiH, in accordance with the modern European standards of administrative decision making.	The Fifth Interim Report accepted	yes	yes	Activity has been successfully implemented. During this activity a study tour to the Republic of Slovenia and the Federal Republic of Austria has been organized, which was originally planned within the third phase of the project.  The Report was adopted by the PARF JMB on October 8, 2010.

<p>6. Preparation of the Draft Administrative Decision Making in BiH Quality Improvement Programme in accordance with the modern European standards of administrative decision making.</p>	<p>The sixth Interim Report and the document “Draft Administrative Decision Making in BiH Quality Improvement Programme” have been accepted by the Supervisory and the Implementation teams.</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>Activity has been successfully implemented.</p> <p>The Interim report and the Draft Programme received the agreement of the Supervisory and the Implementation teams.</p> <p>The Report was adopted by the PARF JMB on January 11, 2011.</p>
<p>7. Consultations on the prepared Draft Programme and drafting report with recommendations and conclusions from the held consultations.</p>	<p>The seventh Interim report, which encompasses the proposals for changes and amendments of the Programme, given by the representatives of project beneficiaries, has been accepted.</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>This activity was completed, but not within the deadline.</p> <p>Even though it was planned for it to last until September 17, it lasted until October 21<sup>st</sup>, which led to the project extension. In this phase, consultations have been implemented and all the participants have given comprehensive comments, opinions and conclusions on the Draft Programme. The institutes of the Administrative Contract and the Complaint, by the recommendations of the SIGMA experts, should have been placed in the final Draft Programme. During this phase, the members of the IT from all administrative levels, especially from the RS, have insisted on a more qualitative explanation of the said institutes. The implementer, in the agreement with the Contracting Authority, with the objective of achieving better quality of the Programme, tried to explain those institutes, in order to avoid excluding them from the Programme. Finally, at the session of the ST, it has been unanimously decided that these two institutes should be taken out of the Programme.</p> <p>The Report was adopted by the PARF JMB on February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011.</p>
<p>8. Deliberating recommendations and conclusions from the held consultations and determining recommendations that would be included in the</p>	<p>The eighth Interim report, which encompasses the final Draft Programme, has been accepted.</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>Activity was implemented in accordance with the amended plan of implementation.</p> <p>The recommendations, which were incorporated in the Programme, were discussed and established, the final draft Programme was drafted and sent</p>

Programme, as well as drafting the final Draft of the Programme.				in the procedure of adoption, together with the Eighth Interim Report. The Report was adopted by the PARF JMB on February 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2011.
--	--	--	--	--

b. 4 Achievement of the Results:

Planned Results		Description of Achievement
R1	Drafted "Administrative Decision Making in BiH Quality Improvement Programme" in accordance with the modern European standards of administrative decision making, which contains legislative, organisational, IT, and measures for strengthening human resources.	<p>In order to achieve the deadlines, all the project activities have been implemented, with certain shifts in deadlines, i.e. extension of duration of the project for two months.</p> <p>During consultations on the prepared draft programme (activity 7), a large part of the time of all the participants in the process of implementation of the project (Implementers, IT, ST and the PARCO) was spent on clarification of two institutes, which in the opinion of the experts of the SIGMA, should have found a place in the final draft Programme. These were the institutes of Administrative Contract and the Complaint. Considering that the beneficiaries were not satisfied with the explanations given on several occasions for these two institutes, at the session of the ST, it has been unanimously decided that the said institutes should be taken out of the Programme.</p> <p>From the standpoint of quality, it should be stressed that the Programme was drafted according to the methodology that was harmonized with the members of the ST and suggested by the experts of the SIGMA, and that in its preparation the experts from all four administrative levels (representatives of the Implementation Team) have been actively involved. In favour of that goes the fact that the programme was adopted by the CoM BiH, the Government of the RS, and the Government of the BD BiH. At this point, it is not possible to estimate when and whether the Programme would be adopted by the Government of the FBiH.</p>

b. 5 Spending of Funds<sup>4</sup>:

Review of the budget structure has shown relatively large share of incidental expenses in the total planned expenses (around 26 %). Therefore, it is not strange that the funds planned for implementation of the project activities were not fully spent. Around 91 % of the total planned project budget was spent. Of that, for the expenses of per diems, 100% of the planned funds was spent for this item, while for the incidental expenses, 66% of the total planned funds were spent. The number of workdays of the experts was spent in accordance with the plan (211 work days).

