

Final Evaluation of the Funding Window UNDP “Support to the implementation of the Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans” Project

1. Project and Evaluation Details

Final Evaluation of the Funding Window UNDP “Support to the implementation of the Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of SALW and their ammunition in the Western Balkans	
Evaluation Timeline	October 2022 – 20 February 2023
Duration being reviewed	May 2019 – September 2022
Review Team	First Call Partners Ltd (Henry Smith, Taz Greyling, Astrit Istrefi, Ben Lovelock, Hope Kilmurry)

Project Title	Support to the implementation of the Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans
Atlas ID	114727
Corporate outcome and output	Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS (2018-2021): Outcome 3. Building resilience to shocks and crises through enhanced prevention and risk-informed development Output 3.3. Regional cooperation enables national systems to ensure the restoration of justice institutions, redress mechanisms and community security, including armed violence reduction and small arms and light weapons (SALW) control
Jurisdictions	Belgrade, Podgorica, Pristina, Sarajevo, Skopje and Tirana.
Region	Europe and Central Asia/Western Balkans
Date project document signed	14-May-19
Project dates	Start: May 2019 End: 28 February 2023.
Project Budget	US\$ 6,257,110
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation (up to 31 December 2022)	Approx. US\$ 6,202,307
Funding source	Federal Government of Germany, through the Funding Windows
Implementing party	Coordinated by the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub for Europe and the CIS, through UNDP SEESAC Implemented by the UNDP COs in Belgrade, Podgorica, Pristina, Sarajevo, Skopje and Tirana.



	Project Title	UNDP Office	Budget	Implementing Period
<i>Completed in 2019</i>	1. Urgent Action on Ammunition Destruction - Project EXPLODE+	UNDP in Sarajevo	\$54,645	July 2019 – December 2019
<i>Completed in 2021</i>	2. Reduce risk - Increase safety – Towards ending SALW misuse in domestic violence context in Serbia	UNDP in Belgrade	\$444,462	September 2019 – December 2021
	3. Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality	UNDP in Belgrade	\$958,284	October 2019 – November 2021
	4. Rogame SALW Storage Upgrade	UNDP in Podgorica	\$162,000	August 2019 – November 2021
<i>Continued in 2022</i>	5. Support Albania’s Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities	UNDP in Tirana	\$1,185,471	December 2019 – December 2022
	6. Countering Illicit Arms Trafficking (CIAT)	UNDP in Sarajevo	\$1,071,283	July 2019 – December 2022
	7. Support to counter Illicit arms trafficking	UNDP in Pristina	\$987,412	September 2019 – August 2022
	8. Improving national SALW-related practices and building violence-resilient communities	UNDP in Podgorica	\$1,000,908	September 2019 – July 2022



2. Table of Contents

1. Project and Evaluation Details	1
3. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	4
4. Executive Summary	5
5. Introduction and Overview	10
6. Description of the UNDP Regional Project	11
7. Final Evaluation Scope and Objectives	12
8. Final Evaluation Approach and Methods	12
9. Analysis of Projects	16
10. Findings and Conclusions	20
11. Recommendations and lessons for the future	37
Annex 1 – Final Evaluation Terms of Reference	40
Annex 1a - Final Evaluation Schedule of Tasks, Timelines and Final Evaluation Deliverables	46
Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix and Data Collection Instruments	47
Annex 3 – List of Individuals or Groups Interviewed	49
Annex 4 – Document Reference List.....	50

3. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym	Description
AWE MP	Ammunition Weapons and Ammunition Master plan
BiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
CEDAW	Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence and Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CIAT	Countering Illicit Arms Trafficking
CIRAM	Common Integrated Risk Analysis Model
COVID-19	Coronavirus 19
CSI	Crime Scene Investigation Units
EU	European Union
ECIS	Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States
EUFOR	European Union Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina
EXPLODE+	Urgent Action on Ammunition Destruction - Project EXPLODE+
FAE	Firearms, Ammunition and Explosives
FCP	First Call Partners
FRONTEX	European Border and Coast Guard Agency
ITF	ITF Enhancing Human Security
INTERPOL	International Criminal Police Organisation
KII	Key Informant Interviews
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
MLRS	Multiple Launch Rocket System
MPTF	Multi-Partner Trust Fund
Moi	Ministry of Interior
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
OECD DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe
RAG	Red, Amber, Green
RF	Results Framework
SALW	Small Arms and Light Weapons
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SEESAC	South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons
SOCTA	Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
ToC	Theory of Change
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
US	United States of America
WRMS	Weapons Registration and Stockpile Management Software

4. Executive Summary

Introduction

In October 2022, First Call Partners (FCP) was contracted by UNDP to conduct the final evaluation of the “Support to the Implementation of the Roadmap for a Sustainable Solution to the Illegal Possession, Misuse and Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their Ammunition in the Western Balkans” project, hereafter referred to as the UNDP Regional Project.

Implementation of the UNDP Regional Project began in May 2019. It was created with the aim of supporting the jurisdictions of the Western Balkans in implementing the “Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW)/firearms and their ammunition in the Western Balkans”. It was intended to assist in the initiation of activities to support Roadmap implementation prior to the establishment and implementation of the Western Balkans SALW Control Roadmap Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF). The project operated as a funding allocation mechanism to channel the 5.5 million EUR contribution from the Federal Government of Germany, to provide targeted projects to support the jurisdictions.

The UNDP Regional Project enabled six UNDP offices in each jurisdiction in the Western Balkans to submit SALW control project proposals and implement projects, coordinated by UNDP SEESAC. The UNDP Regional Project set out to deliver two results:

- To coordinate the implementation of Roadmap projects through UNDP Offices, conducted through a mechanism for fund allocation, monitoring, reporting and managed by UNDP SEESAC (Output 1).
- To implement Roadmap sub-projects through UNDP Offices in six jurisdictions (Output 2).

The UNDP Regional Project funded a total of eight sub-projects across the six jurisdictions.

The UNDP Regional Project was implemented by UNDP’s Regional Istanbul Hub for Europe and the CIS, through UNDP SEESAC. At the jurisdiction level, UNDP Offices managed the implementation of specific sub-projects; while UNDP SEESAC supported the overall coordination of the UNDP Regional Project and provided advisory support to the UNDP Offices implementing sub-projects. The eight individual sub-projects funded by the mechanism were:

1. Urgent Action on Ammunition Destruction, implemented by UNDP in Sarajevo (July 2019 – December 2019)
2. Reduce risk – Increase Safety – Towards Ending SALW Misuse in the Domestic Violence Context in Serbia, implemented by UNDP in Belgrade (September 2019 – December 2021)
3. Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of the Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking Firearms and Firearms Criminality, implemented by UNDP in Belgrade (October 2019 – November 2021)
4. Rogame SALW Storage Upgrade, implemented by UNDP in Podgorica (August 2019 – November 2021)
5. Support for Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities, implemented by UNDP in Tirana (December 2019 – December 2022)

6. Countering Illicit Arms Trafficking (CIAT), implemented by UNDP in Sarajevo (July 2019 – December 2022)
7. Support to Counter Illicit Arms Trafficking, implemented by UNDP in Pristina (September 2019 – August 2022)
8. Improving National SALW-related Practices and Building Violence-resilient Communities, implemented by UNDP in Skopje (September 2019 – July 2022)

The Final Evaluation assessed the UNDP Regional Project against the OECD-DAC criteria of impact, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and coherence as well as assessing cross-cutting principles and values, communications and visibility. The evaluation establishes key findings and lessons learnt from both the general implementation of the UNDP Regional Project and the individual UNDP sub-projects; and provides recommendations for future activities. The Final Evaluation is intended to enable the Project Board, UNDP and the Federal Government of Germany, as the Donor, to examine its effectiveness, its utility and to decide on next steps.

The evaluation covered the period of implementation from 1 May 2019 to 30 September 2022. Given that much of the UNDP Regional Project's duration coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic, the evaluation considered wider contextual factors (political, economic and social) and their impact on implementation. The evaluation process comprised three elements: a detailed document review; a primary research phase, including visits to all six jurisdictions and interviews with all major stakeholders; and report drafting, including some confirmatory interviews with key actors. The field-work component of the research was conducted in late November and December 2022 by a five-person team from FCP.

Summary of progress

Overall, excellent progress was made in implementation of Output 1 – with a broad and *relevant* portfolio of sub-projects managed and delivered *effectively* and coordinated well by SEESAC. Feedback from jurisdiction-level partners is very positive, with numerous examples of how funded sub-projects catalysed broader interventions, demonstrating their *relevance* and showing some early signs of *impact*. Decisions on funding were timely and monitoring and reporting was on the whole *efficient* and appropriate. Output 2 can also be described as being achieved successfully. The eight sub-projects funded by the Regional Project are all *relevant* to the Roadmap and the broader context. They have all been *effective* in terms of delivering the anticipated results and, both singly and taken together, they have been important contributions to building momentum in the implementation of the Roadmap at the regional and jurisdiction levels.

The Federal Government of Germany, which acted as the sole financial contributor to the Regional Project, played an essential and highly *relevant* role in encouraging Roadmap implementation through its political and financial commitments. This led to the eventual establishment of the Multi-Partner Trust Fund, which has benefitted from funding from other partners in addition to the Federal Government of Germany. Germany's leadership role in support of the commitments to the Roadmap made by the six Western Balkans jurisdictions, ably partnered by UNDP, together represent an *effective and impactful* intervention in an important area of regional security and counter proliferation.

The overall success of the Regional Project should be judged by its *effectiveness* at regional and jurisdiction levels. Locally, despite in some cases very significant delays – due to a range of unexpected or unplanned factors – each project has had a beneficial effect. Regionally, within the timeframe of the Regional Project, important early progress with implementation was achieved, in no small part due to the *relevance* and timeliness of the funding provided. However, at the time of conducting the Final Evaluation, the Roadmap

implementation period was only partially complete. Ultimately it is in the successful implementation of the Roadmap, and a timely decision on whether it will be extended or replaced, that the strategic impact of the Regional Project will be defined.

Despite the overall success of the Regional Project, areas of weakness for improvement in future funding arrangements include *coherence* and the need to deepen the principles of true partnership between authorities in the region and international actors, moving beyond the language of donor and beneficiary; further development of project design and monitoring, evaluation and learning so that project management becomes more dynamic, *communications* can be improved, and there can be greater *sustainability*; and greater emphasis on how commitment to cross cutting issues - including gender, human rights and the environment - will deliver tangible change in these critical areas.

Lessons and Recommendations

The main lessons and corresponding recommendations arising from the evaluation are as follows:

Aligning funding with implementation of political commitments.

Lesson for the future 1: The timeliness of German funding support and the ability of UNDP to absorb and distribute funds were critical success factors in establishing early momentum and provided a visible demonstration of financial commitment. Overall, the Regional Project was a success in terms of encouraging delivery, and a success in terms of German Government commitment.

Recommendation 1: Ensure that funding modalities to provide external support are in place at the point at which any new Roadmap, or extension of the current arrangements begin. (All criteria)

Ownership of funding modalities and the goals to which they are aligned.

Lesson for the future 2: Local ownership of funding priorities is essential for effectiveness and sustainability. The Regional Project provided funding for activities and implementation has been effective in delivering aspects of the Roadmap and local SALW strategies and plans. There was some confusion on the part of local partners as to the process through which priorities were identified, and support provided. And in some cases, the 'development sector' language of beneficiaries and donors may not have encouraged local ownership and was perceived differently than a professional relationship between Rule of Law actors. How the relationship between funding mechanisms and the users of the support provided is described by all involved is therefore an important factor in success.

Recommendation 2: Similar future funding mechanisms should take all opportunities to encourage local ownership, including through soliciting priorities directly rather than through implementing organisations, including local counterparts on project management boards, seeking wider local input into monitoring implementation, and most importantly, revising the language used to describe interactions to encourage genuinely equal partnerships. (Relevance, effectiveness, sustainability)

Demonstrating success through 'effects-based' reporting

Lesson for the future 3: Whilst results frameworks and project monitoring have been able to demonstrate the extent to which projects have been implemented, they are less useful in showing what the effect of this has been on Roadmap implementation overall. Ensuring at the outset that the contribution a project will make to outcomes as well as to their direct outputs is identified and measured is important for judging overall effectiveness.

Recommendation 3: Ensure that theories of change are articulated establishing the hierarchy of intended effects and benefits and the assumptions which underpin them. Ensure these changes are captured in monitoring activities. (Effectiveness, coherence)

Investing in programme management

Lesson for the future 4: Locally based UNDP staff with an understanding of the context, the thematic areas and UNDP itself have been central to effectiveness. There are areas in which additional project management contributions would help to ensure that core functions, including lessons learning, adaptation and reporting results could be further improved.

Recommendation 4: For similar future projects, ensure that all the core management functions required for dynamic learning are resourced at the outset. To reduce the overall internal project management requirement, consider hiring external assistance for generic tasks — to enable internal resources to be allocated to learning and adaptation. (Effectiveness, efficiency)

Lesson for the future 5: Most of the Regional Project sub-projects were subject to delays. Some of the reasons – specifically COVID-19 – could not be foreseen nor anticipated. UNDP teams and partners demonstrated flexibility and creativity in addressing this challenge. Some other delays could have been anticipated better. Project planning should include detailed assessments of potential risks which are revised on a regular basis.

Recommendation 5: Standard templates for project risk matrixes should be revised, including more involvement from SALW commissions, which cover a more detailed assessment of a wider range of risks to encourage dynamic management. Risk assessment processes (the act of identifying risks and mitigations and management of residual risks) should be undertaken with SALW Commissions and specific partners in order to encourage local ownership. (Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency)

Lesson for the future 6: Exit strategies for individual projects were not a regular part of project planning activities or monitoring. Considering sustainability at the outset is important in defining how benefits will be maintained following the end of the project period.

Recommendation 6: Articulate the degree of sustainability required and how it will be achieved as part of project planning, and revise assumptions as project implementation progresses. (Sustainability, impact, effectiveness)

Making progress on Gender

Lesson for the future 7: Whilst commitment to gender equality was clear at the Fund level and sub-project level, there were limited observable changes. Specific changes that are intended at both portfolio and project level could have been articulated more clearly from the outset to move beyond the important but limited stage of gender awareness activities.

Recommendation 7: Future project portfolios should include some funded projects that specifically aim for gender outcomes, including a greater proportion of women in SALW technical roles as well as in leadership positions. For all other projects, gender equality changes should be articulated clearly in theories of change and results frameworks. (Impact, effectiveness, gender)

Human rights and human development



Lesson for the future 8: Human rights in particular was not a strong central component of sub-projects despite UNDP's global expertise and focus. Yet human rights are a core element of many aspects of SALW control, including arms transfers controls.

