

## Keep on Talking!

### Review of the Nansen Dialogue Network in the Western Balkans

Vera Devine  
Varja Nikolic  
Hugo Stokke

**R 2008:16**



# Keep on Talking!

## Review of the Nansen Dialogue Network in the Western Balkans

Vera Devine  
Varja Nikolic  
Hugo Stokke

**R 2008:16**

### **CMI Reports**

This series can be ordered from:

Chr. Michelsen Institute  
P.O. Box 6033 Postterminalen,  
N-5892 Bergen, Norway  
Tel: + 47 55 57 40 00  
Fax: + 47 55 57 41 66  
E-mail: [cmi@cmi.no](mailto:cmi@cmi.no)  
[www.cmi.no](http://www.cmi.no)

Price: NOK 50

Printed version: ISSN 0805-505X  
Electronic version: ISSN 1890-503X

Printed version: ISBN 978-82-8062-321-8  
Electronic version: ISBN 978-82-8062-322-5

This report is also available at:  
[www.cmi.no/publications](http://www.cmi.no/publications)

Commissioned by the Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway

### **Indexing terms**

Macedonia  
Croatia  
Kosovo  
Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Peace-building  
Post-conflict  
Reconciliation

### **Project number**

27082

### **Project title**

Norad.(r): Gjennomgang Nansen-dialognettverk

## Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW .....	1
1.3 METHODS OF WORK .....	2
<b>2. NANSEN DIALOGUE CENTRES – INDIVIDUAL OFFICE REVIEWS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 NDC BANJA LUKA.....	5
2.2 NDC SARAJEVO.....	11
2.3 NDC MOSTAR.....	16
2.4 KOSOVAN NANSEN DIALOGUE (KND).....	21
2.5 NDC SKOPJE.....	26
2.6 NDC OSIJEK .....	30
2.7 NDC ACTIVITIES IN SOMALIA AND THE MIDDLE EAST .....	34
<b>3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>36</b>
3.1 CONCLUSIONS .....	36
3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	42
<b>ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>ANNEX 2:LIST OF PEOPLE MET .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: SELECT PROJECT SUMMARIES.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>ANNEX 4: PROJECT COSTS 2005 – 2007 .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>ANNEX 5: LIST OF RELEVANT LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>62</b>



## Executive Summary

Since 1995 the Nansen Academy has run programmes for participants from the countries comprising the former Yugoslavia. From 1997, these courses have been supplemented by the establishment of Nansen Dialogue Centres, the initial one in Pristina, but today adding up to eight centres scattered about the former Yugoslavia (with the exception of Slovenia). Their immediate objective is having “influenced attitudes of ethnic politics and mistrust and contributed to improved ethnic relations and practical cooperation in conflict-ridden communities and their long-term objective is “having contributed to sustainable peace and reconciliation in the Western Balkans by promoting inter-ethnic dialogue”.

The MFA has contributed approx. NOK 148.5 mill. to the centres from 1995 and up to the present date. Two reviews have been conducted over these years, one in 2003 and another in 2005, the first by MFA and the second by NDN. The MFA has decided to commission a fully external review this time with a specific focus on outcomes, impact and sustainability of the activities, the extent to which the potential of the network has been fully realised, whether previous recommendations have been implemented by the offices and finally, assess whether the Nansen dialogue represents a model that can be replicated in or adapted to other environments.

This is a report to follow up the two earlier reviews with a particular view to assess the results (outcomes and impact) from the NDC interventions on the Balkans. The team has selected six offices for review in order to cover a wide range of activities, in Croatia, Bosnia – Herzegovina, Kosovo and Macedonia. The TOR cover a similar wide range of aspects of NDC work, viz. effectiveness, impact, relevance, efficiency and replicability as well as specifications of relevant theories of change and application of methodologies to answer each aspect of NDC interventions. It should be kept in mind that our findings and conclusions only relate to these six centres and not to the entire network.

Two key points in the review are whether the NDN has achieved its immediate objective of having “influenced attitudes of ethnic politics and mistrust and contributed to improved ethnic relations and practical cooperation in conflict-ridden communities”. Secondly, the review should try to establish whether the NDN has contributed towards its long-term objective of “having contributed to sustainable peace and reconciliation in the Western Balkans by promoting inter-ethnic dialogue”.

The first point deals with *outcomes*, understood as the likely or achieved short term and medium term effects of an intervention’s outputs. The team finds that the NDN has quite clearly contributed towards this objective, in most cases by influencing the attitudes and actions of strategic individuals at the community levels. In some cases, this contribution has also led to changes at the institutional level by offering opportunities for interethnic cooperation beyond the space for dialogue. More basically, the NDN has contributed towards recreating and restoring communities by working with other partners to secure the return of displaced people.

The latter question deals with *impact*, understood as the positive, negative, primary and secondary effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. These are results that lie beyond immediate outcomes or sphere of intervention. Here statements can only be tentative at the best. This is so for at least two distinct reasons. Activities are on-going, hence allowing little scope for assessment of long-term effects. Secondly, activities may have terminated, but there are scanty records of what these potential long-term effects may have been, leaving reviewers with little substantial evidence to build on. Nonetheless, we believe that activities aimed at changing institutional practices are likely to have an impact at the community level. However, we do find that

the political and social environment in many instances is so volatile that solid predictions about impact are not going to be very reliable. Activities may be delayed, suspended, disrupted and recommenced owing to events and forces in the environment, and these are forces over which the NDN has very little control and that would require a much larger, stronger presence to deal with.

In general, we have found that results basically stem from changes in ways of thinking and acting of key individuals and groups targeted by the activities. In some instances, some of the larger projects have attempted to effect changes at the community level by offering opportunities for interethnic cooperation at the institutional level and possibly at the social level as well. But larger-scale changes are still channelled through dialogue and processes of persuasion and conviction. Targeting strategic individuals is a way of influencing and hopefully changing opinion in specific local settings, but these ways and means are always vulnerable to the balance of forces in the larger-scale political environment, over which NDC centres have very little control. It has to be borne in mind that the entire political, military and aid effort in the Western Balkans has not succeeded conclusively in changing opinion on the ground, so the efforts of the NCDs should be viewed against the background of the entire aid effort over the years and their variable success rates.

The TOR asks whether there is any programme theory underlying the dialogue approach. The team has tried to identify what may be the key assumptions in NDC work to get an idea of their way of effecting changes in local communities. We find that one key assumption underlying the NDC approach to dialogue in the Western Balkans is to deal with “strategic individuals”, people selected for their position in the respective community on the basis of their potential influence and outreach to a wider strata of the population. Secondly, there is the key notion that neutral space and neutral topics that are relevant across communities will break down prejudices and barriers and eventually result in engaging in other issues of common concern. Thirdly, the transfer of certain skills of communication will prepare beneficiaries to engage in contact with other ethnic groups, leading eventually to greater integration. Fourthly, facilitation from the outside and bringing people to Norway will present them with a potential model to aspire to and make them realise that co-operation across communities is possible and necessary for the common good and fifthly, being on unfamiliar ground will make it easier for their partners to confront uncomfortable issues than at home.

