



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**KOSOVO**

# USAID/KOSOVO

## CONFLICT MITIGATION PROGRAMS: IMPACT AND LESSONS LEARNED

April 30, 2008

This report was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Dr. Richard Blue and Susan Kupperstein on behalf of Social Impact, Inc.

# **USAID/KOSOVO**

## **CONFLICT MITIGATION PROGRAMS: Impact and Lessons Learned**

**April 30, 2008**

Submitted to:  
USAID/Kosovo  
Cognizant Technical Officer: Urim Ahmeti

Contract #: HDA-I-00-03-00124-00 Task Order 35

Submitted by:

**SOCIAL IMPACT** 

Richard Blue, PhD  
Susan Kupperstein

With Support from:  
Irina Gudeljevic  
Lura Limani

**DISCLAIMER**

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The evaluation team sincerely thanks USAID/Kosovo's Program Office for seeking out the PDQ IQC through which they could contract Social Impact, Inc. First, thanks goes to Peter Duffy for his time and openness about discussing the Scope of Work and adapting it to what was possible to accomplish within a short period of time, and also for allowing the team to share its ideas openly regarding the current program and future program design. Special thanks goes to Urim Ahmeti, the CTO for the contract, for being an understanding negotiator regarding the terms of the contract and for gathering and sending the voluminous amounts of documents and contact information for this evaluation. In the case that some information was missing, he was always very responsive with our requests and almost immediately sent the information needed.

The team also thanks John Anderson, the USAID/Kosovo DG chief, and the Economic Growth team for their time and patience as we described our ideas for the future program design. Their support was crucial for moving forward with the idea.

Thanks to US Mission leadership, including Tina Kaidanow, Michael Farbman, and Susan Fritz, for taking time to share their views and hear ours.

The evaluation team would like to thank past and present staff of all of the eight implementing partners who readily and openly discussed their implementation activities, giving freely of their time. The evaluation team especially appreciated the time given by Mercy Corps and IOM staff who were not being evaluated but whose information was crucial to our understanding of other program approaches to conflict mitigation. The team also met with representatives of RTI, World Learning and Chemonics to get an understanding of possible project activities that could be added to the CMP and appreciate their willingness to meet with us.

We especially appreciate the opportunity to talk to K-Serbian and K-Albanian speaking school principals, teachers and students who participated in some of the programs. The energy, intelligence and optimism of many of the students are inspiring and meeting them was great fun.

Special mention goes to Carrie Monahan and Miki Scheidel, SI Project Assistants, for providing important and useful research and tables that enabled us to be more efficient in pulling together the information about all eight projects.

And last but certainly not least, warm thanks to Lura Limani and Irina Gudeljevic. Their knowledge of the political, social and economic situation in Kosovo, as well as their impeccable interpretation skills were invaluable to us for the evaluation and much of the report should be credited to them. Lura gets additional thanks for doing the bulk of the scheduling and for being persistent in setting up the meetings and interviews. We wish you both lots of luck in your future endeavors!

As always, our efforts to capture the complex reality of the situation will fall short, but we have done our best to be faithful to what people told us, as well as to our obligations to exercise our own judgment in the conclusions and recommendations for this report. For this we take full responsibility.

# CONTENTS

- ACRONYMS ..... iii
- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... v
- EVALUATION REPORT ..... 10
- I. Introduction and Evaluation Purpose ..... 10
- II. Country Background ..... 10
- III. Evaluation Objective ..... 11
- IV. Work Plan Schedule and Methods ..... 11
  - Work Plan Schedule ..... 12
  - Methods ..... 12
- V. Project Findings ..... 12
  - Table 1: IPs and Projects ..... 13
  - Supporting youth reconciliation among ethnic groups** ..... 14
    - Activity Description: CRS ..... 14
    - Findings: CRS ..... 15
    - Conclusions: CRS ..... 15
    - Activity Description: Mozaik/Save ..... 16
    - Findings: Mozaik/Save ..... 16
    - Conclusions: Mozaik/Save ..... 17
    - Activity Description: CCE ..... 17
    - Findings: CCE ..... 18
    - Conclusions: CCE ..... 19
    - Activity Description: Sesame Workshop ..... 19
    - Findings: Sesame Workshop ..... 19
    - Conclusions: Sesame Workshop ..... 20
  - Creating civil society and community linkages across the ethnic divide** ..... 20
    - Activity Description: Freedom House ..... 20
    - Findings: Freedom House ..... 20
    - Conclusions for Grant Activities Visited: Freedom House ..... 21
    - General Conclusions: Freedom House ..... 22
    - Activity Description: PDC ..... 22
    - Findings: PDC ..... 22
    - Conclusions: PDC ..... 23
  - Increasing the awareness of Kosovo’s leaders and public at large about the underlying causes of conflict and peace processes in Kosovo** ..... 23
    - Activity Description: AED ..... 23
    - Findings: AED ..... 23
    - Conclusions: AED ..... 25
    - Activity Description: PER ..... 26
    - Findings: PER ..... 26
    - Conclusions: PER ..... 27
  - Comparing CMP with Mercy Corps and IOM Programs** ..... 27
    - Activity Descriptions – CMI/MISI and CEDP ..... 27
    - Findings ..... 28
    - Conclusions ..... 28
- VI. General Findings ..... 28
  - Table 2: Political Relations between ethnic groups in this Area Now ..... 29
  - Table 3: Political relations between ethnic groups now compared to one year ago ..... 29
  - Table 4: Key Informant Estimate of Positive Improvement from Project ..... 30
  - Table 5: Key Informant Plans to Leave Kosovo ..... 30
  - Table 6: Key Informant Optimism about Future in Independent Kosovo ..... 31
- VII. General Conclusions: Impact and Sustainability of the USAID/Kosovo CMP ..... 31
- VIII. Lesson Learned ..... 33
- IX. Recommendation ..... 33

ANNEX I: Scope of Work..... 34  
ANNEX II: New USAID Kosovo Confidence Building Strategy ..... 40  
ANNEX III: Interview Schedule ..... 45  
ANNEX IV: Key Informant Questionnaire ..... 56  
ANNEX V: Focus Group Questionnaire..... 58  
ANNEX VI: Table of Methods Used..... 60  
ANNEX VII: AED Roundtable and Town Hall Meeting Speakers..... 62  
ANNEX VIII: Kosovo Confidence Building Assets ..... 63  
ANNEX IX: Bibliography ..... 74

## ACRONYMS

AED	Academy for Educational Development
ATRC	Advocacy Training and Resource Center
CBKF	Confidence Building in a Kosovo Future
CBO	Community Based Organizations
CCC	Civilian Conservation Corps
CCE	Center for Civic Education
CCSD	Center for Civil Society Development
CCTD	Center for Children's Theater Development
CEDP	Community Enhancement and Development Program
CM	Conflict Mitigation
CMI	Community Mobilization Initiative
CMM	Conflict Management and Mitigation
CMP	Conflict Mitigation Program
CMS	Center for Migration Studies
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CWYC	Citywide Youth Council
DCHA	Democracy Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance
DG	Democracy and Governance
E&E	Europe and Eurasia
EG	Economic Growth
ET	Evaluation Team
EU	European Union
FH	Freedom House
ICCM	Inclusive Community Change Model
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IP	Implementing Partner
K-Albanians	Kosovar Albanians
KAP	Knowledge Attitudes Practice survey
KCRP	Kosovo Community Reconciliation Program
KFOR	Kosovo Force (NATO)
KI	Key Informant
KICCR	Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation
KPS	Kosovo Police
K-Serbs	Kosovar Serbs
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MISI	Municipal Integration and Support Initiative
Mozaik	Model for Community Reconciliation through Multi-Cultural Bilingual Pre-School Education
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
PDC	Partners for Democratic Change
PER	Project on Ethnic Relations
PISG	Provisional Institutions of Self-Government
RFA	Request for Application
RTK	Radio TV Kosovo
Save	Save the Children UK
SC	Municipality Steering Committee
SI	Social Impact, Inc.
SME	Small Medium Enterprise
SOW	Scope of Work
SPSK	Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights

UNMIK  
USAID  
USG  
YSF  
YIHR

United Nations Mission in Kosovo  
United States Agency for International Development  
United States Government  
Youth Securing the Future  
Youth Initiative for Human Rights

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Introduction

USAID/Kosovo's Program Office contracted Social Impact, Inc. (SI) to conduct an evaluation of its Conflict Mitigation Program (CMP), which has been implemented starting in October 2005. The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the effectiveness and program impact of the eight activities under this portfolio. The three broad categories of programming are 1) supporting ethnic reconciliation among youth; 2) creating civil society and community linkages across the ethnic divide; and 3) increasing the awareness of Kosovo's leaders and the public about the underlying causes of conflict and peace processes in Kosovo. Because of the shift in the political context in Kosovo with the negotiations of Kosovo's status in 2006 and 2007, USAID requested that its implementing partners (IP) focus on a fourth cross cutting category of programming to enhance engagement with Kosovar Serbs (K-Serbs) to encourage their identity as integral members of Kosovo society.

The programs included in the evaluation are the following: the "Youth Securing the Future (YSF)" project implemented by Catholic Relief Services (CRS); the "Mozaik: A model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, Bilingual Pre-school Education in Kosovo," Save the Children, UK; "Reconciliation through Civic Education," Center for Civic Education (CCE); "Sesame Street," Sesame Workshop; the "Kosovo Community Reconciliation Program (KCRP)," Freedom House; "Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation (KICCR)," Partners for Democratic Change (PDC); the "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo" (SPSK), Academy for Educational Development (AED); and the regional "Improving Interethnic Relations in the Western Balkans," Project on Ethnic Relations (PER).

## Country Background

Leading up to the Kosovo declaration of independence in February 2008, and the Serbian local elections scheduled for May 2008, tension has been growing. This is a cause for concern. The most recent UNDP Early Warning Polls (March, June and Oct. 2007<sup>1</sup>) indicate a significant drop in the public's confidence in government and international institutions in Kosovo. The satisfaction level with key governing institutions remains critically low. As of October 2007, approximately 28% of the Kosovo population is satisfied with the work of Kosovo Government and 29% with UN Administration in Kosovo (UNMIK). Polling also shows worrying trends in indicators measuring inter-ethnic relations and willingness to protest. The percentage of K-Serbs expressing willingness to "work with K-Albanians" fell from 79% to 28% in six months. More than 50% of K-Albanians and 29% of K-Serbs consider that a prolonged status process would negatively impact inter-ethnic relations. Finally, more Kosovars than ever - 66% - are willing to protest for political reasons. Political events and the population's response to them requires that USAID analyzes current approaches to reconciliation in Kosovo.

After Kosovo unilaterally declared itself a sovereign state independent from Serbia, its self-proclaimed status was quickly recognized by the United States, Great Britain and many other important European Union countries. Other important states, including Russia and Romania, have withheld recognition. Serbia refuses to recognize an independent Kosovo, and continues to partially administer K-Serbian majority territories within Kosovo. Although tensions have remained high in certain areas, as of the time of this evaluation, only one incidence of violent conflict has occurred in north Mitrovica/Mitrovica. Silent protest marches and demonstrations have been held in K-Serbian majority areas.

During the evaluation period, Provisional Institutions of Self-Government (PISG), along with UNMIK and KFOR, have continued to function. The Kosovo parliament is close to finishing a constitution, based on the Ahtisaari Plan, which when promulgated, will establish the legal basis for the new state. However, effective Kosovo political authority in K-Serbian majority areas will remain questionable, and may be further undermined by the results of Serbian local elections in May 2008.

---

<sup>1</sup> See previous Early Warning Reports, [www.kosovo.undp.org](http://www.kosovo.undp.org) publications.

## **Evaluation Objective**

According to the SOW, the principal objective of the evaluation is to assess implementation and impact of assistance under the USAID/Kosovo Conflict Mitigation Program. The evaluation focuses on the impact of the various activities with regard to each activities stated objectives, which include inter-ethnic reconciliation, fostering mutual understanding and respect, and practical cooperation between ethnic groups. However, since each of the activities is organized under and is supposed to contribute to a strategic objective, the SOW directs the evaluation to assess “strengths, successes and overall impact of USAID assistance under the Conflict Mitigation Program.”

The SOW also requires the findings and conclusions about the program’s shortcomings, negative unintended consequences and major constraints. The question of USAID’s “mix and balance of approaches” remains an important question especially as it relates to the program’s effectiveness and efficiency.

The activities included in this program have ended, or will end later in 2008. USAID will be preparing a new Kosovo assistance strategy, which will address the needs of an independent Kosovo, including efforts to mitigate potential ethnic conflict. USAID asked the evaluation team to expand on the last SOW request to “recommend sensible short-term goals for our assistance in conflict mitigation.” Building on the evaluation findings and conclusions, as well as the “lessons learned” by several USAID partners, a “Confidence Building” strategy and program design has been developed. The strategy is found in an annex of the report and the program design was and submitted to USAID as a separate report.

## **Work Plan Schedule and Methods**

Representing Social Impact, the two evaluators were Dr. Richard Blue and Susan Kupperstein. Blue was the team leader for the project. The other two members of the evaluation team, Irina Gudeljjevic and Lura Limani, provided crucial translation services as well as analysis. All four comprise the evaluation team (ET). The evaluation began on March 10, with field work from March 18 to April 16, 2008, and concluded in early May, 2008.

### *Work Plan Schedule*

The work plan was divided into three phases. Phase I, from March 13 to March 25, included meetings with USAID/DCHA/CMM, USAID/Kosovo and the implementing partners. The goal of this phase was to gather information about the program and solicit some initial feedback about its successes and challenges. Phase II, from March 26 to April 12, was the period when the team conducted site visits to a sample of municipalities with conflict mitigation programs and with Mercy Corps and IOM (the comparison activities) projects. Phase III was the writing phase and took place from April 12 to April 15 when the team submitted the draft report.

### *Methods*

The research design is a rapid appraisal, mixed method approach with one comparison group for larger projects such as CRS/YSF. Further, the mission requested in the SOW that the team compare the IOM and Mercy Corp activities with those in the CM program portfolio. Where possible, quantitative as well as qualitative measures are reported as findings; although systematic random sampling of beneficiary groups and project sub-sites was not possible. Key Informant and Focus Group questionnaires were developed drawing on already tested surveys such as the USAID supported UN surveys, or Knowledge Attitude and Practice (KAP) questionnaires included in the existing portfolio. The team found that several of CM partners had conducted systematic surveys of beneficiary opinions immediately following project interventions, as well as more general qualitative evaluations and “lessons learned” reports. The findings from these studies were used to buttress, or in some cases, complicate the findings of the evaluation team.

## **Project Findings**

Overall, the objectives of the eight projects were designed to mitigate conflict and promote inter-ethnic reconciliation. Some of them were agreed to and awarded by USAID/DCHA/CMM in Washington and then passed on to USAID/Kosovo to implement. Seven of the eight projects were less than \$1 million, with AED's program totaling nearly \$2.4 million. The rest ranged from \$252,096 to \$893,636. The projects began in October 2005 and most have not concluded at the time of the evaluation, with the exception of Sesame, PDC and PER. However, the overall duration of the projects, including the sub-components, are short – one to two years – except CRS/YSF which is a three-year program. Another common factor of all of the programs is their limited geographic scope with CRS in the north; PDC in four communities; Save/Mozaik in three kindergarten groups in two municipalities; and AED documentary and TV Magazines with six paired stations in three regions – north, east and south. Only two of the programs had nationwide components/audiences and those were Sesame and AED's information campaigns. PER was unique in that it was a regional effort. Project input-outputs varied somewhat, but largely included training, publication of tailored information, joint proposal development and planning exercises, occasional joint trips to neighboring countries, some physical rehabilitation and equipment, and salary payments for teachers/trainers/travel.

## **General Findings**

The ET had 28 key informant interviews that discussed their views about ethnic relationships in Kosovo, their own optimism and whether they intend to remain in Kosovo, and what is the most important issue for which donor assistance would be helpful. Key Informants (KI) were all leaders and/or implementers and/or participants in various aspects of the eight projects funded by USAID under the Conflict Mitigation Program cross-cutting strategy. Together they comprise a representative sample of activists at different levels in each of the funded projects.

K-Serbian respondents were more likely than K-Albanians to describe relationships as bad and having become worse than a year previous. In open ended responses, key informants from the K-Serbian group described relations as “tense,” “frozen,” “devastated,” and lacking in “trust.” K-Albanian respondents agreed that things were bad at the political level, and noted that people were separated, fearful, and that the K-Serbian population was “not ready” to accept Kosovo's independence. Many respondents made a sharp distinction between the “political” relationship and “personal” relations, especially in enclave areas outside the separated northern municipalities. Both K-Serb and K-Albanians, older people especially, referred to good personal relations “before the war.” What is meant by this is difficult to say.

Asked about the causes behind ethnic tension, K-Serbian respondents referred to the “unilateral declaration of independence,” “parallel institutions,” “manipulation by higher level politicians,” and “disrespect for the rules of negotiation.” K-Albanian respondents tended to identify Belgrade as the “manipulator,” while UNMIK and the Kosovo government were criticized for not being credible or effective.

As noted above, Key Informants were leaders, implementers or participants in the USAID funded CMP activities. As such, we expected that there would be a natural inclination to attribute positive outcomes to the projects even among K-Serbian participants. However, nine of the 28 respondents were unable to judge whether the USAID funded conflict projects they participated in had made a difference, five stated little or some difference, and six saw the project as having real impact. Questions about media programs that sought to improve inter-ethnic relationships did not turn up evidence of KIs remembering watching USAID funded programs. Other than TV Station personnel, only two KIs mentioned the TV Magazine, while three mentioned Sesame Street. Concerning knowledge about the Ahtisaari plan, seven of nine K-Serb KIs said they were well to fully informed, compared to three of six K-Albanians who were well or fully informed.

Asked about how people in their area feel about the future, K-Serbian respondents used terms such as “scared,” “no future,” and, most frequently, “insecure.” However one K-Serbian informant said people

were “terrorized by Belgrade.” For some K-Serbian respondents, they simply asserted that “independence” had no effect, because it was not operative for their area. They were still a part of Serbia. K-Albanians were much more positive, using terms like “relief,” “more secure,” “now a citizen,” and simply “happy.” Some looked forward to entry into Europe.

While most K-Serbian Key Informants have no plans to leave Kosovo, neither do they have optimism for the future. Reasons varied from, “I have my business here” to “My children are in school” to “this is my home.” K-Albanians are very optimistic about the future in an independent Kosovo. Key Informants were asked to suggest the most useful kinds of programs that could be done with donor assistance to improve security and stability in their area. Of the 23 specific suggestions made, 14 had to do with jobs, economic development and promotion of private enterprise.

### **General Conclusions: Impact and Sustainability of the USAID/Kosovo CMP**

1. The USAID Conflict Mitigation program has produced important benefits for those who participated. As noted in the project by project findings, students did learn skills regarding citizenship, dispute resolution, how to think through problems, and other citizenship skills that will serve them well in the future. Some communities did benefit from local projects funded through small grants. Grants to TV stations did strengthen production experience and relationships between Serbian and Albanian language stations. Educators especially welcomed innovative approaches to citizenship development in CRS and CIVITAS programs.
2. Another benefit of the program was the creation of a cadre of trained facilitators, educators, NGO leaders and citizen activists through participation in many of the CM programs. The question is the extent to which persons trained in the current program can be utilized in subsequent development programs.
3. Several information campaigns sponsored by AED may “have been appropriate,” as one respondent put it, during the 2007 period of Ahtisaari negotiations, but the particular impact of these programs is difficult to determine. Among the several media sources of information reported by respondents, including the internet and TV, none funded by USAID stood out, although it is possible that these efforts contributed to the general fund of information available to interested people. Among the Key Informants, most were unable to tell us with any specificity where their information came from. In general, with the evidence at hand, we are unable to attribute program level impact to the USAID information efforts.
4. The impact of the CMP on reconciliation and conflict mitigation is substantially less than anticipated in most of the original proposals. Even among K-Serbian activists who were directly involved in the projects, their optimism about a future in Kosovo remains very low. K-Serbian and K-Albanian participants agree that political- ethnic relationships between K-Serbs and K-Albanians has deteriorated, and for the K-Serbian side, their attitudes are characterized by fear, uncertainty and lack of trust. This finding is supported by the macro-level studies undertaken by UNDP with USAID funding.
5. A possible unanticipated consequence of the Conflict Mitigation Program approach is to re-enforce and, in some cases, to reward the maintenance of ethnic separation and difference. For example, community based infrastructure serving primarily one ethnic community “rewards” that community regardless of its position on cooperation and/or reconciliation. The small and scattered nature of the USAID funded activities was probably not a major factor in this phenomenon, but taken together with UNMIK policies, the Ahtisaari plan, and other program activities focused on K-Serbian areas to the exclusion of K-Albanians, there is a tendency to reinforce separation and ethnic differences. This was also noted by some KI respondents.
6. The sustainability of nearly all of the current CM activities is open to serious question, the value of the programs to participants notwithstanding. These are not inexpensive programs given the anemic budget and capabilities of most Kosovo government entities. Along with the lack of rigorous

evaluation, there seems to be little effort to assess the financial and human resource implications of a roll out of these pilot programs, either in the Ministry of Education or by the project implementers.

7. The conflict mitigation program does little to address the primary concerns of both K-Serbian and K-Albanian residents. These are fear, uncertainty, isolation, and lack of employment and economic opportunity. These are personal concerns that make it relatively easy for political leaders to manipulate vulnerable people and, when it is advantageous, to promote protests and violence.
8. Kosovars of all ethnicities continue to be very confused about who is in charge of the country. They are not necessarily interested about the Ahtisaari plan or constitution but they want to know who is in charge, and who is protecting their rights as citizens. This is clear when looking at the reactions of the K-Serbs in the Final Findings report on the AED Roundtables and Town Hall Meetings – 74% do not want to participate in any discussions regarding the Ahtisaari plan.

### **Lesson Learned**

Any approach to reducing conflict must operate on several levels, political, material, and attitudinal. Reducing the propensity to engage in conflict, and mitigating the effects of conflict should be addressed but as an integral part of a strategy that addresses the primary causes of alienation and hostility on the one side, while on the other side, reorienting the material and societal incentives away from conflict, and towards building confidence, stakeholders, and an attitude of acceptance. The underlying assumption of this strategic reorientation is that it be long term, effectively enforced, and grounded in the institutions of a democratic and rule of law state and a productive, market oriented economy.

A multi-ethnic civil society is an important part of the strategy for reducing conflict. If the goal is to develop a multi-ethnic civil society in Kosovo, then there would have to be a more concerted effort at building capacity in terms of organizational development, implementation, and advocacy. In sum, a strategic grants program would be beneficial if linked to inter-ethnic cooperation and the development of organizational and personal capacities and skills.

### **Recommendation**

The problem of mitigating conflict and the acceptance of the state of Kosovo need to be re-framed. Instead of focusing on reconciliation and conflict mitigation as the organizing goal of the next CM strategy, the focus should be on promoting confidence, stake-holding, and acceptance of a future in Kosovo. This should be done among the 19-26 age group that has the greatest potential for violent conflict, in part because it also has the highest rate of unemployment of any group. Bringing together K-Albanian and K-Serbian unemployed young people, local governments, civil society and the private sector in a program which creates jobs, produces public goods, and builds organizational capacity and personal skills will also reduce the propensity to engage in violent conflict. A coherent strategy, which is designed to produce short term benefits while building assets for longer term economic and political development, was presented to USAID in a separate report.