Recommendation 8: Prioritising human rights in future project development, including through requiring a more detailed assessment of how sub-projects will promote human rights will put the issue in a more central role, and help jurisdictions ensure their obligations on human rights are observed. (Impact, gender)

5. Introduction and Overview

In October 2022, First Call Partners (FCP) was contracted to conduct a final evaluation of the “Support to the Implementation of the Roadmap for a Sustainable Solution to the Illegal Possession, Misuse and Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their Ammunition in the Western Balkans” project, hereafter referred to as the UNDP Regional Project. This final evaluation was conducted in conjunction with a Mid-Term Evaluation of the Western Balkans SALW Control Roadmap Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) and a Mid-Term Review of the “Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW)/firearms and their ammunition in the Western Balkans”, hereafter referred to as the Roadmap.

FCP was commissioned to conduct all three tasks by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The Final Evaluation, the subject of this report, was conducted between November 2022 – February 2023 in three phases: (1) inception report and detailed desk review; (2) data collection mission (including key informant interviews (KII) and group discussions in each regional jurisdiction); and (3) report writing. This Final Evaluation aims to provide an impartial and independent review of the UNDP Regional Project in terms of its impact, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence, cross-cutting principles and values, and communications and visibility. This evaluation report summarises findings, lessons learnt and outlines recommendations to act as guidance for the way forward on the future course of action for the jurisdictions implementing the projects, the Federal Government of Germany, UNDP and Roadmap stakeholders.

This report is the third phase of the final evaluation. It is organised as follows:

1. Project and Evaluation Details
 2. Table of Contents
 3. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations.
 4. Executive Summary (4-5 pages maximum)
 5. Introduction and Overview
 6. Description of the Intervention
 7. Evaluation Scope and Objectives
 8. Evaluation Approach and Methods
 9. Data Analysis
 10. Findings and Conclusions (As a single section, but broken into two sub-sections (a) findings as they relate to the evaluation criteria and cross cutting issues, and (b) a conclusions section which examines interrelationships and implications)
 11. Recommendations and lessons for the future
- Annex 1: ToR for the Evaluation
Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix and Data Collection Instruments
Annex 3: List of Stakeholders Interviewed
Annex 4: Document Reference List

6. Description of the UNDP Regional Project

The UNDP Regional Project has been in operation since May 2019. It was created with the aim of supporting the jurisdictions of the Western Balkans in implementing the Roadmap. It was intended to assist in the initiation of activities to support Roadmap implementation prior to the establishment and implementation of the Western Balkans SALW Control Roadmap Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF). The project operated as a funding allocation mechanism to channel the 5.5 million EUR contribution from the Federal Government of Germany, to provide targeted projects to support the jurisdictions.

The UNDP Regional Project enabled six UNDP offices in each jurisdiction in the Western Balkans to submit SALW control project proposals and implement projects, coordinated by UNDP SEESAC. The UNDP Regional Project set out to deliver two results, each associated with lines of activity. These were:

- Output 1: coordinate the implementation of Roadmap sub-projects through UNDP Country Offices, conducted through a mechanism for fund allocation, monitoring, reporting and managed by UNDP SEESAC.
- Output 2: implement Roadmap sub-projects through UNDP Country Offices in six jurisdictions. The UNDP Regional Project funded a total of eight sub-projects across the six jurisdictions.

The UNDP Regional Project was delivered by UNDP's Istanbul Regional Hub for Europe and the CIS, through UNDP SEESAC. At the jurisdiction level, UNDP Offices managed the implementation of specific sub-projects; while UNDP SEESAC supported the overall coordination of the UNDP Regional Project and provided advisory support to the UNDP Offices implementing sub-projects. The eight individual sub-projects funded by the mechanism were:

1. Urgent Action on Ammunition Destruction, implemented by UNDP in Sarajevo (July 2019 – December 2019)
2. Reduce risk – Increase Safety – Towards Ending SALW Misuse in the Domestic Violence Context in Serbia, implemented by UNDP in Belgrade (September 2019 – December 2021)
3. Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of the Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking Firearms and Firearms Criminality, implemented by UNDP in Belgrade (October 2019 – November 2021)
4. Rogame SALW Storage Upgrade, implemented by UNDP in Podgorica (August 2019 – November 2021)
5. Support for Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities, implemented by UNDP in Tirana (December 2019 – December 2022)
6. Countering Illicit Arms Trafficking (CIAT), implemented by UNDP in Sarajevo (July 2019 – December 2022)
7. Support to Counter Illicit Arms Trafficking, implemented by UNDP in Pristina (September 2019 – August 2022)
8. Improving National SALW-related Practices and Building Violence-resilient Communities, implemented by UNDP in Skopje (September 2019 – July 2022)

7. Final Evaluation Scope and Objectives

Objective

The Final Evaluation assessed the UNDP Regional Project against the criteria of impact, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence, cross-cutting principles and values, and communications and visibility. This Final Evaluation report provides an overview of the key findings; lessons learnt from both the general implementation of the UNDP Regional Project and the individual UNDP sub-projects; and provides recommendations for future activities. The Final Evaluation is intended to capture the performance of the UNDP Regional Project and will enable the project board, UNDP and the Federal Government of Germany to examine its effectiveness, its utility and to decide on next steps.

Scope

The Final Evaluation examined the UNDP Regional Project's performance as a whole, as well as the eight individual UNDP sub-projects implemented across six jurisdictions: Belgrade, Podgorica, Pristina, Sarajevo, Skopje and Tirana. The evaluation covered the period of implementation from 1 May 2019 to 30 September 2022. Given that much of the UNDP Regional Project's duration coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic, the evaluation considered wider contextual factors (political, economic and social) and their impact on implementation. One of the foci of the final evaluation was to assess the gender sensitivity of the UNDP Regional Project and the individual sub-projects funded by it.

8. Final Evaluation Approach and Methods

Approach and Key Priorities

The overall approach sought to analyse data gathered through document review, KII and group discussions to assess the implementation of the overall UNDP Regional Project as well as its sub-projects. The document review gathered data at both project and sub-project level, disaggregated by gender wherever possible. Interviews focused primarily at the sub-project level, with the exception being interviews conducted with regional and international counterparts who had visibility of UNDP's regional-level project. At the overall UNDP Regional Project level, the following questions were identified as the framework for final evaluation.

- To what extent was the UNDP Regional Project aligned with the regional Roadmap for SALW control, Funding Window objectives, UNDP strategic objectives and SDG 16 - peace, justice and strong institutions? Did the project indirectly contribute to other SDGs? To which and how?
- Was the UNDP Regional Project strategically aligned with former and current UNDP strategic plans?
- Did the selection of sub-projects conducted result in a portfolio of relevant and quality funded sub-projects? Did the sub-projects fit together in a coherent portfolio?
- To what extent was the UNDP Regional Project design and management arrangement effective and appropriate for meeting the UNDP Regional Project objective?
- Did UNDP Country Offices establish new partnerships, or consolidate critical ones?
- To what extent were there synergies and interlinkages between the UNDP sub-projects and other projects and initiatives contributing to the Roadmap implementation?
- Did UNDP Country Offices leverage additional resources and scale up their projects?
- To what extent did the UNDP Regional Project's implementation enable UNDP to position itself as a

critical actor on arms control in the jurisdiction where the project was implemented?

- Are there lessons learnt and recommendations that could guide other similar funding mechanisms, such as the MPTF, to strengthen the effectiveness of their support to Roadmap implementation?

In addition to adopting a rigorous approach to data collection and analysis, the evaluation also aimed to identify lessons to support implementation of future projects and approaches to SALW control. This meant that, as well as assessing results (what was achieved), it also examined what worked (and what did not work) to achieve those results. Consequently, the evaluation examined the strategies employed to achieve project outcomes, as well as the organisational systems and processes which underpinned project delivery across the different sub-projects. Following the methodology, submitted in the bid and updated following discussions with the SEESAC team, FCP completed the following:

Detailed Desk Review

The team completed a detailed desk-based review to assess the impact of the UNDP Regional Project and sub-projects against their specific objectives, outcomes and how they contributed to wider implementation of the Roadmap within each jurisdiction. In doing so, the team reviewed all documentation provided, as well as other relevant documentation shared during the evaluation process. Information gathered during this detailed desk review phase was populated in an Excel template, which formed a basis and guided the adaption of questions during the subsequent data collection mission.

Data Collection Mission

The data collection mission was conducted in conjunction with the Mid-Term Evaluation of the MPTF and the Mid-Term Review of Roadmap implementation. Qualitative data collection was conducted through an 18-day field mission with five FCP staff members between 24 November – 10 December 2022, supplemented by remote KII and FGD conducted before and after travel (during the weeks commencing 21 November 2022, 12 December 2022 and 9 January 2023 for confirmatory interviews).

During the field mission, the team spent between two and three days in each jurisdiction. To maximise the time available, the evaluation team divided into two sub-teams, each of which covered all assignments to allow for two sets of meetings to occur at the same time where required. The two teams were as follows, each of which included gender balance, regional, thematic and evaluation experience:

1. Team 1: Henry Smith (team leader, responsible for both the MTR and the evaluations), Hope Kilmurry and Astrit Istrefi (regional expert, responsible for the MTR)
2. Team 2: Taz Greyling (SALW specialist, responsible for the MTR and the evaluations) and Ben Lovelock (evaluation expert, responsible for the evaluations)

The route and timeline were as follows: Tirana: 24 – 25 November; Podgorica: 28– 29 November; Pristina: 30 November – 1 December; Skopje: 2 – 5 December (including the weekend); Belgrade: 6 – 7 December; Sarajevo (with travel to Banja Luka): 8 – 9 December.

Where relevant, the team covered all three assessments in a single meeting with each respondent. Where an interviewee was selected to contribute to more than one assessment, and to maintain separation between the different exercises, the overall approach was communicated to interviewees during requests for interview, and was repeated as part of the introduction to the interview in each case. A separate question-set was developed for the UNDP Regional Project and MPTF Mid-term Evaluation to that developed for the Roadmap Mid-Term Review. Within each interview team, separate leads were appointed to help demarcate between different assessments conducted in the same interview. Interview

notes, taken by all interviewers, made clear which assessment specific responses related to, and this was reflected in combined interview notes for each interview. As outlined in [Annex 2 – Data Collection Instruments](#), according to the stakeholder being interviewed, the team adapted the questions to ensure that they were relevant for the KII or group discussion. This was assessed on a regular basis, with corrections made during the data collection mission phase.

Interviews were sought with the following categories of stakeholders:

- Local SALW Commissions
- Jurisdiction-level sub-project ‘beneficiaries’ (including government ministries, judicial actors and operational agencies)
- Donor representatives
- Relevant UNDP sub-project managers and technical specialists
- Relevant international, regional and local organisations (including UNODC, OSCE, EU, German and French diplomatic representatives).

A full interview sample was confirmed prior to the commencement of each jurisdiction visit. The list of interviewees can be found in [Annex 3](#). A key principle underpinning selection of interviewees was to ensure a sample representative of the wider stakeholder group with an interest in both the regional programme and its specific sub-projects, i.e. a sample that was able to substantiate, deepen and validate the data gathered through the document review phase. The sample was identified in consultation with UNDP and with local sub-project partners, principally the jurisdiction-level Local SALW Commission. In each case, interviewees were contacted by UNDP to introduce the task. This was followed up by the evaluation team through email, setting out the purpose of the interview, and the areas which were covered. In the email, authorisation was sought to use the data gathered in the evaluation report. As part of the introduction to the interview, in each case the interviewer re-explained the purpose of the interview and the use of data. The option of an anonymised response in the event of concerns relating to attribution was also explained. At the end of each interview, the interviewee was provided with the opportunity to raise questions or concerns about data gathering and use. Some did ask for anonymity and non-attribution of their responses.

On return from the data collection mission, the FCP Project Director convened the FCP project team for an internal workshop to finalise data validation processes. This included cross-tabulating responses to specific questions across different interviewees and documents and identifying a small sample of validity discussions to test and validate responses in the event that individual responses were not validated through triangulation during the field visits. The team also discussed emerging findings according to the evaluation criteria and cross-cutting issues, agreed common analysis of the data in line with key research questions and developed recommendations for evaluation criteria. A full overview of detailed desk review data analysis can be found in [Section 9](#).

Following this, and prior to the drafting of this final evaluation report, the evaluation team debriefed the necessary project teams with preliminary findings of the data collection mission for both evaluations.

Review and Report Writing

Once analysis was completed by the FCP evaluation team, the team drafted this final evaluation report based on the findings generated through the detailed desk review and interviews conducted before, after and during the data collection mission.

Once this Final Evaluation report and the MPTF Mid-Term Evaluation report are approved, the FCP team will provide a consolidated findings report which brings together the key findings from both the final evaluation of the UNDP Regional Project and the mid-term evaluation of the MPTF which will include the consolidated findings, challenges, lessons learnt, and forward-looking recommendations of the final evaluation of the UNDP Regional Project and the mid-term evaluation. The report will highlight synergies and provide a consolidated and analytical picture of the two evaluations' findings.

Limitations and challenges

The principal challenge in conducting this evaluation was the time period during which it was completed – including both the very short time period that the evaluation was conducted, alongside the MTR and MTE; as well as the time of year with Christmas and New Year celebrations. This meant focussing the field visit component on capital based KIIs and group discussions. Additional time would have enabled site visits which would have allowed the team to build a stronger understanding of the impact on the ground of the UNDP Regional Project and its sub-projects, and a broader range of interviewees. This was addressed to some degree by ensuring that interviewees included those who have been involved in project implementation and through placing additional emphasis on the considerable levels of project-level reporting. The proximity to independence celebrations, planned local and regional SALW Roadmap consultations, and the Christmas and New Year holiday periods were also a major factor in the timings of visits. The final challenge related to the large scale of reporting and project-related documentation which increased the number of questions and criteria that the document review had to cover. This was understandable given the complexity of the Roadmap and its many metrics, but it required a significant amount of time in an already compressed schedule.

The parallel taskings of the Final Evaluation of the UNDP Regional Project, combined with both the Mid-Term Evaluation of the MPTF and the Mid-Term review of Roadmap implementation was both a challenge and an opportunity for the team. On the one hand, timings led to the consolidation of the three field missions into one trip, meaning that interviews sometimes covered two or three of the evaluations/reviews simultaneously. To avoid any confusion with regards to which project was being evaluated or reviewed, the team was careful to explain what was being discussed in interviews and ensured that there was appropriate separation between the different tasks. On the other hand, this was also an opportunity as it allowed the team to obtain a comprehensive perspective of a broadly diverse set of actors on overall Roadmap progress and the contribution of the dedicated funding mechanisms managed by UNDP. The team monitored this very closely throughout the field mission.

For further information on the deliverables, please see [Annex 1a – Final Evaluation Schedule of Tasks, Timelines and Final Evaluation Deliverables](#).

9. Analysis of Projects

Analysis for the final evaluation combined a comprehensive desk-based document review framed by questions provided by UNDP against which the documents were examined, as well as information compiled during the field mission, in which 46 interviews were conducted with 73 interviewees. The full desk review was conducted in an Excel template agreed during the inception phase; the outline of interviews conducted can be found in [Annex 3 – List of Stakeholders Interviewed](#); and the list of documentation reviewed for the desk-review can be found in [Annex 4 – Document reference list](#).