Overall, it is the assessment of the team that NDCs have been able to meet their *immediate objectives* of changing attitudes among target groups. We are less certain about longer-term impact beyond the specific focus groups, though in some instances NDC initiatives have generated interest beyond the project domain. We find the activities to be *relevant* as regards the selection of localities to intervene as well as specific activities to launch, but we would like to note that it takes time and persistence to be recognised locally, given the level of distrust in many of the localities. Activities are politically and institutionally *sustainable* in some areas, but in the short term not highly financially sustainable. We are concerned about one-off activities and would recommend longer-term engagement with core groups and on selected issues. Activities are *replicable* in a few instances, but we do not find clear evidence that Balkan experiences can be replicated in new areas of NDC interventions beyond the Balkans. We think there would be more *efficiency* gains from concentrating on core mandate issues, developing a stronger field presence and overall capacity-building in NDC areas of expertise. We do not find project management overhead costs to be excessive, subject, however, to the relevant base of comparison.

In the following we will deal more specifically with each TOR key item.

With reference to *effectiveness*, NDC activities in general meet their immediate objectives. All the different types of interventions had some impact on the individual participants involved in them. Objectives are also being reached at the programme level with the qualification that NDC



programming has so far rarely gone beyond 12 months at a time, essentially excluding any contrasting of achievements against medium to long-term plans or indicators of success. Baseline and progress indicators are being used in plan documents, but not in any systematic way to measure progress towards objectives. In a number of cases, most notably in Kosovo, results of NDC interventions have to be seen in conjunction with their partnering with other organizations, which often have much larger resources to rely on.

It is difficult to give a definite answer as to whether NDC interventions provide a more secure environment as conditions differ across the countries in which the NDCs are engaged. It should be noted that security concerns are beyond NDC control and that NDC interventions will remain vulnerable to larger-scale political events. In their specific areas of intervention, it is fair to say that inter-ethnic relations have improved among those specifically targeted. As we have noted, these will often be individuals of key local influence, politicians, municipality officials and professionals, such as teachers. It should be borne in mind that most areas of NDC interventions are in a post-conflict phase so that NDCs are more likely to deal with the lasting effects of conflicts than the conflict itself.

With reference to *impact*, it is difficult to conclusively ascertain the impact of NDC interventions beyond the narrower framework of the respective activities, or the annual programmes, at most. For some interventions, impact can be seen in terms of “role models” being replicated in other areas, particularly in the field of education. With regard to the scale of impact, NDC does operate in environments with substantial international presence, and many of the actors have much more powerful mandates, an incomparably stronger field presence, resulting in substantially more human and financial resources. At best, NDCs activities have had a lasting impact on the individuals involved in the various activities and on inter-group relations in project areas. In a number of cases, individuals confirmed having successfully transmitted skills and knowledge to a wider group of people.

Many of the activities seem not to have had any consistent, discernible impact if compared with its programming assumptions. We were able to confirm in some cases that the work with “strategic” individuals might have had some of the intended multiplier effects. We were less able to confirm that visits to Norway in most cases led to a change of attitude and working habits upon their return to home areas.

As for *replicability*, the NDC type of activities, with the obvious reservations about the fact that each environment is specific and that interventions need to factor in these specificities, can be replicated elsewhere, if expectations on what can realistically be achieved are being adjusted accordingly. The real question lies in trying to argue in favour of the legitimacy of such efforts being brought to countries from the outside, and particularly when such activities do not complement ongoing local or national efforts/policies. However, in one particular case, the Nansen Dialogue Network works with ex-pat groups of Somalis in Norway in order to train them as peace-builders for future work in the capital of Mogadishu in Somalia, drawing upon their double status as both outsiders and insiders. It is certainly the case that NDN plays upon being both insiders and outsiders – insiders with local knowledge and easier access – outsiders with the extra leverage this may provide.

Regarding *relevance*, the evaluators feel that NDC can be strong where it engages with communities, while conducting roundtable discussions, media events/debates, and participating in NGO networking activities tend to dilute its profile, and somewhat divert human and financial resources away from activities in favour of ethnically divided communities and local-level events.

As to the broader question of relevance, it does appear that NDC objectives are aligned with the Norwegian model for peace and reconciliation with its emphasis on long-term willingness to assist, its close co-operation with Norwegian NGOs as entry points to peace and reconciliation processes and the general objective of being a peace assistant, not a peace-maker. The recognition of NDC as a partner varies among the authorities in the countries concerned and persistence, patience and the willingness to be in for the long haul have gradually led to recognition in the specific communities. As for thematic relevance, some projects do address urgent concerns, such as the return and reintegration of displaced people; other projects look to the longer term as for instance multi-ethnic schools or the training of young politicians; while a third group of projects looks to the past with a view to initiate processes of healing and reconciliation. We cannot say that any of these activities is less relevant than the others. We would like to note that NDC interventions generally take place in a post-armed conflict environment so that the centres are more prone to deal with the long-term effects of past conflicts than the conflict itself. Issues of topicality and adaptation to current concerns are potentially double-edged. We find it better for NDCs to work with smaller groups over an extended period than to spread resources too thin over many current concerns.

Regarding *sustainability*, we find that for the activities surrounding local schools in ethnically mixed/divided communities in Croatia and Macedonia, there is a prospect of them having model character, and continuing beyond the individual municipality they are currently being “piloted” in; and some recent/ongoing activities would appear to need sustained support that could eventually lead to some sort of sustainable outcome. In particular, we are thinking of the work with a group from Prijedor on conflict resolution. Financially, none of the activities is sustainability in the short run with expectations of continued Norwegian funding a common feature, possibly to be superseded by EU funding in the medium term. As we have noted above, a few interventions are in the process of creating institutions and overarching structures, but most of them have worked with individuals and target groups defined by professional or other status – for example refugees/displaced.

The question of *efficiency* has to be seen in relation to effectiveness. In several cases, resources might be shifted to better reflect the core direction of NDCs work as being primarily field and dialogue-based. At the moment, there is a slant of people working in the central locations while comparatively few staff is spending time in the field. However, there are potential trade-offs to consider. As steady presence is an advantage for day-to-day management, but on the other hand, there is a risk of being caught up in internal affairs and lose the impartiality that comes with distance. We have another question mark as to whether NDCs have consistently been able to develop, over the years, skills and expertise to conduct relevant dialogue-building activities themselves, or whether their role will always be confined to coordinating and organising activities that then, in turn, have to be procured from other organisations. In some instances, the role of NDN is one of instigator and facilitator, yet in others, activities are resulting from long-term dialogue processes, as has been the case in Kosovo. Consolidation of core activities and more reliance on own expertise is likely to result in efficiency gains.