# EVALUATION REPORT

## I. Introduction and Evaluation Purpose

USAID/Kosovo's Program Office contracted Social Impact, Inc. (SI) to conduct an evaluation of its Conflict Mitigation Program (CMP), which has been implemented starting in October 2005. The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the effectiveness and program impact of the eight activities under this portfolio. The three broad categories of programming are 1) supporting ethnic reconciliation among youth; 2) creating civil society and community linkages across the ethnic divide; and 3) increasing the awareness of Kosovo's leaders and the public about the underlying causes of conflict and peace processes in Kosovo. Because of the shift in the political context in Kosovo with the negotiations of Kosovo's status in 2006 and 2007, USAID requested that its implementing partners (IP) focus on a fourth cross cutting category of programming to enhance engagement with Kosovo Serbs to encourage their identity as integral members of Kosovo society. (See Annex I for the Scope of Work).

This evaluation report provides the Mission with a set of findings and conclusions for each of the projects examining the results that contribute towards attainment of the overall component goals. The report also evaluates USAID's mix of approaches; analyzes if that balance is effective and efficient in mitigating the potential for conflict; and provides "lessons learned" to form the basis of future engagement in this area vis-à-vis the social and political environment in Kosovo.

Specifically, SI has been asked to evaluate the impact of the following activities organized by the three programmatic categories:

**1) Supporting ethnic reconciliation among youth:** the "Youth Securing the Future (YSF)" project implemented by Catholic Relief Services (CRS), the "Mozaik: A model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, Bilingual Pre-school Education in Kosovo" project implemented by Save the Children, UK, "Reconciliation through Civic Education" project implemented by the Center for Civic Education (CCE), and "Sesame Street" project implemented by Sesame Workshop.

**2) Creating civil society and community linkages across the ethnic divide:** the "Kosovo Community Reconciliation Program (KCRP)" implemented by Freedom House, and "Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation (KICCR)" project implemented by Partners for Democratic Change (PDC).

**3) Increasing the awareness of Kosovo's leaders and the public at large about the underlying causes of conflict and peace processes in Kosovo:** the "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo" (SPSK) project implemented by Academy for Educational Development (AED), and the regional "Improving Interethnic Relations in the Western Balkans" project implemented by Project on Ethnic Relations (PER).

## II. Country Background

Leading up to the Kosovo declaration of independence in February 2008, and the Serbian local elections scheduled for May 2008, tension has been growing. This is a cause for concern. The most recent UNDP Early Warning Polls (March, June and October 2007<sup>2</sup>) indicate a significant drop in the public's confidence in government and international institutions in Kosovo. The satisfaction level with key governing institutions remains critically low. As of October 2007, approximately 28% of the Kosovo population is satisfied with the work of Kosovo Government and 29% with UN Administration in Kosovo (UNMIK). Polling also shows worrying trends in indicators measuring inter-ethnic relations and willingness to protest. The percentage of Kosovo Serbs expressing willingness to "work with K-Albanians" fell from

---

<sup>2</sup> See previous Early Warning Reports, [www.kosovo.undp.org](http://www.kosovo.undp.org) publications.

79% to 28% in six months. More than 50% of K-Albanians and 29% of K-Serbs consider that a prolonged status process would negatively impact inter-ethnic relations. Finally, more Kosovars than ever - 66% - are willing to protest for political reasons. Political events and the population's response to them, requires that USAID analyzes current approaches to reconciliation in Kosovo.

After Kosovo unilaterally declared itself a sovereign state independent from Serbia, its self-proclaimed status was quickly recognized by the United States, Great Britain and many other important European Union countries. Other important states, including Russia and Romania, have withheld recognition. Serbia refuses to recognize an independent Kosovo, and continues to partially administer K-Serbian majority territories within Kosovo. Although tensions have remained high in certain areas, as of the time of this evaluation, only one incidence of violent conflict has occurred in north Mitrovica/Mitrovica. Silent protest marches and demonstrations have been held in K-Serbian majority areas.

During the evaluation period, Provisional Institutions of Self-Government (PISG), along with UNMIK and KFOR, have continued to function. The Kosovo parliament is close to finishing a constitution, based on the Ahtisaari Plan, which when promulgated, will establish the legal basis for the new state. However, effective Kosovo political authority in K-Serbian majority areas will remain questionable, and may be further undermined by the results of K-Serbian local elections in May 2008.

### **III. Evaluation Objective**

According to the SOW, the principal objective of the evaluation is to assess implementation and impact of assistance under the USAID/Kosovo Conflict Mitigation Program. The evaluation focuses on the impact of the various activities with regard to each activities stated objectives, which include inter-ethnic reconciliation, fostering mutual understanding and respect, and practical cooperation between ethnic groups. However, since each of the activities is organized under and is supposed to contribute to a strategic objective, the SOW directs the evaluation to assess "strengths, successes and overall impact of USAID assistance under the Conflict Mitigation Program."

The SOW also requires the findings and conclusions about the program's shortcomings, negative unintended consequences and major constraints. The question of USAID's "mix and balance of approaches" remains an important question especially as it relates to the program's effectiveness and efficiency

In 2007-2008, as a result of the shift in the political context in Kosovo, the status talks, the Ahtisaari Plan and the declaration of independence, K-Serbians have become less likely to participate at a variety of levels including in municipal government and in cooperation with the projects implemented by the international community. Hence, USAID/Kosovo realized that the focus of the CMP evaluation, while evaluating each activity, needed to shift to one of evaluating whether the program as a whole was able to engage the K-Serbian community efforts to foster reconciliation and cooperation with K-Albanians.

The activities included in this program have ended, or will end later in 2008. USAID will be preparing a new Kosovo assistance strategy, which will address the needs of an independent Kosovo, including efforts to mitigate potential ethnic conflict. USAID has asked the evaluation team to expand on the last SOW request to "recommend sensible short-term goals for our assistance in conflict mitigation." Building on the evaluation findings and conclusions, as well as the "lessons learned" by several USAID partners, a "Confidence Building" strategy and program design has been developed. The strategy is found in Annex II and the program design was and submitted to USAID as a separate report.

### **IV. Work Plan Schedule and Methods**

Representing Social Impact, the two evaluators were Dr. Richard Blue and Susan Kupperstein. Blue was the team leader for the project. The other two members of the evaluation team, Irina Gudeljovic and Lura Limani, provided crucial translation services as well as analysis. All four comprise the evaluation team (ET). The evaluation began on March 10, with field work from March 18 to April 16, 2008, and concluded in early May, 2008.

## **Work Plan Schedule**

The work plan was divided into three phases. Phase I, from March 13 to March 25, included meetings with USAID/DCHA/CMM, USAID/Kosovo and the implementing partners. The goal of this phase was to gather information about the program and solicit some initial feedback about its successes and challenges. Phase II, from March 26 to April 12, was the period when the team conducted site visits to a sample of municipalities with conflict mitigation programs and with Mercy Corps and IOM (the comparison activities) projects. Phase III was the writing phase and took place from April 12 to April 15 when the team submitted the draft report. (See Annex III for the Interview Schedule.)

## **Methods**

The research design is a rapid appraisal, mixed method approach with one comparison group for larger projects such as CRS/YSF. Further, the mission requested in the SOW that the team compare the IOM and Mercy Corp activities with those in the CM program portfolio. Where possible, quantitative as well as qualitative measures are reported as findings, although systematic random sampling of beneficiary groups, project sub-sites was not possible. Key Informant and Focus Group questionnaires (Annexes IV and V) were developed drawing on already tested surveys such as the USAID supported UN surveys, or Knowledge Attitude Practice (KAP) questionnaires included in the existing portfolio. The team found that several of CMP partners had conducted systematic surveys of beneficiary opinions immediately following project interventions, as well as more general qualitative evaluations and “lessons learned” reports. The findings from these studies were used to buttress, or in some cases, complicate the findings of the evaluation team.

Because of the need to meet with Kosovo grantees and implementing partners for eight activities distributed throughout Kosovo, it was impossible to develop a roster of independent Key Informants. Therefore much of our Key Informant data is derived from respondents who were also significantly involved in the execution of the projects. We were, though, able to organize several focus groups of student participants in the CRS/YSF project, and had general group discussions with CIVITAS students, Mozaik parents, and others. A table of methods used is included as Annex VI.

Below is the map of where the ET traveled during its field work – highlighted in pink.<sup>3</sup>



## **V. Project Findings**

Before going into detail about each program separately, we provide first some observations about the entire portfolio, i.e. commonalities across all projects. Overall, the objectives of the eight projects were designed to mitigate conflict and promote inter-ethnic reconciliation. (See Table 1 below.) A number of them were agreed to and awarded by USAID/DCHA/CMM in Washington and then passed on to USAID/Kosovo to implement. Seven of the eight projects were less than \$1 million, with AED's program totaling nearly \$2.4 million. The rest ranged from \$252,096 to \$893,636. The projects began in October

---

<sup>3</sup> Map from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kosovo>.

2005 and most have not concluded at the time of the evaluation, with the exception of Sesame, PDC and PER. However, the overall duration of the projects, including the sub-components, are all short – one to two years – except CRS/YSF which is a three-year program. Another common factor of all of the programs is their limited geographic scope with CRS in the north; PDC in four communities; Save/Mozaik in three kindergarten groups in two municipalities; and AED documentary and TV Magazines with six paired stations in three regions – north, east and south. Only two of the programs had nationwide components/audiences and those were Sesame and AED. PER was unique in that it was a regional effort. Project input-outputs varied somewhat, but largely included training, publication of tailored information, joint proposal development and planning exercises, occasional joint trips to neighboring countries, some physical rehabilitation and equipment, and salary payments for teachers/trainers/travel.

**Table 1: IPs and Projects**

<b><i>Implementing Partner and Project</i></b>	<b><i>Dollar Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Duration</i></b>	<b><i>Location</i></b>	<b><i>Brief Description</i></b>
<b><i>CRS/YSF</i></b>	\$893,636	May 2006 to May 2009	Seven Municipalities in North and Northwest Kosovo, total of 26 schools	Targeting in and out-of-school youth with tolerance training, community dialogues, leadership training
<b><i>Save/Mozaik</i></b>	\$417,007	September 2006 to September 2008	South and Eastern Kosovo – 2 schools, 3 kindergarten classes	Targets children ages 3 to 6 years of age providing training in conflict resolution skills and bilingual education.
<b><i>CCE/Reconciliation Through Civic Education</i></b>	\$330,000	April 2007 to September 2008	All seven regions of Kosovo, 35 schools (none in Serb majority communities)	Civic education program 6 <sup>th</sup> to 12 <sup>th</sup> grade children to convey fundamental values, principles and institutions of a constitutional democracy.
<b><i>Sesame Workshop/Sesame Project Season Two</i></b>	\$500,527	October 2005 to September 2007	National	26 half-hour episodes dubbed into Albanian and Serbian and broadcasted in Kosovo.
<b><i>Freedom House/KCRP</i></b>	\$650,000	August 2006 to August 2008	Throughout Kosovo	Work with CSOs with a goal to stabilize multi-ethnic communities and ease ethnic tensions.
<b><i>PDC/KICCR</i></b>	\$252,096	August 2006 to August 2007	4 Communities in Kosovo	Community planning for economic and social revitalization of

				Kosovo.
<b><i>AED/Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo</i></b>	\$2,393,793	October 2005 to March 2008	Throughout Kosovo	Increase awareness and understanding on social issues and inter-community relations.
<b><i>PER/Improving Interethnic Relations in the Western Balkans</i></b>	\$280,000	May 2006 to April 2007	Balkan Region	International roundtables to cover a range of issues related to interethnic relations and regional cooperation.
<b><i>TOTAL COST</i></b>	<b>\$5,717,059</b>			

The project findings organized by the categories mentioned above are described below. Each project includes activity descriptions, findings and conclusions.

***Supporting youth reconciliation among ethnic groups***  
(CRS/YSF, Save/MOZAIK, CCE, Sesame)

In looking at these youth programs in terms of bringing together K-Serbian and K-Albanian youth two projects succeeded – CRS/YSF and Mozaik. However, since there were only two K-Serbian children out of 55 in the Mozaik program the engagement is not significant. Sesame was a nationwide program and it is likely that K-Serbian children may have watched, but the program was not designed to specifically engage K-Serbian children.

*Activity Description: CRS*

*Youth Securing the Future (YSF), Catholic Relief Services (CRS)*  
(May 2006 – May 2009, \$893,636)

YSF is a three-year project to reduce concerns about security among high school age youth. The project employs tolerance trainings, community dialogues, political participation, leadership training, problem identification and solving, vocational training and internship training programs that target in-school and out-of-school youth. YSF also seeks to reduce local ultra-nationalism by influencing local decision-makers and advocating for acceptance of diversity. YSF works in seven municipalities in north and northwest Kosovo, connecting youth in 26 high schools across ethnic communities for social engagement and volunteerism. The main objectives of the program are to accomplish the following: Youth are connected across ethnic lines; Inter-ethnic tolerance is increased at the local level; Youth are mobilized for conflict transformation; Youth engage in joint problem solving; Youth advocate for change in local decision-making; and Out-of-school youth promote the acceptance of diversity.

The project has taken place in seven municipalities in north and northwest Kosovo including Mitrovica, Vucitrn/Vushtri, Pec/Peja, Istok/Istogu, Zvecan, Zubin Potok/Zubin Potoku, and Leposavic. The evaluation team conducted focus groups in Mitrovica (north and south), Zvecan and Zubin Potok.

CRS/YSF has attempted to ensure community support of its project and has worked to instill capacity in the student councils being trained. Simultaneously, students are being trained in “peer-mentoring” to ensure continued support and sustainability. Also, the project convened twice-annual meetings of municipal student council representatives from K-Serbian and K-Albanian high schools in an area wide youth council at the Mitrovica Cultural Center in year one. This was suspended due to refusal of K-Serbian Principals to permit further participation following Kosovo independence. Public awareness messages have also been disseminated to target youth and through media.

### *Findings: CRS*

Overall CRS has achieved to the greatest extent engagement of K-Serbians and non-Albanian children in their project compared to the other youth projects. According to CRS staff, working in Mitrovica was the most challenging compared to the other municipalities because the political pressures on the principals of the northern schools was greater and prevented full cooperation. The partial cooperation of the K-Serbian youth was attributed to the fact that they received permission from the Ministry of Education in Serbia. Additionally, the NGOs that work with CRS on this project, Galaxy Stars (south Mitrovica) and Center for Civil Society Development (north Mitrovica), were very competent and central to the implementation of this program.

#### Student Council Project

Student councils are mandated by law in all schools and so was a convenient pre-existing group of youth with which CRS could work. Students and faculty said the CRS program was successful in engaging K-Serbian youth as well as the principals and educators who participated in the activity components. As mentioned before, the current political situation has posed problems for one of the objectives – inter-ethnic cooperation. According to CRS staff, meetings of the Citywide Youth Council in Mitrovica have been suspended because students cannot “cross the bridge” from north to south. However information exchanges have taken place and there are parallel programs which often conclude in a contest and winners. For example, there was an essay contest and the winners from all ethnicities went on a trip to the United States together. Activity leaders point to the success of the project in building tolerance and conflict transformation as demonstrated by the observation that no students participated in the recent protests and riots in Mitrovica over UNMIK in March 2008. K-Serbian student leaders did organize peaceful protests after the declaration of independence of Kosovo in February 2008, according to one informant.

Student leader focus group findings produced mixed results with respect to evidence of increased tolerance and acceptance of diversity. North Mitrovica students were reluctant to take a paying job if they had to work with K-Albanians, for example. K-Serbian student leaders from Zubin Potok had no hesitancy in taking a job working side by side with K-Albanians. Moreover, K-Serbian students reported little change in their attitude toward K-Albanian counterparts, mainly neutral. As several participants said, “we don’t think about them.” K-Serbian students did not accept the independence of Kosovo, denying that that the declaration had any effect in there area.

Participants in the K-Albanian focus groups were much more willing to work with K-Serbians and in general more willing to cooperate with K-Serbian young people.

#### Internship Project

The internship project was really a pilot project for YSF and added in the year two work plan. There was a change in the objectives because of the political situation and CRS could no longer bring students from the north and south together. Hence this activity was limited to Mitrovica and includes 50 participants, 24 from the north and 26 from the south. This was more than CRS anticipated to be interested.

### *Conclusions: CRS*

Of the youth programs, this one makes a more concerted effort to bring K-Albanians and K-Serbs together in the most challenging areas of Kosovo. However, the program suffered because of the tensions around the status negotiations and declaration of independence and has led to relatively little interaction between north and south.

K-Albanian children do not have a problem with K-Serbian counterparts as long as politics are not involved. As long as their country is independent; they understand what it is to be a responsible majority. Further, this project seems to have had an impact on student leaders who have participated on the K-Albanian side, namely increase in self confidence optimism, and some specific skills such as project proposal writing and advocacy.

While K-Albanians certainly are open to ethnic relations, they realize these are not going to happen soon, and for them, reconciliation is less important than going on to University or getting a job. For them, making a go of it in Kosovo is the issue. On the K-Serbian side, political pressure and anxiety is distorting everything, including perceptions of a future in Kosovo or working with K-Albanians. Most of the benefits of the program have accrued to individuals, mainly on the K-Albanian side, or within school cohorts who have learned to take initiatives to promote things of interest to young people. There is little evidence from CRS mid-term evaluation (December 2007) that the project has generated much meaningful interaction. Changes in attitudes toward K-Serbs cannot be attributed to project, as K-Albanians generally are following a conciliatory policy, now that they have established independence. This conclusion is supported by evaluation findings. Reasons for limited interaction in the north are: 1) Belgrade is holding Serbs in Kosovo hostage to its opposition to any compromise; 2) threats to economic well being (salaries paid by Belgrade); 3) political reprisals, pressures to conform to party line; 4) for some, genuine commitment to ultra-nationalist sentiment and sense of superiority over inferior K-Albanians; and 5) concerns over personal security and security of religious institutions.

#### *Activity Description: Mozaik/Save*

*Mozaik: A Model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, Bilingual Pre-school Education in Kosovo, Save the Children, UK  
(September 2006 – September 2008, \$417,007)*

The “Mozaik” project introduces age-appropriate training in conflict-resolution skills for children within the public kindergarten system, and brings children, parents, teachers and communities together for the first time to attend multi-cultural bilingual kindergartens in a pilot program. This activity also incorporates community outreach to enable parents, families and communities to reinforce their children’s positive learning in the classroom. The overall goal of Mozaik is to reduce conflict and increase communication between members of participating communities. Mozaik works with teachers in three kindergartens over two years. A follow-up teacher training system will be set up through the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MEST) and the Faculty of Education.

#### *Findings: Mozaik/Save*

The Mozaik program has the potential of reaching 3% of the pre-school cohort – children from ages three to six. These classes provide a safe environment for parents where they can send their children while they are working, for example. The project also involves teacher training, rehabilitation of classrooms, permission from the Ministry of Education, as well as outreach to school directors and municipal authorities. All of these elements not only make the Mozaik project attractive to parents, but it also provides extra training and knowledge to improve their skills as well.

The model of a Mozaik classroom is that it is bi-lingual education with a child centered approach. Each class comprises students from two different ethnic communities, with K-Albanians as a common denominator since they are a majority in Kosovo. For example, the three groups (and two kindergartens) funded by USAID represent Albanian/Serb, Albanian/Turkish and Albanian/Bosniaks. The model for Mozaik was tested in Macedonia and parents in Kosovo were invited to see the pilot so they could feel comfortable with their children in the program. When breaking down the cost of the program, using direct program costs (\$378,135 out of \$417,007) each of the classrooms costs about \$126,000 and this further breaks down to about \$6,634 per child (total of about 57 children in the program). Attendance in each of the three groups ranges from nine children to 26. There are only two K-Serbian children in the program and they are siblings. From the perspective of engaging K-Serbs, this program has attracted only two out of 57 enrolled.

#### Case Studies

The ET visited three Mozaik kindergartens in the two USAID-funded schools (Kamenice and Prizren) and in one Norwegian-funded school (Pristina). Since the evaluation covers only USAID-funded programs, the findings presented below are only from the Kamenice and Prizren site visits.

In Kamenice/Kamenica, the Mozaik group has a total of nine children, two of whom are K-Serbian. The ET met with the principal for about one-half hour to get her impressions of the program and its impact; however she was only somewhat informed about the details of the Mozaik program, but did not know anything about the financial elements and the curriculum. The ET was not able to meet with the teachers; although it did meet with the parents who were quite satisfied with the program. The team met with a total of four parents, three of them were K-Albanian (women) and one was K-Serbian (he is the father of the two K-Serbian children).

When the ET asked about the K-Serbian gentleman's motivation to enroll his children in the program, his reactions were as follows: 1) the desire for his children to have playmates because there are no children where he lives; and 2) the program was to offer transportation for his children to go to school. He lives in a village that is far away from town. He has been promised that the school van would be ready soon but he has been waiting for five months. If the van is not supplied soon, he will have to withdraw his children because he cannot afford to bring them every day.

The motivation for the K-Albanian mothers for enrolling kids included: 1) small class size; 2) renovated class room; 3) better pedagogy (teachers certified by the Save program); and 4) bi-lingual teaching was appreciated, but not critical. The one criticism of the program had to do with the resignation of the original Serbian-language educator who was part of the program from its inception in Kamenice's kindergarten. The K-Serbian educator stepped down immediately following Kosovo's declaration of independence because she was afraid that her house in Serbia was going to be vandalized if she continued in the school. As a result, the school had to scramble to find a Serbian speaking person to become the second educator in the classroom. Because it was a last minute hire, the teacher had not been trained at the time of the visit in the Mozaik program, nor was she a certified teacher. This brings about concerns from the parents that their children are not getting the quality of education that they received with the first teacher. They were also upset because they had not been informed of the change until they came to the school on the same day the ET met with them.

In Prizren, the ET encountered a slightly different situation; however the director seemed as uninformed as the director of the school in Kamenice. Here there are two Mozaik groups each with more than 20 children. As mentioned above, they are Albanian/Turkish and Albanian/Bosniak. The ET met with around 18 parents mixed between K-Albanian, Turkish and Bosniak. All of the parents agreed that their motivations for sending their children to the program were 1) the classrooms had been rehabilitated; 2) it is a bi-lingual program; and 3) it is a child-centered approach. When asked if there was increased tolerance among the children as a result of the program, they said that there are no strong ethnic tensions in Prizren which translates down to the children. The main concern of a couple of parents was that the classrooms were too big and that the age range too disparate (ages three to six).

#### *Conclusions: Mozaik/Save*

Overall, the value of this program for inter-ethnic cooperation and/or reconciliation and engaging K-Serbs is questionable due to very small numbers of children reached, its high cost, and the general refusal of K-Serbian parents to enroll in the program. All of the three programs visited were in communities where there are reduced ethnic tensions and so the purpose of promoting tolerance, inter-ethnic cooperation and/or reconciliation was not relevant to parents. Even if the program could be rolled out to additional schools, it would still reach a very small number of children – likely less than the 3% who attend kindergarten. Further, to roll out this program to more schools would necessarily involve more donations because it is unlikely that the Kosovo government could pay for this expensive program in the near distant future.

#### *Activity Description: CCE*

*Reconciliation through Civic Education, Center for Civic Education (CCE)/CIVITAS Kosovo (April 2007 – September 2008, \$330,000)*

This project develops and implements civic education programs in classrooms at 6th - 12th grade levels at selected schools across Kosovo. These programs focus upon the development, among teachers and

their students, of an understanding of the fundamental values, principles, and institutions of constitutional democracy, especially political tolerance, respect for the rule of law, and support for the equality of all citizens – all of which assume reciprocity between citizen and state, and all fundamental to a sustained and properly functioning democratic system. The program also targets political and civic leaders, school administrators, community leaders, and pre-service university professors. The three main CCE stated objectives are to: 1) decrease inter-group enmity within and between Kosovo's various ethnic groups by establishing long-term intervention efforts at the 6-12th grade levels, 2) introduce curricular programs to guide the development of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for competent and responsible participation in democratic self-government, 3) implement sustainable elementary and secondary civic education programs in public and private schools throughout Kosovo's seven educational districts.