The table below provides an overview of the key findings for each of the projects implemented as part of the UNDP Regional Project. It covers the criteria described in the methodology section above, with the exception of ‘impact’, due to the fact that questions provided to the team and used for the document analysis did not focus on impact specifically.¹ The table provides a ‘helicopter’ overview of the assessment of progress against each project according to a red, amber, green (RAG) rating. [Section 10](#) provides a more detailed qualitative assessment of progress under each criteria and should be read alongside the data below. This section looks predominantly at Output 2: implement Roadmap sub-projects through UNDP Country Offices in six jurisdictions – analysing their progress against each of the criteria.

The RAG rating was conducted as follows:

RAG Rating System	
Green	Meets the criteria assessed, with few or no improvements to be made
Amber	Partially meets the criteria assessed
Red	Does not meet the criteria assessed
Grey	Not Applicable: it was not possible to assess the criteria

Project and Criteria	RAG Rating	Justification
Urgent Action on Ammunition Destruction - Project EXPLODE+ (Sarajevo)		
Relevance	Green	Close alignment with Goals 5, 6 and 7 and was relevant to the needs in in Sarajevo.
Effectiveness	Green	Project delivered on time and to budget with slightly improved final total of destroyed ammunition pieces. It also had a clear, intended result which was achieved and measured, delivered on time.

¹ Impact was addressed as part of the KIIs and group discussions and is therefore covered in section 10 ‘Findings and Conclusions’

Efficiency		Delivered within budget lines. Used existing local facilities and low funding allocations to project management. Perceived as efficient use of resources.
Sustainability		Pieces of ammunition cannot be reactivated and pose no threat. Use of existing facilities helps with their sustainability.
Coherence		Project located within Sarajevo's plan AWE MP, and coordinated with EU and EUFOR.
Communications		Whilst a communications strategy was drafted at the beginning of the project, with updated delivered - it was difficult to assess whether internal communication with stakeholders was regular or effective from desk-review.
Cross-Cutting		N/A - but appears to have very minimal consideration on gender and human rights-based approaches.
Reduce Risk - Increase Safety - Towards ending SALW misuse in domestic violence context in Serbia (Belgrade)		
Relevance		Linked to Goal 4 and contributed to Goal 2. Represents a key issue identified in the context.
Effectiveness		Good progress achieved on this project, with outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 achieving expected results, and half of 1.4 achieved. During continuation, progress also made on 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7.
Efficiency		Additional cost extension of \$150k in final stage of project. Deemed as appropriate and justifiable.
Sustainability		Engagement with a range of actors both within the government as well as civil society, media etc. which has supported sustainability. E-learning also used.
Coherence		Whilst limited evidence of coordination with other regional actors, partnerships were established and strengthened with national partners.
Communications		Project had a comprehensive communications strategy with web presence, press releases, social media reporting, campaigns, local media visibility and publications. Unclear on internal comms.
Cross-Cutting		Gender and human rights focus of project.
Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality (Belgrade)		
Relevance		Linked to Goals 1, 3 and 5. High relevance to the context - critical to improve regulatory framework for custody chain, increase capacity of CSI units and improve management and storage of ballistic evidence.
Effectiveness		All activities completed with results achieved across all outputs.
Efficiency		Delays encountered due to COVID-19 and other factors - led to several extensions and budget revisions.
Sustainability		SOPs provided; SALW-related equipment procured and installed; software; water tanks - limited information on maintenance of this equipment. However, capacity has been strengthened from project demonstrating some level of sustainability.
Coherence		Cooperation reported with Swedish Police on a project they were implementing with the MoI and National Forensic Centre.
Communications		Clear communications strategy outlined in the Project Document, with evidence of UNDP in Belgrade conducting external communications, publications, as well as references being included in local media.

Cross-Cutting		Evidence of support to gender equality through capacity building of CSI units for conducting criminal investigations in reported cases of domestic violence. More could be done on gender - limited reference to women being trained, as well as gender mainstreaming throughout the project.
Rogame SALW Storage Upgrade (Podgorica)		
Relevance		Linked to Goal 7, in line with SALW Strategy and Action Plan and of key relevance to the context.
Effectiveness		All activities completed; fully implemented and constructed magazines handed over in Nov 2021.
Efficiency		Significant delays (6 no-cost extensions - much of which beyond the control of both UNDP and the implementer).
Sustainability		Concerns raised regarding will and capability for maintenance and repair by MoI/Police moving forward.
Coherence		Only other initiative mentioned in Rogame storage area is ITF work.
Communications		Communications strategy is disproportionate to the project; whilst handover ceremonies useful, limited information on communication of project activities on local channels.
Cross-Cutting		Unable to assess in detail but appears to have very limited on promotion of gender equality or marginalised or disadvantaged groups.
Support Albania's Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities (Tirana)		
Relevance		Link to Goal 1 and 2, as well as KPIs 2, 3, 8, 9 and 10. Project is demand-led, responding to MoI communication.
Effectiveness		All activities implemented, 4 SOPs, 16 capabilities plus Tirana extra, technology and software and related training.
Efficiency		Funding of project was sufficient in terms of strategy; some issues of efficiency identified as project appears to have suffered from an over/under estimation of times and unit costs. Also experienced significant delays - some were unavoidable (such as earthquake).
Sustainability		Concerns regarding a lack of whole life management of equipment including budgets for maintenance, repair, refresher training etc.
Coherence		Reports mention meetings with other local, Western Balkans, European and International institutions.
Communications		Whilst communications strategy has some gaps, significant internal communications; as well as evidence of local ownership of project.
Cross-Cutting		Whilst aiming to be linked to SDG 16; concerns over gender component with a lack of real activity or any engagement with marginalised groups.
Countering Illicit Arms Trafficking (CIAT) (Sarajevo)		
Relevance		Contributed to Goals 2 and 3 and relevant to the key issues of detection and prevention of diversion in Sarajevo, demonstrated by support of several local strategies.
Effectiveness		Demonstrated a progressive approach.
Efficiency		Adequate and appropriate funding allocated. Only issue was time due to COVID-19, as well as low response to specialised equipment tenders. Could have been accelerated if process was adapted.
Sustainability		Whilst good inclusion of participating institutions, equipment and database maintenance and repair seems under-focused on, lack of whole life management conditions prior to donation.

Coherence		Project consistent with similar projects in other jurisdictions that, together, formed a horizontal effort across the Western Balkans to better identify and prevent diversions at borders.
Communications		Good approach to communications: included videos for training, use of social media to advertise work; wide inclusivity of local institutions.
Cross-Cutting		Evidence of attempts to promote gender equality through inclusion of women in training - but more could have been done. Supported SDG 5 and 16.
Support to counter Illicit arms trafficking (Pristina)		
Relevance		Relates to Goal 3. Trafficking identified as a priority by EUROPOL SOCTA and Pristina's Strategy.
Effectiveness		Most activities have been implemented, although with significant delays. Capacity yet to lead to significant increases in seizures, although documentation does not cover the final results.
Efficiency		Insufficient information in documentation. However, small underspend >\$50k. Providing the capacity building leads to operations, it will be perceived as efficient.
Sustainability		All outcome areas aim to develop institutional capacity - significant training as well as equipment provided. However, future maintenance arrangements of the equipment not guaranteed.
Coherence		Whilst aligned with strategic plans, limited information on the literature on synergies and interlinkages between the UNDP projects and other projects contributing to Roadmap implementation.
Communications		Clear communications plan set out in the ProDoc; Pristina Police Facebook page details progress made.
Cross-Cutting		Commitment to UNDP gender goals and priorities in initial Programme Document - some evidence of this in documentation but not in detail. Nor engagement with marginalised and disadvantaged groups.
Improving national SALW-related practices and building violence-resilient communities (Skopje)		
Relevance		Contributed to Roadmap Goals 2, 4 and 7 and is identified as relevant to the context.
Effectiveness		Despite delays, the outputs were achieved almost entirely.
Efficiency		Three delays but no changes to the budget; one issue regarding hardware procurement but this was resolved. The programme lasted 2 years longer than originally intended - UNDP had issues recruiting a team leader.
Sustainability		Outputs expected to last beyond lifespan of the project: especially due to training for IT personnel. However, limited information on maintenance of hardware in the long term.
Coherence		Collaboration with UNODC, multiple local partnerships consolidated throughout implementation.
Communications		Clear communications plan outlined in the Project Documentation and there is evidence that this has been followed.
Cross-Cutting		Only one activity looking into gender-disaggregated data - much more could be done on this, as well as engagement with disadvantaged and marginalised groups.

10. Findings and Conclusions

This section is structured according to the key evaluation criteria outlined in [Section 3](#) above.

Impact

The understanding of impact used for this evaluation is that set out by the OECD-DAC:

“Impact addresses the ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects of the intervention. It seeks to identify social, environmental and economic effects of the intervention that are longer term or broader in scope than those already captured under the effectiveness criterion. Beyond the immediate results, this criterion seeks to capture the indirect, secondary and potential consequences of the intervention. It does so by examining the holistic and enduring changes in systems or norms, and potential effects on people’s well-being, human rights, gender equality, and the environment”²

Presenting a full picture of portfolio- and sub-project- level impact is challenging. This is partly due to the scale of the UNDP Regional Project relative to the ambition of the Roadmap, which makes attributing wider and more systemic change difficult. It is also due to the reporting arrangements for the sub-projects and of the Funding Window UNDP “Support to the implementation of the Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans” as a whole, which focussed principally on delivery of activities and immediate outputs and lower-level outcomes – rather than wider scale impact on the ground (see commentary in effectiveness and efficiency sections below).³ Finally, the duration of the UNDP Regional Project and sub-projects makes achieving ‘transformative’ change difficult: given the recent completion dates of several projects, it is too soon to tell whether and to what extent longer term and broader changes have taken place. However, it is possible to identify some important areas in which early signs of impact are observable. They are as follows:

Catalytic effect on the establishment of the MPTF. The Regional Project was an essential step in establishing the Multi Partner Trust Fund. In addition to providing an interim solution whilst the MPTF was being discussed and developed, it provided a mechanism for UNDP to continue its engagement with SALW Commissions and other important stakeholders. The approach of nesting an existing funding arrangement within a more bespoke and longer-term mechanism for supporting Roadmap implementation is innovative and has been proven to be effective. As part of considering which aspects of the Roadmap experience are replicable in other contexts, the existence of a mechanism such as the Regional Project is an important prerequisite to early momentum and effective early implementation.

Achieving early momentum with Roadmap implementation. Without the Regional Project it is unlikely that initial funding support would have been disbursed as quickly or efficiently. As a technical as well as a political concept, the Roadmap required an early injection of external funding to complement that provided by jurisdictions directly. There was no other obvious mechanism through which this could have

² <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm#impact-block>

³ As mentioned above, a Mid-Term Evaluation is being conducted on the Multi-Partner Trust Fund, which came into existence after the UNDP Funding Window.

been provided without additional bureaucratic requirements. The Regional Project therefore had an effect in terms of generating momentum and helping Roadmap implementation get off to a positive start.

Engaging a wider supporting stakeholder group. The Regional Project provided a means through which funding in support of the Roadmap could be provided, therefore demonstrating ‘proof of concept’ and as a consequence, encouraging the involvement of others in the MPTF. Whilst other funding was provided by donors on a bilateral level, the Regional Project provided visibility of German support and encouraged discussions on coherence between the Federal Government of Germany and other prospective donors. The impact of the Regional Project in this area therefore is one of initiating greater coherence – facilitated in part by SEESAC and UNDP – in future support provided for implementation.

Providing visible demonstrable donor support to the Roadmap. As a political commitment, the Roadmap requires the confidence and support of jurisdictions as well as their international partners. The Regional Project acted as a vehicle for the Federal Government of Germany to demonstrate its commitment – ‘putting its money where its mouth is’. Similarly, it provided the mechanism through which UNDP could renew its commitment to SALW control and to partnership across the region.

Incubating projects and initiatives that were taken forward through later funding mechanisms. The Regional Project played an important incubator and catalytic role in establishing projects⁴ that were then taken on at higher scale through other mechanisms (in this case through the MPTF). It helped UNDP to refine project development and management arrangements and put in place some of the staffing requirements that have been essential in delivering projects funded through the MPTF.

At the point at which the final evaluation of the Roadmap is conducted, it will be important to return to the Regional Project to establish whether its outcomes (either at the Regional Project level or through sub-projects) have had enduring effects, both on Roadmap implementation and on wider SALW control efforts across the region. In the remaining period of implementation, it is vital that donor funded projects emphasise monitoring and reporting change at the outcome and impact level in order to establish a more developed understanding of the wider effects.

Relevance

Relevance to UNDP⁵

Thematically, the UNDP Regional Project was relevant to UNDP’s 2018-2021 Strategic Plan as the project sought to build resilience, directly in the Western Balkans and indirectly in Europe and globally, to shocks and crises (UNDP’s strategic outcome C). The UNDP Regional Project also sought to provide some of what UNDP globally terms its “signature solutions”, namely effective inclusive accountable governance (signature solution two) and gender equality and empowerment of women and girls (signature solution six). A relevance link was also articulated in the UNDP Regional Project document with regards to the

⁴ Projects that were taken/replicated under the MPTF include ‘Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality’ in Belgrade; ‘Support to Albania’s Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities’ in Tirana; Countering Illicit Arms Trafficking’ in Sarajevo and ‘Support to counter illicit arms trafficking’ in Pristina.

⁵ <https://www.undp.org/iraq/publications/undp-strategic-plan-2018-2021> ; <https://www.undp.org/publications/undp-strategic-plan-2022-2025>

SDGs, particularly those related to gender equality and empowerment (SDG 5) and just, peaceful and inclusive societies (SDG 16) and related targets, which were also part of UNDP's 2018-2021 Strategic Plan. The main targets of relevance to the UNDP Regional Project were SDG target 5.1, ending discrimination against women and girls, 5.2, ending violence against women and girls, 5.5 ensuring full participation in leadership and decision-making, 5.c having and enforcing gender equality legislation, 16.1 reduced violence and death rates and 16.4 reducing illicit arms flows.

The UNDP Regional Project was relevant to UNDP's 2022-2025 Strategic Plan in similar ways to the preceding strategy, thematically linking to the delivery of the SDGs and UNDP's signature solutions related to resilience, gender and governance. UNDP's 2018-21 and 2022-25 Strategic Plans both aim to project UNDP as a strong and trust-worthy partner in the UN system providing thought-leadership and delivering results effectively and efficiently. Through the UNDP Regional Project, UNDP SEESAC as well as six UNDP Offices were able to demonstrate these brand qualities and so the project was very relevant to UNDP from a corporate point of view.