There may also be efficiency gains to be had from cutbacks in infrastructure and overall network management. Some NDCs have moved to less expensive offices and there is less funding for the network parts of the Nansen Dialogue Network, including the project management team in Norway which is in the process of being drastically reduced. The network is projected to have less significance in the future as centres will assume higher responsibility for securing their own funding. This may reduce co-ordination costs but conceivably at the cost of coherence. However, we do find that project management costs are not excessive for an organizational network of this kind, but this is dependent on what is regarded as the relevant base for comparison. For knowledge- and research-based NGOs of the type of CMI and PRIO, NDC PM costs are not excessive, but could be so if compared to other humanitarian NGOs. Below we summarise the observations regarding individual NDN centres.

*NDCs Bosnia-Herzegovina*

There are three Nansen-Dialogue Centres in BiH: in Banja Luka, Sarajevo, and Mostar. While all three centres adopt broadly the same mission statement, there is some variation in the way in which the individual centres interpret it, with NDC Banja Luka standing out in terms of their considerable focus on a TV programme. A substantial part of the activities of NDC Mostar is focused on the city itself, with increasing focus on work in Stolac. The NDCs Banja Luka and Sarajevo now have a specific emphasis on work outside their “headquarters”.

All three NDCs have tried to accommodate the recommendations from the 2003 and 2005 evaluations: these concerned mainly the need to consolidate the work to become more focused on inter-ethnic dialogue building activities in refugee and returnee communities, and cutting down on activities that had a more general civil society-building character. While such activities had been part of the NDC portfolio before, they have, overall, received a greater focus in the past few years.

Despite some difficulties in assessing the impact of these activities, interventions have, by and large, had a somewhat ad-hoc character, and there has been no medium to long-term work with specific target groups in specific communities that would allow a perspective, over time, on what the effects of NDCs interventions are, beyond a general-level recognition that the skills transferred through seminars have addressed a need and been useful to participants at the individual level. In a few instances, individual participants confirmed having transmitted some of the skills further (e.g. NDC Banja Luka’s work with teachers). Hence the results and potential impact of these activities are likely to remain at the individual level. At this point, it is difficult to point to changes in institutional and societal practices beyond those groups specifically targeted by the activities.

Anticipated changes in the funding modalities have led to a welcome and much needed shift in strategic planning of the offices, and there appears now to be a planning perspective spanning more than the previous 12-month cycle. Given continued funding, this will allow centres to move to a more strategic medium-to long-term perspective on their interventions in the difficult communities in which they are working. It will hopefully also make them a more credible partner with the target communities.

However, there is still a clear slant towards high-profile events, and, it seems, a preference for roundtables and media work involving politicians. The impact of this work is highly uncertain. Grassroots-level work in difficult communities appears to be more difficult and probably more frustrating—but it also seems more needed. The evaluators therefore would urge another round of reflection on whether the portfolios (and budgets) are genuinely well balanced towards work in communities.

Important work in Prijedor/Sanski Most, Srebrenica/Bratunac, and Stolac has started over the past couple of years. This work, in order to be responsible and serious, needs to be sustained over time and appropriate planning needs to reflect strategies for safeguarding achievements against being off-set by political developments (NDC Sarajevo and its work in Srebrenica/Bratunac municipalities). We also urge some internal reflection on how to avoid inadvertently doing harm by not offering target groups appropriate follow-up processes once painful dialogue processes on facing the past have started (NDC Banja Luka).

*NDC Skopje and NDC Osijek*

Both the NDC Skopje and the NDC Osijek have opted for long-term engagement in the education sector. These projects go back several years and the projected end result is an inter-ethnic school in both cases. In order to reach this goal, both centres have worked with the local municipal authorities, with educational offices and services, with teachers and organized parents to take a

more active role in advocacy and in engaging in school affairs. In the Jegunovce municipality in Macedonia, this work has been actively supported by the local authorities whereas in Vukovar in Croatia, support has tended to come from the national level rather than from the local city council, reflecting the still remaining inter-ethnic tensions in that particular area. As a means to assess the potential interest in a new school, IT and English classes as well as Albanian and Macedonian language classes have been offered in Jegunovce in a deliberate attempt to combine the useful with knowledge of both languages on an extra-curricular basis. In terms of turn-out, these activities have been hugely successful, threatening to overwhelm supply. In the Croatian case, the elective subject of the cultural and spiritual heritage of the Eastern Slavonia region, intended as part of the New School curriculum, has already been picked by other schools in the region. In both cases, potential impact has been discernible as the idea of inter-ethnic schools, curricula and courses has generated interest beyond the specific project activities generated and facilitated by the NDC offices. Even though the schools have not been established yet, the idea has caught on, despite local resistance, particularly in Vukovar.

However, engaging in projects with physical and infrastructural outputs such as schools raises the question of whether the NDCs run the risk of promising more than they can deliver as both projects cannot be accommodated within the regular annual budget, forcing both NDCs to seek funding through the Norwegian bilateral budgets as a first resort. In the longer term, funding may be sought from the EU as both Croatia and Macedonia are candidate countries. If financial sustainability is not assured at the moment, both projects appear to be backed up by higher political authority and by public education authorities. In these cases, the NDCs appear as partly instigators, partly facilitators as the projects increasingly ensure local ownership. Potential impact beyond municipality level, though, seems to be better in Macedonia than in Croatia.

#### *Kosovan Nansen Dialogue*

Nansen dialogue work in Kosovo presents a highly varied picture. In line with the recommendations of previous evaluations, KND has increasingly focused their activities on the return of displaced people resulting from the war in 1999 (and the events of 2004). The KND contribution, as has been acknowledged by many interviewees, has been to bring representatives of receiving and returning communities to the table in order to get a process of dialogue going. In the case of the villages of Fushë Kosova – Kosovo Polje (FKP), this engagement goes back several years with repeated meetings of a core group of representatives. In the FKP case, the engagement has borne fruit, though the gains do appear precarious, subject to sudden and unpredictable setbacks. KND has also been engaged in the return of Romas to their former domicile in Mitrovica South over several years, though this engagement is to be faded out in 2008.

Differently from other NDC offices, KND partners extensively with both multi-lateral organizations and NGOs in the return projects so any assessment of project success or failure cannot be done without considering the whole. However, KND has also been initiating dialogue in Obiliq/c and in Mitrovica. While these dialogues took place in a multitude of locations, covering a wide range of topics, frequently at a high political level, the results have been variable in terms of operational plans with more success in Obiliq/c than in Mitrovica, no doubt reflecting the very difficult terrain in the latter city. KND operates small projects in two areas, a small village outside Obiliq/c and in a neighbourhood in Mitrovica North, offering IT and English classes to the communities concerned, similarly to the NDC Skopje work in the Jegunovce municipality.