#### *Findings: CCE*

The ET visited the headquarters of CCE's partner CIVITAS Kosovo and three CIVITAS programs in Kosovo in three different municipalities, Peje/Pec, Prizren and Fushe Kosove/Kosovo Polje. The first visit, in the Cambridge Gymnasium in Peje/Pec, the ET only met with the director of the school and the two CIVITAS Educators. This was a new private school (only one year old) with only 70 K-Albanian children total – grades six to 11. Of the 70, 16 children participated in the CIVITAS class and the program they developed was for humanitarian assistance to the local poor community largely consisting of Romas. The director of the school had heard about CIVITAS because his son is the director of CIVITAS-Kosovo. The teachers were quite pleased with the program because it allowed the students to look beyond their own lives to help others.

The second school visited was in Prizren at the Motrat Qiriazhi School. Here the ET was able to meet with the director, deputy director, two teachers of the two CIVITAS classes, and the students. The school was at first reluctant to take on the program due to severe overcrowding as it was operating three shifts for 1,750 students, and found it difficult to set aside two classrooms for the two CIVITAS groups. The two CIVITAS classes comprised one group of K-Albanian students (about 18) and one group of Bosniak students (about 18). The students volunteered to be part of the CIVITAS program. While the classes never coordinated on their CIVITAS projects (likely because of the language barrier), each had very interesting projects. The K-Albanian group developed a proposal to fix the laboratory at the school and the Bosniak children developed an idea to integrate children with special needs. Both sets of children were very proud about their proposals and satisfied with the program.

The third school was "Bajram Curri" Fushe Kosove, Sllatine in Fushe Kosove/Kosovo Polje. The ET met with 18 children who formed the CIVITAS class. Instead of having one age group in the CIVITAS program, the teachers decided to combine the group so there were children from sixth to ninth grade. The purpose for combining the age groups was so that more children could be exposed to the CIVITAS program. In other words, the children in the program would interact with their peers spreading the ideas of the program. The first project that the group designed was about raising awareness regarding trafficking, especially child trafficking. While this is a very mature topic, the children researched it according to the theme of human rights and that everyone is entitled to them per the UN Declaration of Human Rights. This was an exceptional group of children who have many ideas for raising awareness.

With 35 schools in CIVITAS project, and a budget of \$330,000, the USAID unit cost per school is \$9430 (rounded). The cost of introducing the program to all 350 elementary schools would be approximately \$3.3 million. This cost would go down as economies of scale and program capacity set in. The longer term cost of a fully developed program would be roughly \$7000 per school (based on one CIVITAS class, or \$2.5 million for school year. Ministry officials value the CIVITAS program for its interactive approach to developing good citizenship. They described the mandatory civics classes as "theoretical," whereas CIVITAS is applied, experiential, and engages the children more effectively. Also, teachers in the program are enthusiastic about it and undoubtedly benefit as teachers. Asked about whether the Ministry had given thought to integrating the CIVITAS program into the regular curriculum, either with the existing civics course or as replacement for it, the Ministry said it would have to review the results. As of now, according to the official, there is no evaluation, review, or priority setting process in place by which to make choices and develop a realistic strategy for curriculum development. The Ministry has many

specifically focused donor funded programs (human rights, citizenship, youth leadership, kindergarten reform, trafficking, to name a few), and must rely on donor funding for independent evaluation and assessment.

#### *Conclusions: CCE*

None of the schools visited by the ET, or any other schools where CIVITAS is being conducted, engaged K-Serbian children. And because there was no baseline done, it is difficult to say whether any attitudes or behavior changes occurred among the students. However, it can be said that all of the children interviewed were very excited about the program and the opportunity to think through problems, especially those that are often left to adults, and try to come up with solutions. Overall, though, the project is lacking because the students are only responsible for identifying problems and potential solutions. They are not empowered to find the means to address the problems. Only one school (not visited by the team) in Djakova was able to get funding to implement their projects – school renovation funded by the Italian military.

The children's task is only to develop a proposal for addressing an identified problem and not to seek funding or the means to advocate or find solutions to the problem. Hence, from the ET's perspective, the program does not take the children to the next step, which is performing advocacy. This is a crucial skill that when defending the rights of minorities or victims could be translated into reconciliation projects in the future.

Additionally, while this project has been supported in theory by the Ministry of Education, there is no sense that it could actually be incorporated into the official school curriculum. As it stands, some of the CIVITAS classes are in place of the official civic education class, but if these ideas and skills are to be maximized, it would be essential for it to become part of the formal curriculum. For the relatively low cost, ~\$330,000 for 26 schools (an average of one class per school), it seems that more children could be involved – even with the same number of teachers trained.

Although CIVITAS is well received by students, teachers and administrators, its sustainability is questionable, in part because of the costs of the program, but also because the Ministry does not appear to have a process for establishing priorities and long term development strategies.

#### *Activity Description: Sesame Workshop*

##### *Sesame Street– Season Two, Sesame Workshop (October 2005 – September 2007, \$500,527)*

Season Two consisted of production of 26 half-hour episodes of pre-edited Sesame Workshop library material which included Muppet and animation segments that address a range of cognitive and pro-social educational objectives, such as numeracy, health and social relations. All materials were dubbed into K-Albanian and Serbian and broadcast through Radio Television of Kosovo (RTK), and three local Serbian TV stations. In addition to TV production, the project included an educational outreach initiative that extended the project goals beyond the television viewing experience. This outreach included production of storybooks that support and reinforce the program's core messages, and a facilitator's guide for parents and teachers to provide developmentally appropriate tips using the materials at home and in the classroom.

#### *Findings: Sesame Workshop*

The Sesame Workshop project was implemented at the national level with Kosovar children as its target population. Based on the information provided in the Sesame materials, including quarterly reports for USAID, the main purpose of the project was to target children of the ages between three and seven because of the lack of access they have to pre-school/kindergarten. As mentioned above, only about 3% of Kosovar children attend preschool. Because this is a national level program, it is difficult to evaluate it based on the level of engagement with K-Serbs. However, it is possible to look at whether there were behavior and attitudinal changes as a result of the project given the educational aspect of the show.

Given the constraint on resources of the evaluation team (time, no ability to conduct a scientific survey, etc.), the ET is relying on some questions that were asked during focus groups and key informant interviews with parents and youth, as well as the evaluation Sesame did on their program. Based on the key informant interviews and the focus groups, most of the respondents had not heard about the Sesame programs. If adults knew about it, it was because they watched it in the 1970s when they were children. Of the groups of youth, there was one teenager from Southern Mitrovica who watched Sesame because he liked the Muppets. In sum, if Sesame was watched by any of the respondents or their children or younger siblings, it was because of the show rather than education.

Based on the independent and rigorous January 2008 evaluation conducted by Sesame on the educational impact of the program,<sup>4</sup> the conclusions are that children who watch sesame street in K-Albanian and K-Serb twice a week at times of their choosing, score higher (statistically significant higher) on measures of tolerance, respect for diversity, acceptance, etc. K-Serbian kids actually advance more on the test dimensions than do K-Albanian kids. However, the study also reveals that Sesame Street is not among the top ten watched kid shows for either K-Serbs or K-Albanians. This suggests that Sesame Street is not widely viewed by the target audience, a finding similar to our more anecdotal evidence. Nor could the team find evidence that Sesame Street was relevant to, or watched by children in the other USAID funded pre-school tolerance building program, Mozaik.

#### *Conclusions: Sesame Workshop*

Sesame Street's positive impact on K-Albanian and K-Serbian children has been demonstrated by its own evaluation report, but limited viewership severely constrains the overall impact on the target generation. Further, failure to develop multiple uses of Sesame Street in other programs also limits the impact. After two rounds of Sesame St in Kosovo, the ET believes that unless the cost of integrating it into Kosovo public television's regular programming are borne by Kosovo, perhaps with subsidy from the Sesame Workshop, it lacks sufficient breadth of impact to warrant continued USAID funding.

#### ***Creating civil society and community linkages across the ethnic divide*** (Freedom House/KCRP and Partners for Democratic Change)

##### *Activity Description: Freedom House*

*Kosovo Community Reconciliation Program (KCRP), Freedom House (FH)*  
(August 2006 – August 2008, \$650,000)

The goal of the activity is to stabilize multi-ethnic communities and ease ethnic tension by mobilizing Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) around community-driven reconciliation initiatives. Through grants to CSOs, the activity aims to increase cooperation among and between multi-ethnic communities on issues such as freedom of movement, youth, religious freedom, local government cooperation and decentralization, free and objective media reporting on human rights, and cultural preservation. The project also provides professional support in reconciliation and networking techniques for CSOs through specially designed seminars and internship opportunities. The long-term objective of the program is to develop a network of strong CSOs to advocate for policies supporting multi-ethnicity and respect for diversity.

##### *Findings: Freedom House*

The ET primarily looked at the grants that were awarded during the first year of the program. Out of the 16 grants that were awarded, the ET was able to meet with leaders and participants of six of the projects as well as the Foundation for Democratic Initiatives, FH's local partner that assisted with the grant making process. Specifically, the team met with representatives from the following:

- Lansdowne NGO – from Gjilan, conducts language courses in Albanian, Serbian and English

---

<sup>4</sup> Source: Assessment of Educational Impact of Rruga Sesam and Ulica Sezam in Kosovo: Report of Findings prepared for Sesame Workshop. January 2008. New York, NY. FLUENT in collaboration with SMMRI Kosovo.

- Radio Contact Plus (Serbian) – from northern Mitrovica/Mitrovica, in partnership with Radio Mitrovica (Albanian) they broadcast informative programs from both sides of the Ibar/Iber river that include “every day” issues important to the citizens of this municipality
- Center for Children’s Theater Development (CCTD) and Gheto Theater – from Pristina and Lapje Selo, a play called “Bridge” was written and produced in both Albanian and Serbian and played in both languages around the country (Prizren, Pristina, Lapje Selo)
- Our Home (K-Serbian) – in partnership with the Center for Migration Studies (CMS) from Belgrade and the Kosma radio network the project envisioned four debates (only one occurred at the time of this writing) to discuss issues facing the Kosovo Assembly
- Youth Initiative for Human Rights (YIHR) (K-Albanian) – worked in partnership with NGO INPO (K-Serbian) and volunteer activists to mount anti-discrimination campaigns throughout the country called *My Initiative* to get young people to think critically about political and social processes and react to violations of human rights
- KOSMA Radio Network – in partnership with CMS, this is a non-Albanian network of radios covering the entire country to provide Serbian language information about Kosovo to local communities

#### *Conclusions for Grant Activities Visited: Freedom House*

All of these projects were implemented by serious organizations with laudable goals and objectives. Each of them competed in a Request for Application (RFA) process and was awarded a grant based on their ideas and their ability to implement the projects. From activities that were implemented by each of these grantees, as well as the others with which the team could not meet, it appears that the individual projects each met their goals. However, there are a few that particularly stand out in terms of possible replication in the future.

#### Sub-conclusion – CCTD and Gheto Theater

The CCTD and Gheto Theater project produced a play that was written as a symbol of bridging the gap between the different ethnicities in Kosovo and it was realized in both Serbian and Albanian languages and put on in both communities. The apparent feedback received on the play from children to their parents was very positive. Expanding this project so that it can be received nation wide would help bring the message to more people. Additionally, putting on the play in both languages back-to-back at an all day festival may also have a wider impact.

#### Sub-conclusion – YIHR

The YIHR project, to bring young people together in an action network, has a lot of potential. However, based on the interview with the program manger, it is clear that the youth trained as activists are on a volunteer basis only and so their participation could be ephemeral as opposed to sustainable. A strong advocacy network in all of Kosovo that can be maintained would be ideal, but more resources would need to be invested in this project. As it was granted by FH, there is not enough reach and therefore not enough impact for the messages to resonate.

#### Sub-conclusion – KOSMA Network

The KOSMA network project has a lot of potential in terms of bringing information in the Serbian language to Kosovo since many of the Serb-speaking community live in enclaves that are relatively isolated (and this is also true for some K-Albanian communities). However, the project that was funded through CMS was only to prepare half-hour information programs at 5pm daily. To really address the information vacuum for K-Serbs, it would have been beneficial as a follow up to this project funded through CMS to work directly with KOSMA.

#### Sub-Conclusion – Our Home and Lansdowne

The ET does not see any overall benefit of the Our Home grant to sponsor four debates. From the field interviews conducted and the materials read, it appears that the Kosovar community, from all communities, is debate-fatigued. The impact of the debates is not large enough to warrant continuing them on the small scale.

Further, in terms of scale, both the Lansdowne and Radio Contact Plus grants were designed with good ideas. However, the reach is very local. The radio covers only the Mitrovica municipality – though a key area in terms of conflict mitigation – and Lansdowne is primarily in Gjilan/Gnjilane.

#### *General Conclusions: Freedom House*

The problem statement that Freedom House intended to address in its Kosovo Community Reconciliation Program (KCRP) was "...local multi-ethnic CSOs do not have the tools to mount a **sustained** reconciliation effort that includes the expressed needs of their respective constituencies" (from proposal and cooperative agreement). However, the way the program was structured, to provide a number of small grants to a variety of CSOs in Kosovo, did not lend itself to providing tools to mount a reconciliation effort that could be maintained. While for most of the projects K-Serb and K-Albanian participation was evident, though in some cases it was only K-Serb, the programs were not big enough in scope or long enough in duration to sufficiently contribute to reconciliation. What the program did do, however, was reinforce cooperation between the different ethnicities in the country, share information and provide support to some organizations' project ideas that they had been wanting to implement. In sum, this program was more of a civil society program rather than a conflict mitigation program.

In evaluating this program along the lines of K-Serbian participation, it is certain that each and every one of the 16 grants awarded engaged K-Serbs. Yet, except for with the Kosma radio network, there is a relatively small number of K-Serbs engaged and when they were involved it was in parallel to the K-Albanian project. Sustained reconciliation would be more effective if K-Serbs and K-Albanians cooperate in the same project rather than in parallel.

#### *Activity Description: PDC*

##### *Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation (KICCR), Partners for Democratic Change (PDC)*

*(August 2006 – August 2007, \$252,096)*

Through PDC and its local partner Partners-Kosova, KICCR contributed to reconciliation by empowering Kosovars to cooperatively address community conflicts. Participants in four targeted communities assessed unresolved conflicts in their communities, brought together stakeholders, and facilitated the resolution of contentious issues that are crucial for the economic and social revitalization of Kosovo, such as job creation, perceptions of safety and security, freedom of movement and access to education. The program 1) addressed specific, persistent local disputes that hinder full participation by minorities, young people and women in the economic, political and social life of municipalities; 2) built the foundation for communities to proactively address issues in a collaborative manner before they become Kosovo-wide or violent conflicts; and 3) built more trusting relationships between majority and minority communities, and between government and civil society community members. This was done through a combination of training, coaching by experienced mediators, participatory assessment, cooperative planning, and grant-making.

#### *Findings: PDC*

The ET went to two of the four communities where PDC conducted its activities – Bablak and Rahovec/Orahovac. The other two communities with PDC projects are Viti/Vitina and Lipjan/Lipljan. Basically, the ET sees that the hypothesis of the program – people working together to build communities – is an effective way to bring divided communities together, and is one that is widely used in many similar programs: MISI for example, or many OTI programs in other countries. In this case, there was already a history of the communities working together for at least one year (in the case of Bablak) or several years (in the case of Rahovec). Based on the interview with the implementing partner in Pristina, these communities were targeted because they knew they would find communities willing to participate in this pilot project. Specifically, PDC applied the "Inclusive Community Change Model" (ICCM) in Kosovo because it "...emphasizes broad participation, allowing marginalized groups as well as the majority to have a voice in decisions that affect their everyday quality of life" (p.2, PDC Lessons Learned). PDC is

also working from the premise that for ethnic integration to be successful it has to come from the local level.

*Conclusions: PDC*

Based on the hypothesis and premise, the ET finds that this program does have some beneficial impact for the communities that participated in this project especially in terms of making infrastructure improvements and training, even though infrastructure was not the primary focus on the project. In terms of the evaluation, the team also confirms that this program did engage the K-Serbian communities in each of these areas. However, it would be a stretch to say that the program contributed in a broad sense to ethnic reconciliation or even behavior/attitude change since the major benefits affected only those particular cities/villages and because there was already cooperation among K-Serbs and K-Albanians before the project.

Overall, the ET concludes that this type of program does have merit in Kosovo and if expanded, could do a lot to improve the conditions of the community as well as community relations. The team is also impressed with the amount of thought PDC put into this project knowing that it is a pilot and it could not accomplish everything. This is evidenced by the paper they wrote called "Lessons Learned: A Review of the Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation Program" (December 2007). As they say in the document, "...building healthy local communities and decreasing ethnic tension in Kosovo remains a long-term goal towards which KICCR has made significant, but necessarily localized, 'baby' steps in four small communities" (p.6).

***Increasing the awareness of Kosovo's leaders and public at large about the underlying causes of conflict and peace processes in Kosovo***  
(AED, PER)

*Activity Description: AED*

*Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo (SPSK), Academy for Educational Development (AED)*  
(October 2005 – March 2008, \$2,393,793)

The project's objective is to increase awareness and understanding among mainly K-Albanian and K-Serbian of the "other community's" perceptions, concerns, and opinions on social issues and inter-community relations, to trigger intra-community and inter-community dialogue on such issues, and to promote norms of tolerance and compromise during the Kosovo future status process. The project pursues this through core activities: 1) A Kosovo future status process "Knowledge-Attitudes-Practices" (KAP) survey of respondents in Kosovo and Serbia proper, with the findings disseminated widely to the media and to political, civil society, and international donor stakeholders in these geographic areas; 2) Kosovo team reporting "TV magazine" series on social issues (including future status issues) and inter-community relations that is produced jointly by journalist/cameraman teams from K-Albanian and Serbian Kosovar local TV stations, and broadcast on their TV stations and other stations in both Kosovo and Serbia proper; and 3) Provision of strategic communications technical assistance to Kosovo's Provisional Institutions of Self-Government (PISG) in unveiling the status settlement plan and status-related issues to avert misunderstanding about the status process which threatened to derail political progress and stability. The project implements information campaigns to communicate components of the plan and status process to the Kosovo public, both majority and minority populations.

*Findings: AED*

The AED project within CMP cannot be described as one activity implemented over several years, but many activities implemented over several years that do not necessarily tie in with each other but did address immediate needs as identified by USAID and the USOP (now the US Embassy in Kosovo). Since the beginning of the project, there have been nine contract modifications and about five chiefs of party over the last 2.5 years. In essence, this project served as a "catch all" for USAID/Kosovo so that they could respond as critical requests arose.

The overall program has included the following activity components:

- Dialogue Mapping
- Knowledge, Attitude and Practice Survey (KAP) (originally there were supposed to be two but they only did one)
- Inter-ethnic Journalist Documentaries
- Pro-peace teledrama (cancelled because it would not have worked in the Kosovo context)
- Inter-ethnic TV Magazine episodes (building from the documentaries)
- Strategic communication (for government)
- Key Municipal Stakeholder Roundtables and Regional Public Town Hall Meetings

Out of this list of activities, the ET was able to research in more detail the TV Magazine project, the Stakeholder Roundtable and Town Hall Meeting components. The KAP was only done once, and therefore USAID missed additional opportunities to find out crucial information about what was happening in Kosovo during different timeframes. However, the ET notes that the KAP does offer some baseline from which more extensive comparisons could be done (and this was the only extensive baseline aside from the CRS KAP survey). The only other survey that is repeated is the Early Warning Study done by UNDP.<sup>5</sup>

The other component that the ET did not look into with too much detail is the strategic communication activities. The team did ask a question during the key informant interviews regarding whether the interlocutor was familiar with the Ahtisaari Plan and the constitution, among other important documents and political changes happening in Kosovo. This question was trying to measure the extent to which people received and remembered receiving materials that AED produced, understanding that they would not have identified the materials as AED or USAID because they were not branded as such. Overwhelmingly, the respondents told the ET that they got the information, if they wanted it, from newspapers or the internet as opposed to brochures or the public service announcements. Additionally, people appeared overwhelmed at all of the information that was in the public domain saying that it was hard for all of them to absorb it. Also, many people just wanted to know what was happening in their own communities.

In terms of evaluating this program on the basis of whether it engaged Kosovar Serbs, the ET has determined that there was ample outreach to this community as well as participation. It remains to be seen, however, whether attitudes and behaviors have changed as a result of the activities.

#### Documentary/TV Magazines

The overall goal of the inter-ethnic documentary and TV Magazine activity was to “advance inter-ethnic cooperation in the Kosovo broadcast media sector” (p.2, Evaluation Report). A total of six TV stations worked in pairs to produce eight minutes of the 26 minute TV Magazine episode – all three pairs had a segment appear on each of the 15 episodes. The pairs comprised one Kosovar Serbian TV station and one Kosovar Albanian. The participation stations were TV Most and TV Mitrovica (Zvecan and Mitrovica); TV Puls and TV Vali (Gjilan/Gnjilane); and TV Herc and TV Tema (Strpce/Shterpce and Ferizaj/Urosevac).

All of the journalists were satisfied with the project and with working together in their pairs. Two of the pairs (Most and Mitrovica and Tema and Herc) had co-operated together before the project – even though one of the objectives was to have K-Serb and K-Albanian stations work together for the first time. TV Puls and TV Vali, according to a respondent from TV Puls, mentioned they had wanted to work together before the program, but needed a third party to bring them together to raise the level of comfort. Now all three of the stations cooperate on a more regular basis; though at the time of this writing TV Mitrovica had its licenses taken away for violating their bandwidth agreement. There was some disappointment that the post-production was not done by any of these stations, rather it was outsourced.

---

<sup>5</sup> The team also interviewed UNHCR in an effort to learn more about the data base and indicators used by UNHCR to assess potential conflict areas or issues. The interview was not successful.

### Roundtables/Town Hall Meetings

The Roundtables and Town Hall meetings were implemented in two phases. AED partnered with the Advocacy Training and Resource Center (ATRC) to organize a total of 29 community roundtables in March 2007.<sup>6</sup> Five Town Hall Meetings, typically including a larger audience because they were held on a regional basis, were organized in May 2007 in Ferizaj/Urosevac, Peje/Pec, Mitrovice/Mitrovica, Prishtina/Pristina and Gjilan/Gnjilane. The purpose of both types of meetings was to inform people directly about the Ahtisaari Plan. Specifically, “the objective of the roundtables was to increase the knowledge of Kosovars about the Ahtisaari settlement document, to provide explanations to citizens about any unclear points of the proposal, and to promote and facilitate open channels of communication between Kosovar leaders, civil society, international representatives and citizens” (p.1, Final Findings). According to AED, the Roundtables and Town Hall Meetings reached approximately 2,500 citizens and 2,500 copies of the Ahtisaari plan were distributed. A breakdown of the ethnic composition of the municipalities where events were held is as follows: 28 events were organized in Albanian majority municipalities (six of which were in mixed municipalities (Bosniaks, Serbian, Roma, and Turkish), one in a K-Serbian majority mixed municipality, and five events in K-Serbian majority municipalities” (p.1, Final Findings).