Relevance to Western Balkans Partners

The relevance of SALW control sub-projects fluctuated between May 2019 and September 2022 for contextual reasons across all six jurisdictions as well as in Europe and globally, not least due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic.⁶ Tackling the pandemic became the priority from early 2020 and throughout 2021,⁷ with all six Western Balkans jurisdictions only going into recovery phases in the first six months of 2022, when the UNDP Regional Project was winding up. The war in Ukraine, related energy and food crises, took root in February 2022 and continued to the end of the UNDP Regional Project.

Across the Western Balkans a number of elections took place and leading to changes in governments, periods of political uncertainty and significant delays in resulting political processes (in Podgorica, Pristina and Skopje) within a general backdrop of polarised politics between ruling parties and their opposition sometimes with legislative repercussions (i.e., laws not being agreed). These issues were compounded by a range of other contextual challenges such as serious and organised crime, corruption, dynamic migratory populations, natural disasters (e.g., the earthquake in Albania on 26 November 2019)⁸, unemployment and the rise of informal economies that did not contribute to gross domestic product, geopolitical as well as sub-national dynamics. These contextual dynamics meant that while tactical and operational level stakeholders found UNDP Regional Project sub-projects highly relevant, this was not always the case for senior officials, leading to sustainability issues (see the Sustainability of Sub-Projects Section below) in some instances.

It was found that SALW – and therefore the implementation of the Roadmap itself - was seen as relevant across all six jurisdictions due to the perception of it as an enabler of other priority crimes, e.g., armed robberies, narcotics and domestic violence, rather than as a priority in its own right.⁹ SALW were not the main focus of law enforcement in any of the six jurisdictions, but implementing the Roadmap and better controlling SALW helped prevent and/or reduce the impact of prioritised crimes.

⁶ Focus Group discussions (FGD) in all jurisdictions.

⁷ FGD and KII in all six jurisdictions.

⁸ KII with Tirana Local SALW Commission members.

⁹ KII and FGD in Belgrade and Sarajevo.

Some jurisdictions approached the UNDP Regional Project under chapters 23 and 24 of the EU Acquis,¹⁰ considering Roadmap implementation via this project to be a prerequisite for EU membership.¹¹ Therefore, implementation remained politically relevant, even when SALW control as a thematic area, was a lower order priority than for example, controlling serious and organised crime linked to human trafficking, narcotics and the informal economy.

Relevance to the Roadmap

The portfolio of sub-projects covered all of the Roadmap goals and was relevant to Roadmap implementation in a fair and balanced way, reflecting Roadmap priorities when the UNDP Regional Project started, which were on legislation and policies (goal 1) as well as on reducing illicit SALW flows (goal 3) in an evidence-based way (goal 2). UNDP Country Offices developed sub-projects with counterparts in each jurisdiction, which improved their relevancy locally (e.g., in Sarajevo unplanned explosions were of immediate concern, whereas in Belgrade a priority was reducing the disproportionate impact of SALW on women and girls). Sub-projects mapped onto Roadmap goals and targets as well as jurisdiction-specific local needs as follows:¹²

1. Goal 1 (harmonised legislation) and KPI 1 (number of legal frameworks):
 - a. Belgrade: Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of the Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality, which also contributed to the Action Plan for the Implementation of the SALW Control Strategy.
 - b. Tirana: Support to Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities, which also contributed to the National Action Plan 2019-2021 and responded directly to a Ministry of the Interior communiqué on needs.
2. Goal 2 (evidence-based), KPI 2 (numbers of gender/age needs-based policies), KPI 3 (number of cases versus number of seizures), KPI 7 (Firearms Focal Point set up/not) and KPI 8 (number of inter-institutional cooperation cases):
 - a. Belgrade: Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of the Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality.
 - b. Sarajevo: Countering Illicit Arms and Trafficking (CIAT), which also contributed to the National SALW Strategy and Action Plan, its 2015-2020 Strategy for Preventing and Combatting Terrorism and its 2017-2020 Strategy for Fighting Against Organised Crime, as well as successors to these. The project was also seen by authorities as directly relevant to their compliance with chapters 23 and 24 of the EU Acquis.
 - c. Skopje: Improving National SALW-related Practices, which also contributed to the 2017-2021 National Strategy and Action Plan.
 - d. Tirana: Support to Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities.

¹⁰ KII in Pristina and Belgrade.

¹¹ https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/eu-and-western-balkans-towards-common-future_en. However, the data collection mission revealed EU accession not to be a motivator of Roadmap implementation in parts of the Sarajevo jurisdiction.

¹² Primarily sub-project progress reporting.

3. Goal 3 (reduced illicit flows), KPI 4 (number of adjudicated cases versus seizures), KPI 5 (border seizures versus EU seizures traced to Western Balkans, KPI 6 (number of diverted export licenses) and KPI 9 (number of operational intelligence cooperation):
 - a. Belgrade: Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of the Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality.
 - b. Pristina: Safety and Security Programme Support to Counter Illicit Arms Trafficking, which also contributed to Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council of 2 December 2012: “Implementing the European Agenda on Security: EU Action Plan against Illicit Trafficking in and Use of Firearms and Explosives”, Pristina’s Integrated Border Management Strategy, the 2017-2021 SALW Control Strategy and its Countering Organised Crime Strategy.
 - c. Sarajevo: Countering Illicit Arms and Trafficking (CIAT).
4. Goal 4 (increased awareness), KPI 10 (number of disaggregated incidents) and KPI 14 (% citizen satisfaction):
 - a. Belgrade: Reduce Risk, Increase Safety, Towards Ending SALW Misuse in Domestic Violence Contexts, which contributed to the Action Plan for the Implementation of the SALW Control Strategy, the National Strategy for Gender Equality, Action Plan for Gender Equality, and Belgrade’s international commitments related to gender-based violence and gender equality, such as the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence and Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), as well as the chapters 23 and 24 of the EU Acquis.
5. Goal 5 (decreased illicit possession) and KPI 11 (number voluntarily surrendered):
 - a. Belgrade: Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of the Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality.
6. Goal 6 (decreased surpluses) and KPI 12 (number confiscated or destroyed):
 - a. Sarajevo: Urgent Action on Ammunition Destruction – Project Explode+, which also contributed to the National SALW Strategy and Action Plan, its 2015-2020 Strategy for Preventing and Combatting Terrorism and its 2017-2020 Strategy for Fighting Against Organised Crime, as well as successors to these.
7. Goal 7 (decreased proliferation risk) and KPI 13 (number of storage facilities compliant with international standards):
 - a. Podgorica: Rogame Storage Upgrade, which also contributed to Podgorica’s 2019-2025 SALW strategy.

Relevance to the Federal Government of Germany

The relevancy of the UNDP Regional Project and its sub-projects to the German Federal Foreign Office was two-fold. Firstly, as an EU member state that had agreed the EU Strategy Against Illicit Firearms, Small Arms and Light Weapons and their Ammunition, the Western Balkans was a particular area of focus. And secondly, weapons and explosives had been found in the hands of criminals in Germany that had

proliferated there after the Yugoslav, Bosnian and Kosovo wars.¹³ Officials feared a major flow of SALW into Germany, even though this had not yet materialised.¹⁴ The UNDP Regional Project, and Roadmap implementation in general, went some way towards preventing further increases in the somewhat nascent flow of weapons into the EU in May 2019, when the UNDP Regional Project started.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness Implementing UNDP Strategy

From both a 2018-2021 UNDP Strategic Plan and a 2022-2025 UNDP Strategic Plan point of view, the UNDP Regional Project was very effective in that UNDP's reputation, as a trustworthy partner, provider of thought-leadership, deliverer of effective and efficient results, and a strong partner in the UN system, was successfully advertised.¹⁵ As a result, even before the UNDP Regional Project ended, UNDP became a grantee of not just the Federal Government of Germany, but also a number of other international government donors, boosting both UNDP's reputation, as per its 2018-2021 and 2022-2025 strategies, and subsequently UNDP's business development by SEESAC and Country Offices.

However, research for this evaluation revealed that the effectiveness of the UNDP Regional Project to SDG 16 (just, peaceful and inclusive societies) was less than the effectiveness of the project in projecting the corporate brand of UNDP.¹⁶ This could be because, in the case of peace, the contribution of the project and sub-projects could not be proven as the distance between very high-level strategic SDG goals and lower-level project outputs was too great to attribute causality. Apart from the implementation of the 'Reduce Risk – Increase Safety – Towards ending SALW misuse in Domestic Violence Context in Serbia', it was found that the UNDP Regional Project was not effective at contributing to SDG 5 (gender equality and empowerment – see the Cross-cutting Principals and Values: Gender Section below).

Effectiveness Implementing the Roadmap

The UNDP Regional Project document was well-aligned to the Roadmap. The likelihood of effectiveness in meeting objectives was improved through good project design, including well-articulated theories of change that matched the subsequent investments through sub-projects.¹⁷ The only theory of change articulated in the UNDP Regional Project document that was not sufficiently invested in was building SALW stockpile inspection systems and building up life-cycle management of SALW stockpiles. This remained a gap by the end of the UNDP Regional Project on 30 June 2022 (or indeed 28 February 2023, considering project extensions). This led to a lack of effectiveness in implementing goal 7 (decreased proliferation risk).

The UNDP Regional Project was more successful at effectively contributing to Roadmap goals 1-6, with the more major investments directed at goals 2, by helping jurisdictions to create evidence and use it for better identification, prevention and criminal pursuit, and goal 3, by helping jurisdictions to reduce illicit flows through law enforcement capability development.¹⁸ The judicial part of the criminal justice pathway was under-invested in during the UNDP Regional Project, the role of the judiciary being limited to participation in workshops and events alongside other institutional partners and contributing to scenario

¹³ https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Firearms/2020_REPORT_Global_Study_on_Firearms_Trafficking_2020_web.pdf

¹⁴ KII, particularly in Belgrade and Pristina.

¹⁵ KII, including, but not limited to, Chairs of Local SALW Commissions, in all six jurisdictions.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Comparison of project and sub-project proposals.

¹⁸ Sub-project budgets.

development for exercises.¹⁹ However, given that the UNDP Regional Project represented just the start of a longer Roadmap implementation effort, and that the entirety of resource came from just one government, it would be unfair to expect the UNDP Regional Project to fund the entirety of Roadmap implementation. What the UNDP Regional Project did achieve was an effective start, primarily on goals 2 and 3, but also on goals 1, 4, 5 and 6. This finding is based on detailed desk review.

Effectiveness of Meeting Funding Window Criteria

The two criteria highlighted in the UNDP Regional Project document were the need for catalytic effect and the need for national ownership.²⁰

Funding the UNDP Regional Project led ultimately to the MPTF becoming a functioning funding mechanism. Some of the Funding Window projects morphed and further developed into other projects.²¹ For example, the existence of the Sarajevo 'Countering Illicit Arms Trafficking' (CIAT) project enabled the development of the Pristina 'Support to counter illicit arms trafficking' project, also under the UNDP Regional Project. Some newer iterations of Funding Window sub-projects were also funded by MPTF. For example, the two trafficking projects outlined above led to MPTF's Support to Counter Illicit Arms Trafficking in Pristina, project EXPLODE+ continued under MPTF, the second phase of Belgrade police directorate capability development was implemented under MPTF, taking off from where Funding Window ended. Some new projects were triggered by the UNDP Regional Project that were funded outside of the MPTF, such as bilateral investments in physical security and stockpile destruction. This proves that Funding Window support to the UNDP Regional Project did trigger actions and reactions that furthered Roadmap implementation. This means that the Funding Window was effectively used for catalytic effect.

The effectiveness of the UNDP Regional Project in tapping into existing national ownership and furthering it, however, was less successful.²² Some of the contextual factors, beyond the control of UNDP, that increased and reduced national ownership were described in the Relevance to Western Balkans Partners Section above. UNDP could have done more to optimise national ownership during project and sub-project design phases. Some of the wording in project documents and (according to the data collection mission phase of this final evaluation) the language used by some UNDP counterparts, was problematic, leaving some partners in jurisdictions with the impression that UNDP, and potentially European governments, thought of them as recipients of aid and sources of SALW proliferation problems rather than as equal partners. This did not encourage national ownership.²³ See the Project Sustainability Section below.

Effectiveness of Output One, Efficient Coordination by SEESAC

SEESAC coordinated implementation of Roadmap projects and enabled communication between Roadmap stakeholders internationally, regionally, and at the jurisdiction level. This communication catalysed new partnerships or approaches leading to action, particularly on WhatsApp, Viber, via email and telephone in a way that was faster and more informal than, for example, Memorandums of Understanding or Mutual Legal Assistance protocols.²⁴ Coordination managed by SEESAC both harmonised, as well as prevented duplication with others both regionally and sub-nationally, but there

¹⁹ The CIAT sub-project progress reports.

²⁰ UNDP Regional ProDoc.

²¹ Funding Window sub-project revisions and MPTF sub-project proposals.

²² KII and FGD across all six jurisdictions.

²³ Many KII and FGD, in all six jurisdictions, particularly larger ones.

²⁴ Belgrade, Podgorica and Pristina KII, plus KII with NABIS and Interpol.

were instances when partners were informed of activities rather than truly coordinated. This led to some limited occasions, when local SALW Commissions struggled to keep control of what was going on in their jurisdiction, or project implementers had to adjust to others in a reactive rather than collaborative way. Complications of this sort were caused by multiple actors, including in-kind donations by European government organisations as well as donor funding decisions that had either not previously been sense-checked with the relevant SALW Commission or where there was disagreement on the requirements in a jurisdiction.²⁵

The data collection mission undertaken as part of this final evaluation revealed that the effectiveness of the UNDP Regional Project in delivering output one, an efficient Roadmap project coordination mechanism, was partial – there was good coordination, but it was not necessarily efficient, particularly for smaller jurisdictions and UNDP offices that lacked the absorption capacity, e.g. Podgorica and Skopje.²⁶ The opportunity cost of serving reporting and meeting requirements for implementing partners was significant, reducing, for example, their time to implement projects ; according to some, so much so that they effectively lost significant proportions of time drafting reports and attending meetings as part of wider Fund management.²⁷

This is not a critique of the governance architecture set up and managed by SEESAC. This evaluation finds that the benefit of face-to-face meetings and virtual meetings went beyond coordination of Roadmap projects, into operational collaboration and the creation of a community of practice that had a catalytic and operational effect. Indeed, local and regional coordination meetings (and other events organised at sub-project-level) had multiplier effects, both in terms of operational collaboration and, more geopolitically, in furthering the peace agenda as per SDG 16. This positive effect of SEESAC coordination events mattered in a region that is affected by regional instability and historical as well as current tensions. The part of output one, coordination, that would have benefited from modification is reporting, which could have been more effective had the focus been on articulating and proving change, rather than reporting on activities.