It was noted that no illogical data or unjustified spending of funds have been found.

<sup>4</sup> For more detailed information on spending of funds, please see the Table 1 of this Report

### **c. Effectiveness of the Project**

Beneficiaries of the project had the possibility during the whole implementation of the Project to give suggestions, proposals and comments to all the materials drafted through the project, and to directly affect the project development and achievement of the project results through regular meetings and workshops.

The result of the Project is the programme that was adopted in the Republic of Srpska (adopted on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011), at the level of the Council of Ministers of BiH (adopted on November 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011) and the Brčko District of BiH (adopted on February 7, 2012).

Considering that most of the measures foreseen by the Programme would be implemented through amendments to the L(G)APs, while smaller number of measures would be a subject of other regulations (e.g. Law on Electronic Operations, Law on Civil Servants), implementation of amendments to the L(G)APs would greatly achieve the project purpose.

At the level of the Council of Ministers of BiH, at the moment of writing of this Report, there was a work on amendments to the LAP, and it is expected that during July 2012, the Ministry of Justice of BiH would send a proposal of the draft LAP to the CoM BiH. These amendments would cover a great part of the measures from the Programme. It should be stressed that these are the amendments to the law, not adoption of the new law, so therefore, the measure stipulating the change of the title of the law in the “Law on General Administrative Procedure” would not be implemented. In addition to the measures stipulated by the Programme, the amendments to the LAP would include also the institutes of “administrative contract” and “complaint”, which were not covered by the Programme.

In the Republic of Srpska, so far, through the amendments to the LGAP, approximately one quarter of measures from the Programme has been implemented. In the programme of work of the Government of the RS for 2012 no amendments to the LGAP were foreseen, so initiation of the procedure of amendments cannot be expected before 2013.

In the Brčko District of BiH, during July, there will be a procedure of enacting the new Law on General Administrative Procedure, and it is expected that in late 2012 or early 2013, this Law would be adopted.

The Programme was still not adopted by the Government of the Federation of BiH. In early 2012, the PARCO sent the letters of urgency to the Federal Ministry of Justice and to the PAR Coordinator in the FBiH, so the draft Programme would be put on the Agenda of a session of the Government of the Federation of BiH. So far, the said draft with the proposal of the conclusions was not discussed or put on the Agenda of a session of the Government of the FBiH.

### **d. Impact**

The impact of the project on macro plain (social and institutional) is still not visible. In order to achieve that, it would be necessary to adopt the Programme at all the administrative levels and that the measures it proposes are incorporated in the appropriate legal acts. Considering the fact that so far only one part of the Programme was incorporated in the LGAP in the RS, while on other administrative levels the procedure of amendments to the LAPs is still not completed or even initiated, it can be said that the draft Programme only just created the preconditions for establishment of more quality, simpler and more efficient practice of

administrative decision making, i.e. for improvement of quality of administrative decision making in BiH.

In addition to the very drafting of the Programme, its adoption at all administrative levels would be the next step that is supposed to be implemented in order to achieve the project purpose and objective. While at the levels of the CoM BiH, the RS and the BD BiH this step has been made, in the Federation of BiH that has not yet been achieved. This notes that the assumption necessary for achievement of the project purpose and the objective has not been fully achieved.

By fulfilling all the measures set by the Programme, six objectives from the Revised Action Plan 1 (measures from the Programme have been incorporated in the RAP 1) would be fulfilled as follows:

**AP 1.7.** LAPs of all the levels will explicitly stipulate delegation of authority to make decisions in administrative procedure by the manager of the administration body to their subordinates;

**AP 1.8.** Ensure that all the bodies of public administration acquire data necessary for action from public records by official duty;

**AP 1.13.** Enable electronic communication of the parties and the bodies;

**AP 3.2.** Strengthen the role of administrative inspection;

**AP 3.4.** Introduce obligation of the second instance body to decide based on merit;

**AP 5.4.** Further develop training programmes for the area of administrative procedure, within a horizontal system of training of civil servants.

#### **e. Sustainability**

Considering that the project result was still not institutionally supported at the level of the Federation of BiH, sustainability of the project results is uncertain when it comes to this administration level. If the support in the form of adoption fails, a direct impact of the project at the level of the Federation of BiH will fail as well.