Both phases of meetings involved a panel of high level speakers from Kosovo and the international community, though primarily speakers were from the US, United Kingdom and France. A list of speakers is provided in Annex VII.

Because there were so many meetings reaching many people, to get an idea of impact, the ET read through the Final Findings report about the events and also met with a group of people who attended both the Roundtable and Town Hall meeting in Ferizaj/Urosevac. The meeting was arranged by AED’s partner ATRC and the team met at Avonet’s office (a local NGO in Ferizaj/Urosevac). The ET had planned to meet with one of the foreign panelists to get his perspective on the events, but that meeting was cancelled.

At the group discussion in Ferizaj/Urosevac, the ET received mostly positive feedback about the event. There was one Roundtable and one Town Hall meeting in this municipality where 350 people attended the Roundtable and around 40 to 45 people attended the Town Hall meeting. From this group’s perspective, the events were extremely valuable especially because they had the opportunity of asking questions about the Ahtisaari plan and the timeline for the declaration of independence – although at that time they thought they were going to declare it in June 2007 rather than in February 2008. The informants stressed that the meetings were attended by people who were already very interested prior to attending the meetings. One of the informants at the Avonet office was a member of the municipal council and he commented that the municipality was very supportive of these events and very involved. Informants thought the meetings were important in assuaging anxiety of people who attended, less because of the “information” content of the meetings, and more because the foreigners, especially the Americans in attendance, allowed people to believe that America would protect Kosovo’s interests.

The AED effort in organizing and reporting on this activity was quite detailed. The 17-page Final Findings report details the methods for organizing the events, results of a pre- and post- survey disseminated in several municipalities, as well as detailed notes about the questions and reactions of the participants. As a result of this effort, AED came up with nine findings and recommendations that would be very helpful if this type of activity is repeated in the future.

### *Conclusions: AED*

At first glance, the assortment of activities that comprise the AED project seem to lead to a conclusion that USAID/Kosovo did not have a strategy. It was challenging for AED to constantly have to switch gears and make sure they had the appropriate staff to implement the requested activities. But the one

---

<sup>6</sup> Information taken from the “Final Findings and Recommendation Report from Ahtisaari Proposal Community Roundtables and Town Hall Meetings” (October 2007).

consistent thread throughout this entire project was that it responded to the changing political conditions on the ground. However, because the project was constantly switching directions, it was very difficult for AED to really monitor the impact of each of the components as they were being implemented.

Further, the overall hypothesis of this program seems to be that if people are informed, political instability in the political processes in Kosovo will be less likely. Information alone does not make the case. With information comes clarification about what is going on, the timeline, etc. but it does not mean that those who are not accepting a different political status for Kosovo will change their mind.

#### Documentary/TV Magazines

The main conclusion that the ET has drawn from this activity is that while the objective of having the TV stations work together was achieved, the impact of the program was lessened because it was aired monthly rather than weekly diluting the possibility of the viewers to remember and internalize the messages from the episodes. Further, because post-production was not in the hands of the partners who did the filming, there was less than expected ownership over the material. This perception was clear as a result of the interviews with five out of the six participating stations. If this type of activity will be tried again, it would be more effective if the episodes were aired on a regular basis, such as one per week, and accompanying this effort with an advertising campaign on the TV stations as well as with fliers in public. The team could not determine an estimation of how many viewers from each station actually watched the shows because there was no funding for the stations to do a survey in their municipalities – this should also be part of this type of activity package in the future.

#### Roundtables/Town Hall Meetings

The meetings were probably important less for the information function than for the reassurance that was given to anxious Kosovar citizens that their interests would not be ignored. The meetings may have helped convince Kosovar Albanians that the “price of independence” was indeed giving the K-Serbian population leeway to accept a new reality. Further, it appears that participatory meetings of this kind have not been the norm in Kosovo, so the novelty of being able to meet and ask questions was a positive experience as was remarked by several of the informants, especially the deputy from the municipal council in Ferizaj/Urosevac.

#### *Activity Description: PER*

*“Improving Interethnic Relations in the Western Balkans,” Project on Ethnic Relations (PER)  
(May 2006 – April 2007, \$280,000)*

The project organized two international roundtables to cover a range of issues related to interethnic relations and regional cooperation. The first roundtable was held during the mid-2006 Kosovo negotiation process. It facilitated a policy-oriented discussion on how to deal with changing interethnic dynamics when former majorities become minorities. The second roundtable was scheduled to take place after the Kosovo status is determined, and encourage the region’s politicians to shift their attention from issues of interethnic strife and ethnic gains to building a secure, prosperous, and forward-looking European region.

#### *Findings: PER*

PER has been working in Kosovo since 1991 and therefore they have many inroads to high level politicians that many other organizations do not have as a result of the trust built over the years. PER’s working hypothesis is twofold: 1) any effort at the local level to promote and instill reconciliation must be validated at the level of the political elite/decision makers; and 2) that reconciliation accomplished at the highest levels of government will trickle down to the local levels. To address these hypotheses, PER organized two regional meetings funded by USAID in 2006 and 2007 to discuss issues concerning the state of the Balkans and the changes to come. During the Budapest meeting in December 2006 called “New Majorities and Minorities in the Changing Balkans,” the two topics addressed were “the issue of Kosovo’s future status and the issue of relations between so-called mother countries and their ethnic kin living in neighboring states” (p.2, PER Final Report). At the Athens meeting in June 2007 called “The Balkans as a Source of Security and Stability in Europe,” they were to discuss “strengthening regional peace and security, and creating foundations for self-sustaining democratic societies” (p.3, PER Final

Report) but as with the Budapest meeting Kosovo was the center of attention since the Ahtisaari document had recently been released.

PER cites that one of its major accomplishments with the two roundtables was bringing Kosovar Serbs and Kosovar Albanians together in the same room. They used the regional venue as a neutral place to initiate dialogues. Here is how they describe their success with the roundtable in Athens:

Just as the issue of Kosovo and its final status stole the limelight of the Budapest meeting, so too did it dominate the discussion in Athens. It would be unjust to claim that any great meeting of the minds occurred between the Serb and Kosovo Albanian participants during the PER event, but the mere presence of both sides at the same table to take part in discussions about how their actions affect the wider region is a significant sign of hope for the area's future. It is, in effect, a clear signal that representatives from both sides of this argument, no matter how extreme their disagreement might be, have an invested interest in maintaining peace and security in the region. (p.3, PER Final Report)

In sum, PER approaches the problems in Kosovo as political rather than ethnic. So if they can bring the key politicians to the table in a neutral setting to begin to dialogue, reconciliation or acceptance may be more likely in the end.

#### *Conclusions: PER*

In comparison with all of the projects of the USAID/Kosovo Conflict Mitigation Program, this one is an outlier. All of the other programs focus on the local level within Kosovo, but this project focuses at the national and regional levels and beyond. Further, the ET does not have an argument with their overall hypothesis and in terms of the evaluation the program did engage Kosovar Serbs. However, these types of programs are long term, expensive (\$280,000 for only two roundtables) and do not necessarily fit within this portfolio that has short to medium-term objectives. Additionally, it is almost impossible to verify impact of these kinds of programs because the major output is dialogue. While there is nothing wrong with an end goal of bringing conflicting groups to the table in a regional, non-threatening setting, there is no evidence that there is a "trickle down" effect into Kosovo. That being said, the ET concludes that these types of high level, multilateral programs make more sense being funded directly out of the State Department through an intermediary such as the Project on Ethnic Relations.

#### ***Comparing CMP with Mercy Corps and IOM Programs***

In the SOW, USAID asked the ET to compare the eight CMP activities with projects implemented by Mercy Corps and IOM. These programs are categorized as small-scale community-based infrastructure projects that target minority populations in Kosovo.

#### *Activity Descriptions – CMI/MISI and CEDP*

Mercy Corps has been implementing the Municipal Integration and Support Initiative (MISI) in Kosovo since 2004, with its offshoot the Community Mobilization Initiative (CMI) which started in 2006. CMI/MISI uses "an incentive-based approach to encourage municipal authorities and communities to take leading roles in the process of return and reintegration of minority citizens."<sup>7</sup> Mercy Corps is active in 14 municipalities throughout Kosovo and emphasizes working with a Municipal Steering Committee (SCs) to determine the needs of the community. By working with the SCs, the program enhances the prospects of breaking down barriers between the communities and the municipality and reintegration of minority populations. The addition of CMI enabled Mercy Corps to work with the municipalities of Leposavic/Leposaviq and Zvecan/Zveqan in northern Kosovo to identify infrastructure projects to improve the quality of life for its residents.

IOM's program is called the Community Enhancement and Development Program (CEDP), which has been ongoing since 2006. The IOM project "concentrates on improving the living conditions of targeted

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://mercycorps.org/countries/kosovo/611>

residents of the northern part of Kosovo through the implementation of projects that are designed to respond rapidly, visibly, and at the community level to critical public needs.”<sup>8</sup> The CEDP projects are intended to be swiftly implemented with a high impact and visibility that demonstrates the willingness of the local authorities to improve the quality of life of their citizens in the northern municipalities of Mitrovica/Mitrovica town and Zubin Potok municipality. These projects are meant to augment the existing infrastructure and provide materials and equipment to identified institutions.

### *Findings*

These programs are distinct from the other CMP activities, with the exception of the PDC project, because they use infrastructure as a mechanism for allaying a propensity for unease and conflict as well as providing an incentive for displaced people to return to their communities. In the case of Mercy Corps, infrastructure projects are a mechanism to provide incentives for the municipal authorities to create an environment favorable for returnees and for reintegration of the minority populations. For IOM, it is to demonstrate that the infrastructure needs of the majority minority towns and municipalities in the north are not neglected. The other CMP projects used youth, information, and civil society organizations to try to reduce the propensity for conflict between communities. PDC’s project is an exception because it followed a similar model to CMI/MISI in working with a steering committee to identify the projects, though on a much smaller scale and at the town or village level.

### *Conclusions*

In terms of evaluating the CMI/MISI and CEDP approaches vis à vis the eight CMP projects, the ET concludes that there is value added in implementing both types of project simultaneously but not separately. The value and impact of the infrastructure projects could be amplified by using the youth organizations, NGOs, etc. to help announce the achievements. For example, in municipalities where CMI/MISI or CEDP is improving a structure or a road, a group of students in the youth council could cut the ribbon at the opening ceremony. In other words, involving the groups from the other CMP projects in the infrastructure projects would help reinforce the efforts.

Additionally, the team heard several times that these infrastructure projects, while valued, are sometimes less visible than the projects from the Serbian Government. For example, one respondent in northern Kosovo said about the MISI project, “There is positive influence on people’s mind that they participate in decision-making. However, it is not enough to have a greater impact. Because, Serbia invests in this area and their investments are bigger and more visible to the people.” One way to mitigate Serbia’s influence is to involve more than the municipality and some community members in the decision-making process by having public information campaigns and involving other active organizations in the communities.

However, there is a danger with the infrastructure projects that communities establish a veneer of cooperation to receive infrastructure improvements, while behind the scenes ethnic tensions are boiling under the surface. The ET observed that in the town of Bablak there is an appearance of cooperation among the entire community, so it has received the attention of both PDC and Mercy Corps. However, there are still problems under the surface with regards to Serbian cooperation with K-Albanians.

## **VI. General Findings**

In this section we present the findings from 28 key informant interviews with regard to their views about ethnic relationships in Kosovo, their own optimism and whether they intend to remain in Kosovo, and what is the most important issue for which donor assistance would be helpful.

Key Informants (KI) are all leaders and/or implementers and/or participants in various aspects of the eight activities funded by USAID under the Conflict Mitigation Program cross-cutting strategy. Together they comprise a representative sample of activists at different levels in each of the funded projects. Due to

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.iomkosovo.org/Projects.html>

time constraints and the need to understand the performance of each of eight projects, the evaluation team was unable interview otherwise knowledgeable Kosovars who were not direct implementers/participants.

The interview consisted of two parts: first, the KI explanation and assessment of their particular project, and second, a series of more general questions about ethnic relations in Kosovo. The findings presented below represent, for the most part, the results of the second part of the interview.<sup>9</sup>

**Table 2: Political Relations between ethnic groups in this Area Now**

Scale	K-Serbian N=14	K-Albanian N=14
Very bad 1	4	1
2	3	3
3	2	2
4		3
Very good 5	1	1
N/A	4	4

**Table 3: Political relations between ethnic groups now compared to one year ago**

Scale	K-Serbian N=14	K-Albanian N=14
Much Worse	5	1
Somewhat Worse	2	4
No Change	2	2
Somewhat Better	1	3
Much Better		1
N/A	4	3

K-Serbian respondents were more likely than K-Albanians to describe relationships as bad and having become worse than a year previous. In opened ended responses, key informants from the K-Serbian group described relations as “tense,” “frozen,” “devastated,” and lacking in “trust.” K-Albanian respondents agreed that things were bad at the political level, and noted that people were separated, fearful, and that the K-Serbian population was “not ready” to accept Kosovo’s independence. Of note is the statement by three K-Serbian respondents, who said they were not angry at K-Albanians, but their anger was directed to “the international community” including the United States.

Many respondents made a sharp distinction between the “political” relationship and “personal” relations, especially in enclave areas outside the separated northern municipalities. Both K-Serb and K-Albanians, older people especially, referred to “good personal relations” “before the war.” What is meant by this is difficult to say.

Asked about the causes behind ethnic tension, K-Serbian respondents referred to the “unilateral declaration of independence,” “parallel institutions,” “manipulation by higher level politicians,” and

---

<sup>9</sup> The calculation of percentages was not done due to the relatively small number of key informants participating. Percentages would have given a misleading sense of precision and weight to the distribution of responses.

“disrespect for the rules of negotiation.” K-Albanian respondents tended to identify Belgrade as the “manipulator,” while UNMIK and the Kosovo government were criticized for not being credible or effective.

**Table 4: Key Informant Estimate of Positive Improvement from Project**

Scale	All Key Informants N=28
No Improvements	0
1	
2	3
3	2
4	5
Significant Positive	1
Too Early	5
Can't Say	4
N/A	8

As noted above, Key Informants were leaders, implementers or participants in the USAID funded CM projects. As such, we expected that there would be a natural inclination to attribute positive outcomes to the projects even among K-Serbian participants. However, nine of the 28 respondents were unable to judge whether the USAID funded conflict projects they participated in had made a difference, five stated little or some difference, and 6 saw the project as having real impact.

Questions about media programs that sought to improve inter-ethnic relationships did not turn up evidence of KIs’ remembering watching USAID funded programs. Other than TV Station personnel, only two KIs mentioned the TV Magazine, while 3 mentioned Sesame Street.

Concerning knowledge about the Ahtisaari plan, seven of nine K-Serbian KIs said they were well to fully informed, compared to three of six K-Albanians who were well or fully informed.

Asked about where they get their information, respondents mentioned RTS and RTK, KFOR, B92, and, most frequently, the Internet.

### **Optimism about a future in an Independent Kosovo**

Asked about how people in their area feel about the future, K-Serbian respondents used terms such as “scared,” “no future,” and, most frequently, “insecure.” However one K-Serbian informant said people were “terrorized by Belgrade.” For some K-Serbian respondents, they simply asserted that independence had no effect, because it was not operative for their area. They were still a part of K-Serbia.

K-Albanians were much more positive, using terms like “relief,” “more secure,” “now a citizen,” and simply “happy.” Some looked forward to entry into Europe.

**Table 5: Key Informant Plans to Leave Kosovo**

Scale	K-Serbian N=14	K-Albanian N=14
No Plan to Leave	8	8
1		
2	0	2
3	2	0
4	0	0
Firm Plan to	0	0

Leave 5		
N/A	4	4

**Table 6: Key Informant Optimism about Future in Independent Kosovo**

Scale	K-Serbian N=14	K-Albanian N=14
No Optimism 1	5	0
2	3	0
3	3	0
4	0	6
Most Optimistic	0	5
N/A	3	3

While most K-Serbian Key Informants have no plans to leave Kosovo, neither do they have optimism for the future. Reasons varied from, “I have my business here” to “My children are in school” to “this is my home.” K-Albanians are very optimistic about the future in an independent Kosovo.

Key Informants were asked to suggest the most useful kinds of programs that could be done with donor assistance to improve security and stability in their area. **Of the 23 specific suggestions made, 14 had to do with jobs, economic development and promotion of private enterprise.** Other suggestions were “longer term projects,” “improve security,” “get UNMIK” out,” “environmental cleanup” and, from one very emphatic person, “after nine years you haven’t got the electricity up and running: FIX THE ELECTRICITY.”

## VII. General Conclusions: Impact and Sustainability of the USAID/Kosovo CMP

1. The USAID Conflict Mitigation program has produced important benefits for those who participated. As noted in the project by project findings, students did learn skills regarding citizenship, dispute resolution, how to think through problems, and other citizenship skills that will serve them well in the future. Some communities did benefit from local projects funded through small grants. Grants to TV stations did strengthen production experience and relationships between K-Serbian and K-Albanian language stations. Educators especially welcomed innovative approaches to citizenship development in CRS and CIVITAS programs.
2. Another benefit of the program was the creation of a cadre of trained facilitators, educators, NGO leaders and citizen activists through participation in many of the CM programs. The list of “Human Resource Assets” created by the program is included as Annex VIII. The question is the extent to which persons trained in the current program can be utilized in subsequent development programs.
3. Several information campaigns sponsored by AED may “have been appropriate,” as one respondent put it, during the 2007 period of Ahtisaari negotiations, but the particular impact of these programs is difficult to determine. Among the several media sources of information reported by respondents, including the internet and TV, none funded by USAID stood out, although it is possible that these efforts contributed to the general fund of information available to interested people. Among the Key Informants, most were unable to tell us with any specificity where their information came from. Moreover, as Key Informant activists in USAID funded projects, more K-Serbians than K-Albanians felt they were knowledgeable about the Ahtisaari Plan. However, immediate post event surveys did indicate that participants in the town hall meetings valued the program at the time.<sup>10</sup> In general, with

10 USAID in its comments on the working draft referring to the various media efforts: “The productions were never branded as AED or USAID, the campaigns were done as part of a concerted effort with the government a bore a motto ‘Kosovo Welcomes the

the evidence at hand, we are unable to attribute program level impact to the USAID information efforts.

4. The impact of the CMP on reconciliation and conflict mitigation is substantially less than anticipated in most of the original proposals. Even among K-Serbian activists who were directly involved in the projects, their optimism about a future in Kosovo remains very low. K-Serbian and K-Albanian participants agree that political- ethnic relationships between K-Serbs and K-Albanians has deteriorated, and for the K-Serbian side, their attitudes are characterized by fear, uncertainty and lack of trust. This finding is supported by the macro-level studies undertaken by UNDP with USAID funding.

There are many reasons for the gap between project expectations and the actual impact on conflict mitigation and reconciliation. These reasons are more fully discussed in the introduction to the recommended new approach to conflict mitigation found in the separate report submitted to USAID Kosovo. Summarized here, the main reasons are:

- Fragile program hypotheses mostly focused on the personal level, by breaking down ethnic - stereotypes, increasing communication, promoting contact and ethnic-interaction, and joint decision making for the production or acquisition of a public good. Personal level programs may produce micro-level, or community benefits, but these are rarely powerful enough to counter macro-level pressures against cooperation, or to overcome deeply held anxieties, fears, and loyalties based on ethnic affiliation and “collective memories of injustice.”
- The CM program activities lacked coherence, were geographically scattered, and were too limited in duration and numbers of people involved to have much impact.
- Although promoting inter-ethnic cooperation was a key feature of many of the activities, the level, frequency, intensity and magnitude of such cooperation was very limited, especially by mid 2007 and after the declaration of independence in February 2008.
- Many of the programs were structured as “pilot programs,” but with a few exceptions, the kind of rigorous evaluation of program outcomes usually found in a “pilot program” was completely lacking.
- Activities were isolated from each other and did not exploit opportunities for leveraging synergy and greater impact.

Where there is evidence of inter-ethnic cooperation associated with the CM activities, it is difficult to attribute this cooperation to the various interventions, as most informants claimed they already had relations prior to the commencement of the USAID funded activity.

5. A possible unanticipated consequence of the Conflict Mitigation Program approach is to re-enforce and, in some cases, to reward the maintenance of ethnic separation and difference. For example, community based infrastructure serving primarily one ethnic community “rewards” that community regardless of its position on cooperation and/or reconciliation. Participating in a “parallel” program rewards both without demanding much in the way of real cooperation. Cooperating in a kindergarten program aimed at starting ethnic interaction at the youngest level is producing benefits to the schools and to the parents that have little to do with, and far outweigh, anything that comes from ethnic interaction. The small and scattered nature of the USAID funded activities was probably not a major factor in this phenomenon, but taken together with UNMIK policies, the Ahtisaari plan, and other program activities focused on K-Serbian areas to the exclusion of K-Albanians, there is a tendency to reinforce separation and ethnic differences. This was noted by some KI respondents.
6. The sustainability of nearly all of the current CM activities is open to serious question, the value of the programs to participants not withstanding. These are not inexpensive programs given the anemic budget and capabilities of most Kosovo government entities. Along with the lack of rigorous

---

Future’. It was not possible to attribute this to AED and USAID. Besides, all that coverage on TV and roundtables was due to AED and USAID work in the background.

evaluation, there seems little effort to assess the financial and human resource implications of a roll out of these pilot programs, either in the Ministry of Education or by the project implementers.

7. The conflict mitigation program does little to address the primary concerns of both K-Serbian and K-Albanian residents. These are fear, uncertainty, isolation, and lack of employment and economic opportunity. These are personal concerns that make it relatively easy for political leaders to manipulate vulnerable people and, when it is advantageous, to promote protests and violence.
8. Kosovars of all ethnicities continue to be very confused about who is in charge of the country. They are not necessarily interested about the Ahtisaari plan or constitution but they want to know who is in charge, and who is protecting their rights as citizens. This is clear when looking at the reactions of the K-Serbs in the Final Findings report on the AED Roundtables and Town Hall Meetings – 74% do not want to participate in any discussions regarding the Ahtisaari plan.

### **VIII. Lesson Learned**

Any approach to reducing conflict must operate on several levels, political, material, and attitudinal. Reducing the propensity to engage in conflict, and mitigating the effects of conflict should be addressed but as an integral part of a strategy that addresses the primary causes of alienation and hostility on the one side, while on the other side, reorienting the material and societal incentives away from conflict, and towards building confidence, stakeholders, and an attitude of acceptance. The underlying assumption of this strategic reorientation is that it be long term, effectively enforced, and grounded in the institutions of a democratic and rule of law state and a productive, market oriented economy.

A multi-ethnic civil society is an important part of the strategy for reducing conflict. If the goal is to develop a multi-ethnic civil society in Kosovo, then there would have to be a more concerted effort at building capacity in terms of organizational development, implementation, and advocacy. In sum, a strategic grants program would be beneficial if linked to inter-ethnic cooperation and the development of organizational and personal capacities and skills.

### **IX. Recommendation**

The problem of mitigating conflict and the acceptance of the state of Kosovo need to be re-framed. Instead of focusing on reconciliation and conflict mitigation as the organizing goal of the next CM strategy, the focus should be on promoting confidence, stake-holding, and acceptance of a future in Kosovo. This should be done among the 19-26 age group that has the greatest potential for violent conflict, in part because it also has the highest rate of unemployment of any group. Bringing together K-Albanian and K-Serbian unemployed young people, local governments, civil society and the private sector in a program which creates jobs, produces public goods, and builds organizational capacity and personal skills will also reduce the propensity to violent conflict. A coherent strategy which will produce short term benefits while building assets for longer term economic and political development is presented to USAID in a separate report.