It might appear, everything else being equal, that dialogue with definable and operational goals has a higher possibility of success than more open-ended dialogues. It may also be a matter of pitching the dialogue at the right level in the sense that participants have a possibility of effecting change. If the dialogues are beyond their capacities, requiring higher political backup, they are inevitably subject to the vagaries of high politics. KND has consistently tried to engage the Serb community,

but with mixed results. Work with student associations has not got off the ground. Some dialogue evenings have been held with Serbs in Mitrovica North and there are plans for initiating a Nansen Inter-ethnic Forum in Pristina this year. These appear to our knowledge to be open-ended engagements and expectations may have to be adjusted accordingly.

Nonetheless, given the reality on the ground in Kosovo, we do see a point of having a NDC/KNDC presence to deal with an environment which is volatile and unpredictable and will most likely remain so in the foreseeable future. Given this environment, it may be premature to expect projects to be sustainable when legitimate questions can be raised as to whether the new state of Kosovo itself is in any way economically sustainable.

#### *NDC projects outside the Balkans*

The team has had a brief look at projects in Somalia and the Middle East to see whether experiences from the Balkans can be replicated in these engagements. Beyond the trivial fact that dialogue is the common method for all Nansen engagements, we do find that these projects will have to be judged on their own merits and that experiences cannot be easily transferred. In particular, the Somalia project offers a different model as it engages Somali ex-pats in Norway as agents of change in Somalia. Yet, working with clan structures and in a large city such as Mogadishu is likely to raise other challenges than working with inter-ethnic co-operation in smaller communities and villages in the Balkans.

In Annex 3, we have given a condensed summary of six projects, one for each of the six offices we have visited. The summaries cover the following key terms; background/ justification; risks/opportunities; inputs; target groups; outputs; outcomes and impact. For outcomes, projected or actual have been distinguished. For impact, the same distinction has been applied and a further distinction has been made between level of impact; individual, institutional and social. This annex gives a potted view of what has been accomplished so far, though the list is far from exhaustive. For the full verbal account, readers are advised to go to the main text.

#### *Recommendations*

On the basis of the above observations, generally and drawing on the individual centre reviews, the evaluators believe that the comparative advantage of NDC is primarily in its very local-level activities involving members of ethnically mixed/divided communities. More efforts should be undertaken to fully realise the potential of this work. NDC should sustain presence and efforts in areas where interventions have recently started and see processes through with the maximum of efforts and resources.

We would argue that a local approach – small areas with problems that are amenable to NDC intervention and are manageable given capacity and resources are a better option than large-scale operations and open-ended roundtables for achieving results. The underlying assumption is that the former can only be contemplated in partnership with other organizations with the requisite competence and resources and the latter is frequently too open-ended to yield tangible results.

Secondly, we would think NDC work would be strengthened if projects were able to specify operational objectives and results that address issues beyond changing the mindsets of individual beneficiaries with a view towards establishing services and/or changing institutional practices. For this type of work, they would need to involve local authorities and expertise as they have done for a number of projects. Their distinct contribution may be partly to instigate, by lobbying, and facilitating and coordinating later on, making sure that the beneficiaries are in the driving seat and ensuring local ownership.

We would argue for medium-level dialogue – in the sense of avoiding issues that the NDCs and their constituents are not likely to solve without higher political backup. If the environment is conducive to tackling these issues, then it may be worth trying. In situations of deadlock, the efforts may come to nought.

We would also argue for long-term engagement with a core group of people. One NDC advantage, recognized by many interviewees, is their staying capacity and local presence – to come in and remain in when other agencies come and go. NDC work has more of a process character than a project character with definable start and termination points.

Finally, while many projects address past injustices and wrong-doings and provide a space for airing grievances and seeking understanding, we do also see an advantage in projects that can benefit the entire community independently of ethnic belonging – with the long-term vision of making ethnic distinctions less relevant for local community decision-making. This does not in any way disqualify activities dealing with past events and processes dealing with how to cope with the legacy of the past.

We would argue that if these considerations can be given precedence in future programming, there is good reason for continued MFA support.

Questions should be asked at the level of the donor what realistically can be achieved with a limited budget and limited human resources, in a limited geographical area. At the same time, the possible futility of NDCs efforts in such environments does not argue against them: we believe that there is a value to be had in being on the ground and demonstrating alternative models to local communities.

For interventions of the type NDC is pursuing to be successful, we find that time – and continuity of funding – is key: in order to engage in a meaningful way, project staff needs to have the possibility of ensuring to potential beneficiaries that theirs is not a one-off engagement in a specific community, but that they are there to stay and pursue their efforts. These long-term efforts should on the other hand be assured of reliable funding so as to avoid doing harm to beneficiaries and their expectations. We would strongly recommend continued funding of these longer-term processes, particularly when there are tangible results at hand.

With regard to overall discussions on aid ownership, we believe that there should be some reflection on the role of an outside donor in providing assistance that cuts deep into the social texture of a society. While not questioning the need for reconciliation activities in the region, we believe that in order to be genuinely successful, it would help if they are grown and driven from inside the respective society, and that their importance is recognised at the official level. Outside assistance can only facilitate such a process, but the true responsibility would have to remain with the parties themselves. In environments where there is not, yet, any readiness to tackle these painful issues, there need to be some reflection and discussion on what kind of success can realistically be expected.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Since 1995 the Nansen Academy has run programmes for participants from the countries comprising the former Yugoslavia. From 1997, these courses have been supplemented by the establishment of Nansen Dialogue Centres, the initial one in Pristina, but today adding up to eight centres scattered about the former Yugoslavia (with the exception of Slovenia). The purpose of these centres is to promote inter-ethnic dialogue among the communities in which they are situated and hence contribute to sustainable peaceful relations and reconciliation.

The MFA has contributed approx. NOK 148.5 mill. to the training courses and the centres from 1995 and up to the present date. Two reviews have been conducted over these years, one by MFA in 2003 and another one by NFN in 2005. The MFA has decided to commission an external review this time with a specific focus on impact and sustainability of the activities, the extent to which the potential of the network has been fully realised, whether previous recommendations have been implemented by the offices and finally, assess whether the Nansen dialogue represents a model that can be replicated in or adapted to other environments.

### 1.2. Purpose of the review

As stated in the TOR, the main purpose of the review is to assess to what extent the Nansen Dialogue Network has achieved its *immediate objective* of having “influenced attitudes of ethnic politics and mistrust and contributed to improved inter-ethnic relations and practical cooperation in conflict ridden communities”. Furthermore, the review should also endeavour to establish to what extent the network has contributed to its *long term, overall objective* of having “contributed to sustainable peace and reconciliation in the Western Balkans by promoting inter-ethnic dialogue”.