Since the start, through the work of the ST, the beneficiaries were involved and consulted in the process of planning, as well as in the process of orientation and implementation of the project, which was a significant factor from the aspect of property of the project and project sustainability.

The beneficiaries of the project at the administration levels of BiH, the RS and the BD BiH are obligated to use the exit results in the next period, through amendments of the LAPs (LGAP), which guarantees sustainability of the project results at these administrative levels. The obligation stems from the fact that the governments adopted the Programme and obligated the competent institutions to apply it / use it when amending legal regulations. Next, it should be pointed out that changes in policy and priorities of the senior level should not have any impact on sustainability of the project, considering the long-term determination of Bosnia and Herzegovina to reform the public administration and approximate to the European standards in this segment.

Change of economic factors in the country cannot have a more significant influence on impact and benefits of this project. Considering that application of the Programme does not require more significant additional financial and human resources changes (apart from, possibly

changes of regulations in the sense of introduction of new forms of communication of administration bodies and finding human resources solutions), these very significant segments will not have a negative impact on sustainability of the project.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Generally, the project, in spite the initial problems and a lack of experience of the Implementer and the Contracting Authority, was successfully implemented.

From one side, the project activities, with minor shifts in deadlines end extension of the project of 2 months, were implemented in accordance with the plan. A quality project result has been achieved, i.e. the *Draft Administrative Decision Making in BiH Quality Improvement Programme* has been drafted, in whose draft, in addition to the experts engaged by the Implementer, the experts from all four administration levels in BiH (members of the Implementation Team) were actively involved.

From the other side, the purpose and the objective of the project were not fully achieved. However, it can be said that for the great part the preconditions for their achievement have been provided. In the next period, it is realistic to expect the implementation of the Programme in practice, i.e. through amendments to the laws for establishment of more quality, more efficient and simpler practice of administrative decision making, i.e. improvement of quality of administrative decision making in BiH. Considering that the Programme was not adopted at all the administration levels in BiH, i.e. that it was not adopted in the F BiH, achievement of the project purpose and the objective at this administration level is questionable. If the support of the Federation authorities fails, the formal-legal basis would fail as well, i.e. obligation for application of measures from the Programme in future amendments to the legal regulations, which regulate the area of administrative decision making. For that reason, it would be necessary to reinitiate the initiative to put the Programme on the Agenda of the session of the Government of the F BiH, so it would be discussed and adopted, which would fully provide the conditions for improvement of quality of administrative decision making at this administration level as well.

In the end, it can be noted that although the project result has been achieved, the assumption of full support to implementation of the activities from the AP 1 by all the governments in BiH was not fulfilled, so the project purpose and the objective were still not fully achieved. However, on three out of four administration levels the preconditions for their achievement during 2012 and 2013 have been provided.

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering that from the completion of the project activities until the moment of writing this Report a lot of time has passed, and that the process of amendments to the laws implies a relatively long procedure, and that the intention in this part of the Report is to give recommendations that could contribute to further successful implementation of the Project (achievement of the project purpose and objective), the following recommendations were given:

- 1. To find an efficient manner, as soon as possible, to send the Administrative Decision Making in BiH Quality Improvement Programme in the procedure of adoption at the session of the Government of the Federation of BiH (through the PAR Coordinator of the F BiH or in some other manner);**

- 2. To ensure that the governments in BiH, who have not done that yet, to include the amendments to the Law on (General) Administrative Procedure in their plans of work for 2013.**

## **7. LEARNED LESSONS**

The practice of reporting, applied on this project, has been shown as inadequate, or even counterproductive. The reports of frequency of each month, with the existing procedures of giving agreements by the ST and approval by the PARF JMB, led to the fact that the persons appointed in the said bodies did not have enough time to both properly read the reports and meet the obligations of their regular jobs, considering that their engagement in these bodies was only an additional activity with their regular jobs. This needlessly spent the resources, both of the Implementer and of the Contracting Authority and other project partners. For that reason, the frequency of interim reports should be restricted for the period of 3 to 6 months, depending on the specifics of respective projects.

Also, in this case, the amount of incidental expenses was not adequately planned, i.e. the planned incidental expenses were too high so the funds were not fully spent (around 66 per cent has been spent), so when the project budget is drafted, it is necessary to estimate the said item of expenses more realistically.