**SCOPE OF WORK**  
**Evaluation of USAID/Kosovo's Conflict Mitigation Program**

**I. Purpose**

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the implementation, effectiveness and outcome of activities executed under USAID Kosovo's Conflict Mitigation Program. In particular, it will evaluate the programmatic impact of major components of the programs addressing:

- 1) Supporting ethnic reconciliation among youth:** the "Youth Securing the Future (YSF)" project implemented by Catholic Relief Services (CRS), the "Mozaik: A model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, Bilingual Pre-school Education in Kosovo" project implemented by Save the Children, UK, "Reconciliation through Civic Education" project implemented by the Center for Civic Education (CCE), and "Sesame Street" project implemented by Sesame Workshop.
- 2) Creating civil society and community linkages across the ethnic divide:** the "Kosovo Community Reconciliation Program (KCRP)" implemented by Freedom House, and "Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation (KICCR)" project implemented by Partners for Democratic Change (PDC).
- 3) Increasing the awareness of Kosovo's leaders and the public at large about the underlying causes of conflict and peace processes in Kosovo:** the "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo" (SPSK) project implemented by Academy for Educational Development (AED), and the regional "Improving Interethnic Relations in the Western Balkans" project implemented by Project on Ethnic Relations (PER).

As implementation of the Conflict Mitigation program began, USAID observed that the acceleration of a political process leading to Kosovo's independence was exacerbating feelings of isolation and vulnerability among Kosovo's Serb communities. Increasing visibility and engagement with Kosovo Serbs assumed greater importance to USG. As such, a fourth "cross cutting" component was added to the portfolio:

**4) Enhance engagement with Kosovo Serbs to encourage their identity as integral members of Kosovo society.**

With over two years of assistance to the overall reconciliation and conflict mitigation efforts in Kosovo (excluding two distinct small-scale infrastructure projects targeting minority populations in Kosovo<sup>11</sup>) USAID has committed over \$5.7 million in this area. The Mission requests proposals from prospective bidders for a formal evaluation of impact made under the Conflict Mitigation Program, including lessons learned and implications for future assistance.

The evaluation will provide the Mission with a set of findings and conclusions for each of the components, examine the results in each particular component's portfolio that contribute towards attainment of the overall component goals, as well as evaluating USAID's mix of approaches and analyzing if that balance is effective and efficient in mitigating the potential for conflict. The evaluation will serve as the 'lessons learned' and form the basis of future engagement in this area vis-à-vis social and political environment in Kosovo.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Community Development and Enhancement Program (CEDP) implemented by International Organization for Migration (IOM), and Community Mobilization Initiative/Municipal Integration Support Initiative (CMI/MISI) implemented by Mercy Corps.

## II. Background

As described in an assessment<sup>12</sup> conducted by USAID's Conflict Management and Mitigation Office (CMM) and staff from the E&E Bureau in March 2005, "Kosovo exists in a state of lingering low-level conflict, as opposed to a traditional post-conflict situation. Deep-seated economic problems, inter-ethnic distrust, and politicized government institutions are destabilizing elements that have kept Kosovo at risk for violence since the war ended in 1999." However, outbreaks of actual violence today are rare. Since March 2004, when rioting occurred in 33 locations across Kosovo and resulted in deaths and destruction of homes and churches, there have not been major violent incidents.

However, Kosovo's future status remains undecided, and the growing tension is a cause for concern. The most recent UNDP Early Warning Polls (March, June and Oct. 2007<sup>13</sup>) indicate a significant drop in the public's confidence in government and international institutions in Kosovo. The satisfaction level with key governing institutions remains critically low. As of October 2007, approximately 28% of the Kosovo population is satisfied with the work of Kosovo Government and 29% with UN Administration in Kosovo (UNMIK). Polling also shows worrying trends in indicators measuring inter-ethnic relations and willingness to protest. The percentage of Kosovo Serbs expressing willingness to "work with Albanians" fell from 79% to 28% in six months. More than 50% of Albanians and 29% of Serbs consider that a prolonged status process would negatively impact inter-ethnic relations. Finally, more Kosovars than ever - 66% - are willing to protest for political reasons. Political events and the population's response to them, requires that USAID analyzes current approaches to reconciliation in Kosovo.

## III. USAID assistance

USAID/Kosovo's Conflict Mitigation Program aims to address the underlying causes of conflict by bringing together youth of all ethnic groups, creating linkages across the ethnic divide, and increasing the awareness about the final status process.

### 1) Supporting youth reconciliation among ethnic groups

*"Youth Securing the Future (YSF)" project  
Implemented by Catholic Relief Services (CRS)  
(May 2006 – May 2009, \$893,636)*

YSF is a three-year project to reduce concerns about security among high school age youth. The project employs tolerance trainings, community dialogues, political participation, leadership training, problem identification and solving, vocational training and internship training programs that target in-school and out-of-school youth. YSF also reduces local ultra-nationalism by influencing local decision-makers and advocating for acceptance of diversity. YSF works in seven municipalities in north and northwest Kosovo, connecting youth in 26 high schools across ethnic communities for social engagement and volunteerism.

*"Mozaik: A Model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, Bilingual Pre-school Education in Kosovo" project  
Implemented by Save the Children, UK  
(September 2006 – September 2008, \$417,007)*

The "Mozaik" project introduces age-appropriate training in conflict-resolution skills for children within the public kindergarten system, and brings children, parents, teachers and communities together for the first time to attend multi-cultural bilingual kindergartens in a pilot program. This activity also incorporates community outreach to enable parents, families and communities to reinforce their children's positive learning in the classroom. The overall goal of Mozaik is to reduce conflict and increase communication between members of participating communities. Mozaik works with teachers in three kindergartens over two years. A follow-up teacher training system will be set up through the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MEST) and the Faculty of Education.

---

<sup>12</sup> This assessment will be provided to the contractor as part of the package of documents to be reviewed during the evaluation.

<sup>13</sup> See previous Early Warning Reports, [www.kosovo.undp.org](http://www.kosovo.undp.org) publications.

*“Reconciliation through Civic Education” project  
Implemented by Center for Civic Education (CCE)  
(April 2007 – September 2008, \$330,000)*

This project develops and implements civic education programs in classrooms at 6th - 12th grade levels at selected schools across Kosovo. These programs focus upon the development, among teachers and their students, of an understanding of the fundamental values, principles, and institutions of constitutional democracy, especially political tolerance, respect for the rule of law, and support for the equality of all citizens -- all of which assume reciprocity between citizen and state, and all fundamental to a sustained and properly functioning democratic system. The program also targets political and civic leaders, school administrators, community leaders, and pre-service university professors. The three main CCE stated objectives are to: 1) decrease inter-group enmity within and between Kosovo’s various ethnic groups by establishing long-term intervention efforts at the 6-12th grade levels, 2) introduce curricular programs to guide the development of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for competent and responsible participation in democratic self-government, 3) implement sustainable elementary and secondary civic education programs in public and private schools throughout Kosovo’s seven educational districts.

*Sesame Street project – Season Two  
Implemented by Sesame Workshop  
(October 2005 – September 2007, \$500,527)*

Season Two consisted of production of 26 half-hour episodes of pre-edited Sesame Workshop library material which included Muppet and animation segments that address a range of cognitive and pro-social educational objectives, such as numeracy, health and social relations. All materials were dubbed into Albanian and Serbian and broadcast through Radio Television of Kosovo (RTK), and three local Serbian TV stations. In addition to TV production, the project included an educational outreach initiative that extended the project goals beyond the television viewing experience. This outreach included production of storybooks that support and reinforce the program’s core messages, and a facilitator’s guide for parents and teachers to provide developmentally appropriate tips using the materials at home and in the classroom.

## **2) Creating civil society and community linkages across the ethnic divide**

*The “Kosovo Community Reconciliation Program (KCRP)”  
Implemented by Freedom House  
(August 2006 – August 2008, \$650,000)*

The goal of the activity is to stabilize multi-ethnic communities and ease ethnic tension by mobilizing Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) around community-driven reconciliation initiatives. Through grants to CSOs, the activity aims to increase cooperation among and between multi-ethnic communities on issues such as freedom of movement, youth, religious freedom, local government cooperation and decentralization, free and objective media reporting on human rights, and cultural preservation. The project also provides professional support in reconciliation and networking techniques for CSOs through specially designed seminars and internship opportunities. The long-term objective of the program is to develop a network of strong CSOs to advocate for policies supporting multi-ethnicity and respect for diversity.

*“Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation (KICCR)” project  
Implemented by Partners for Democratic Change (PDC)  
(August 2006 – August 2007, \$252,096)*

KICCR contributed to reconciliation by empowering Kosovars to cooperatively address community conflicts. Participants in four targeted communities assessed unresolved conflicts in their communities, brought together stakeholders, and facilitated the resolution of contentious issues that are crucial for the economic and social revitalization of Kosovo, such as job creation, perceptions of safety and security, freedom of movement and access to education. The program 1) addressed specific, persistent local disputes that hinder full participation by minorities, young people and women in the economic, political and social life of municipalities; 2) built the foundation for communities to proactively address issues in a collaborative manner before they become Kosovo-wide or violent conflicts; and 3) built more trusting

relationships between majority and minority communities, and between government and civil society community members. This was done through a combination of training, coaching by experienced mediators, participatory assessment, cooperative planning, and grant-making.

### **3) Increasing the awareness of Kosovo's leaders and public at large about the underlying causes of conflict and peace processes in Kosovo**

*"Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo" (SPSK)  
Implemented by Academy for Educational Development (AED)  
(October 2005 – March 2008, \$2,393,793)*

The project's objective is to increase awareness and understanding among mainly Albanian Kosovars and Serbian Kosovars of the "other community's" perceptions, concerns, and opinions on social issues and inter-community relations, to trigger intra-community and inter-community dialogue on such issues, and to promote norms of tolerance and compromise during the Kosovo future status process. The project pursues this through core activities: 1) A Kosovo future status process "Knowledge-Attitudes-Practices" (KAP) survey of respondents in Kosovo and Serbia proper, with the findings disseminated widely to the media and to political, civil society, and international donor stakeholders in these geographic areas; 2) Kosovo team reporting "TV magazine" series on social issues (including future status issues) and inter-community relations that is produced jointly by journalist/cameraman teams from Albanian and Serbian Kosovar local TV stations, and broadcast on their TV stations and other stations in both Kosovo and Serbia proper; and 3) Provision of strategic communications technical assistance to Kosovo's Provisional Institutions of Self-Government (PISG) in unveiling the status settlement plan and status-related issues to avert misunderstanding about the status process which threatened to derail political progress and stability. The project implements information campaigns to communicate components of the plan and status process to the Kosovo public, both majority and minority populations.

*"Improving Interethnic Relations in the Western Balkans" project  
Implemented by Project on Ethnic Relations (PER)  
(May 2006 – April 2007, \$280,000)*

The project organized two international roundtables to cover a range of issues related to interethnic relations and regional cooperation. The first roundtable was held during the mid-2006 Kosovo negotiation process. It facilitated a policy-oriented discussion on how to deal with changing interethnic dynamics when former majorities become minorities. The second roundtable was scheduled to take place after the Kosovo status is determined, and encourage the region's politicians to shift their attention from issues of interethnic strife and ethnic gains to building a secure, prosperous, and forward-looking European region.

## **IV. Objectives of the Evaluation**

The principal objective of this evaluation study is to assess implementation and impact of assistance under the USAID/Kosovo Conflict Mitigation Program. More specifically, the evaluation should respond to, but not be limited to, the following key questions:

- For each activity, were desired results achieved? Did the results have an impact in promoting reconciliation and goals of major components within USAID/Kosovo Conflict Mitigation Program?
- What was the effectiveness and efficiency with which results were achieved? In evaluating efficiency, focus on USAID's mix and balance of approaches, sustainability and implementing mechanisms? How can we improve our portfolio in terms of balance and approaches including management units?
- What are the strengths, successes and overall impact of USAID assistance under the Conflict Mitigation Program?
- Which aspect of the program introduced innovative approaches?
- What were the shortcomings? where there any unintended negative impacts?
- What are the lessons learned?
- What are the major constraints facing assistance in this area?
- Did these programs contribute to mission objectives in democracy and governance, and economic growth programs?

- In weighting the strengths and shortcomings of program approaches, include in your consideration a comparison with the approach used under the two distinct small-scale community based infrastructure projects targeting minority populations in Kosovo (CEDP and CMI/MISI).
- Recommend sensible short-term goals for our assistance in conflict mitigation?

In addressing these questions the contractor shall utilize an evaluation methodology plan that includes:

- A review of available materials (implementing partner contracts and grant agreements and amendments; performance monitoring plans; quarterly reports, implementing partner surveys and external references)
- Key informant interviews with USAID/Washington and USAID/Kosovo staff, representatives of implementing partners, relevant UNMIK and PISG representatives and municipal officials.
- Surveys, focus group sessions, and/or one-on-one interviews of randomly selected stakeholders and end beneficiaries.
- Well-defined measures that will be used to evaluate performance, impact, cost-effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of achievements under the Conflict Mitigation Portfolio.

USAID/Kosovo will provide a list of potential interviewees and information sources before and upon arrival in Kosovo, as well as provide the above-mentioned documents.

## **V. Schedule and Deliverables**

### **A. Schedule**

It is anticipated that the Contractor will spend approximately up to five weeks in performing this evaluation. At the beginning of the period, and possibly after time in Kosovo, the Contractor shall spend up to 6 working days in US interviewing people who are familiar with the work in Kosovo and finalizing the report. The Contractor will spend up to 24 work days in Kosovo with an authorized six-day working week. USAID anticipates that the evaluation team will gain a solid familiarity with the programs prior to the field work in Kosovo.

The Contractor will begin work at a mutually acceptable time, after consultation with USAID/Kosovo. Field work in Kosovo should commence no later than February 25, 2008.

### **B. Deliverables**

- 1) A draft work plan outlining the schedule and course of the evaluation, to be submitted within two working days after arrival in Kosovo.
- 2) There is to be a briefing at the half-way point of the evaluation, with debrief before leaving Kosovo.
- 3) A draft of the final report shall be submitted to the Mission for review before the team leaves Kosovo. The Mission will respond with comments within 5 working days. The contractor shall submit the final report within 5 working days thereafter. The final report should contain an Executive Summary and should clearly identify the team's findings, conclusions, and lessons learned. Appendices should, at a minimum, list the people and organizations interviewed. The evaluation should be well-written and concise, not repetitive or unnecessarily wordy. The report (excluding annexes) should be no more than 30 pages, containing an executive summary of no more than five pages and the body of the report of no more than 25 pages.

### **C. Team Composition and Qualifications**

The Contractor's team will consist of three experts (the Mission envisions two expatriates and one local). The team leader will be assigned the ultimate responsibility for overall team coordination and development of the final report. It is assumed the team will conduct the site visits to ensure that a maximum number of project sites can be visited. The team leader must be a senior evaluator with

experience conducting similar evaluations of USAID programs and activities, and possess at least ten years of development experience.

The other team members should have an optimal mix of expertise in some or all of the following areas: conflict mitigation and conflict resolution, social services, education, media, community and civil society development. Experience in the Balkans is desirable. Consultants with significant experience in developing countries in their areas of specialty are preferred.

USAID/Kosovo will engage a specialist from USAID/Washington or neighboring Missions in the region to join the team during field work in Kosovo. In addition, USAID/Kosovo staff from the Program and Project Development Office (PPO) will be available to provide background information and materials.

D. Logistical support

The Contractor is responsible for obtaining its own logistical support in Kosovo, including accommodations, translation, transport and secretarial support.

E. Payment terms

Final payment will be made upon submission and approval of the final report.

### **A New USAID Kosovo Confidence Building Strategy**

***“Build Confidence on the part of all citizens of all backgrounds”***

***“Develop initiatives in the informal education sector to meet the unique needs of youth outside the education sector”***

***“Increase efforts to strengthen local government capacity through programming and partnerships”***

**Lessons for Kosovo’s Next Transition**  
**Discussion Paper #1, Mercy Corp, February 2007**

***“Instead of focusing on “reconciliation,” focus on the shared interest in economic development”***

***“Under polarizing political circumstances, it takes time to build the trust necessary to convince people to participate”***

**Lessons Learned: A Review of the Kosovo Inclusive**  
**Community Change and Reconciliation Program**  
**Partners for Democratic Change, December 2007**

### **The current Conflict Management Program**

The program evaluation of the USAID Kosovo Conflict Mitigation program, organized under a cross-cutting Strategic Objective, has concluded that the various activities funded over the 2005-2008 period have produced benefits for various participants. As a ‘conflict mitigation’ program, the strategy is somewhat misdirected, since there has been only one serious confrontation since 2006 when most of the programs were introduced. However, the impact of the program on advancing reconciliation, reducing the propensity for violent confrontation, and on convincing Serbian minorities to accept the political reality of an independent Kosovo has been relatively minor. The reasons for this lie in the small scale of most of the activities; the limited level of interaction actually achieved between ethnic communities; the lack of coordination, synergy and leverage among the activities, and with other USAID strategic programs; the relatively short time periods for each effort; and the weakness of the underlying program theory and causal logic of the various activities. Moreover, the justification for the projects as ‘pilot projects’ does not appear to be warranted, as, with a few exceptions, serious evaluation of the impact, cost and benefits, the sustainability of these activities and the development of replication strategies has not been undertaken. As a ‘coherent strategy’ this conflict mitigation program falls far short of its goals and objectives.

### **Building Confidence, Acceptance and Stakeholders in a Kosovo future**

Conflict Mitigation is important, as are efforts to improve communication, respect and tolerance. In Kosovo at the present time, there are powerful factors that contribute to hostility and the potential for conflict which must be addressed by changing the incentive structures away from a propensity for conflict, to an incentive structure that supports material well being (jobs), security (effective policing, justice), and confidence in a future (acceptance of the reality of a Kosovo state). Until Serbs become stakeholders in Kosovo, they will cling to a political allegiance to Serbia, reinforced by Belgrade’s propaganda and material support (to civil servants, teachers, retirees, educators, utility workers, etc.). Serbians will always be Serbs, but the question is, can Serbs sever their political allegiance to Serbia, and accept that they can live and prosper as a minority in an Albanian majority society and nation? Sovereignty cannot be divided. There are only three options: 1) Kosovo extends its sovereignty over Serbians living in the border areas and in the enclaves with no special arrangements for governing the Serbian populations in those areas; 2) the border areas are joined with the Serbian state, while smaller enclaves are governed by Kosovo state; or 3) some kind of autonomous status is carved out by which the Serbian contiguous

areas are nominally within Kosovo (border security, customs, national taxes, police, and elected national level representatives), but in all other functions they are self-administering. The current situation whereby the border areas are administered by UNMIK, KFOR, Serbia and Kosovo is untenable and perpetuates a sense of insecurity for many, and the hope by some that the Serbian majority areas can remain a part of the Serbian state.

Discussions with the USAID Program Office staff identified three possible programmatic approaches to reducing the propensity to conflict<sup>14</sup>: 1) multiethnic cooperation, 2) outreach to Serbs (independent of others), and 3) Serbs as ‘triggers of conflict.’ The ET recognizes that in a diverse society, the protection of the rights of minorities and efforts to integrate minorities in to the larger economy and polity are of critical importance in the proper functioning of a democratic nation.

Our examination of the actual participants in the conflict mitigation programs shows that among the eight programs, only the AED, CRS/YSF, Partners and Mozaik/Save actually brought together members of the ethnic communities in joint activities. AED paired Albanian and Serbian television stations to produce TV Magazine episodes and one documentary. YSF promoted joint meetings between Serbian and Albanian student council leaders. Partners supported joint decision making for selection of community projects in mixed villages. At the kindergarten level, Save’s Mozaik project brought together pre-school children from the Albanian, Bosniak, and Turkish communities, as well as two Serbian siblings from a Serbian community in Kamenica. In each of these programs, efforts to engage Serbian and Albanian communities were difficult to realize, largely for reasons that have to do with structural and macro-policy issues rather than lack of effort by the activity implementers.

ET’s critique of many of these activities is that while nearly all have intrinsic merit, the current effort is addressing dimensions of the conflict which are relatively minor factors in causing, creating and supporting the conditions for Serbian-Albanian inter-ethnic conflict. Also, the current program is engaging with locales and segments of the population which probably have the least propensity to conflict, for example elderly Serbians living in scattered enclaves, and pre-school and young people still in high school, or communities characterized by the presence of other ethnic minorities rather than Serbs.

Based on our interviews and experience in other countries with a history of conflict, past and present, we find that the important causes of a propensity to conflict are:

1. History: everyone has a story about the war and the ravages that occurred. Both sides have reason to be angry and fearful of the other. Both sides have been willing to take to the streets and to inflict violence on individuals as well as revered symbols of the other community.
2. Language: the lack of a lingua franca shared by all Kosovars contributes to separation by neighborhood, in schools, in the work place, and in government. While many older generation Kosovars are bi-lingual, especially in the professional classes, the younger generation of Kosovars speak only Albanian or Serbian. English may be emerging as a common language, but its functionality may be more than a generation in the future.
3. Political Position: Albanians now have their ‘state;’ they are willing to suspend their anger and desire for ‘justice’ for the 1999 war, and to accept Serbians into Kosovo if this is ‘the price’ of independence and entry into Europe. How long this will last before desires for ‘revenge’ reassert themselves is an open question. Unless economic and social conditions improve in Kosovo, special treatment and benefits to the Serbian populations will not be tolerated for long.

On the other side, Serbia has ‘lost,’ at least for now, the political fight to keep Kosovo as a province of Serbia; but Serbians in Kosovo still define themselves as Serbians, carry Serbian

---

<sup>14</sup> Rather than ‘mitigating’ conflict, the authors prefer to ‘reduce the propensity’ for conflict by changing incentive structures and building positive confidence in a society.

passports/identification, are administered in some areas by Serbian government, and their kids go to separate schools run by Serbian principals and teachers who report to Belgrade. K-Serbs may profess willingness to cooperate with Albanians at the personal, commercial and/or professional level, but they are held hostage to the political resistance of Belgrade to the loss of a province once ruled by and considered a historical part of Serbia. Belgrade exerts considerable pressure on civil servants receiving salaries, on elderly people receiving pensions, and Serbs living in Kosovo who are also stakeholders in Serbia through family, property etc, and through general fear mongering through Serbian media.