Effectiveness of Output Two, Delivery of Sub-projects by UNDP Offices

The UNDP Regional Project delivered output two through implementing Roadmap projects. Overall, there was a lack of reporting and emphasis on the operational use of new capabilities and how new capabilities impacted on the criminal justice chain (including the judiciary and convictions), the risk of proliferation, or the security of women and girls. Project stakeholders seemed satisfied, in many cases proud, of what they had achieved with Funding window support, but this was an intangible, indirect and subjective measure of effect. This is understandable given the early phase of Roadmap implementation that the UNDP Regional Project supported. However, the longer-term effects of the capacity built during this phase would expect to be visible once Roadmap implementation is more mature.²⁸

Progress reports included lessons learned of variable quality and it was not possible to see when and how feedback loops in the project management cycle resulted in change as a consequence of lessons being applied. Future proposals and progress reporting could be accompanied by a lessons-tracker that documents lessons learned and if/how they are applied to on-going projects. A similar approach could be

²⁵ For instance, KII in Sarajevo.

²⁶ KII with Local SALW Commissions and Firearms Focal Points in all six jurisdictions.

²⁷ KII with a range of stakeholders across all jurisdictions.

²⁸ The issue of how capacity has been employed and its effects on the issues the Roadmap seeks to address is reviewed in the Mid Term Review of the Western Balkans SALW Roadmap, conducted alongside the final evaluation of the UNDP Regional Project. Overall, it finds that whilst there are some indications at the mid-point of implementation, further impact should be detectable during the remaining implementation period if the underpinning theory of change is to be validated.

taken to risk management, the risk register becoming a live project manager's document with an action column that also gets updated. As it was, lessons, monitoring and risk management processes ended up being more of a project proposal requirement than a project management tool. There were instances (e.g., in relation to procurement, recruitment and tendering) where if the lessons learned in one sub-project had been applied in another sub-project it could have improved project effect (and efficiency).

Effectiveness of Sub-projects

The quality of sub-project design was good overall, suggesting that they were an effective means of delivering the concepts set out in their objectives. This included problem analysis, theories of change, results frameworks, risk registers and performance measures. In general, proposals were clear and simple, as were performance metrics, which remained largely activity based. Some parts of proposals were somewhat generic and formulaic in nature, such as contributions to UN values including SDGs and gender. See the Cross-cutting Principals and Values: Gender Section below. Not all sub-projects had reference to a baseline, therefore the scale of anticipated change was difficult to demonstrate.

Some interviewees explained that they found proposal-writing or contributing to proposals very resource intensive. However, they were willing to undertake the work because it resulted in funding for activities that they wanted to undertake. This was a trade-off that made sense to jurisdiction-level partners.²⁹ A lack of absorption capacity, including in UNDP Offices, may in part explain why, once proposals were written, approved and funded, there appears to be relatively limited evidence of awardees translating proposals into project management plans, although the evaluation team neither routinely requested or were offered these documents and as such, has limited information available through which to make a conclusion.

Whilst improvements to reporting are outlined in detail, the combination of the desk-based review and interviews demonstrated the benefits of sub-projects, (for instance, better security, lower explosive risks, more collaboration between law enforcement agencies etc).³⁰ However, what the contribution to longer term and higher level changes were (for instance, the risk of proliferation was reduced, public attitudes towards weapons changed, more suspects were charged) was not clear at this stage of Roadmap implementation, and will in most cases require a longer term perspective to assess. The following overview draws on the data collection mission,³¹ and less on the desk review due to the nature of reporting.

1. *Tirana*: The 'Support to Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities' sub-project delivered more harmonised procedures and better crime scene investigation including chain of custody and improved ballistic analysis. This improved and harmonised capability has led to better case preparation thanks to more admissible evidence, leading to a greater chance of conviction (or, indeed, acquittal), more cases being closed thanks to centralised exhibit analysis data management, as well as a greater possibility of evidence being used for prosecutions by European countries. Whilst the data provided to the evaluation team did not provide widespread examples of effectiveness in practice; there is evidence of the equipment being used on a regular basis by stakeholders. Examples of effect include the use of equipment to determine DNA analysis which led to solving two crimes, one of which had been unresolved for 15 years.³²

²⁹ KII/FGD, particularly with those receiving equipment including forensic laboratories, police and border police.

³⁰ Mostly from KII/FGD with firearms focal points, border police, postal services and customs authorities.

³¹ KII/FGD, particularly with law enforcement agencies (police, border police).

³² KII in Tirana.

2. *Sarajevo*: The ‘Countering Illicit Arms and Trafficking (CIAT)’ sub-project built the identification, prevention of diversion and criminal pursuit capabilities of border police, 12 police forces (police in 10 cantons, Republika Srpska and Brcko District), the State Postal Agency, Ministry of Security and the State Investigation and Protection Agency. Despite significant challenges faced by the project team, there is evidence of good engagement of both law enforcement and prosecution units, with actors participating in joint exercises. This ability to more frequently and more accurately identify SALW diversion from legal trade, traffic and smuggling via the post and at borders, as well as operationally exercised inter-institutional cooperation, has led to better identification, prevention as well as use of the rule of law to pursue perpetrators.
3. *Sarajevo*: The effectiveness of the ‘Urgent Action on Ammunition Destruction – Project Explode+’ sub-project in reducing the human and infrastructural risk from unplanned explosions was high in terms of completing what the project set out to do quickly (by September 2019). The project exceeded its original disposal target, by disposing an additional 18 pieces of Multiple Launch Rocket System (MRLS) ammunition, having destroyed 1,439 pieces by the end of the project.³³ However, the overall effect was relatively low considering that what was destroyed, even if slightly more than was originally envisaged, given the scale of the overall task that goes beyond the scope of the project.
4. *Pristina*: The ‘Safety and Security Programme Support to Counter Illicit Arms Trafficking’ sub-project improved first and second line checks at border posts, drawing on lessons learned from Sarajevo and Zagreb. These included use of the identification handbook that was developed in Sarajevo as well as three dogs that were able to detect polymer weapons; improved incident response and surveillance at border posts; improved identification, detection and prevention of trafficking via online shopping and use of postal or courier services; improved registered weapon information management (using software); enabled the use of the Common Integrated Risk Analysis Model (CIRAM) that is also used by the European Border and Coast Guard Agency (FRONTEX) and European member states for better threat, vulnerability, risk and impact-based planning on border security; enabled Firearm Focal Points, police and border police to better analyse and profile SALW-related border security problems, including various sources of intelligence and identifying intelligence gaps; ran intelligence-led operations; and developed and shared knowledge products. It is anticipated that these additional capabilities and intelligence-led operations should lead to increased identification, prevention of diversion and trafficking as well as implementation of the rule of law, bringing in customs, prosecutors as well as forensics, to pursue perpetrators. There were examples of two operations in 2022, as well as evidence of CIRAM being used. However, the data provided to the evaluation team did not enable the team to confirm if this was achieved in practice more generally, highlighting the need for improved monitoring in future projects.
5. *Skopje*: The ‘Improving National SALW-related Practices’ sub-project expanded Skopje’s Weapons Registration and Stockpile Management Software (WRMS) so that registered firearms dealers could update the system with details of stocks in their possession and tracing of traded weapons. It sought to improve information management via the Ministry of Internal Affairs across all institutions with a

³³ 2019 Annual Report, UNDP Regional Project, p. 39.

role in SALW control, linking up numerous databases;³⁴ and equip the Ministry of Internal Affairs with the necessary IT to be able to enable data sharing. The development of WRMS was completed in 2021, with technical support provided throughout 2022; furthermore, police information management system (IMS) was finalised in 2022. From the data provided, it is too early to determine the effectiveness of the project on the context in Skopje.

6. *Podgorica*: The ‘Rogame Storage Upgrade’ sub-project improved physical security around Podgorica’s Ministry of the Interior Police Directorate’s storage facility composed of two storage magazines and a guard house, around five kilometres away from the capital. The project was completed with upgrade works handed over. The project successfully reduced the risk of firearms and ammunition proliferation.
7. *Belgrade*: The ‘Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of the Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality’ sub-project improved and standardised crime scene investigation. It established robust chain of custody procedures including systems that developed open case file data, ensured that laboratory handling and data management around exhibits and evidence complied with European standards and sped up ballistic analysis. Whilst there is limited data on the impact of the project in practice in Belgrade, it can be inferred that better open case file management will have led to more cases being closed, and better overall law enforcement as well as forensic capability will have enabled prosecutors to have more admissible evidence leading to a greater chance of conviction (or acquittal).
8. *Belgrade*: The ‘Reduce Risk, Increase Safety, Towards Ending SALW Misuse in Domestic Violence Contexts’ sub-project increased the use of domestic violence and gender-based violence evidence on SALW policy making related to licenses as well as on legislative provisions on and judicial response to armed violence against women and girls. Further, it delivered awareness-raising campaigns, to the public on SALW dangers, and to journalists on responsible reporting; and built the capability of civil society organisations and government institutions to better understand armed violence against women and girls and to better protect them and better use criminal justice systems to serve women and girl victims and survivors of armed violence. Whilst the impact of the project is typically long-term in nature and there is a lack of data – there were some clear examples of effectiveness of the project including: the development of good practices from a policy perspective and raised awareness levels regarding the relationship between domestic violence and firearms, ammunition and explosives (FAE) – particularly through the ‘Journalists against violence’ group – which has improved awareness among the public through extensive reporting. Anecdotal evidence also revealed a prioritisation of gender equality among key stakeholders in the MoI.

³⁴ The data collection mission identified that Skopje’s elaborate information management strategy was largely not operational due to lack of premises, equipment, software and staff. The database plan included a line ministry iBase database that was populated from the legal weapons database (WRMS), a crime scene incident database (CEMS), the French-donated ballistics database (Evofinder), import/export database (EXIM) and an Integrated Ballistic Identification System (IBIS) database. The line ministry would have a traffic database as well as Interpol’s Illicit Arms Records and tracing Management System(iARMS).

Effectiveness for the Federal Government of Germany

The aim of German funding for the UNDP Regional Project was to initiate support to jurisdictions to implement the Roadmap prior to the establishment of the MPTF. The intent was to not have to wait for the multilateral funding mechanism to be set up before implementation began. This objective was clearly and unambiguously met. The foundations for the MPTF were laid and handover to the MPTF was relatively smooth,³⁵ and therefore the aim was successfully achieved.

Efficiency

Output One (Efficient SEESAC Coordination)

As above, the UNDP Regional Project output one could have been more efficiently delivered had there been a feedback loop after the initial cycles of reporting. A feedback loop could have been in the form of consultations with implementing and project partners to assess the status of a project, the efficiency of the reporting requirements and identify any challenges that might arise. This would have supported modification of project design to fit the capacity of partners. This is not a critique levied at UNDP or SEESAC, but rather a lesson learned for the future which underlines the importance of dynamic project management.

Output Two (Delivery of Sub-projects)

The efficiency of output two varied from project to project as one would expect. Some sub-projects were delivered within cost and on time, e.g., project Explode+ was delivered very quickly, completed by September 2019 and with a low budget. If efficiency were measured in terms of cost, time, human and material resources used in sub-projects in order to achieve proportionate results, then the resource in shortest supply was time.³⁶ This was not just for implementing organisations: UNDP Offices as well as implementing partners needed time to recruit subject matter experts, and to procure specialist inputs. UNDP Offices applied the same standardised governance architecture to all eight sub-projects, according to project documents, even though some were 10 times more expensive than others. Management efficiency could have been improved by scaling up or down the governance architecture to fit the complexity of the sub-project.

Some projects were subject to repeated cost and no-cost extensions, e.g., Podgorica 'Rogame Storage Upgrade' sub-project that was no-cost extended six times. While this could, in part, be explained by COVID-19, events including earthquakes and weather conditions, and changes of government, not all delays can be attributed to external factors. For example, the Belgrade 'Reduce Risk, Increase Safety, Towards Ending SALW Misuse in Domestic Violence Contexts' sub-project was subject to a cost extension, the delay understandable because the sub-project included face-to-face awareness-raising that was not possible due to the impact of elections and the COVID-19 pandemic. The increase in costs was on a new project to build on the lessons learnt and findings from the project, entailing additional project activities that the Project Board agreed to support.

The Podgorica 'Rogame Storage Upgrade' sub-project is an example of a sub-project that could potentially have been more efficiently managed, e.g., by sole-sourcing or combining design and construction tenders for such a small sub-project, reducing the amount of reporting to fit the size of the sub-project and the

³⁵ KII/FGD, particularly those with Local SALW Commission representatives.

³⁶ Progress reports.

absorption capacity of the partners, and through diplomatic intervention to reduce delays related to occupants not vacating quickly and handover of facilities.

The Tirana ‘Support to Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities’ sub-project is an example of a sub-project that may have over-supplied, as the sub-project built up the capability of 12 crime scene investigation units that authorities were considering merging into four regional larger capabilities after the sub-project ended.

Whilst some projects were allocated additional resources, the majority of the new resource/scaling up can be seen through the MPTF, as originally planned. Within the UNDP Regional Project itself, there was reference to other preceding, concurrent or subsequent UNDP programming in some of the detailed desk review literature (e.g., project EXPLODE+, Rogame SALW Storage Upgrade), and new proposals were submitted to the MPTF when it started to function. This enabled the transition from a funding mechanism that was being phased out to its replacement without significant gaps or breakpoints.

Sustainability

Project Sustainability

Sustainability requires national ownership (e.g., the allocation of a domestic budget covering whole-life costs of equipment, training and refresher training, continuous improvement processes). Criteria for Funding Window allocation included the requirement for any project to have strong national ownership. However, the UNDP Regional Project document seems to reflect a view that the relationship between the stakeholders was that of donor, implementer and beneficiary, a classic development aid relationship whereby one party pays, another delivers and a third benefits.

Having a UNDP Regional Project document that labelled UNDP’s Istanbul Regional Hub, UNDP SEESAC and six UNDP Offices as “implementing organisations” was confused, particularly as, in so many projects, the implementation (awareness raising campaigns, training, refurbishment) was outsourced, with UNDP playing the role of administrator and quality manager. Labelling institutions and organisations controlling SALW in jurisdictions as “beneficiaries” was also inaccurate both from a contribution of inputs point of view (all partners used domestic budgets and provided in-kind contributions) and from a “who benefits?” perspective (weapons proliferate from the EU into the Western Balkans too – controlling SALW benefits Europe as well as the Western Balkans, and international organisations).

If national ownership is to be enhanced and sustainability optimised in future SALW control projects, a lesson learned is that this demands an equitable partnership approach couched in co-dependent terms that enhance ownership. European governments as well as Western Balkans jurisdictions are beneficiaries of SALW control work. Failure to accurately recognise and articulate the mutual *quid pro quo* relationships between stakeholders involved in SALW control will lead to sustainability challenges if end-users fail to take ownership of the maintenance, repair or refresher training that is required to keep capabilities operational.