Considering that the project documentation did not establish the deadline precisely, i.e. quality and time determined indicators that would serve to evaluate achievement of the purpose and the objective, it is hard to establish their fulfilment. Therefore, when drafting the project documentation, it is very significant to establish quality indicators for evaluation of successfulness, prepared by the SMART<sup>5</sup> criterion. This provides for clarity and measurability of the purpose and the objective, thus facilitating future evaluation of the project.

In the end, the significance of anticipating risks and assumptions should be stressed, i.e. their influence on final outcome of the project, and significance of timely evaluation of the project. When drafting the project, but also when it is being implemented, it is very significant to foresee the project risks, and define the assumptions, i.e. preconditions, that need to be fulfilled in order for the project to be successfully implemented. Here we speak about the assumptions at the level of the project purpose and the objective. This project is a good example of a situation when there are assumptions whose failure to fulfil presents a risk for final success of the project. The *Programme* alone, as a result of the project, is not enough for the project to be successful and it would be necessary for the decision makers to be acquainted with the said risk, and to adequately react in order to mitigate it / remove it, i.e. fulfil special preconditions. In order to have the attention of the decision makers drawn to these segments, it is necessary to ensure a timely evaluation of the projects, which would establish, among other things, also the influence and sustainability of the project, and possible problems and obstacles that might have an influence on achievement of the project purpose and the objective.

---

<sup>5</sup> Objectively measurable indicators should be: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound

## **List of Annexes**

1. *List of Interlocutors / Interviews*
2. *Plan of Project Activities*
3. *Project Budget Structure*

Dates of Evaluators' Visits: from May 29 to July 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2012

Interviewed persons: see the List of Interlocutors in the Annex.

Date of Report: July 20, 2012



## Annex I

### List of Interlocutors / Interviews

No	Name and Surname	Position, Sector	Institution	Place	Date	Meeting Held (Yes/No)
1.	Maja Rudan	Expert Advisor for Public Administration Reform	Public Administration Reform Coordinator's Office	Sarajevo	May 29, 2012.	Yes
2.	Muamer Muftić	Project Management	Zamm media CONSULTING d.o.o.	Sarajevo	May 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2012.	Yes
3.	Amer Boloban					
4.	Azra Omerhodžić	Member of the IT <sup>1</sup>	Administration Inspectorate of the Brčko district	Brčko	June 6, 2012.	Yes
5.	Vesna Nenadić	Member of the IT Member of the ST <sup>2</sup>	Ministry of Administration and Local Self Governance of the RS	Banja Luka	June 8, 2012.	Yes
6.	Ljiljana Todorović	Deputy member of the ST				
7.	Mirjana Klemens	Member of the ST	Ministry of Justice of the FBiH	Sarajevo	June 26, 2012.	Yes
8.	Senad Oglečevac	Member of the IT	Ministry of Justice of the BiH	Sarajevo	July 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2012.	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Implementation Team

<sup>2</sup> Supervisory Team

## Annex II – Plan of project activities

<i>Sequence No</i>	<i>Description of services</i>	<i>Deadline for completing services</i>	<i>Time period of provision of services</i>
<b>1.</b>	Collecting data on the process of administrative decision-making in the administrative bodies at the level of BiH, Entity and Brčko District of BiH.	40 days	From 22/12/2009 to 30/01/2010
<b>2.</b>	Analysis of the current state administration in the area of administrative decision-making at the level of BiH, Entity and Brčko District of BiH.	40 days	From 31/01/2010 to 11/03/2010
<b>3.</b>	Collecting data on the process of administrative decision-making in at least two countries, members of the European Union, which have similar legal traditions and polity as well as Bosnia and Herzegovina and the good practices of administrative decision.	40 days	From 12/03/2010 to 20/04/2010
<b>4.</b>	Creating a comparative analysis of administrative decision-making process at the level of BiH, Entity and Brčko District of BiH with selected members of the European Union and prepare a written proposal of the Program elements.	40 days	From 21/04/2010 to 30/05/2010
<b>5.</b>	Preparation of a document with proposed measures to improve the quality of administrative decision-making in BiH, in line with modern European standards of administrative decision	40 days	From 31/05/2010 to 09/07/2010
<b>6.</b>	Preparation of Draft of the Programme for improving the quality of administrative decision-making in BiH in line with modern European standards of administrative decision	30 days	From 10/07/2010 to 08/08/2010
<b>7.</b>	Conducting consultations on Draft of the Programme and making reports with recommendations and conclusions from the previously held consultations	40 days	From 09/08/2010 to 17/09/2010
<b>8.</b>	Considered and established recommendations will be included in the program, made the final Draft of the Programme and submitted to the Supervisory Team for approval	30 days	From 18/09/2010. to 17/10/2010
<b>9.</b>	The total number of days:	300 days	300 days