4. Insecurity: there is little or no trust among Serbs in Kosovo's justice institutions or in the possibility of being governed fairly in a Kosovo Albanian majority state. See, for example, the Open Society survey of 2007 for Serbian attitudes toward an independent Kosovo, or the USAID funded UNDP Early Warning Surveys, both of which demonstrate deterioration in confidence, trust and acceptance of a permanent, independent Kosovo state.
5. Lack of clarity with regards to who is 'in charge'...KFOR, UNMIK, KPS, Americans: Lack of clarity breeds anxiety and opportunism for those who wish to take advantage of the situation to agitate for a return to the status quo ante. For many in the Serbian community, this uncertainty perpetuates the belief in the possibility of a political outcome more favorable to their desire to be independent of Kosovo sovereignty.
6. Parallelism, and corresponding emphasis on institutionalizing ethnic distrust, isolation, separation of communities through UNMIK, and some donor assistance programs contribute to the 'institutionalization' of separation, rather than creating incentives for acceptance and ultimate integration. For many in the North and elsewhere, there are economic and social benefits in the current situation.
7. Poor local government services, whether transport, infrastructure maintenance, social services. Because enclave Serbs tend to live in smaller rural communities, they are more difficult to serve, and hence are/feel neglected by a new Kosovo government.
8. Passive entitlement culture: An expectation that government will/should solve all problems exists especially among older people.
9. Poor sense of democratic citizenship, democratic culture and accountability linkages between political decision makers and local people. Even if people on both sides would rather avoid conflict, they lack the ability to resist extremist leaders or to hold them accountable for engaging in destructive behavior. This 'powerlessness' is reinforced by the economic dependency in the K-Serbian population as noted above.
10. Unemployment: an anemic economy constrained in part by past conflict factors, depending on direct and indirect foreign spending and assistance. Unemployment and lack of prospects creates despair, frustration, anomie, and anger looking for a scapegoat. This is especially the case for the age group 19-26, who have graduated from High School, but are having difficulty finding jobs.
11. While youth are often the front lines of violent confrontations, the instigators and organizers of protests and confrontations are more likely to be mature adults in their forties and fifties. It is this group that grew up in the 'good old days' of Yugoslavia, with guaranteed employment, and Serbian political dominance, and who now suffer from loss of status and economic and political security. Those with jobs generally work for the Serbian state. (See USAID Kosovo, "Assessment of Economic Conditions and Possible Development Projects in Northern Kosovo," October 2006, for data on income sources and unemployment in the four northern municipalities with Serbian majorities.)

There are a number of factors which may be contributing to but are not the primary causes of an increased proclivity to conflict in Kosovo. These are:

1. Lack of empathy or 'understanding' of the similarities of, or troubles faced by the other side. Shared misery is not necessarily an incentive to accept, cooperate or eventually integrate. Kosovars of all ethnic backgrounds have a good understanding of the various problems associated with an anemic economy, under-funded public services, and limited educational opportunities.
2. Unwillingness of young people to interact, co-operate, or work together when there are both collective and selective benefits for doing so. Most Serbian respondents interviewed by ET say that they are willing to work with Albanians in paying jobs and visa versa.
3. The anxieties of older Serbian populations scattered in small enclaves throughout Kosovo do not significantly contribute to the propensity to conflict, even though older people may blame their troubles on the current political status. It is unlikely that pensioners will be the instigators of conflict, and there is little evidence that these feeling are assuaged by current conflict mitigation programs, except in those programs that offer some collective benefit through cooperation.
4. Unwillingness of older people to live in same small town or village. Older Serbs have left and returned, or have continued to reside in Albanian majority areas. In 'mixed' villages (that is, where populations are not separated into distinct neighborhoods), older people of both communities have learned each others language and claim that before the war, they 'got along' with other communities.
5. Unwillingness of farmers to work together for a common material gain. A cooperative of Albanian and Serbian wine grape producers was formed in Rahovec/Orahovac without donor instigation and support, later receiving a small grant to travel together to Macedonia to observe vita-culture practices there. USAID consultants are pessimistic about the growth potential of the Kosovo wine industry, but the formation of the cooperative suggests that where there is an economic incentive, farmers of both communities can cooperate in a structured form. (See USAID Kosovo: "The State of the Wine Industry in Kosovo" July 21, 2006.)
6. Lack of sophisticated knowledge of current events, plans, actions. Media does shape or reinforce attitudes and in certain situations, behaviors as well. For media to be effective, it has to be more or less continuous, repetitive, and relatively simple in its messages. Episodic efforts to enhance knowledge of complex situations independent of what is being transmitted through regular TV, radio and newspapers are difficult to evaluate.

Much of the current conflict management portfolio is focused on these kinds of causal factors. The current program does not address, or does not affect with sufficient comprehensiveness, persistence and level of effort the causal power of the major factors contributing to the propensity to conflict. More powerful historical, macro-political and economic factors will always trump the impact of conflict mitigation programs of the type funded by USAID from 2005 to the present. Much of the current program does not engage Serbs and Albanians in sufficient numbers, frequency, or intensity to fundamentally change attitudes, behaviors or the incentive structures necessary to encourage permanent changes in both. It does not produce sufficient benefits to convert distrustful skeptics into 'accepting participants' and stakeholders in the new reality. As noted, each of these programs has intrinsic merit, and some may well be integrated into a more comprehensive effort that addresses macro constraints, at least in the short to medium term.

The ET believes that unless the structural factors that contribute to the propensity to ethnic conflict are addressed, the danger of conflict, confrontation and other forms of destabilization will persist, and could cause havoc at any time. The team believes that useful elements of conflict mitigation approaches can

be integrated into a development program that emphasizes economic development, good governance, including rule of law, and civil society in the more comprehensive sense of the word, that is, to include democratic citizen education in schools. Finally, the team believes that the current policy of providing exclusive benefits to Serbian majority areas, permitting parallel institutions to persist, and maintaining the separation of the communities may contribute to short term stability, along with KFOR, but does little to promote confidence building and acceptance among the Serbian population. It may in time generate a backlash of resentment among K-Albanians who are struggling as well.

We are painfully aware that some of these causal factors can never be adequately addressed or 'mitigated' through the efforts of a relatively short term foreign assistance program. Bias, intolerance, discrimination and separation are features of US society, notwithstanding decades of effort and many social programs designed to overcome them. Nor can a program change the macro-dynamics of Balkan politics. We do believe that a well designed, comprehensive, and materially helpful program can help to "dry up the lake" in which intolerance thrives.

ANNEX III: Interview Schedule

**Interview Schedule  
Richard Blue and Susan Kupperstein  
USAID/Kosovo Conflict Mitigation Program Evaluation**

**Thursday, March 13, 2008**  
US

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Judith Dunbar USAID/CMM 1- 202-712-4186	USAID donor meeting	USAID	3:00pm

**Friday, March 14, 2008**  
US

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Allison Poyac-Clarkin Sr Prog Officer Former Sr Tech Advisor/Program Manager Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo 1825 Connecticut Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20009-5721 Tel. 202-884-8000 <a href="mailto:aclarkin@aed.org">aclarkin@aed.org</a>	Implementing Partner Meeting	AED offices	10:00am
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Laina Reynolds Levy Program Manager Partners for Democratic Change 182 Second Street, Suite 301 San Francisco, CA 94105 Tel: 415-896-5000 ext. 309 Fax: 415-896-5005 Skype: lainalevy <a href="mailto:lrlevy@partnersglobal.org">lrlevy@partnersglobal.org</a> <a href="http://www.partnersglobal.org">http://www.partnersglobal.org</a>	Implementing Partner Meeting	Conference call	1:50pm
Susan Kupperstein	Arlene Benitez Assistant Director CIVITAS International Programs Center for Civic Education 5145 Douglas Fir Road Calabasas, CA 91302 Phone: 818-591-9321 <a href="http://www.civiced.org">www.civiced.org</a>	Implementing Partner Meeting	Conference call	3:00pm

**Monday, March 17, 2008**  
US

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Dan Donohue Country Director Sesame Workshop 1 Lincoln Plaza New York, NY 10023 tel: 212-875-6845 fax: 212-875-7349 <a href="mailto:dan.donohue@sesameworkshop.org">dan.donohue@sesameworkshop.org</a> and Ilana Umansky <a href="mailto:Ilana.Umansky@sesameworkshop.org">Ilana.Umansky@sesameworkshop.org</a>	Implementing Partner	Conference Call	2pm
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Alex N. Grigor'ev Executive Director Project on Ethnic Relations 15 Chambers Street Princeton, NJ 08542-3707, USA Tel +1-609-683-5666 Fax +1-419-858-4443 Email <a href="mailto:alex.grigorev@per-usa.org">alex.grigorev@per-usa.org</a> Web <a href="http://www.per-usa.org">www.per-usa.org</a>	Implementing Partner	Conference Call	3pm

**Thursday, March 20, 2008**  
Pristina

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	In brief with USAID/Kosovo Program Office Peter Duffy Urim Ahmeti Perihane Ymeri	USAID donor	USAID	9:00
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Overview of Decentralization USAID Local Governance programs - Jeton Cana	USAID Donor	USAID	10:00
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Catherine Rothenberger Mercy Corps Mission Director <a href="mailto:missiondirector@ks.mercycorps.org">missiondirector@ks.mercycorps.org</a> +38138/549-704; 044/120-023	Comparison Implementer	Mercy Corps Office	15:00
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Andrew Phelan Program manager  Radovan Jovanovic	Comparison Implementer	IOM offices	16:30

	Program Assistant  Community Enhancement and Development Program (CEDP) IOM (mob)044161644 or 0637361872; Dragodan, Arberia Prishtine			
--	--	--	--	--

**Friday, March 21, 2008**

Pristina

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Florent Vranica "Youth securing the future" project, manager (Catholic Relief Services) 044 500 760 Bregu i Diellit,	Implementing Partner Meeting	CRS offices	9: 00 am
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Ahmet Kryeziu Project manager 044 599 599 Petrit Myrtezaj 044 588 488 Dragodan, Near USAID	Implementing Partner meeting	Save the children offices	11:00
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Zana Krasniqi Project Manager Freedom House/KCRP 044 235 911 Prishtine	Implementing Partner meeting	Hotel Pristina Restaurant	14:00
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Michael Farbman USAID/Kosovo Mission Director	USAID Donor	USAID offices	16:00

**Saturday, March 22, 2008**

Pristina

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Shukrije Gashi Project director, KICCR/ PDC/Partners Kosova 044 502 198 038 543 350 Address: Kurrizi, Dardania SU 1/3 no.11, 3rd floor	Implementing Partner Meeting	PDC Offices	9:30
Richard Blue  Susan	Shpresa Mulliqi Project director Sesame Workshop	Implementing Partner Meeting	Hotel Pristina	12:00

Kupperstein	044 115 679			
-------------	-------------	--	--	--

**Monday, March 24, 2008**

Pristina

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Besim Beqaj Director of Center for Civic Education 044 500 499 Eqrem Çabej 31 (përballë palestrës "1 Tetori"), 10000 Prishtinë, Kosovë Tel & fax: + 381 38 222 383;	Implementing Partner Meeting	CIVITAS offices	11:30
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Leon Malazogo PER Representative	Implementing Partner Meeting	A&A Restaurant	2:00

**Tuesday, March 25, 2008**

Pristina

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Mytaher Haskuka Program manager of Early warning reports 038 249 066 Pejton, main UNDP offices	Information gathering	UNDP offices	9:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Polly Grant Project Director Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo/ AED	Implementing Partner Meeting	AED offices	10:30
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Tina Kaidanow Chief of Mission US Office in Pristina	US Government	USOP Office	15:00

**Wednesday, March 26, 2008**

Mitrovica

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Adnan Hasi Program Officer  Afrodite ? Program Assistant  YSF/CRS Mob: +377 44 176 216 Office: +381 28 530 482 <a href="mailto:ahasi@eme.crs.org">ahasi@eme.crs.org</a>	Implementing Partner	CRS offices South Mitrovica	10:00

Irina Gudeljevic	Petar Prica Program Manager (COP), CRS Kosovo Youth Securing the Future Mob: +377 44 176 255, +381 65 422 66 55 pprica@eme.crs.org	Implementing Partner Meeting	CRS offices, Zvecan	10:00am
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Migjen Abrashi Program Director, Galaxy Stars, YSF/CRS Mob: +377 44 310 099; +381 63 75 74 585 Office: +381 28 523 140 migjen_abrashi@hotmail.com	Implementing Partner Meeting	CRS offices, Southern Mitrovica	11:30
Irina Gudeljevic	Momcilo Arlov CCSD Program Coordinator Center for Civil Society Development YSF/CRS Mob: +381 (0) 63 1 046 819 Office: +381 (0) 64 6 343 031 <a href="mailto:momcilo.arlov@ccsd-kosovo.org">momcilo.arlov@ccsd- kosovo.org</a>	Implementing Partner Meeting	CRS offices, Northern Mitrovica	11:30
CANCELED	Nexhmedin Spahiu, 044 147 596 028 29 905 <a href="mailto:nspahiu@yahoo.com">nspahiu@yahoo.com</a>	TV Mitrovica contact [beneficiary], AED project	Southern Mitrovica	14:00

**Thursday, March 27, 2008**

Mitrovica

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Mirjana Milutinovic Radio Kontakt Plus +381 28 425 023	Key Informant	Southern Mitrovica	10:00
Richard Blue  Susan Kupperstein	Albanian Focus Group and interview with key informant	YSF focus group	YSF implementation school	11:30
Irina Gudeljevic	Serbian Focus group and interview with key informant	YSF focus groups	CCSD office , Northern Mitrovica	11:30

Irina Gudeljevic	Lazar Amprovski Educator CCSD	Key Informant	CCSD office, N. Mitrovica	1:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	YSF random Albanian school director/ key informant	Key informant	YSF school, Southern Mitrovica	2:00
Irina Gudeljevic	Sasa Miletic Senior Outreach Officer, MISI Mercy Corps	Key Informant	Mercy Corps Office, Zvecan	2:00

**Friday, March 28, 2008**  
Pristina and Zvecan

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time of Interview
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Nazlishahe Luma Headmistress of "Gezimi Yne" kindergarten Tel: 038 553 913	Key Informant	"Gezimi Yne" Kindergarden – Mozaik (not USAID funded)	9:30
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Albanian Focus Group, Mozaik kindergarten	Key Informant with one parent – Turk (was supposed to be a focus group)	Mozaik Kindergarten	10:00
Irina Gudeljevic	Misel Koneski Program Assistant IOM	Key Informant	IOM, Zvecan	10:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Agon Maliqi YIHR, Kosovo Project Director  049 117 221	Key informant (subgrantee of KCRP)	"Kafja e Vogel", cafe	11:30
Irina Gudeljevic	Zoran Vuckovic Principal, High School	Key Informant	CRS High School (Focus Group cancelled)	12:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Jeton Neziraj Director of Centre for Children's Theatre Development, +377 44 186 393	Key Informant (KCRP subgrantee)	Dodona Children's Theatre	1:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Francesco Ardisson Senior Protection Officer, UNHCR 038-241-509	Information gathering	UNHCR	3:00

**Saturday, March 29, 2008**

FOCUS GROUP CANCELLED BECAUSE OF CAR TROUBLE IN ZUBIN POTOK

**Monday, March 31, 2008**  
Kamenice, Gjilan, Pristina

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Shyhrete Kastrati Headmistress of "Filizat" kindergarten, 0280 371 988	Key Informant	"Filizat " Kindergarden	11:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Albanian- Serbian Focus Group , MOZAIK kindergarten	Mozaik focus group with parents	Mozaik Kindergarten	11:30
Irina Gudeljevic	Cvetko Milenkovic TV Puls, AED TV Magazine  063 703 55 83	Key Informant	TV Puls Silovo, Gjilan	1:15
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Shaban Terziu Landsdown, KCRP grantee 044 178 606 And??	Key informant	Hotel Pristina	4:00

**Tuesday, April 1, 2008**  
Rahovec, Gjakova

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Slavisa Kolasinac Qamil Cena Elvi' Donguti KICCR Beneficiaries 044 203 862.	Key Informants	Rahovec	10:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Nebojsa Antic Program Director Nasa Kuca 064 524 1003	Key Informant/KCRP Grantee	Rahovec	12:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Bashkim Rrahmani FDI 044 154 785	Key Informant/FH partner	Gjakovo, FDI offices	3:00

**Wednesday, April 2, 2008**  
Ferizaj, Zubin Potok, N. Mitrovica

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Osman Cokli And Mr. Dinich KICCR Beneficiaries tel 044 128 401	Key Informant	Bablak, Ferizaj	10:00

Irina Gudeljevic	Ivica Trifunovic Principal	Key Informant	High School in Zubin Potok	11:00
Irina Gudeljevic	Focus Group with High School Student	Focus Group	High School in Zubin Potok	12:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Visar Hoti President TV Tema 044 120 487	Key Informant/AED grantee	Ferizaj	12:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Shaban Shabani Avonet Coordinator (044657953).	AED Roundtable Participants, Focus Group	House of Culture, Ferizaj	2:00
Irina Gudljevic	Veroljub Miletic +381 63 825000 +381 28 665 655	TV Most contact key informant AED project	N. Mitrovica	3:00

**Thursday, April 3, 2008**

Peje, Klina

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Jakup Beqaj Director and Owner  2 Educators  CIVITAS 044 138 366.	Key Informants	Cambridge Gymnasium	10:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Bujar Nura 044 207 327	Comparison Group with Village people	Vidanje, Klina	2:00

**Friday, April 4, 2008**

Pristina

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Name and Contact Information</b>	<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Location of Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>
Richard Blue, Susan Kupperstein, Irina Gudeljevic and Lura Limani	Peter Duffy Program Officer  Urim Ahmeti Task Order CTO	Half-way Debrief	USAID in Pristina	10:00

**Saturday, April 5, 2008**

Strpce

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Bojan Mladenovic Owner, Director TV Herc (AED documentary and TV Magazine)	Key Informant	Strpce	9:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Slavisa Ljubisailjevic Owner, Director Radio Spektar	Key Informant	Strpce	11:30

**Monday, April 7, 2008**

Prizren

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein,	Vjosa Gashi Tel: 044 140 128	Kindergarten Head, Key informant	Kindergarten "Yilka" Prizren,	10:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Discussion Group/Interviews	Parents, Educators/ Key informants	Prizren	10:30
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Shefqet Osmani nr.044-402-018.	Head of " Motrat Qirazi" , CIVITAS project implementer	rr.Hafez Ismail Haki .Prizren	12:00
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Atifa Beqiroski 044 286 406. Arber Gashi	Educators / key informants	rr.Hafez Ismail Haki .Prizren	12:30
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Focus Group with students	CIVITAS participants, beneficiaries - Albanian and Serbian students	rr.Hafez Ismail Haki .Prizren	12:45

**Tuesday, April 8, 2008**

Pristina and Fushe Kosove

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein,	Ardian Gjini	MP/ participant in PER/ key informant	Parliament building	10:00

Susan Kupperstein	Tahir Shabani tel. 044 283 740	School Director , CIVITAS program	School "Bajram Curri" Fushe Kosove, Sllatine	1:00
Susan Kupperstein	Hedije Maliqi tel. 044 256	Educators	School "Bajram Curri" Fushe Kosove, Sllatine	1:30
Susan Kupperstein	Focus group with students	CIVITAS participants	School "Bajram Curri" Fushe Kosove, Sllatine	1:35
Richard Blue	Megan Falvey Chief of Party FORECAST/World Learning Pashko Vasa Street #16 Pristina, Kosovo 381 38 246 691 381 38 246 690	Implementer Interview (for assessment of program opportunities)	World Learning Office	2:00
Richard Blue	Martin Wood Chief of Party Chemonics KCBS	Implementer Interview (for assessment of program opportunities)	Chemonics office	3:30

**Wednesday, April 9, 2008**  
Pristina, Laplje Selo, Caglavica

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Susan Kupperstein	Zoran Ristic tel.+381(0)638273400	key informant Ghetto Theater, Partner org. – Center for Children's Theatre Development – KCRP, Freedom House	Restaurant "Dragan" Laplje Selo	10:00
Susan Kupperstein	Zivojin Rakocevic tel.+381(0)63360030	Chairperson of KOSMA Network- Center for Migration Studies	KIM Radio, Caglavica	11:30
Susan Kupperstein	Bojan Stojanovic Assembly Member Srpska Libaraina Stranka (SLS) – Serbian Liberal Party 044 520 034	Key Informant (for assessment of program opportunities)	Parliament	1:30
Richard Blue	Barry Reed COP Decentralization Program 038 246 070/1 <a href="mailto:breed@rti.org">breed@rti.org</a>	Implementing Partner (for assessment of program opportunities)	RTI office	4:30

**Thursday, April 10, 2008**  
Pristina

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue/Susan Kupperstein	Arber Salihu Ministry of Education Representative (responsible for MOUs with CIVITAS)	Key Informant	Ministry of Education	10:00

**Friday, April 11, 2008**  
Pristina

Interviewer	Name and Contact Information	Type of Meeting	Location of Meeting	Time
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	John Anderson DG Office Director USAID 038 243 673 ext 139	Donor meeting (for assessment of program opportunities)	USAID	1:30
Richard Blue Susan Kupperstein	Jennifer Tikka Flora Arifi Dardane Peja USAID/EG Business Development Team 038 243 673 ext 119	Donor meeting (for assessment of program opportunities)	USAID	2:30

**Saturday, April 12, 2008**  
Pristina  
NO MEETINGS – WRITING

**Monday, April 14, 2008**  
Pristina

Richard Blue and Susan Kupperstein, USAID Meeting with Mission Director Michael Farbman, Deputy Mission Director, Susan Fritz, Peter Duffy and Urim Ahmeti, 4:00pm

**Tuesday, April 15, 2008**

**Wednesday, April 16, 2008**  
DEPARTURE

**USAID KOSOVO CONFLICT MITIGATION PROGRAM EVALUATION – March/April 2008**

**KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS**

*EXPLAIN PURPOSE OF THE EVALUTION. DESCRIBE USAID INTEREST IN REDUCING CONFLICT AND ENCOURAGING POSITIVE ATTITUDES AND RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MINORITY AND MAJORITY POPULATIONS IN KOSOVO.*

*EXPLAIN THAT INFORMANT HAS BEEN SELECTED AS A PERSON KNOWLEGEABLE ABOUT THE LOCAL SITUATION, AND ABOUT GENERAL EFFORTS TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS IN THIS MUNICIPALITY/COMMUNITY.*

*EXPLAIN THAT NO ANSWERS WILL BE ATTRIBUTED TO SPECIFIC INDIVIDUALS. CONFIDENTIALITY IS CRITICAL TO ENSURING FRANK AND HONEST RESPONSES TO OUR QUESTIONS. THE QUESTIONS WILL BE OPEN ENDED FOR THE MOST PART, BUT WE WILL ASK YOU TO RATE CONDITIONS HERE ON A FEW DIMENSIONS DURING OUR DISCUSSION.*

*THE INTERVIEW WILL TAKE ABOUT ONE HOUR.*

*ASK THE RESPONDENT IF H/SHE IS WILLING TO ANSWER YOUR QUESTIONS.*

---

Interviewer complete this section.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

1. Location of the Interview  
(Community/Municipality) \_\_\_\_\_
2. Respondent's Position (Principal, Educator, NGO activist, elected leader, official, other)-  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. R Gender \_\_\_\_\_
4. Age \_\_\_\_\_
4. Ethnicity (ask if in doubt) a. Albanian b. Serb c. Bosniak d. Roma e. other \_\_\_\_\_
5. Employment status: a. Retired b. Gov. office c. Private Sector d. not employed  
e. student f. part time/intermittent

---

Respondent Questions (Notes from Open ended respondents may be kept in separate notebook or recording device. PLEASE KEY YOUR NOTES TO THE QUESTIONS BELOW)

1. How would you describe relations between Serbs and Albanians in this area today?
  - 1.1 Please rate ethnic relations on a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 meaning very bad and 5 meaning very good.