The key supposition is that inter-ethnic dialogue is a vital ingredient in achieving sustainable peace in the Western Balkans. Other political factors and agencies may be at work in achieving the long-term objective of sustainable peace, but the distinct ingredient of the NDN approach is dialogue across the various communities in the areas covered.

The Nansen Dialogue Network operates eight Centres (and one branch office) in all throughout the former Yugoslavia and each Centre runs a number of projects. Looking at the various projects across the Centres, there is a common thread running through them which might be formulated as follows – from a state of division to a state of integration. Many of these projects address the problem of divided communities – whether these are manifested in displacement of communities or in the existence of divided institutions, for instance in the educational sector. Some of the projects deal with specific techniques – such as mediation. Others deal with making public sector institutions work better – such as the municipal public sector in Bujanovac and the Ombudsman office in Novi Sad. Yet others are working on strengthening democracy and civil society (as in Montenegro), with media presentations (and presence) (as in Banja Luka), with a target group in general such as youth or with academic studies (such as in Novi Sad University).

However, a review cannot realistically expect to deal with all of these varieties of addressing the question of division, so as a criterion for selection we have selected offices that deal with two types of interventions central to the Nansen mandate:

- Multi-ethnic schools
- Return and integration of displaced communities

One of the effects of the civil wars in the former Yugoslavia was to divide the educational sector into separate schools and classes for the communities affected by the conflict. One objective for the NDN has been to promote and work for joint and multi-ethnic schools in various parts of the areas covered.

Three offices are working on the establishment of multi-ethnic schools: NDC Osijek, NDC Skopje and NDC Mostar. For sure, there are other projects dealing with educational and schooling issues in different ways, for instance through offering mediation services in schools and conducting dialogues with students, pupils and youth in general.

Secondly, the return and integration of displaced communities due to the war is a very tangible way of assisting the victims of war and helping them towards a new future. Three other offices address this concern: Kosovan Nansen Dialogue, NDC Banja Luka and NDC Sarajevo.

All three offices deal with returnees – the first with Serbs and Romas to villages in Kosovo, the second with returnees to municipalities in Republica Srpska and the third with returnees to the Bratunac – Srebrenica area of Eastern Bosnia. Here the issue is not only the actual return, but also the reintegration of returnees to their former area of domicile. The long-term impact of this process would be the actual extent of integration (or reintegration).

This selection will obviously not cover all offices or all projects, but for reasons of manageability a selection has to be made and we settled on these six offices. Of course, any generalisation will be limited in validity to the samples made. But the sample is broad enough to cover a wide variety of activities as well as keeping a focus on core mandate activities (as identified by the 2003 evaluation).

The TOR also address the issue of impact and the review has accordingly been extended into the past in order to make assessments about terminated projects and activities. As the review covers six offices, we have in some cases given a broader view of activities in the present and in the past and in other cases kept a narrower focus on specific projects. As such, the review has attempted to catch both the breadth and depth of NDC engagement.

The review has been asked to look at a number of issues which deal with

- Effectiveness - immediate objectives
- Impact – long term objectives beyond project (incl. replicability)
- Relevance – alignment with Norwegian policies, conflict analysis
- Sustainability – process continuation beyond project duration
- Efficiency – costliness in terms of results

Full specifications of the key terms are given in the attached TOR.

### 1.3 Methods of work

The review work has to a large extent consisted of interviews with a range of respondents. We have covered project staff – NDN staff working on specific projects; beneficiaries – those specifically targeted by the project (and previous beneficiaries); target group beyond beneficiaries – those not targeted by the project; people with knowledge about project/organisation – specifically NDN; people with knowledge about the subject; people of influence locally – officials/ politicians/ media/



associations; and peers – similar types of organisations (local, national, international) working on similar or comparable types of projects.

In-depth, partially structured interviews with individuals/agencies have been conducted in the localities selected and supplemented by written material collected during the review. These include standard questions structured around the issues given in the TOR; non-standard questions to take account of project/locality specificity; review of project documentation, including progress reports and monitoring/evaluation reports, if available; review of project-relevant documentation – similar/comparable projects/ organisations; review of contextual documentation relating to locality and area – general background to understanding the environment and to the extent possible, observation at project-organised events. In general, questions have been structured around the specifics of given projects. As activities are very diverse, quantitative assessments by ways of surveys have not been possible to do.

With reference to the individual items in the TOR, the team has assessed *effectiveness* on the basis of annual work plans and mid-year plans and the extent of monitoring and evaluations done by each office on individual projects and on observations made during field visits. It should be noted that NDC does not submit project documents in the usual sense of activities spanning several years, but work plans covering one year of activities with an annual budget. The plans usually specify inputs and outputs and include indicators of progress in a somewhat unsystematic manner, usually pairing basin lines with projected outcomes. Attribution is in some cases difficult as NDCs partner with other organisations for larger-scale activities. The question of security has been assessed on the basis of people's perceptions, but also on NDC analyses of their operational environment.

*Impact* has been assessed by including terminated projects in the review and by interviewing former participants of NDC activities. In some cases, impact can be seen in the replication of "role models" of on-going projects, demonstrating that NDC initiatives have had effects beyond the specific locality. In other cases, impact cannot be estimated independently of the contributions of other agencies, particularly for large-scale projects in which many partners are involved. However, impact is in most instances transmitted through individuals, and the review has accessed individuals in order to gain an impression of projected impact through their accounts. In most cases, impact has to be seen as projected impact as activities are on-going.

*Relevance* has been assessed along a number of dimensions. Policy documents show the alignment with Norwegian official policies. The relevance of Lillehammer has been assessed in relation to concrete project activities. The recognition of NDC work differs across their areas of operation, making an understanding of the environment essential for assessment. A key point in NDC work has been to seek out areas of ethnic contention rather than areas of ethnic normality, highlighting the importance of conflict analysis. But as the individual office reviews bear out, NDC has gone about this task in a number of different ways in which past events, present concerns and future aspirations all play a part.

*Sustainability* can be assessed both in institutional and financial senses. It has been a point for the review to find out whether the objective is to change individual or institutional practices and whether activities are one-off or extensive over a longer period of time. The review finds examples of combinations of both dimensions. Financial sustainability depends on the extent to which national or local authorities are willing to pick up costs in the near future. In most cases, operations do rely on outside funding, particularly so in poorer parts such as Kosovo. However, in some cases, results may be politically and institutionally sustainable without being financially sustainable in the short run.