Sustainability of Sub-projects

At a more tactical level, national ownership and sustainability of the eight sub-projects under Funding Window support to the UNDP Regional Project was variable. This was not unexpected given the diverse context and requirements across the region, but more could have been done to build sustainability into sub-project design. Most equipment donated across sub-projects were not accompanied by explicit whole-life management conditions before the donation was agreed. Capabilities built were not always institutionally future-proofed, e.g., as mentioned above, in Tirana 12 crime scene investigation units were

established but local authorities were planning to re-organise these into four regional crime scene investigation capabilities after the sub-project ended.

There was good sustainability of awareness-raising campaigning, regarding the harms of SALW and/or legislative changes.³⁷ Awareness-raising activity tended to gain traction and increase in popularity over time. From interviews in Belgrade and Skopje, this appeared to be because participating law enforcement agencies could see the benefit of such campaigns, including improved police-community relationships.

There was good sustainability of law enforcement agency identification, prevention and criminal pursuit activity.³⁸ Law enforcement activity to identify, prevent and pursue SALW misuse depended on how SALW linked to national and local policing priorities. In the Western Balkans, those policing priorities tended to not to focus on SALW control explicitly, but rather on crimes where the presence of illegal weapons was common, e.g., organised crime including human trafficking and narcotics as well as other contraband, inter-gang violence, armed robberies and thefts. Nonetheless, in Belgrade, Pristina, Sarajevo and Tirana, law enforcement agencies demonstrated pride in the modernisation and standardisation of their policing practices, through everything from SALW identification manuals, collaboration between customs, police and border police, crime scene management and chain of custody, to forensics and collaboration with prosecutors.

Coherence

The main driver of coherence on the ground was SEESAC at a regional level and UNDP Offices within each jurisdiction. SEESAC regional coordination played to the unique strengths of UNDP (the ability to bring a global view to SALW control, working in partnership with authorities in all six jurisdictions). This led to both horizontal (thematic, regional) and vertical (management approach) synergies. SEESAC and UNDP Offices were able to compare Roadmap implementation needs across the region against jurisdiction-level understanding of SALW-related activity at sub-national level, which led to a coherent portfolio of sub-projects that filled sub-national gaps while concurrently responding to most Roadmap goals.

The use of theories of change at the sub-project level added to coherence. Theories of change in the UNDP Regional Project document included that: if laws and regulations existed and were harmonised, then efficiency of SALW control would increase through the application of the rule of law; if there was a stronger evidence-basis, there would be fewer unattended to risks and greater agility; if there was more detection and more/faster adjudication, then flows would reduce; if the public were more aware and more SALW and ammunition were seized, then illicit possession would reduce; and if there was more capable inspection around stockpiles and storage, then there would be less proliferation.³⁹ These theories informed which sub-projects received funding and the amount of funding that was given to each, which resulted in a coherent portfolio of sub-projects, prioritising some Roadmap goals over others. The only gap area, comparing what was funded against theories of change, was the lack of funding for stockpile

³⁷ e.g., Successors to Belgrade's 'Reduce Risk – Increase Safety – Towards Ending SALW Misuse in a Domestic Violence Context sub-project'; and Skopje's 'Improving National SALW-related Practices and Building Violence-resilient Communities' sub-project.

³⁸ e.g. Successors to: Belgrade's 'Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking Firearms and Firearms Criminality' sub-project; Tirana's 'Support for Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities' sub-project; Sarajevo's 'Countering Illicit Arms Trafficking (CIAT)' project; and Pristina's 'Support to Counter Illicit Arms Trafficking' sub-project.

³⁹ UNDP Regional Project Document..

inspection regimes and for whole-life management of munitions and ammunition. In all other aspects, what was funded concurred with the UNDP Regional Project's proposed theories of change.⁴⁰

Within each jurisdiction, SEESAC as well as UNDP Offices were able to seek synergy with other non-Funding Window Roadmap projects and initiatives, which was in part reflected in sub-project proposals, but also in interview responses as part of the data collection mission. Numerous respondents involved in sub-project delivery reflected on other relevant contributions, including for instance from the EU, software and in-kind software and information technology investments from the Government of France, funding for community awareness-raising from Sweden, and forensics investments from the UK. For the most part, partners in jurisdictions and UNDP Offices were able to de-conflict and adjust to multiple investments made by a variety of donors.

Research for this evaluation only identified a few instances where coherence was poor, e.g. when a sub-national authority decided to run an awareness-raising campaign unilaterally without making sure key messages were consistent with campaigns in other sub-national locations.⁴¹ In another example, a forensic laboratory in one capital had so many bilateral and multilateral donors (each with different administrative processes) that it required four to five people spending a week every quarter on proposal writing and project reporting, which resulted in a loss of a fifth of their human capacity for forensic work.⁴² These instances of incoherence were few, and not within the ability of SEESAC and UNDP Offices to affect. For the most part, efforts by SEESAC, UNDP Offices and partners in the jurisdictions did achieve good strategic and donor coherence.

Physical security and stockpile management was one of the programmatic areas that – outside of the Funding Window and UNDP Regional Project – has in the past received large quantities of support, including via NATO, the International Trust Fund Enhancing Human Security, and from the United States.⁴³ This meant that historically coherence was complicated by two factors: firstly, the number of donors funding work in the same physical location with the risk of duplication; and secondly, parallel stockpile management of landmines and other explosive ordnance and SALW funding to sites that stored both, leading to a risk of drifting away from SALW control priorities. UNDP Offices managed to avoid the risk of Funding Window resources being diluted by supporting wider stockpile priorities through close stakeholder coordination in the area of physical security and stockpile destruction. For example, sub-project Explode+ was part of a larger Sarajevo surplus stockpile destruction effort that included SALW, as well as other munitions. Sub-project coherence was achieved through coordination with the Ministry of Defence, armed forces and EUFOR. Another example was the Podgorica 'Rogame Storage Upgrade' sub-project, which was part of a larger effort to improve safety and security around Podgorica's state ammunition and SALW storage facilities, part of which was delivered by the local UNDP Office prior to this Funding Window project. Military magazines in Rogame were refurbished by other donors and the Funding Window sub-project invested only in police magazines.

The UNDP Regional Project and sub-projects were all positioned under the Roadmap and the UN Development Assistance Framework and associated SDGs.⁴⁴ This meant, even if in the case of UN

⁴⁰ Comparison of sub-project proposals against UNDP Regional Project Document.

⁴¹ KII/FGD in Sarajevo.

⁴² KII/FGD in during field mission between 24 November – 9 December 2022.

⁴³ KII/FGD in all six jurisdictions, including in relation to MPTF physical security investments, not just the Funding Window 'Rogame SALW Storage Upgrade' sub-project.

⁴⁴ <https://unsdg.un.org/resources/united-nations-development-assistance-framework-guidance>

strategies this was a conceptual rather than practically provable cascading down of higher-level strategy, the UNDP Regional Project and sub-projects did cohere with international and regional policies.

Cross-cutting Principles and Values

Gender

The Funding Window Regional UNDP Project was set at Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) gender equality policy marker two,⁴⁵ meaning “principal”, not “significant” and not “targeted”.⁴⁶ This setting meant that, according to the OECD DAC: “Gender equality is the main objective of the project and is fundamental in its design and expected results. The project would not have been undertaken without this objective”.

One of the few areas where project performance was inadequate was in the area gender equality and empowerment of women. It may have been more appropriate to tag the UNDP Regional Project at DAC gender equality marker one. This would have meant that gender equality was an important and deliberate objective, but not the principal reason for undertaking the project, often explained as gender equality being mainstreamed in the project. Had the UNDP Regional Project been tagged at marker one, it would have met expectations because both output one (coordination) and output two (sub-projects) delivery did include discussion of, and awareness-raising about, the importance of gendered responses.

On output one, in terms of coordination, knowledge projects, and the set-up of the MPTF, there was a considerable amount of attention paid by SEESAC to promoting and enabling a gendered response. However, in relation to output two, only one sub-project, in Belgrade, could be considered to meet the requirements of DAC gender equality policy marker two. The effect on the security risks faced by women and girls from that sub-project remained unknown when this final evaluation was completed. The other seven sub-projects could, at best, be described as having a requirement for disaggregation of data and inclusion of women in, for example, training events.

Skopje’s ‘Improving National SALW-related Practices’ sub-project had a DAC gender marker of two. Nonetheless, despite its innovative gendered intent, the data collection mission phase of this final evaluation found no evidence of impact on equality and inclusion.

Belgrade’s ‘Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of the Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigation and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality’ sub-project mentioned the contribution to Law on Preventing Domestic Violence, Family Law and the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence. However, the data collection mission phase found no evidence of such contributions.

Human Rights

Neither the detailed desk review nor the data collection mission revealed any targeted implementation of a rights-based approach to development. None of the literature reviewed in relation to the UNDP Regional Project and its sub-projects included rights-based analysis or reporting. Most virtual as well as face-to-face interviewees were duty bearers, responsible for the part of the social contract (the other part lying with rights holders) that involves ensuring, for example, that discrimination against women ends, that legal arms licensing, trade and transfers were subjected to human rights risk analysis (e.g., not exporting weapons to end-users with a poor human rights record, denying licenses to applicants who had

⁴⁵ UNDP Regional Project Document.

⁴⁶ <https://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/dac-gender-equality-marker.htm>

a history of violence, performing due diligence, etc.), that suspects are presumed innocent and adjudicated fairly, based on evidence, and that sub-conscious and conscious bias are rooted out of the work place. None of these respondents spoke in rights-based terms.

The main implicit rights-based approach was in relation to the link between small arms possession and gender-based violence, domestic violence and femicide in Belgrade jurisdiction and an aspiration to eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls. Another implicit rights-based approach related to the right to bear arms, under certain conditions, through the enforcement of licensing. It was not possible to evaluate how the UNDP Regional Project and its sub-projects defended minority and disadvantaged groups, fought discrimination, and promoted liberty due to a lack of data. It appeared that the rights-based impact of SALW control work as per the sub-projects and UNDP Regional Project was not actively considered nor planned for. There was no evidence of safeguards for the vulnerable, inclusion other than of women at training events or of benefits from the work specifically around minority groups.

Human Development

The main contribution of the UNDP Regional Project and its sub-projects to the SDGs was conceptually to SDG 16 and SDG 5 (see the Relevance to UNDP Section above). However, the practical contribution to these goals on the ground was not quantifiable. The inclusion of such references in proposals seems formulaic and template-driven rather than substantive, possibly because UNDP was the prime grantee of the project and sub-projects and SDGs are part of its *raison d'être* and corporate strategy. No harm was done making these references, but no gain was made either.

Environment

The evaluation team did not encounter specific reference to environmental concerns and responses in generic project documentation or during interviews. However, subsequently during consultations on this report it became clear that there are specific environmental requirements which are undertaken as part of all UNDP programming, such as the 'Social and Environmental SES' assessment which is mandatory for all projects. No assessment has been made on these assessments other than to note their existence.

Communications and Visibility⁴⁷

The UNDP Regional Project as well as all eight sub-projects had a communications and visibility plan, as per the project proposal template used by UNDP. SEESAC's digital presence and wider communication was excellent: it was frequent, sustained, politically astute, positive, gave credit without alienating or exposing or individual contributors, and was very promotional, both of the Federal Government of Germany's contributions, but also overall, regarding the achievements of Roadmap implementation.

Some sub-project communications plans were rather formulaic and generic, others were very specific. Some sub-project activities, particularly those involving a public information campaign, included websites and press releases, social media reporting, social media campaigns, visibility in the local media, presence at international events and the releasing of publications. Others relied on specific events, such as a handover ceremony. However, during the data collection mission, it became clear that many respondents, including those who were part of sub-projects, did not know that the Federal Government of Germany had paid for what they had worked on or received, and most stakeholders, both internal and external to these sub-projects, either believed that the UN was paying or simply did not know.

⁴⁷ Combination of project and sub-project proposals, progress reports and KII/FGD in jurisdictions.

It may be that stakeholder awareness could be improved in a way that has an impact on international relations and foreign policy. This could be done through the development of a strategic communications strategy at the level of future UNDP regional projects, with target audiences that are external to project delivery. Specific audiences could include the public / electorate, key line ministries of importance (trade, defence, foreign affairs etc.) – this would ensure that rather than relying on SEESAC digital presence, sponsors of future SALW control work are more able to see the correlation between their contributions and return on investment.

11. Recommendations and lessons for the future

The following lessons and recommendations are derived from the analysis in the preceding sections. Given the UNDP Regional Project has concluded and has been superseded by other funding sources, including the MPTF, recommendations are offered for broader take-up, both with regards to extensions to the current Roadmap, or a future replacement for it. They could also have utility in other contexts or on other issues where the lessons learned from the Roadmap experience, including associated funding mechanisms are applied. This section combines lessons for the future with relevant recommendations. Recommendations have been annotated to describe which OECD-DAC criteria are relevant in each case.

Aligning funding with implementation of political commitments.

Lesson for the future 1: The timeliness of German funding support and the ability of UNDP to absorb and distribute funds were critical success factors in establishing early momentum with implementation. It provided a visible demonstration of financial commitment from a major political supporter of the Roadmap. Overall, the Regional Project was a success in terms of encouraging delivery, and a success in terms of German Government commitment. The German Government decision to provide early funding whilst longer term arrangements were being established helped to make the case for the involvement of others, as well as providing UNDP with a mechanism to disseminate early support.

Recommendation 1: Ensure that funding modalities to provide external support are in place at the point at which any new Roadmap, or extension of the current arrangements, begins. The scale of early funding is not initially as important as the speed with which it is made available, accessed and distributed, providing that additional follow-on funding is made available. (All criteria)

Ownership of funding modalities and the goals to which they are aligned.

Lesson for the future 2: Local ownership of funding priorities is essential for effectiveness and for longer term sustainability. Emphasising local ownership may require additional engagement but it is also likely to lead to increased success. The Regional Project provided funding for activities that were generally seen as relevant, and in most cases, implementation has been effective in delivering aspects of the Roadmap and local SALW strategies and plans. There was some confusion on the part of local partners as to the process through which priorities were identified, and support provided, although these did not undermine the appreciation for support voiced by local actors. However, in some cases, the ‘development sector’ language of ‘beneficiaries’ and ‘donors’ was perceived differently in contrast to what were seen as day-to-day professional relationships between law enforcement actors such as EUROPL and INTERPOL.

Recommendation 2: Similar future funding mechanisms should take all opportunities to encourage local ownership. This could take the form of soliciting priorities from SALW Commissions directly rather than

through implementing organisations, including local counterparts on project management boards, seeking wider local input into monitoring implementation, and most importantly, revising the language used to describe interactions to encourage genuinely equal partnership and to ensure it does not reinforce unhelpful power dynamics. (Relevance, effectiveness, sustainability)

Demonstrating success through ‘outcome-based’ reporting

Lesson for the future 3: Whilst results frameworks and project monitoring have been able to demonstrate the extent to which projects have been implemented, they are less useful in showing what the effect of this has been on Roadmap implementation overall. The lesson therefore is that ensuring at the outset that the contribution a project will make to higher level changes (often described as outcomes) as well as to their direct results (outputs) is important for judging overall effectiveness, but also for assessing the contribution to – coherence with – wider efforts.