Rating: 1      2      3      4      5

2. How does the situation compare with one year ago about this time?

Interviewer Rate R's Answer: 1      Much Worse

- 2. Somewhat Worse
- 3. No Change
- 4. Somewhat better
- 5. Much Better

3. What are the major causes that help to explain the current situation?
4. Are you familiar with the \_\_\_\_\_(project name) that has been active here? Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
I've heard of it \_\_\_\_\_ Not familiar \_\_\_\_\_
5. Did you participate, and if so, what was your role?
6. Tell us a bit about the project. Who was involved? Did people/students from both Serbian and Albanian or other communities participate together?
7. In your view, did participation in this project change anything? If so, what?
- 7.1 Please rate the changes, if any, on a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 indicating little or no change, and 5 being significant positive improvement in relations.  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5
8. Over the last several years, there have been several television and other media programs aimed at improving inter-ethnic relations in Kosovo. Are you familiar with some of these programs? If so, can you tell which ones?  
(Interviewer note specific mentions of any of the AED TV shows or Sesame Street)
9. Thinking back over the last year, there was considerable effort to inform people in Kosovo about the UN Comprehensive Proposal for the Kosovo Status Settlement of March 2007, the so-called A.....plan.
- 9.1 How familiar are you with the content of this proposal?  
Interviewer rates: 1 2 3 4 5 (high)
10. Can you tell us how you became informed about the proposal? (friends, neighbors, local political leaders, media. Probe for specific Media sources)
11. Now that Kosovo government has declared independence, how do people around here feel about the future?
12. How about your own view? On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being most optimistic, how would you rate your own feelings about your future in an independent Kosovo?
- 12.1 R Rates: 1 2 3 4 5 (most optimistic)
13. Do you have any thoughts about moving you and your family from Kosovo?  
Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being no thought of leaving and 5 being making firm plans to leave, please rate your own situation as of today.
- 13.1 R Rates: 1 2 3 4 5 (firm plans to leave)
14. What would be the most useful kind of program that could be done with assistance of the donors to improve security and stability in this area?  
(probe for specifics, economic growth, more effective education, infrastructure, etc.)

Thank the Respondent for his answers. Reassure h/her about confidentiality.

**USAID KOSOVO CONFLICT MITIGATION PROGRAM EVALUATION-MARCH APRIL 2008**

**(FOCUS) GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

NOTE: FOCUS GROUPS SHOULD BE SELECTED BASED ON ONE OR MORE DIMENSIONS RELEVANT TO THE PROJECT. EXAMPLE: PARENTS OF CHILDREN IN MOZAIK PROGRAM OR TEACHERS IN CIVIC EDUCATION PROGRAM.

IF A 'FOCUS' GROUP IS NOT POSSIBLE, BUT A MORE DIVERSE GROUP CAN BE ASSEMBLED, USE THE SAME QUESTIONS.

EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF THE DISCUSSION, INSURE CONFIDENTIALITY, AND MAKE SURE EVERYONE AGREES TO PARTICIPATE.

WHERE POSSIBLE, ONE PERSON SHOULD ASK QUESTIONS, ANOTHER SHOULD KEEP NOTES AND RECORD ANSWERS.

**(FOCUS) GROUP: DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION ABOUT THE GROUP**

INTERVIEWER \_\_\_\_\_ RECORDER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

1. SUBJECT OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION
  - A. PROJECT NAME \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. PROJECT LOCATION \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. WHEN ACTIVITY TOOK PLACE \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. DISCUSSION LOCATION \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. WHO IS IN THE FOCUS GROUP? (ask group members)
  - A. NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. AGE CLASS 16-17 \_\_\_\_\_ 18-25 \_\_\_\_\_ 26-40 \_\_\_\_\_ 41-65 \_\_\_\_\_ 66 OVER \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. GENDER F. \_\_\_\_\_ M. \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. ETHNICITY AL. \_\_\_\_\_ S. \_\_\_\_\_ R. \_\_\_\_\_ B. \_\_\_\_\_ T. \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. EDUCATION Secondary School student \_\_\_\_\_ HS Graduate \_\_\_\_\_  
University \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate \_\_\_\_\_

---

**(FOCUS) GROUP QUESTIONS. USE FOCUS GROUP TECHNIQUES TO INSURE EVERYONE PARTICIPATES, AND ALL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO INDICATE THEIR CHOICE. RECORDER SHOULD GET MAIN POINTS AND RECORD VOTES WHERE NEEDED.**

1. We are here to discuss the \_\_\_\_\_ project. How many participated in the project? (Example 6/8) (Probe)
  
2. What are the main things you remember from the project?:
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_
  
3. Did participation in the project help you personally in any way? Why/Why not? (probe)



ANNEX VI: Table of Methods Used

Activity	Implementing Partner Interview	Key Informant Interview	Focus Group	Discussion Group
<p><i>Youth Securing the Future (YSF)</i>  <i>Catholic Relief Services (CRS)</i>  <i>May 2006 – May 2009</i>                      \$893,636                      (7 municipalities)</p>	<p>1 from Pristina</p> <p>2 Mitrovica (north and south)</p> <p>1 from Galaxy Stars</p> <p>2 from CCSD</p>	<p>2 Albanian principles</p> <p>2 Serbian Principal (Zvecan and Zubin Potok)</p>	<p>2 in S. Mitrovica (1 Turk out of the 2 groups, total of ~13 or 14 kids)</p> <p>1 N. Mitrovica (5 students all Serb)</p> <p>1 in Zubin Potok (4 Serb students)</p>	
<p><i>Mozaik</i>  <i>Save the Children, UK</i>  <i>September 2006 – September 2008</i>                      \$417,007                      (2 USAID-funded projects)</p>	<p>1 at HQ</p> <p>2 in Pristina</p>	<p>1 in Pristina, principal and 1 Turk Parent</p> <p>1 principal in Kamenice (Alb)</p>		<p>1 Kamenice (4 people, 3 Alb, 1 Serb)</p> <p>1 Prizren (~18 people, mixed Albanian, Bosniak and Turk)</p>
<p><i>Reconciliation through Civic Education</i>  <i>Center for Civic Education (CCE)</i>  <i>April 2007 – September 2008</i>                      \$330,000                      (all 7 school districts)</p>	<p>1 from HQ</p> <p>1 from Pristina</p>	<p>1 principal and 2 educators from the same school in Peje/Pec(Alb)</p>	<p>1 in Prizren – 2 classes, 1 Albanian and 1 Bosniak (total of ~36 kids)</p> <p>1 in Fushe Kosove, 18 kids all Albanian</p>	
<p><i>Sesame Street - Season Two</i>  <i>Sesame Workshop</i>  <i>October 2005 – September 2007</i>                      \$500,527</p>	<p>2 from HQ</p> <p>1 from Pristina</p>			
<p><i>Kosovo Community Reconciliation Program (KCRP)</i>  <i>Freedom House</i>  <i>August 2006 – August 2008</i>                      \$650,000                      (16 grantees, including FDI?)</p>	<p>1 from Pristina</p> <p>1 from FDI</p>	<p>Radio Kontakt Plus (Serb)</p> <p>Lansdowne (1 Alb, 1 Serb)</p> <p>IYHR (Alb)</p> <p>CCTD (Alb)</p> <p>Nasa Kuca (1 Serb)</p> <p>Radio Spektar (1 Serb)</p> <p>Gheto Theater (1 Serb)</p> <p>Kosma Radio Network/Radio Kim (1 Serb)</p> <p>(6 organizations total)</p>		

Activity	Implementing Partner Interview	Key Informant Interview	Focus Group	Discussion Group
<p><i>Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation (KICCR)</i>  <i>Partners for Democratic Change (PDC)</i>  <i>August 2006 – August 2007,</i>  <i>\$252,096</i>            4 communities</p>	<p>1 from HQ            1 from Pristina</p>	<p>Rahovec (3 people, 2 Alb, 1 Serb)             Bablak, Ferizaj (1 Alb, 1 Serb)             (total 2 meetings)</p>		
<p><i>Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo (SPSK)</i>  <i>Academy for Educational Development (AED)</i>  <i>October 2005 – March 2008</i>  <i>\$2,393,793</i>            6 TV stations            #? Roundtables            Information campaign</p>	<p>1 from HQ            1 from Pristina</p>	<p>TV Puls (2 Serbs)             TV Tema (1 Alb)             TV Most (1 Serb)             TV Herc (1 Serb)             (total 4 stations)</p>		<p>1            (Avonet, All Albanians in Ferizaj)</p>
<p><i>Improving Interethnic Relations in the Western Balkans</i>  <i>Project on Ethnic Relations (PER)</i>  <i>May 2006 – April 2007</i>  <i>\$280,000</i>            2 regional seminars</p>	<p>1 from HQ            1 from Pristina</p>	<p>1 Albanian participant (MP)</p>		

## ANNEX VII: AED Roundtable and Town Hall Meeting Speakers

### **Kosovar Speakers:**

Hashim Thaqi, President of PDK  
Agim Ceku, Prime Minister of Kosovo  
Ardian Gjini, Minister of Environment  
Gjylnaze Sylja, Chief of Parliamentary Group of AAK  
Arben Gashi, RIINVEST  
Naim Behluli, Advisor to the Deputy Prime Minister from the Ministry of Local Governance  
Blerim Shala, Coordinator of Unity Team  
Petar Vasic, President of the Novoberde Municipal Assembly  
Naim Jerliu, Member of Parliament [LDK]  
Ismet Hashani, Obiliq Municipal Assembly President  
Fehmi Mujota, President of Municipality  
Oliver Ivanovic, Bajram Rexhepi, PDK  
Sadri Ferati, Chief Executive of Mitrovica municipality  
Esat Stavileci, Professor of Constitutional Law, University of Prishtina  
Muharrem Shabani, Chairman of Municipal Assembly of Vushtrri  
Dardan Velija, Political Advisor to the Prime Minister  
Kushtrim Shaipi, UBO Consulting  
Skender Zogaj, Municipal Assembly President of Fushe Kosova  
Lulzim Peci, Executive Director, KIPRED  
Dukagjin Hetemi, Chief of Executive of Ferizaj  
Oliver Ivanovic, Member of SKLM  
Dusan Janjic, Senior Analyst  
Kolë Berisha, President of Assembly.

### **International Community Speakers:**

David Blunt, Head of the British Office  
Thierry Reynard, Head of the French Office  
Patrick Mura, Head of the Italian Office  
Casper Klynge, head of the European Union Planning Team  
Alex Laskaris, Deputy Principal Officer, USOP  
Brian Jones, Political Secretary of British Office  
Ruairi O'Connell, Deputy Head of British Office  
Tom Yazdgerdi, Political Section Bureau Chief, USOP.

ANNEX VIII: Kosovo Confidence Building Assets  
(from CM Program 2005-2008)

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
<b>General</b>			<p>Trainings provided: Organizational Development</p> <p>Project Management Cycle</p> <p>Proposal Writing</p> <p>Human Rights</p> <p>Tolerance</p> <p>Peacebuilding Theories and Skills</p> <p>Joint Problem Solving for a Common Future</p> <p>Approaches to Constructive Conflict Transformation</p> <p>Minigrants Essay Contest and 5 Winners</p>	<p>6 classes in 5 public kindergartens with 88 children 12 educators, (2/class)</p> <p>*these are overall statistics but only 2 kindergartens and 3 classes are funded by USAID in Prizren and Kamenice. Other schools in Peje/Pec, Prishtine and Obilic.</p> <p>The USAID funded numbers are 44 children in Prizren and 10 in Kamenice.</p>	<p>Steering Committee Members (CIVITAS Kosova, MEST<sup>15</sup>, Kosova Pedagogical Institute, University of Prishtina, a Serbian civic leader, Albanian teacher and student representatives)</p> <p>65 teachers from seven districts from Kosovo have been trained in two groups</p> <p>15 teachers as trainer of trainers</p>	<p>Produced 26 half-hour TV episodes with live action films featuring Albanian, Serbian, Turkish, Bosniak, Croatian, Ashkalia, Egyptian, Roma, and Gorani children together</p> <p>Aired on RTK and 2 Serb language outlets, TV Most in Zveçan and TV Herc in Štrpce</p>	<p>478 people trained in conflict mitigation/resolution skills</p> <p>34 NGOs, 4 new NGOs established in 4 villages, 40 local NGOs engaged during different phases of the program.</p> <p>460 people reached through completed community-based reconciliation projects</p>	<p>23 (13 Albanian and 10 Serb) Community facilitator organized into 4 multiethnic Facilitation Teams</p> <p>Four Community Working Groups with 83 people (45 Albanian, 30 Serb, 5 Roma and 3 other)</p>		<p>Participants from:</p> <p>Political Dialogues (Oct. 2007, Feb 2008 and March 2008)</p> <p>Budapest meeting December 2006</p> <p>Athens Meeting, June 2007</p> <p>(Lists of participants can be found in the activity reports)</p>
<b>Besiane/ Podujeva</b> (October 2007)	130,000	.008%								
<b>Decan/Decani</b> (April 2008)	40,000	0% (w/2 IDPs)			School: Lidhja e Prizrenit					
<b>Dragash</b> (June 2006)	40,775	0% (G&B)					Subgrantee: NGO Zenit			
<b>Fushe Kosova/o Polje</b> (July 2007)	40,000	7%			Schools: Bajram Curri and Sveti Sava		Radio K (Kosma)			

<sup>15</sup> MEST is the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
<b>Ferizaj/ Urosevac</b> (April 2008)	160- 170,000	0.04%			School: Ganimete Tërbeshi			In Bablak: Facilitators: Osman Cokli  Burim Bajrami  Radovan Petrovic  Vesna Denic  Rajko Denic  Voja Petrovic  Project: Library – multi- ethnic Library Steering Group	TV Tema (directors, journalists, cameramen)  Youth Center Ferizaj (TV Mag screener)	
<b>Gjakova/ Dakovica</b> (October 2007)	150,000	0%			School: Dëshmorët e Hereqit  (different districts) Schools: Hajdar Dushi Jahë Salihu		Grantee/Partn er: Foundation For Democratic Initiatives  NGO Forum Gjakova			
<b>Drenas/ Glogovac</b> (June 2006)	70,400	0%								
<b>Gjilan/Gnjilane</b> (April 2008)	130,000	9%			Schools: Musa Zajmi, Nazim Hikmet, Zenel Hajdini, and Selami Hallaqi		Radio Laser (Kosma)  Grantee: Lansdowne	TV Puls & TV Vali (directors, journalists, cameramen)  Kosovo Center for International Cooperation (KCIC) (TV Mag screener)  Harizma, Gornje		

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
									Kusce (TV Mag screener)	
<b><i>Istog/Burim</i></b> <i>(April 2008)</i>	56,000	1.4%	Schools and Directors: Imer Lajqi, Gymnasium Secondary School "Haxhi Zeka"; Isa Hoxhaj, Technical Secondary School "Mithat Frasherli"  Presidents of Student Councils: 1. Fjolla Ademaj, Gymnasium Secondary School "Haxhi Zeka" 2. Nazmi Buleshaj, Technical Secondary School "Mithat Frasherli"		School: Ismil Qemali					
<b><i>Kline/Klina</i></b> <i>(April 2008)</i>	55,000	0.72%			School: Motrat Qiriazii					
<b><i>Kamenice/Kamenica</i></b> <i>(April 2008)</i>	63,000	17%		Shyhrete Kastrati Director of Filizat kindergarten (1 group Alb/Turkish)			Radio Kosovska Maenica (Kosma)  Grantee: Kosovka Devojka (Stop Corruption, K-S) with K-A "Lidhja e Gruas"			
<b><i>Kacanik/Kacanik</i></b> <i>(April 2008)</i>	43,000	0%			School: Emin Duraku and Skenderbeu					
<b><i>Leposavic/Leposaviq</i></b> <i>(April 2008)</i>	18,600	96.77%	Schools and Directors: Ivica Mihajlović, Secondary Agricultural School, Lešak; Vukašin Jezdimirović, Secondary Technical School "Nikola				Radio Mir and Radio Bubamara (Kosma)  Grantee: ELSA Media Pulse			

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
			Tesla", Leposavić  Presidents of Youth Councils: 1. Miloš Veličković, Secondary Agricultural School 2. Ivana Barać, Secondary Technical School "Nikola Tesla"							
<b>Lipjan/Lipijan</b> (October 2007)	76,000	12.5%			School: Emin Duraku			Facilitators: Naser Gashi  Divna Filipovic  Lidija Jovanovic  Esad Xhymshiti  Ardita Mustafa  Project: Municipal budgeting		
<b>Malisheva/Malisevo</b> (April 2008)	65,000	0%			School: Naim Frashëri					
<b>Mitrovica/Mitrovica</b> (June 2006)	20,000	85%	City Wide Youth Council (CWYC)  50 interns (north and south)  Subawardee: Momcilo Arlov , Center for Civil Society Development  North Schools and Directors: Kragović Dragoljub, Secondary Economic School; Dimitrije Denić,		Schools: Meto Bajkraktari and Abdullah Shabani		Radio Contact Plus (Kosma and their own grant)  Radio Mitrovica (Kosma)  Youth of JAZAS Kosovo	TV Mitrovica (directors, journalists, cameramen)  Me Dora ne Zemer (With hand on the Heart) (S. Mitrovica TV Mag screener)  Youth Initiative Mitrovica (YIM) (N.		

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
			Secondary Technical and Gymnasium School displaced from Vučitrn municipality; Slobodanka Žorić, Gymnasium; Radovan Tanić, Secondary Technical School; Vukomir Jovanović, Secondary Medical School  Presidents of Youth Councils: 1. Danica Radović, Secondary Economic School 2. Aleksandra Đilas, Gymnasium School displaced from Vučitrn municipality 3. Aleksandar Nastić, Secondary Technical School displaced from Vučitrn municipality 4. Miloš Vasić, Gymnasium 5. Ana Kompirović, Secondary Technical School "Mihajlo Petrovic Alas" 6. Marko Petrović, Secondary Medical School						Mitrovica TV Mag screener)  K-S KAP Interviewers  Center for Civil Society Development (N. Mitrovica, roundtables/ town halls for Serbs)	

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
			<p>Subwardee: Migjen Abrashi, Galaxy Stars</p> <p>South Schools and Directors: Fazli Hajrizi, Gymnasium Secondary School "Frang Bardhi"; Asllan Istrefi, Medical Secondary School "Dr. Xheladin Deda"; Bali Uka, Economic Secondary school "Hasan Prishtina"; Hysen Hasani, Technical Secondary School "Arkitekt Sinani"</p> <p>Presidents of Student Councils: 1. Bujar Kurti, Gymnasium Secondary School "Frang Bardhi" 2. Jellda Jarolli, Medical Secondary School" 3. Ambera Kelmendi, Economic Secondary school "Hasan Prishtina" 4. Bekim Osmani, Technical Secondary School "Arkitekt Sinani"</p>							
<i>Novoberde/ Novo Brdo (April 2008)</i>	3,900	39%								
<i>Obilic/Obilic (July 2007)</i>	30,000	11.33 %								
<i>Peje/ Pec (April 2008)</i>	81,026	1,04%	Schools and Directors: Emina Gorani, Applicative Arts School "Odhise Paskali"; Syzana		School: "Kolegji Cambridge"		Radio Gorazdevac (Kosma)  Radio Hayat			

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
			<p>Matoshi, Technical Secondary School "Shaban Spahia"; Vehbi Shala, Economic Secondary School "Ali Hadri"; Isa Nikqi, Medical Secondary School</p> <p>Presidents of Student Councils:  1. Trim Qarkagjiu, Gymnasium secondary School "Bedri Pejani" 2. Kaltrina Vokshi, Applicative Arts School "Odhise Paskali" 3. Florim Lajqi, Technical Secondary School "Shaban Spahia" 4. Jehona Hysenaj, Economic Secondary School "Ali Hadri" 5. Njomza Doqi, Medical Secondary School</p>				(Kosma)			
<b><i>Pristine/ Pristina</i></b> <i>(October 2007)</i>	500,000	2.5%			Schools: Zenel Hajdini, Asim Vokshi and Cambridge School		<p>KOSMA Radio Network, Zivojin Rakocevic, Chairperson Caglavica;</p> <p>Darko Dimitrijevic Project Coordinator Gorazdevac</p> <p>Radio Kim (Kosma) - Caglavica</p>		K-A KAP Interviewers  ATRC – roundtable/t own hall meetings	

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
							Radio Gracanica (Kosma)  Radio Antena (Kosma)  Partner: Kosovo Media Association  Grantee: Center for Children's Theater Development w/ Ghetto Theater  Youth Initiative for Human Rights			
<b>Prizren</b> <i>(October 2007)</i>	240,000	0.09%		Vjosa Gashi Director Kindergarten "Yllka" (2 groups – Alb/Bosniak and Alb/Turkish)	Schools: Sezai Surroi, Dëshmorët e Zhurit, Motrat Qiriazi, Fadil Hisari, Përparimi		Radio Astra (Kosma)  Grantee: NGO Zenit			
<b>Rahovec/ Orahovac</b> <i>(October 2007)</i>	73,700	1.76%			School: Xhelal Hajda – Toni		Radio Focus (Kosma)  Subgrantees: NGO Konak Nasa Kuca  Schueler Helfen Leben  NGO Hareja	Facilitators: Fadil Sokoli  Slavisa Kolasinac  Beqir Haxhijaha  Marian Saric  Qamil Sena  Sylejman Bala  Project:		

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
								Agricultural Cooperative - Agrokop (wine)		
<i>Shtime/Stimlje</i> <i>(July 2007)</i>	29,000	0%			School: Naim Frashëri					
<i>Skenderaj/Srbica</i> <i>(January 2008)</i>	72,600	0.5%					Four cross-community committees were established through the projects with IDPs in Skenderaj/Srbica municipality  Grantee: Women's Center "Prehja"			
<i>Strpce/Shterpce</i> <i>(April 2008)</i>	13,600	66,91 %					Members of Kosma Network: Radio Bozani, Radio Herc, Radio Spektar		TV Herc (directors, journalists, cameramen)  Buducnost bez straha (Future without Fear)/(TV Mag screener)	
<i>Suhareka (Theranda)/ Suva Reka</i> <i>(October 2007)</i>	80,000	3.75%								
<i>Viti/Vitina</i> <i>(April 2008)</i>	59,800	5.581 %			School: Ndre Mjeda		Radio Klokot (Kosma)	Facilitators: Mustafe Shabani  Ibrahim Shabani  Ismet Sejdu  Bojan		

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
								Krcmarevic Radica Cvetkovic  Project: Reviving 20 Village Councils		
<b>Vushtrri/ Vucitrn</b> (April 2008)	102,662	4%	North Schools and Directors: Nikola Stolić, Secondary Technical School "Nikola Tesla", village Priluzje, Vuçitrn  President of Student Council: 1. Miloš Adžančić, Secondary Technical School "Nikola Tesla"  South Schools and Directors: Nexhmedin Maxhuni, Gymnasium Secondary School "Eqrem Qabej"; Naip Azemi, Technical Secondary School "Lutfi Musiqi"; Selvete Sholla, Professional Technical Secondary School "Latif Berisha"  Presidents of Student Councils: 1. Visar Mulaku, Gymnasium Secondary School"Eqrem Qabej" 6. Aron Bunjaku, Technical Secondary				Radio Mix (Kosma)			

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>% Serb</i>	<i>CRS/YSF</i>	<i>Mozaik/Save</i>	<i>CIVITAS/CCE</i>	<i>Sesame</i>	<i>FH/KCRP</i>	<i>PDC</i>	<i>AED</i>	<i>PER</i>
			School "Lutfi Musiqi" 7. Blerim Ibrahimi, Professional Technical Secondary School "Latif Berisha"							
<b>Zubin Potok</b> <i>(April 2008)</i>	14,900	93.4%	Schools and Directors: Ivica Trifunović, Secondary Technical and Gymnasium School "Grigorije Božović"  Presidents of Youth Councils: 1. Marija Žuvić, Secondary Technical School "Grigorije Božović" 2. Slobodan Perović, Gymnasium School "Grigorije Božović"		School: Osman Rama (Albanian)		Radio M (Kosma)			
<b>Zvecan</b> <i>(April 2008)</i>	17,000	94.5%	Schools and Directors: Zoran Vučković, High School  Presidents of Youth Councils: 1. Premović Miloš, High School						TV Most (directors, journalists, cameramen)	

<http://www.osce.org/kosovo/13982.html>

Municipal Profiles and Maps  
(Date of profile)

**USAID/Kosovo Conflict Mitigation Program  
Evaluation Bibliography**

**Implementing Partners**

**AED Documents**

***AED Contract Modifications***

- AED. "Draft Task Order DFD-I-01-05-00244-00." 29 September, 2005.
- AED. "Modification to Contract 1 DFD-I-01-05-00244-01."
- AED. "Modification to Contract 2 DFD-I-01-05-00244-02."
- AED. "Modification to Contract 3 DFD-I-01-05-00244-03." 22 January, 2007.
- AED. "Modification to Contract 4 DFD-I-01-05-00244-04."
- AED. "Modification to Contract 4 DFD-I-01-05-00244-04: Attachment 1 – Kosovo Settlement document Information Outreach Campaign and Technical Assistance."
- AED. "Modification to Contract 5 DFD-I-01-05-00244-05." 6 March, 2007.
- AED. "Modification to Contract 6 DFD-I-01-05-00244-06." 24 March, 2007.
- AED. "Modification to Contract 7 DFD-I-01-05-00244-07." 6 July, 2007.
- AED. "Modification to Contract 8 DFD-I-01-05-00244-08." 10, September, 2008.
- AED. "Modification to Contract 9 DFD-I-01-05-00244-09." 1 February, 2008.
- AED. "Support for Peace and Stability in Kosovo ICRP Task Order # DFD-I-00-05-00244-00 Modification No. 6." 2007
- AED. "Task Order Grand Total Summary Budget Phase III Period of Performance: September 30, 2007-September 29, 2007." 2007.
- AED. "Task Order Grand Total Summary Budget Phase IV Period of Performance: September 30, 2007-December 31, 2007." 2007.