*Efficiency* may be determined both at the project and programme level. There are methodological difficulties as activities are not framed as project documents with a stipulated budget over a timeframe, but as annual work plans which may be adjusted from year to year. Furthermore, the results of dialogue activities are hard to measure as results are often couched in terms of changed inter-ethnic relations and personal attitudes. Thirdly, in project where there are tangible results, as in the case of return of refugees and internally displaced, NDC is a part of a larger activity with other agencies, and assessments are most easily made at the level of the entire activity. However, estimates of efficiency gains may be made at the infrastructure and coordination levels beyond the specific projects..

*Replicability* can be assessed at two different levels, first, in terms of impact, and secondly, in terms of transferability. We have tried to see whether ideas and activities have spread to other areas beyond the project domain itself, i.e. whether NDC ideas and activities have generated interest elsewhere..Furthermore, we have had a brief look at NDC activities beyond the Balkans to see whether project experiences from the Balkans can be transferred to new areas.

With regard to *theories of change*, we find that the underlying logic of NDC interventions might approximate a statement of this sort; if we do x, it will lead to y which will have a key influence on z. If we insert dialogue for x, target group of strategic individuals for y and policy decision for z, we may have a model for change. But a model of this sort may not catch the entirety of interventions and the weak linkage may be the connection between y and z. Many of the interventions do not have a highly specified objective beyond offering a space for dialogue in which individuals are free to talk about their past experience, present concerns and visions for the future. The purpose may be to effect an attitudinal change rather than to change institutional practices with the hope that policy changes may occur at one point in the future. Other types of interventions have much clearer objectives, as in the case of return of refugees and internally displaced, where figures can be given on actual accomplishments.

We find that the NDC approach in many instances can be viewed as a *process* type of activity in which the primary objective is to bring the parties together to talk and where the achievement of specific objectives is a secondary objective. The DAC Guidance on evaluating conflict prevention and peace-building argues that dialogue activities can be seen as having a *process* focus rather than an *outcome* focus, particularly where the primary objective is effecting individual attitude changes.

The review has settled on a large number of cases, in order to grasp the breadth of NDC interventions. While a few case studies could have been selected and studied in depth, conclusions would then have to be much more cautious and tentative given the small sample. By a broader selection, we have a better basis for drawing general conclusions on the above key terms. We have tried to include a broad group of respondents as an attempt at triangulation, though they would have to have some knowledge about NDC project activities in order to qualify. This might not be enough to exclude bias, but we have included previous assessments and evaluations of NDC activities in our review in order to get an impression of views and opinions on activities in the wider environment. We have not systematically attributed statements to individual interviewees as some of the statements may be sensitive and possibly given in confidence. As many statements are perceptions and not statements of fact, they cannot be independently verified and must be seen as opinions and viewpoints and not as authoritative and definite.

Below follow individual office reviews of the six offices selected. The reviews cover as wide a range of activities as possible, on-going as well as terminated ones. In order to systematise our findings, we have in the concluding section selected one project from each office below and given a condensed summary of each, using seven key terms for comparison. These range from background.to impact.

## 2. Nansen Dialogue Centres – Individual Office Reviews

### 2.1 NDC Banja Luka

#### Introductory comments on NDC Banja Luka

The 2003 evaluation recommended that NDC Banja Luka make adjustments to the composition of its staff in order to reflect the organization's mission statement of promoting inter-ethnic dialogue. This recommendation has been taken up. The evaluators feel, however, that despite the commitment to inter-ethnic dialogue at the mission, programme, and activity level, NDC BL threatens to undermine its own objectives by paying insufficient attention to what might seem details on that matter. The NDC Banja Luka website gives language options as being "English" and "Serbian". Given the sensitivity of this issue, this negligence is not acceptable. Participants of one of the activities have remarked on the repeated use of interpreters from one ethnic group which made them feel uneasy.

The 2005 evaluation urged a focus on monitoring and evaluation; the evaluators did not necessarily get the impression that this had been taken up in seriousness: while information on participants, for example, is available in a variety of documents, there is no consolidated database of past and current participants; for many participants, contact details are missing; basic quantitative data are not necessarily available. With specific regards to the TV show, data indicating how many viewers the different shows attracted are the same as five years ago given in an internal document; figures given by the NDC co-ordinator during a public statement were different, but attracted a certain degree of scepticism from some of the interviewees.

#### General comments on activities and results

NDC Banja Luka has successfully streamlined most of its activities to focus primarily on work in the Sanski Most/Prijedor area facilitating inter-ethnic dialogue, on the one hand, and on the TV shows "Buka", on the other hand.

With the exemption of the TV shows "Buka", and, to some extent the "Beauty in Diversity" activity, there is an overall impression of fragmentation and a one-off character of activities in the overall portfolio of NDC Banja Luka. While thematically and geographically, the field activities follow the same parameters, none of them has lasted long enough to involve a specific group of participants over a medium or long-term, nor are the activities designed to reflect on potential impact beyond their duration and the immediate objective (teaching skills of non-violent communication, human rights, and conflict resolution). There is no clear reference to how participants are expected or anticipated to put these skills to use, and how this could be measured, beyond the fact that participants are chosen to represent NGOs, institutions, the media etc. and are as such, potential multipliers. The assumption appears to be that by virtue of selecting participants that reach, through their professions, out to the community that the skills that they will have acquired through the seminars/activities will be fed into the wider community, and will initiate change. We were able, to some extent, to confirm the usefulness of the skills participants received at the individual level. In some instances (in particular where NDC's work had targeted pedagogues), participants confirmed that they had been able to transmit these skills wider.

NDC, in particular in its field work, seems to tap into a niche in that there are only few organizations, not only in the Prijedor/Sanski Most area, but throughout BiH, that deal explicitly with inter-ethnic dialogue. The timing seems to be particularly good now in that some of the physical pre-conditions (return of DPs and refugees to their pre-war homes) have been met, and people face the day-to-day task of actually living together again in one community. The return of a large number of pre-war inhabitants was certainly the result of the people's own drive to return, plus the pressure exerted by the international community not only with regards to return issues, but also with regards to representation of ethnic groups in the municipal administrations etc.

However, activities should go beyond short-term work with the people involved, and instead engage with them in a medium to long-term process. There is certainly a strong argument for a field presence, which would allow NDC to better understand the specific needs and dynamics of the communities its activities are supposed to benefit, in addition to being in more frequent contact with the target audience that might help to tailor the specific actions. We also suggest a reflection on the relative costs of the activities in the current portfolio and possibly, for making alterations to programming choices, maybe in favour of more work in the communities.

The need for medium- to long-term engagement in the target communities is a specific concern with regards to initiating, and seeing through, activities that fall under reconciliation work in the narrower sense. We believe that responsible programming dictates that such activities cannot be conceived as one-off seminars/events (and not be at the end of a funding cycle with no certain prospect of a continuation of funding). This comment goes to the very core of how programming and activity design is being undertaken and based on what knowledge choices are made.