Recommendation 3: Ensure that project theories of change are articulated which establish the hierarchy of intended effects and benefits and the assumptions which underpin them. Ensure that these changes are captured in monitoring activities, including through ‘change stories’ and case studies. (Effectiveness, coherence)

Investing in programme management

Lesson for the future 4: Local UNDP project managers have been essential to successful project delivery. Locally based staff with an understanding of the context as well as in the thematic areas, and of UNDP, have been central to Regional Project effectiveness. There are areas in which additional project management contributions would help to ensure that core functions, including lessons learning, adaptation and reporting results could be further improved. Given inevitable resourcing challenges, consideration should be given to which project management functions must remain in-house, and which could be undertaken by others, including either project partners or external specialist actors (including MEL firms and appropriately skilled civil society partners).

Recommendation 4: For the future, ensure that all the core management functions required for dynamic learning are resourced at the outset. To reduce the overall internal project management requirement, consider hiring external assistance for generic tasks – the quarterly reporting methods – to enable internal resources to be allocated to learning and adaptation. (Effectiveness, efficiency)

Lesson for the future 5: Most of the Regional Project sub-projects were subject to delays. Some of these – specifically COVID-19 could not have been foreseen nor anticipated. UNDP teams across the region, working with partners demonstrated flexibility and creativity in addressing this challenge. Some other delays, including in recruiting UNDP staff and concluding procurement processes, whilst also to some extent affected by COVID-19, could have been anticipated better. The lesson here is that project planning should include detailed assessments of potential risks, with more detailed assessment at the outset, which is then revised on a regular basis.

Recommendation 5: Standard templates for project risk matrixes should be further developed to encourage more dynamic management. This could include a requirement to analyse in more detail the nature of the risk and its potential impact, the mitigations that will be taken, and the residual risk, which is then reviewed on a quarterly basis, with results feeding into management decisions. This risk

assessment process should be undertaken with SALW Commissions and specific partners in order to encourage local ownership. (Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency)

Lesson for the future 6: Exit strategies for individual projects, which outlined how results would be sustainable were not a regular part of project planning activities or monitoring. Considering sustainability at the outset is important in defining how benefits will be maintained following the end of the project period.

Recommendation 6: Articulate the degree of sustainability required and how it will be achieved as part of project planning, and revise assumptions as project implementation progresses. (Sustainability, impact, effectiveness)

Making progress on Gender

Lesson for the future 7: Whilst commitment to gender equality was clear throughout the Regional Project at both portfolio and in many cases, at sub-project level, there were limited observable changes. The lesson in this regard is that the specific changes that are intended at both portfolio and project level could have been articulated more clearly from the outset in order to get beyond the important but limited stage of gender awareness activities. SEESAC in particular provided extensive inputs into gender analysis and guidelines and these could form the basis of future, more outcome-focused activities to increase gender equality in SALW control.

Recommendation 7: Future project portfolios should include some funded projects that specifically aim for gender outcomes, including a greater proportion of women in SALW technical roles as well as in leadership positions. For all other projects, gender equality changes should be articulated clearly in theories of change and results frameworks. (Impact, effectiveness, gender)

Human rights and human development

Lesson for the future 8: Human rights in particular was not a strong central component of sub-projects despite UNDP's global expertise and focus. Yet human rights are a core element of many aspects of SALW control, including arms transfers controls.

Recommendation 8: Prioritising human rights in future project development, including through requiring a more detailed assessment of how sub-projects will promote human rights will put the issue in a more central role, and help jurisdictions ensure their obligations on human rights in for instance, the Arms Trade Treaty, are observed. (Impact, gender)

Annex 1 – Final Evaluation Terms of Reference⁴⁸

EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

Purpose

The purpose of the Project Evaluation is to provide an impartial review of the UNDP regional project in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, cross-cutting principles and values, and communications and visibility. The information, findings, lessons learnt, and recommendations generated by the evaluation will be used by the Project Board, UNDP, and the Federal Government of Germany to assess the performance and value of the regional project, and as guidance for the way forward in the future course of action. The evaluation is conducted back-to-back with the mid-term evaluation of the Western Balkans SALW Control Roadmap Multi-Partner Trust Fund, given the common objectives and implementing organizations (i.e., UNDP Offices in the Western Balkans).

Objective

The evaluation objective is to examine the overall performance of the Roadmap regional project and specifically of the individual UNDP projects, their results, inputs and activities, and how the outputs delivered added value to the Roadmap implementation. In a substantive analysis of the effectiveness of the project approach and feedback from beneficiaries, the evaluation aims to assess cause and effect relations, identifying the extent to which the observed changes can be attributed to the UNDP Roadmap projects.

Scope

The evaluation will assess the project's performance to understand the extent to which the project and its activities have been able to support the Western Balkan authorities' efforts in the implementation of the Western Balkans SALW Control Roadmap. The evaluation will look at the performance of the funded projects implemented by the UNDP Offices in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia, and Kosovo, looking at their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, cross-cutting principles and values, and communication and visibility. Based on these assessments, the evaluation will assess the overall performance of the regional project. The evaluation should also analyse the project's catalytic value, including partnerships, and synergy with other projects and initiatives.

The evaluation will cover the period from the set of the project in May 2019 to 30 June 2022.

Apart from desk review of key documents (see Attachment 2), the evaluation will draw from interviews with all parties involved, including SALW Commissions and other project beneficiaries, donor partners, UNDP project managers, key international, regional, and local organizations (see Attachment 1). The emphasis will be to conduct a pragmatic evaluation that complements existing information.

The evaluation will take into consideration the political, economic and social changes that occurred during the three years of implementation of the regional project, and in particular the challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY QUESTIONS

⁴⁸ To note, this does not include the ToR in its entirety but just the relevant section to demonstrate the key requirements, scope and focus of the Final Evaluation.

The evaluation should be guided by the following questions, to determine the relevance, performance, results, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, including lessons learned and forward-looking recommendations of the UNDP projects implemented in the framework of the regional project. The evaluation questions are summarized below.

a) Relevance

- To what extent have the projects supported the Western Balkans jurisdictions' efforts towards meeting the Roadmap goals and targets, and the specific needs/priorities of the target groups and beneficiaries? What is the project impact and benefit on the implementation of the Roadmap? What would the implementation of the Roadmap have been like without the projects' intervention in the area of concern?
- What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the project's interventions?
- Have the SALW Commissions in each jurisdiction steered the projects' design and implementation? How?
- Have all relevant risks been considered when designing the projects, and have the risks been regularly monitored and updated to respond to any changes in the environment in which the projects have been implemented?
- To what extent has the project been successful in ensuring complementarity, harmonisation and coordination with other relevant interventions of the governments in the Western Balkans and other donors, avoiding duplication of efforts and adding value?

b) Effectiveness

- Have the projects' results frameworks been well defined and relevant to measure the achievement of the project objective and results?
- To what extent have the projects' activities been implemented, and the intended results and the specific objective/outcome achieved? What are the main accomplishments of each project?
- Have there been any delays in the projects' implementation, what have been the causes, and have they been resolved? Were adequate steps taken by the project to adjust its implementation strategy to the new circumstances and needs imposed by COVID-19 pandemic relevant? What lessons have been learnt from these cases?
- Is the quality of achieved outputs satisfactory? To what extent are key stakeholders/final beneficiaries satisfied with the project implementation and the outputs delivered? What are some of the specific challenges in the area of concern?
- Have the projects through their achievements/outputs been effective in supporting the Western Balkans jurisdictions in the implementation of the Roadmap and the achievement of the Roadmap goals and targets?
- Have the funded projects been adequately monitored by their governance mechanisms including the SALW commissions, implementing organizations, donors?

c) Efficiency

- Have the requested and provided funding been sufficient to meet the needs identified by the projects?
- Have resources (financial, human, technical) been allocated strategically and economically to achieve the projects' results?
- Is the relationship between project inputs and results achieved appropriate and justifiable?

- Have there been any weaknesses in programme design, management, human resource skills, and resources?

d) Sustainability

- To what extent are the achieved outcomes and outputs sustainable? Will the outputs lead to benefits beyond the lifespan of the project?
- To what extent have the projects strengthened and promoted local ownership and leadership? To what extent have the target groups and other stakeholders taken an active role in implementing the project?
- To what extent have the capacities of relevant government institutions been strengthened to sustain the results of the projects?
- What are the elements that do not deliver sustainable results?
- What are the innovations/ best practices that need to be further build upon?
- Have lessons learnt been documented by the projects on a regular basis?

e) Cross-cutting principles and values

- To what extent have the projects contributed to and promoted gender equality, empowerment of women, rights-based approach, and human rights in their planning and implementation?
- Are there any good practices in promoting positive changes in gender equality?
- Could gender mainstreaming have been improved in planning, implementation or follow up?
- To what extent have the marginalized and disadvantaged groups benefited from the work of the projects?

f) Communications

- Do projects have a proper external communications strategy or action plan? Is the individual contributors' visibility adequately ensured?
- Has the internal communication with stakeholders been regular and effective? Have the project beneficiaries and key stakeholders been aware of the project activities and results? If not, what could have been improved?
- Have the project beneficiaries show ownership of the projects' results through the communication of project activities on their own channels?

The evaluation should gather the findings of the individual project assessments into a consolidated evaluation of the regional project. At the regional level, the evaluation will be also guided by the following questions:

- To what extent was the regional project aligned with the regional Roadmap for SALW Control, Funding Windows objectives, and UNDP strategic objectives and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 - peace, justice and strong institutions?
- Has the project indirectly contributed to other SDGs? To which and how?
- Has the project been strategically aligned with the former and current UNDP Strategic Plans?
- Has the selection of projects conducted at the onset of the regional project resulted in a portfolio of relevant and quality funded projects? Have the projects fit together in a coherent portfolio?
- To what extent was the regional project design and management arrangement effective and appropriate for meeting the project objective?
- Have the UNDP Offices established new partnerships, or consolidated critical ones?

- To what extent have there been synergies and interlinkages between the UNDP projects and other projects and initiatives contributing to the Roadmap implementation?
- Have the UNDP Offices leveraged additional resources and scaled up their projects?
- To what extent has the project's implementation enabled UNDP to position itself as a critical actor on arms control in the jurisdiction where the project has been implemented?
- Are there lessons learnt and recommendations that could guide other similar funding mechanisms such as the Western Balkans SALW Control Roadmap MPTF to strengthen the effectiveness of their support to the Roadmap implementation?

The evaluation needs to assess the degree to which the project initiatives have supported or promoted gender equality, a rights-based approach, and human development. In this regard, United Nations Evaluation Group's guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation should be consulted.

METHODOLOGY

Based on the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, UNEG Norms and Stand for Evaluations (2016) and in consultations with UNDP Office, the evaluation will be participatory, involving relevant stakeholders.

The Evaluation Team will propose an evaluation methodology and agree on a detailed plan for the assignment as a part of the evaluation Inception Report. The proposed methodology should employ innovating participatory approaches, relevant quantitative, qualitative or combined methods to conduct the evaluation, based on diverse ecosystem of evidence, using gender sensitive data collection and analytical methods and tools applicable in the concrete case. The Evaluation Team is expected to combine the standard and other evaluation tools and techniques to ensure maximum reliability of data and validity of the evaluation findings. These methods and approaches need to generate feedback loops and insights for transformational change. Stakeholder participation is an important source of data which can mitigate observational biases. The Evaluation Recommendations will be forward looking and focused on adaptation in the changing system addressed by the Project intervention.

Limitations to the chosen approach/methodology and methods shall be made explicit by the Evaluation Team and the consequences of these limitations discussed in the proposed methodology. The Evaluation Team shall, to the extent possible, present mitigation measures to address these limitations.

The Evaluation Team is expected to carry out the evaluation process with careful consideration of these Terms of References. In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluation, the Evaluation Team should ensure an evaluation design that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk during the data collection phase or the dissemination phase.

Standard UNDP evaluation methodology would suggest the following data collecting methods:

- Desk review: The Evaluation Team will conduct a detailed review of the project materials and deliverables including the Project Document/Description of the Action, theory of change and results framework, monitoring and project quality assurance reports, annual workplans, consolidated progress reports etc. *An indicative list of documents for desk review is provided in Attachment 2.*
- Key informant interviews: The Evaluation Team will interview representatives of the SALW Commissions, project beneficiaries and partners, UNDP, other relevant stakeholders in all Western Balkans jurisdictions, as well as representatives of the donor and UNDP SEESAC. For the interviews,

the Evaluation Team is expected to design evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability criteria, according to different stakeholders to be interviewed. *An indicative list of main stakeholders that may be considered for meetings is provided in Attachment 1.*

- **Meetings / focus group discussions with SALW Commissions and project beneficiaries:** 1-2 site visits per Western Balkans jurisdiction will be arranged to discuss with stakeholders and review the results. The visits shall be conducted in tandem with the visits planned within the mid-term evaluation of the Western Balkans SALW Control Roadmap MPTF. The evaluation team is requested to respect the COVID-19-related measures in place in the respective jurisdiction.
- Other methodologies, as appropriate, such as case studies, statistical analysis, social network analysis, etc.⁴⁹

UNDP Evaluation Guidelines Note: *As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. If it is not possible to travel to or within the jurisdiction for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager. If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel.*

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff. International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel.
No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

The final methodological approach, including interview schedule, field visits, and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP and the evaluators.

EVALUATION TASKS AND DELIVERABLES

Following the initial briefing and a detailed desk review, the Evaluation Team will be responsible for delivering the following products and tasks:

- **Inception Report (10-15 pages)** will be presented before the evaluation starts. The inception report sets out the conceptual framework to be applied in the evaluation. It includes the understanding of the evaluation objectives, theory of change, evaluation questions and possible sub-questions, defines the detailed methodology, and provides information on data sources and collection, sampling and key indicators. The Inception Report should elaborate an **evaluation matrix** (template available in Attachment 3) and propose a schedule of tasks, activities and evaluation deliverables. The Evaluation Inception Report should follow the structure proposed in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, p. 26-27.
- **Evaluation and data collection mission:** Upon the approval of the Inception Report and the evaluation work plan by the UNDP, the Evaluation Team is expected to carry out the project evaluation. To collect data and insights on the project, the Evaluation Team will undertake at least one field mission per jurisdiction and have meetings and interviews with relevant stakeholders, including SALW Commissions, project beneficiaries, UNDP project teams, other stakeholders as relevant. UNDP will provide support in

⁴⁹ [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, Annex 2. Summary of common data-collection methods/sources used in UNDP evaluations](#)

in establishing initial contact with the authorities before the organization of meetings and identifying interpreters and covering the costs the interpretation (if required). Following the field missions, and prior to the drafting of the evaluation report, the Evaluation Team will debrief the UNDP team with preliminary findings.