### Annex III - Budget structure of the project

1	2	3		4
Sequence No	Description of services	Costs	Additional costs	Total cost
1.	Collecting data on the process of administrative decision-making in the administrative bodies at the level of BiH, Entity and Brčko District of BiH.	59.850,00	6.650,00	66.500,00
2.	Analysis of the current state of administration in the area of administrative decision-making at the level of BiH, Entity and Brčko District of BiH.	52.150,00	6.750,00	58.900,00
3.	Data collection on the process of administrative decision-making in at least two countries, members of the European Union, which have similar legal traditions and polity as well as Bosnia and Herzegovina and the good practices of administrative decision-making.	23.000,00	30.200,00	53.200,00
4.	Creating a comparative analysis of administrative decision-making process at the level of BiH, Entity and Brčko District of BiH with selected members of the European Union and preparation of a written proposal of the Programme elements.	40.000,00	9.400,00	49.400,00
5.	Preparation of a document with proposed measures to improve the quality of administrative decision-making in BiH, in line with modern European standards of administrative decision-making.	40.000,00	9.400,00	49.400,00
6.	Preparation of Draft of the Program for improving the quality of administrative decision-making in BiH in line with modern European standards of administrative decision-making.	20.000,00	8.500,00	28.500,00
7.	Conducting consultations on Draft of the Programme and making reports with recommendations and conclusions from the previously held consultations.	25.000,00	20.600,00	45.600,00
8.	Considered and established recommendations will be included in the Programme, made the final Draft of the Programme and submitted to the Supervisory Team for approval	20.000,00	8.500,00	28.500,00
Total price without VAT:		280.000,00	100.000,00	380.000,00
VAT:				64.600,00
Total price including VAT:				444.600,00

### Budget structure of additional costs

1	2	3	4
Activity	Additional costs	Additional costs	Total of additional expense
1.	Cost of maintenance / workshops and consultations / Cost of hotel room accommodations for implementation team members / food costs / costs of refreshing beverages / rental costs for conference room / cost per diem and travel	6.650,00	6.650,00
2.	Cost of maintenance / workshops and consultations / Cost of hotel room accommodations for implementation team members / food costs / costs of refreshing beverages / rental costs for conference room / cost per diem and travel	6.750,00	6.750,00
3.	Cost of maintenance / workshops and consultations / Cost of hotel room accommodations for implementation team members / food costs / costs of refreshing beverages / rental costs for conference room / cost per diem and travel	30.200,00	30.200,00
4.	Cost of maintenance / workshops and consultations / Cost of hotel room accommodations for implementation team members / food costs / costs of refreshing beverages / rental costs for conference room / cost per diem and travel	9.400,00	9.400,00
5.	Cost of maintenance / workshops and consultations / Cost of hotel room accommodations for implementation team members / food costs / costs of refreshing beverages / rental costs for conference room / cost per diem and travel	9.400,00	9.400,00
6.	Cost of maintenance / workshops and consultations / Cost of hotel room accommodations for implementation team members / food costs / costs of refreshing beverages / rental costs for conference room / cost per diem and travel	8.500,00	8.500,00
7.	Cost of maintenance / workshops and consultations / Cost of hotel room accommodations for implementation team members / food costs / costs of refreshing beverages / rental costs for conference room / cost per diem and travel	20.600,00	20.600,00
8.	Cost of maintenance / workshops and consultations / Cost of hotel room accommodations for implementation team members / food costs / costs of refreshing beverages / rental costs for conference room / cost per diem and travel	8.500,00	8.500,00
Total:		100.000,00	100.000,00
VAT:			17.000,00
Total of additional expenses including VAT:			117.000,00