### Beauty of Diversity (Ljepota u različitosti)

From April to July 2003, NDC Banja Luka conducted the first part of its "Beauty of Diversity" activity, consisting of a series of 11 workshops. The programme targeted representatives of local associations and NGOs "representing all nationalities living in Banja Luka". Participants came from the following associations/NGOs: the Muslim Charitable Society "Merhamet", "Caritas" of Presnaće parish, St. Sava Youth Association, Association of the Czech in RS, Association of the Slovenians in RS and Association of the Macedonians in RS. The objectives of the programme were described as follows:

- "to open a space for inter-ethnic dialogue between the young members of the organisations / associations that represent all nationalities living in Banja Luka
- to facilitate a programme of interactive workshops dealing with issues such as: skills of non-violent communication, prejudices, identity and change, mutual cooperation.
- to explore possibilities of mutual cooperation between participants of the programme, either through present NDC Banja Luka programme lines or by initiating new activities
- to come out with concrete activities that will be carried out by the participants of the programme"

The workshops dealt with skills and techniques on non-violent communication, negotiation techniques etc. A second programme cycle, held from November to December 2003, brought together broadly the same group of participants as the first cycle, and focused on each nationality giving a presentation on culture, history, and traditions to the wider group. The content of the second cycle of the programme had been decided by participants themselves, and was, in this way, responsive and demand-driven, although there was certainly more of a "feel good" character to those activities (including listening to folk music and socializing over cocktails etc.). A number of participants continued their involvement with NDC in other, "Training of Trainers", activities and

report the skills having been obtained there as being very useful for them on a practical level (in particular the writing of project proposals that helped them to apply for funding).

Participants interviewed felt genuinely appreciative of the skills they gained during the workshops, and confirmed that it had given them more confidence and a sense of security which they had not had before. They also confirmed that the activities had provided a space in which they could break communication barriers vis-à-vis other ethnic groups, and which, for the first time, showed them a way out of their perceived isolation in Banja Luka. Participants state that, to this date, they are keeping in contact, which they attribute directly to the activity. This would suggest that at the activity level, and judged against its own objectives, the activity has been successful.

It is, however, difficult to say whether, and in which way, the project had a long-term impact on the community and the way in which ethnic minorities are involved in the wider society. The mere fact that the involved individuals from associations got to know each other better is not, yet, an indicator that multi-ethnic dialogue has been established on a broader level, and on substantial questions, or that the individuals involved in the activities felt empowered to participate in the debate about key questions affecting them.

### Activities Sanski Most-Prijedor

In the first 6 months of 2007, 211 people (206 Bosniaks and 5 Croats) had returned to Prijedor municipality—one of the highest numbers in the entire Republika Srpska. This has continued a steady flow, since 2001, making Prijedor one of the municipalities with the most substantial minority return in the entire BiH. The number of Serb returnees to Sanski Most, is, by contrast, with 2000, rather low. Work in the neighbouring Prijedor and Sanski Most municipalities has become a core focus of NDC BL work since 2004, as a direct follow-up to recommendations from the 2003 evaluation, which urged a programmatic emphasis on working on inter-ethnic dialogue and refugee/IDP/returnee issues in both municipalities.

Activities have taken different formats.

### Divided Communities

A specific focus has been, in 2004, within the framework of the “Divided Communities” project, on work with the local media in Prijedor and Sanski Most. Within the framework of this cycle of activities, NDC facilitated the production and emission of 11 radio shows on the local radio in Prijedor, and 13 TV emissions broadcast on local TV stations in Prijedor and Sanski Most. In addition to initiating/contributing to the emission’s topics to receive wide coverage in the communities, the programme also aimed at establishing contacts with potential future participants of NDC activities, and to promote the aims and objectives of NDC. The design of the activities followed the analysis that there was very little capacity in the local media, both in Sanski Most and in Prijedor, to tackle difficult subjects, as well as a great degree of fear of journalists to be associated, by their local communities, with difficult themes, or such that challenge the mainstream political opinion. At least in part, the features were produced by journalists who feared to be identified as the authors.

The 2005 internal evaluation reported NDC BL staff judging the numbers of audience of the shows as having been relatively low. In a self-evaluation, NDC Banja Luka felt that there was definitely a need to continue, in a “consistent” fashion, to work with local media; it was not, however, defined, what such follow-up might consist of in the context of what the NDC as an organization with its specific mission objective and limited resources *can* offer to such a group (the needs for capacity building for the media at local and central levels in BiH are, undoubtedly, massive, and can in no

way be sufficiently addressed by an organization such as NDC). Individual journalists from both municipalities continue to participate in different NDC BL activities, such as the autumn 2007 dialogue building seminars that were designed to bring together a group of influential people from both municipalities (see below). It is, however, questionable, whether this constitutes a “consistent” follow-up of any kind.

### Dialogue-building activities with different groups in Prijedor and Sanski Most

In late 2004, a conference with the title of “Prijedor-Sanski Most 1992-2004-2010: The current political situation in Sanski Most and Prijedor and possibilities for co-operation between the two municipalities (*Trenutna politička situacija u Sanskom Mostu i Prijedoru i mogućnosti saradnje između dvije opštine*)” was held in Prijedor. It was followed by a series of roundtable discussions under the title of “Reconciliation and Coexistence (*Pomirenje i zajednički život*)” involving different stakeholders (representatives of political parties, the municipal authorities of Sanski Most and Prijedor, NGO representatives etc.) in 2005. In the framework of this series of activities, which aimed at connecting the different institutions and administrative structures of both communities, a meeting between the two mayors was held; according to NDC Banja Luka, this was the first meeting of the two mayors since the end of the war, which is not entirely accurate—there have been meetings before (as early as 1996 between the then mayors Alagić and Stakić). What is, true, however, is that this was the first time that municipal authorities had met in such a broad composition and discussing not the relative shares or delivery of reconstruction assistance, but issues such as reconciliation and coexistence. NDC has clearly been credited by those involved in the events for bringing this issue to the table. The roundtables were followed up by separate meetings of the different peer groups of the two municipalities, during which they developed individual action plans for follow-up activities. These follow-up meetings were not initiated or facilitated by NDC Banja Luka, but were a direct result of the contacts established during the series of roundtables; they indicate a certain level of sustainability of results achieved going beyond the duration of the activity itself.