- **Draft Evaluation Report:** Based on the findings generated through desk review and data collection mission, the Evaluation Team will prepare and submit the Draft Evaluation Report to the UNDP team for review. The Evaluation Report should follow the guidelines and structure proposed in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, p. 28-29. **The Findings and conclusions section of the report should include both findings from the assessment of the individual UNDP projects, as well as findings relevant for the regional project as a whole.**
- **Evaluation review process** (and eventual dispute settlement): Comments, questions, suggestions and requests for clarification on the evaluation draft will be submitted to the Evaluation Team and addressed in the agreed timeframe. The Evaluation Team should reply to the comments through the **evaluation audit trail document**⁵⁰ and not directly in the draft report. If there is disagreement in findings, these should be documented through the evaluation audit trail, while effort should be made to come to an agreement. The audit trail should follow the structure proposed in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, p. 30.
- **Evaluation debriefings:** Once the evaluation draft report is agreed upon with UNDP, the Evaluation Team will participate in at least two debriefing meetings to present the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation to all relevant stakeholders. The meetings are expected to take place online.
- **Evaluation Report** (maximum 50 pages of the main body) should be logically structured, contain data and evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and forward-looking recommendations, and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The standard outline of the evaluation report is provided in Attachment 4. The Evaluation Team should be ready to participate in presentations of the final evaluation, and present the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation.

UNDP Evaluation Guidelines Note: *In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by UNDP and/or the service provider that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid. Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the contractor invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.*

⁵⁰ Template available at http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf, p. 25

Annex 1a - Final Evaluation Schedule of Tasks, Timelines and Final Evaluation Deliverables

Activity	Estimated # of days	Date of completion	Place	Responsible party
Phase One: Detailed desk review and inception report				
Meeting briefing with project team	-	At the time of contract signing, est. week of 7 November 2022	Online	Evaluation Team/ project team
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team	-	At the time of contract signing, est. week of 7 November 2022		Project team
Detailed desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	3 days	Within one week of contract signing est. week of 14 November 2022	Home-based	Evaluation Team
Submission of the inception report (10-15 pages)	-	Within two weeks of contract signing, 17 November 2022		Evaluation Team
Comments and approval of inception report	-	Within three days of submission of the inception report, est. week of 21 November 2022	Online	Evaluation Manager / Project team
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits and interviews	12 -14 interview days plus required travel days	24 November – 10th December	Field visits in 6 jurisdictions	Evaluation Team/ Project team to facilitate contacts for interviews
Debriefing to Project team	0.5 day	Within one week after the consultation and field visits are conducted, est. 16 December 2022	Online	Evaluation Team, Project team
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum of the main body of the report), executive summary (4-5 pages)	7 days	Within two weeks of the completion of the field mission	Home-based	Evaluation Team
Draft report submission	-	Est. 16 January 2023		Evaluation Team
Consolidated UNDP and key stakeholder comments to the draft report	-	Within one week of submission of the draft evaluation report, est. 23 January 2023	Online	Evaluation Manager/ Project team
Debriefings with Project team and UNDP's Senior Management.	0.5 day	Est 15 February 2023	Online	Project team/ Evaluation Team
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments and submission of the report to UNDP (50 pages maximum of the main body)	5 days	Est. 20 February , with presentation of Evaluation Results by 28 February 2022	Home-based	Evaluation Team
Finalisation of consolidated findings report alongside finalisation of MPTF MTE	0.5 day	Est. 20 February	Home-based	Evaluation Team
Estimated total days for the evaluation	30-32 (excluding travel days for field mission)			

Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix and Data Collection Instruments

Introduction – Guidance for the interview

The interviews and group discussions will intend to capture the following findings:

1. *What are the key lessons learned, identified risks and opportunities in the implementation of these projects?*
2. *Are there specific aspects of the project implementation that have been identified as good practices or lessons learned, used in other geographic or thematic areas?*
3. *Have organizations and donors effectively supported the implementation of the Western Balkans Roadmap through these projects? What have been the challenges? What should improve in the future?*
4. *Is the distribution of support reflecting the priorities of the project implementation? Are there areas/needs within the projects where the support provided has been identified to be more limited or non-existent?*
5. *What evidence can respondents give that illustrates progress or lack of progress against the Western Balkans Roadmap?*

This will be explained at the beginning of the interview. Where necessary, the interview will focus specifically on the UNDP Regional Project, the MPTF or both (and include the MTR where necessary) – this will be adapted to the stakeholder being interviewed. Not all questions will be asked during every interview or discussion - these will be adapted according to the stakeholder(s), drawing on the questions below which are an overview of the key issues identified. For example, questions for donors will focus on the strategic level, while for other stakeholders, focus will be more granular looking at implementation of specific projects. It must also be noted that the way in which questions are asked will also be adapted to ensure that they are appropriate for the stakeholder in question. Questionnaires will be sent to stakeholders ahead of interview with the questions already adapted.

Relevance

What is/was the relevance (and strategic performance) of the UNDP Regional Project/specific project in terms of Road Map goals & targets, as well as regional, country-specific and local needs? Any gaps – what could not be achieved or prioritised?

- Degree of positive / negative change achieved versus actual needs of the context. Risks of firearms and explosives misuse, illicit use and trafficking. Details on perceived / actual gaps.
- Synergies and linkages across the programme (and externally).
- How well is it tailored to needs and what specific impacts achieved (positive/negative/unintended)?

Effectiveness

Have the projects/the UNDP Regional Project been managed effectively: have quality outcomes been achieved. Degree of stakeholder satisfaction with these? What lessons have been learned and applied?

- Quality of TOC, programme design, management tools, RFs, risk management etc. Application of UN values. [Mostly from literature, but interviewees may have views.]
- Have the right outputs and outcomes been achieved? Quality of results (and measurement)?
- Effective identification and use of lessons to improve - both for projects and regionally?
- Covid 19, political, social, economic impact on delivery and how managed. Any other constraints / delays?

Efficiency

To what extent has the use of available resources been efficient across the project/UNDP Regional Project? Any lessons?

- Effective (economical) application and management of resources provided: does programme governance work? (Particularly by SALW commissions – need examples).
- Any leverage of additional resources achieved? Any resource gaps?
- Management overhead issues [not in terms of reference, but donors will be interested].

Sustainability

What the sustainability of the outputs and outcomes that have been delivered in [jurisdiction/project] - to what extent are these durable and impactful beyond project lifespan?

- Any sustainability glitches?
- Any sustainability best practices emerging (and have lessons been applied)?
- Has local ownership been a driving factor? Any examples of good take-up here?
- Have government institutions been strengthened (and will this be durable)?
- What are the takeaways on sustainability and what should be the next steps in this area?

Cross-cutting principles & values

Have gender equality, empowerment of women and a rights-based approach been both contributed to and promoted during planning and implementation?

- Good practices and lessons?
- Potential for improvements to mainstreaming in planning and implementation?
- Results for marginalised / disadvantaged groups – any benefit from the work?

Communications

What communications strategy was used across the project/UNDP Regional Project and was it effective?

- Any lessons on improving stakeholder awareness?
- Have beneficiaries taken ownership and actually communicated results themselves?

Regional and Strategic level performance

Management, alignment, and impact of the project/UNDP Regional Project from a regional and strategic perspective?

- Extent that programme catalysed new partnerships or approaches leading to action.
- Extent that programme harmonised / avoided duplication with other in region interventions.
- Extent to which management arrangements effective for the regional context.
- Any lessons to be shared with others (funding mechanisms and regions)?

Final questions

- *Any driving factors or issues that we have failed to ask about?*
- *Request permission to follow up for any additional information / gaps (email if needed).*

Annex 3 – List of Individuals or Groups Interviewed

As part of the Final Evaluation, the Evaluation Team interviewed the following stakeholders:

Total number of interviews conducted for Final Evaluation of UNDP Regional Project	46
Total number of individuals interviewed for Final Evaluation	73
Total number of men interviewed for Final Evaluation	46
Total number of women interviewed for Final Evaluation	27

Breakdown of interviewees per jurisdiction⁵¹	
Belgrade	18 (6 M/12 W)
Podgorica	4 (4 M/0 W)
Pristina	10 (9 M/1 W)
Sarajevo and Banja Luka	16 (11 M/5 W)
Skopje	13 (8 M/5 W)
Tirana	3 (3 M/ 0 W)
Regional	9 (5 M/4 W)

Breakdown of interviewees per institution	
Security Sector (Includes Police/MoI/MoD/MoIA/Customs/Export Control/Ballistics/Forensics)	33 (27 M / 6 W))
Implementers (UNDP, UNODC, OSCE, ITF, NABIS, EUROPOL, INTERPOL, NATO)	33 (17 M/ 16 W)
Donors/Wider Donor Community	2 (2 M/ 0 W)
Civil Society Organisations	5 (0 M/ 5 W)

A full list of interviewees can be provided on request.

⁵¹ As demonstrated in the breakdown in the following table, this includes representatives of government institutions, donors and international organisations, as well as any other relevant stakeholder such as implementing partners and civil society.

Annex 4 – Document Reference List

1. Roadmap for a Sustainable Solution to the Illegal Possession, Misuse and Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and Their Ammunition in the Western Balkans, by 2024.
2. Tirana: Action Plan 2022-2024. Decision No. 754, dated 9/12/2021 On the Approval of the Action Plan 2022-2024 of the Small Arms, Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Explosives Control Strategy 2019 – 2024.
3. Tirana: Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Explosives Control Strategy 2019 – 2024.
4. Sarajevo: Small Arms and Light Weapons Control Strategy 2021 – 2024.
5. Pristina: Action Plan for Control of Small and Light Weapons and Explosives 2017 – 2021.
6. Podgorica: Strategy for Combating Illegal Possession, Misuses and Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their Ammunition from 2019 to 2025. Podgorica, November 2018.
7. Skopje: National Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) Control Strategy and Action Plan, 2017 – 2021 (Revised Version).
8. Belgrade: Action Plan for the Implementation of the SALW Control Strategy for the Period 2019 -2020.
9. Roadmap Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Regional Reporting Framework, 1 January – 31 December 2018. 1st KPI Report.
10. Regional Narrative Progress Report on the Implementation of the Roadmap. Progress information on the Roadmap Goals Overall Targets. 1 January – 31 December 2018. 1st Narrative Report.
11. Roadmap Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Regional Reporting Framework, 1 January – 30 June 2019. 2nd KPI Report.
12. Regional Narrative Progress Report on the Implementation of the Roadmap. Progress information on the Roadmap Goals Overall Targets. 1 January – 30 June 2019. 2nd Narrative Report.
13. Roadmap Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Regional Reporting Framework, 1 July – 31 December 2019. 3rd KPI Report.
14. Regional Narrative Progress Report on the Implementation of the Roadmap, 1 July – 31 December 2019. 3rd Narrative Report.
15. Roadmap Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Regional Reporting Framework, 1 January – 30 June 2020. 4th KPI Report.
16. Regional Narrative Progress Report on the Implementation of the Roadmap, 1 January – 30 June 2020. 4th Narrative Report.
17. Roadmap Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Regional Reporting Framework, 1 July – 31 December 2020. 5th KPI Report.
18. Regional Narrative Progress Report on the Implementation of the Roadmap, 1 July – 31 December 2020. 5th Narrative Report.
19. Roadmap Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Regional Reporting Framework, 1 January – 30 June 2021. 6th KPI Report.
20. Regional Narrative Progress Report on the Implementation of the Roadmap, 1 January – 30 June 2021. 6th Narrative Report.
21. Roadmap Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Regional Reporting Framework, 1 July – 31 December 2021. 7th KPI Report.
22. Regional Narrative Progress Report on the Implementation of the Roadmap, 1 July – 31 December 2021. 7th Narrative Report.
23. Contribution by Regional and International Organisations – Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans by 2024. 1st Report.

24. Contribution by Regional and International Organisations – Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans by 2024. 2nd Report.
25. Contribution by Regional and International Organisations – Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans by 2024. 3rd Report.
26. Contribution by Regional and International Organisations – Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans by 2024. 4th Report.
27. Contribution by Regional and International Organisations – Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans by 2024. 5th Report.
28. Contribution by Regional and International Organisations – Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans by 2024. 6th Report.
29. Contribution by Regional and International Organisations – Roadmap for a sustainable solution to the illegal possession, misuse and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and their ammunition in the Western Balkans by 2024. 7th Report.

UNDP Regional Project

1. Regional Project Document.
2. Project documents and annexes (project results frameworks, project budgets, multi-year annual work plans, project risk matrixes, project revisions, progress reports, project Board Meetings, and Coordination meetings) of the projects implemented by the UNDP Country Offices in the framework of the regional project:
 - a. Support Albania's Law Enforcement Authorities to Strengthen Firearms Criminality Evidence Management and Investigation Capacities, implemented by UNDP in Tirana, project budget: \$1,185,471, implementing period: December 2019 – June 2022
 - b. Countering Illicit Arms Trafficking (CIAT), implemented by UNDP in Sarajevo, project budget: \$1,071,283, implementing period: July 2019 – June 2022
 - c. Urgent Action on Ammunition Destruction - Project EXPLODE+, implemented by UNDP in Sarajevo, project budget: \$54,645, implementing period: July 2019 – December 2019
 - d. Support to counter Illicit arms trafficking, implemented by UNDP in Pristina, project budget: \$987,412, implementing period: September 2019 – June 2022
 - e. Rogame SALW Storage Upgrade, implemented by UNDP in Podgorica, project budget: \$162,000, implementing period: August 2019 – November 2021
 - f. Improving national SALW-related practices and building violence-resilient communities, implemented by UNDP in Skopje, project budget: \$1,000,908, implementing period: September 2019 – May 2022
 - g. Reduce risk - Increase safety – Towards ending SALW misuse in domestic violence context in Serbia, implemented by UNDP in Belgrade, project budget: \$444,462, implementing period: September 2019 – December 2021
 - h. Advancing the Capacities of the Ministry of Interior in the Field of Custody Chain, Crime Scene Investigations and the Ballistic Laboratory in the Field of Operations and Investigations in Trafficking of Firearms and Firearms Criminality, implemented by UNDP in Belgrade, project budget: \$958,284, implementing period: October 2019 – November 2021
3. Guidance note on the submission, selection and implementation of the initiatives to be funded through the regional project
4. Consolidated quarterly reports 2019-2022.

5. UNDP Funding Windows Regional Project 2021 – Annual Report.
6. UNDP Funding Windows Regional Project 2020 – Annual Report.
7. Project Board annual progress reports
8. Regional coordination meeting February 2020 (meeting report)
9. Project Board meeting minutes
10. UNDP project revision documents (requests and decisions by the regional project manager or Project Board)
– seven of the eight UNDP projects requested project revisions: no-cost extensions, budget revisions, or additional budget.
11. Social media accounts and website of the UNDP Offices and beneficiaries of funded projects.