***AED Work Plans***

- AED. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: 2005-2006 Workplan 30 September 2005-30 June 2006, Including Activities for a Possible Extension to Oct 31 2006." 9 January, 2006.
- AED. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Workplan 01 June 2007-December 31, 2007." 7 August, 2007.
- AED. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo Workplan: 1 April-30 June 2008." 11 March 2008.

***AED Progress Reports***

- AED. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Monthly Progress Report 01 February-31 March 2006." 14 April, 2006.
- Annex 1: "Statement of Roles and Tasks for KAP Survey and Focus Group Activity." AED, 2006.
  - Annex 2: "Team Reporting Workshop Participants." AED, 2006.
- AED. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Monthly Progress Report 01 April-30 April 2006." AED, May 12, 2006.
- Annex 1: "Participant List for Kosovo Team Reporting Workshop No. 2" AED, 2006.
- AED. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: 01 May-30 May 2006." AED, 14 June, 2006.
- AED. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: 01 June-30 June 2006." AED. 21 July, 2006.
- Annex A: "Staff Observations of Kosovo Team Reporting documentary Screening Events." AED, 2006.
  - Annex B: "Kosovo Team Reporting Documentary Screening Viewer Feedback Form Report." AED. 2006.

- Annex C: “AED Kosovo Team Reporting ‘TV Magazine Series’ Concept Paper – Submitted to USAID/DCHA/CMM and USAID/Kosovo on June 22, 2006.” AED, 2006.
- AED. “Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo Monthly Progress Report 01 July-31 July 2006.” 18 August 2006.
- Annex 1: “Final KAP Survey Press Release.” AED, 19 July 2006.
  - Annex 2: “Kosovo Albanian News Media Reports on KAP Survey Findings: English Translation on Reports.” AED, 2006
  - Annex 3: “Serbian News Media Reports on KAP Survey Findings: English Translation on Selected Reports.” AED, 2006
  - Annex 4: “SMMRI Top Line Report: Serbian Focus Groups, First KAP Survey.” AED, June 28, 2006.
  - Annex 5: Kosovar Institute for Policy. “Kosovo Future Status Process: Top Line Report, Focus Group Research.” AED, June/July 2006.
- AED. “Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo; Monthly Progress Report 01 August-31 August 2006. 19 September, 2006.
- Annex 1: “English Translation of Politika Article” August 2006.
  - Annex 2: “Monitoring and Evaluation Report: Kosovo Team Reporting ‘Looking to the Future’ Democracy Series” Final report on Viewer Feedback Forms.” AED, 31 August, 2006.
  - Annex 3: “Local TV Station Broadcast Schedule for Kosovo Team Reporting TV Magazine” AED, 2006.
- AED. “Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Monthly Progress Report 01 September-30 September 2006.” 15 October, 2006.
- AED. “Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Monthly Progress Report 01 November-30 November 2006.” 15 December, 2006.
- AED. “Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Monthly Progress Report 01 December-31 December 2006.” 16 January, 2007.
- AED. “Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Monthly Progress Report 01 January-31 January 2007.” 14 February, 2007.
- Annex 1: “Phase I Media Campaign RFP” 9 January, 2007.
  - Annex 2: “Phase 1 Campaign Media Buy Plan” 2007.
  - Annex 3: “KTR TV Magazine Impact and Results” 2007.
- AED. “Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Quarterly Progress Report 01 February-31 March 2007.” 22 April, 2007.
- AED. “Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Quarterly Progress Report 01 April-30 June 2007.” 16 July 2007.
- Annex IV: “Phase II Media Campaign Monitoring Report.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex V: “Pre-Testing Options for Security Public Service Announcement.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex VI: “List of Serbian Journalists Invited to Debate.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex VII: “Subgroup Retreat SWOT Analysis.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex VIII: “Retreat Group Work Outcomes.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex IX: “Distribution List of International Brochures.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex X: “Informational Brochure Feedback Questionnaire.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex XI: “AED Workplan for Constitution Outreach and Public Education.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex XII: “AED Request for Proposals for Constitution Web Site.” AED, 2007.
- AED. “Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Quarterly Progress Report 01 July-30 September 2007.” AED, 15 October, 2007.
- Annex 1: “Kosovo Community Outreach Grant Program, Annual Program Statement.” AED, 31 August, 2007.
  - Annex 2: “Potential Albanian and Inter-Ethnic LINGO’s.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex 3: “Grant Application Evaluation Criteria.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex 4: “Debriefing on Kosovo Team Reporting Strategic Planning Retreat: Summary of Action Plan Recommendations.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex 5: “Constitution Brochure draft Text.” AED, 2007.
  - Annex 6: “Website Draft Content Text.” AED, 2007.

- Annex 7: "Website RFP." AED, 21 July, 2007.
  - Annex 8: "RROTA Subcontract Selection Memorandum." AED, July 25, 2007.
- AED. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Quarterly Progress Report 01 October-31 December 2007." AED, 15 January, 2008.
- Annex 1: "Next Steps Strategic Outreach Communications in Kosovo: Recommendations." AED, 20 November, 2007.
  - Annex 2: "Potential Albanian and Inter-Ethnic LINGOs." AED, 2007.
  - Annex 3: "Link Production Transcript." AED, 2007.
  - Annex 4: B2 Solutions "The Concept for the Constitution Campaign." 2007.
- Ahmeti, Urim and Riffat Sulaiman. "Comments: AED Kosovo-Modification Email" AED, 2007.

### **AED Miscellaneous**

- AED. "AED Kosovo Team Reporting 'TV Magazine Series' Concept Paper. 22 June, 2006.
- AED. "Final Findings and Recommendation Report from Ahtisaari Proposal Community Roundtables and Public Town Meetings." AED, October 2007.
- AED. "Kosovo Settlement Document Information Outreach Campaign and Technical Assistance: Technical Response." 2007.
- AED. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Kosovo Mapping Report." 2005.
- Annex 1: "Dialogue Initiatives."
  - Annex 2: "Individuals and Organizations Consulted in Mapping Type."
  - Annex 3: "Kosovo Mapping Bibliography."
- Blazevska, Daniela. "Findings and Feedback from Participants in the AED Kosovo Team Reporting TV Magazine Activity." Skopje, 2006.
- Finkel, Steven E and Daniel Wallace. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo: Public Opinion in Kosovo: Findings from Recent Polls and Directions for Future Surveys." AED, 2006.
- Mulvihill, Mary. "Support to Peace and Stability in Kosovo Project: PowerPoint." AED, 8 March, 2006.
- Poyac-Clarkin, Allison. "Proposed Senior Technical Advisor/Program Manager." AED, 2007.
- Wilson, Andrea E. "07-0608 AED Responses Phase 3 and 4." AED, 2007.

### **Catholic Relief Services Documents**

- Catholic Relief Services and USAID. "CRS/Kosovo Youth Securing the Future, Annual Work Plan Year 2, Narrative Annex."
- Catholic Relief Services and USAID. "Youth Securing the Future Project: Annual Work Plan, May 22, 2006 – May 21, 2007." 26 Aug 2006.
- Catholic Relief Services. "Youth Securing the Future: Post-Technical Assistance Recommendation." 20 April 2007.
- Catholic Relief Services. "YSF Performance Monitoring Plan (July 2007)."
- Catholic Relief Services. "YSF Performance Tracking Sheet (July 2007)."
- Catholic Relief Services. "YSF Year 2 Matrix of Activities (July 2007)."
- Catholic Relief Services. "Youth Council's Meeting Minutes Template."
- Catholic Relief Services. "Youth Securing the Future (YSF) Communication strategy-Media coverage."
- Catholic Relief Services. "KAP Baseline Survey." Date?
- Norrgard, Lee. "Project Narrative." Catholic Relief Services.
- Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. *Quarterly Report: June 30, 2006-September 30, 2006*. Catholic Relief Services. 30 Oct 2006.
- Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. "Assessment of Existing Youth Capacities: North."
- Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. "Assessment of Existing Youth Capacities: South."
- Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. "M&E Database Workbook."
- Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. "M&E Manual."
- Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. *Quarterly Report: October 1, 2006-December 31, 2006*. Catholic Relief Services. 15 Jan 2006.
- Appendix 1: Turnic, Milica. "CRS Serbia Request to SME." Catholic Relief Services.
  - Appendix 2: Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. "YSFP Program Summary." Catholic Relief Services.

- Appendix 3: Mujanovic, Dino. “CRS Serbia Memo to CCK.” Catholic Relief Services.
  - Appendix 4: Catholic Relief Services. “CCK Response to CRS Serbia.”
  - Appendix 5: UNICEF. “Guidelines for Student Councils (Albanian).”
  - Appendix 6: UNICEF. “Guidelines for Student Councils (Serbian).”
  - Appendix 7: Catholic Relief Services and USAID. “Call for Proposals: The Youth Securing the Future Program.” 1 Dec 2006.
  - Appendix 8: Catholic Relief Services and USAID. “Focus Groups Reports.” 3 Nov 2006.
  - Appendix 9: Catholic Relief Services and USAID. “Public Meeting Report.” 15 Nov 2006.
- Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. *Quarterly Report: January 1, 2007-March 31, 2007*. Catholic Relief Services. 30 April 2007.
- Appendix 1: Catholic Relief Services. “Youth Securing the Future: Post-Technical Assistance Recommendations.” 20 April 2007.
  - Appendix 2: Catholic Relief Services. “USG Compliance and Financial Management workshop for CRS staff and Partners, Feedback Report.” March 2007.
  - Appendix 3: Catholic Relief Services. “List of school-based mini-grants proposals.”
  - Appendix 4: Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. “Measuring the Impact of Youth Programming in Conflict Management and Mitigation: A Concept Paper.” Catholic Relief Services. 5 March 2007.
  - Appendix 5: Orlovic, Milica. “KAP Pre-Testing Report—North Mitrovica.” Youth Initiative Mitrovica. 26 March 2007.
  - Appendix 6: Abrashi, Migjen. “KAP Pre-Testing Report—South Mitrovica.” Youth Initiative Mitrovica. 28 March 2007.
  - Appendix 7: Catholic Relief Services and USAID. “Call for Essay Submission: How do you envision peace and tolerance?” 26 March 2007.
- Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. *Quarterly Report: April 1, 2007-June 30, 2007*. Catholic Relief Services. July 2007.
- Prica, Petar and Vranica, Florent. *Quarterly Report: July 1, 2007-September 30, 2007*. Catholic Relief Services. October 2007.
- Appendix 1: Catholic Relief Services. “YSFP M&E Database.”
  - Appendix 2: Catholic Relief Services. “Youth Councils Y2: North.”
  - Appendix 2a: Catholic Relief Services. “Youth Councils Y2: South.”
  - Appendix 3: Catholic Relief Services and USAID. “Call for Best Photo Competition: A Day In Life Of Your City.” 10 Sep 2007.
  - Appendix 4: “CWYC Situation Analysis Report—Serbian.” Sep 2007.
  - Appendix 4a: “CWYC Situation Analysis Report—Albanian.” Sep 2007.
  - Appendix 5: “CWYC Strategic Platform Report—Serbian.” Sep-Oct 2007.
  - Appendix 5a: “CWYC Strategic Platform Report—Albanian.” Sep-Oct 2007.
  - Appendix 6: “Assessment database SO2 Companies—North.”
  - Appendix 6a: “Assessment database SO2 Companies—South.”
  - Appendix 7: “Assessment database SO2 participants—North.”
  - Appendix 7a: “Assessment database SO2 participants—South.”
  - Appendix 8: “Assessment Regional Center for Vocational trainings: Capabilities (north and south Mitrovica) and Kosovo wide.”
  - Appendix 8a: “Assessment Technical School displaced from Vucitrn, Mitrovica North.”
  - Appendix 8b: “Assessment Technical School ‘Nikola Tesla’ Mitrovica North.”
  - Appendix 8c: “Assessment Technical School ‘Arkitekt Sinani’ Mitrovica.”
  - Appendix 9: “SO2 Participants’ Selection—North.”
  - Appendix 9a: “SO2 Participants’ Selection—South.”
  - Appendix 10: USAID. “YSFP 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Financial Status Report.”
- Prica, Petar. “Youth Securing the Future: Mid-Term Evaluation Report.” November 2007 to February 2008.
- Attachment 1 YSF Results Framework 1
  - Attachment 2 YSF Results Framework 2
  - Attachment 3 Terms of Reference
  - Attachment 4 List of Stakeholders

- Attachment 5 Data Collection Tools  
Stojanovic,Aleksandar. "North Mitrovica Out-of-School Focus Group Report." Catholic Relief Services. 28 September 2006.

### **CCE Documents**

Center for Civic Education. "CCE-KOS Timeline Update, First Quarter." June 2007.  
 Center for Civic Education. "CCE-KOS Timeline Update, Third Quarter." December 2007.  
 Center for Civic Education. "CCE Progress Report, April-June 2007." June 2007.  
 Center for Civic Education. "CCE Progress Report, July-September 2007." September 2007.  
 Center for Civic Education. "CCE Progress Report, October-December 2007." December 2007.  
 Center for Civic Education and National Conference of State Legislatures: "We the People, Project Citizen", 2000.  
 Gelband, Bruce. "CCE Award 167-G-00-07-00101-00." USAID. 27 Apr 2007.

### **Freedom House Documents**

Freedom House. "Info Details for KCRP grantees."  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Grantees Contact Details."  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Quarterly Progress Report, July 25 to September 30, 2006." October 30, 2006.  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Work Plan." October 25, 2006.  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Quarterly Progress Report, October 1 to December 31, 2006." January 31, 2007.  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Quarterly Progress Report, January 1 to March 31, 2007." April 30, 2007.  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Proposal Number KCRP1-07-583-210 for Center for Migration Studies: Keeping the Picture in Focus: Transparent Unbiased Information on Kosovo Status." July 2, 2007.  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Quarterly Progress Report, April 1 to June 30, 2007." July 31, 2007.  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Year One Program Achievements and Year Two Work Plan." October 15, 2007.  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Quarterly Progress Report, July 1 to September 30, 2007." October 31, 2007.  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Quarterly Progress Report, October 1 to December 31, 2007." January 31, 2008.  
 Freedom House. "KCRP Illustrative Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. January 5, 2007.  
 Gelband, Bruce. "Cooperative Agreement." USAID. 25 July 2006.

### **Partners for Democratic Change Documents**

Bartel, Margaret. "KICCR Closeout Info Sheet." USAID.  
 Gelband, Bruce. "PDC Grant Agreement." USAID. 23 Aug 2006.  
 Levy, Laina Reynolds. "KICCR Workplan Cover Letter." Partners for Democratic Change. 3 Oct 2006.  
 Partners for Democratic Change. "Final Report to the U.S. Agency for International Development, Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation Program."  
 Partners for Democratic Change. "Lessons Learned: A Review of the Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation Program."  
 Partners for Democratic Change. "KICCR Indicator Plan—revised." September 2006.  
 Partners for Democratic Change. "KICCR Training Beneficiaries."  
 Partners for Democratic Change. "KICCR workplan—23 Aug 2006 to 22 Aug 2007."  
 Partners for Democratic Change. "Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation Program, Final Conference Agenda."  
 Partners for Democratic Change. "Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation Program, Sub-Grant Amendments." 12 June 2007.  
 Partners for Democratic Change. "Quarterly Report: October 1 – December 31, 2006, Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation Program."  
 Partners for Democratic Change. "Quarterly Report: January 1 – March 31, 2007, Kosovo Inclusive Community Change and Reconciliation Program."  
 Shonholtz, Raymond. "KICCR Closeout Cover Letter." 14 Dec 2007.

## **Project on Ethnic Relations**

- Plaks, Livia. "Cover Letter—Final Report." 13 Nov 2007.
- Project on Ethnic Relations. *The Balkans as a Source of Security and Stability in Europe*. Princeton, New Jersey: 2007.
- Project on Ethnic Relations. "Final Report to United States Agency for International Development, Grant No. REE-G-06-00078-00, September 2006 – August 2007."
- Project on Ethnic Relations. "Improving Interethnic Relations in the Western Balkans: A proposal for funding from the United States Agency for International Development." 10 March 2006.
- Project on Ethnic Relations. *New Majorities and Minorities in the Changing Balkans*. Princeton, New Jersey: 2007.
- Project on Ethnic Relations. "Strengthening Interethnic Political Dialogue in Kosovo. Report of PER Meetings with Kosovo Albanian and Serb Politicians, Pristina, Kosovo, March 12-13, 2008."
- Project on Ethnic Relations. "Strengthening Interethnic Political Dialogue in Kosovo. Meeting Report, Pristina, January 31 – February 1, 2008."
- Project on Ethnic Relations. "Strengthening Interethnic Political Dialogue in Kosovo. Meeting Summary Report, Pristina, October 25-26, 2007."

## **Save the Children Documents**

- Hikmet, Nazim. "Mozaik: A model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, bilingual Pre-school education in Kosovo/a. Annual Report for period 8<sup>th</sup> September 2006-30<sup>th</sup> September 2007." Save the Children and USAID. September 2007.
- Hikmet, Nazim. "Mozaik: A model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, bilingual Pre-school education in Kosovo/a. Quarterly Report for the period of 9<sup>th</sup> January 2007 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2007." Save the Children and USAID. April 2007.
- Hikmet, Nazim. "Mozaik: A model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, bilingual Pre-school education in Kosovo/a. Quarterly Report for the period of 1<sup>st</sup> October 2006 to 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2006." Save the Children and USAID. April 2007.
- Hikmet, Nazim. "Mozaik: A model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, bilingual Pre-school education in Kosovo/a. Quarterly Report for the period of 8<sup>th</sup> September 2006 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2006." Save the Children and USAID. October 2006.
- Hikmet, Nazim. "Mozaik: A model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, bilingual Pre-school education in Kosovo/a. Quarterly Report for the period of October 2007 to December 2007." Save the Children and USAID. January 2008.
- Hikmet, Nazim. "Mozaik: A model for Community Reconciliation through Multicultural, bilingual Pre-school education in Kosovo/a. Quarterly Report for the period of April 2007 to June 2007." Save the Children and USAID. July 2007.
- Rabkin, Janice. "GIM Report on Inclusive Education Projects, 2005-2007, Save the Children in Kosovo." Save the Children. 14 March 2008.
- Russell, Donella. "Save the Children Award 167-G-00-06-00106-00." USAID. 8 Sep 2006.
- Save the Children, Search for Common Ground, and USAID. "Mozaik Directors' Proposed Training Modules."
- Save the Children, Search for Common Ground, and USAID. "Mozaik educators' support and training programme 2007."
- Save the Children. "September 2007 USAID Mozaik Financial Report."
- Save the Children. "Workplan."
- USAID. "December 2007 USAID Mozaik Financial Report."
- USAID. "Modification of Assistance 2." 23 January 2007.

## **Sesame Workshop Documents**

- Barahona, Ginny. "USAID Final Report." Sesame Workshop. 14 December 2007.
- FLUENT and SMMRI. "Assessment of Education Impact of Rruga Sesam and Ulica Sezam in Kosovo: Report of Findings." January 2008, New York, NY.
- Gelband, Bruce. "Sesame Workshop Signed Grant." USAID. 28 Sep 2005.

Hasanagic, Snjezana Kojic, Selma Kapo and Vigan Behluli. "Research About the Reception of Rruga Sesam and Ulica Sezam in Kosovo: Children's Assessment Report." Prism Research, April 30, 2005.

Sesame Workshop. "Program Description."

Sesame Workshop. "Summary of Findings: *Rruga Sesam/Ulica Sezam* Impact Evaluation."

## **Other Resources**

### **Mercy Corps**

Mercy Corps. "MISI Potential to Affect the Current Situation within Kosovo: Municipal Infrastructure and Support Initiative." April 1, 2004.

Mercy Corps: "Lessons for Kosovo's Next Transition" Discussion Paper #1, February 2007.

### **MSI**

Blair, Harry, Lorel Donaghey and Dardan Velija.. "Kosovo Civil Society Sector Assessment." USAID. May 2, 2004.

### **Labor Market Research**

Funkhouser, Edward. "Overview of Labor Market in Kosovo: What Do We Know From Household Surveys?" January 30, 2003.

Funkouser, Edward. "Youth Employment and Unemployment in Kosovo. January 30, 2003.

RIINVEST. "Labour Market and Unemployment in Kosovo." USAID, January 2003. Pristina.

SEGURA/IP3 Partners LLC. "Assessment of Economic Conditions and Possible Development Projects in Northern Kosovo." USAID. October 2006.

### **Polls**

Kosovo Foundation for Open Society. "Serb Community in Kosovo: About Problems and Hopes for the Future." October 2007. Pristina.

### **United National Development Programme**

UNDP. "The Rise of the Citizen: Challenges and Choices," Human Development Report Kosovo 2004. Pristina.

UNDP. "Youth, A New Generation for a New Kosovo," Human Development Report Kosovo 2006. Pristina.

UNDP. "Early Warning Report: Kosovo October 2007, Number 18." USAID and UNDP. October 2007.

UNDP. "Early Warning Fast Facts. Number 19." USAID and UNDP. January 2008.

### **United Nations Security Council**

Ahtisaari, Martti. "Comprehensive Proposal For The Kosovo Status Settlement." March 26, 2007.

### **USAID**

USAID Mission in Kosovo. "Strategic Plan 2004-2008." July 2003.

USAID/Kosovo. "Activity Pager: Effective Municipal Initiative." August 2007.

### **Wine Industry Research**

Hartwell, Chris. "The State of the Wine Industry in Kosovo: Kosovo Cluster and Business Support Project." USAID. July 21, 2006.

For more information, please visit  
<http://73Hwww.usaid.gov/missions/kosovo>

**U.S Agency for International Development**

**1300 Pennsylvania Ave, NW**

**Washington, DC, 20523**

**Phone: (202) 712-0000**

**Fax: (202) 216-3524**

**Web: [www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov)**