A series of seminars on “Non-violent communication and peaceful conflict resolution” was held for teachers in 2004 and 2005, with the aim of creating an environment conducive to communication in which students, including returnees, felt safe. Each target group (teachers from primary schools in Prijedor and Sanski Most) went through three seminars, each of which lasted three days, in total, 28 teachers participated. The teachers then conducted follow-up seminars with students from the older grades of the primary schools. Teachers were also the target group of two seminars, in 2005, on “Upbringing and Education for Human Rights”. In autumn 2007, 22 teachers from Sanski Most municipality participated in a “Mediation in School” workshop, which was organized in co-ordination and co-operation with other NDCs. Participants in the various activities targeted at teachers were genuinely positive about the experience. They reported to having passed on techniques (interactive work, role play etc.) they had learned during the seminars to their students, with visible results on the overall climate in the classroom and the absence of physical and psychological violence among the children, as well as a high academic achievement rate in the grade. There was a consensus on the utility of this type of activity for the teaching profession, and the need for a continuation of activities involving teachers.

In autumn 2007, two seminars (one took place locally, the second in Lillehammer) were held for the same group of “influential people” from Prijedor and Sanski Most. The seminars, entitled “Reconciliation as a precondition for democratic development of local community” aimed at opening a “space among our participants on dealing with the past [...]”. Participants were selected using NDCs specific local experience, the focus being on members of the municipal government and administration and MPs of the RS Assembly from Prijedor, as well as local NGO activists, a journalist and a policeman from Prijedor now working on community policing issues at the RS

police headquarters in Banja Luka. During the Lillehammer seminar, some participants were for the first time speaking about traumatic war-time events, and it appears to have been the first time that others were directly confronted with victims of atrocities that they had heard talked about, but which had until then, been abstract and distant. Some stories/confessions came as an almost physical shock to participants, and while none of the participants was a perpetrator of the individual events, there appears to have been a moment of asking for forgiveness.

It is too early to try to make judgements about the impact of this activity. The evaluators met with almost all participants at the seminar. Interviewees seemed genuinely enthused and moved by what they had experienced in Norway, and there was a strong impression of an urge to talk about the powerfulness of this experience for the participants. There was a running thread to all participants' comments that the activity had been well timed – it would have been impossible to do something similar even a couple of years earlier. Also, the strength of the experience was attributed to the fact that the group was able to open up having been put in a completely new environment in Lillehammer; an effect that hadn't been achieved during the first seminar close to their home environments. Certainly, the completely new/different environment contributed to participants not being able to "run away" or evade speaking and hearing about traumatic war-time events, something that had happened during the first seminar. The group is extremely keen on continuing to work together. In addition, the experience has been so eye-opening and powerful to them that participants have been discussing ways to make others in their communities share this experience. One idea that is circulating is to open a local centre for reconciliation and dialogue. Another idea is to have similar seminars in the different local communities of Prijedor and Sanski Most municipalities. Participants feel, however, that at this stage, they would not be able to pull either of this off on their own, and they would need the help of NDC to see these things through (this is one of the concrete reasons for which it is felt that NDC should have a permanent field presence).

There are, however, a few issues of concern with this type of activity which we want to flag.

First, NDC BL as the organizers and facilitators of the activity might want to reconsider their own role. Participants were not convinced that it was justified to have NDC BL staff, as well as an outside person that had been brought in as a facilitator/trainer/consultant, be active participants in the seminar, in particular when it was supposed to focus on Prijedor and Sanski Most, i.e. on specifically local issues and relationships between local people. Participants felt that this damaged the dynamics of the seminar, in addition to getting a sense of condescension that somebody from outside both communities feels entitled, in this environment, to set the tone. Trust in the impartiality of one of the trainers seems also to have been seriously damaged.

Second, Serbs and Bosniaks each had different views on what the objective of the seminar was. For the Serb participants, the aim seems to have been to make each other understand that they had all equally been victims of the war, no matter of what ethnic group they each belonged to (a view echoing a wide-held belief among Serbs in the RS). Once a consensus was reached on this, it should be possible to move on. NDC BL was criticized for not bringing in representatives from the Serb side that had experienced a comparable amount of suffering, but they were convinced that that had been the idea. Bosniaks, however, left with the impression that their Serb colleagues had not understood that on the territory of Prijedor, the suffering had been bigger on their side. This is not necessarily an issue as such, it just shows that there is still a lot of work to be done, and opens the question as to whether this type of activities can responsibly be conceived as a one-off event.

Yet, it is not clear that now, after opening up this traumatic experience, there is a follow-up mechanism in place to offer support to participants. This concerns both the Serb (for whom an association by default/proxy to the atrocities suffered by the two Bosniak participants must be extremely unsettling) and the Bosniak side. We therefore do have question marks as to whether it is

prudent to offer this type of activity as stand-alone events at the end of a funding cycle with uncertainties over future funding, or whether more careful planning, including thorough reflection on what participants bring to the table by way of personal experience and what can realistically be offered to them, should either foresee a *series* of activities over the medium-term, or refrain from such activities altogether.

In sum, this is not an argument against this type of activity, on the very contrary. Despite the criticism, there has been an overwhelming consensus by participants that this type of dialogue, painful as it is, is necessary and should continue; some ideas that have emerged from the group have been mentioned above. So, this is rather an argument in favour of a more medium-term approach to this type of activities, and for drawing some lessons learned in terms of activity design etc. from this specific experience..

### “Buka” TV shows

NDC Banja Luka has, since 2001, been involved in a TV show, “Buka”. The author of the show joined NDC as a co-ordinator in 2003; he continues to front the programme. The show is a joint undertaking between NDC, the Banja Luka-based Alternativna Televizija (ATV), and the Centre for the Decontamination of Information of Young People (*Centar za informativnu dekontaminaciju mladih Banja Luka*). NDC is, to a substantial extent, funding the production of the programme, and is also in charge of developing the concept. Background research and preparation is being carried out by the Centre for the Decontamination of Information, upon guidance from NDC.

Despite its popularity, a TV show like “Buka” is unlikely to be on any of the major news channels’ mainstream programmes as no business, due to its links with political parties, would pay for advertisement time during the emission. In this respect, ATV could not recuperate the production costs which are now covered by NDC.

The choice of topics seems relevant--exploring and debating the roots and consequences of nationalism, the individual and collective responsibility for the war, and the impact of nationalist policies on the everyday lives of citizens and providing the audience with alternative points of view on these topics have been consistent characteristics of the programme. The show is consistently attracting high-profile guests from both entities, and from neighbouring Croatia and Serbia (where the show is also watched).

Some of the participants interviewed for the purpose of this evaluation had been guests on the programme at one point or another, and so were aware of it. Others knew the programme, but did not necessarily know the link to NDC, while some people the evaluators talked to did not know the show.

There is nothing in principle to be said against a TV show such as “Buka”, although we do understand that the way in which NDC Banja Luka interprets its mission/mandate is very personality-driven, and clearly coincides with one of the co-ordinator’s main professional interests, and ambitions, in journalism. The question is, rather, whether this is how NDN wants to interpret its mission objective, and whether the organization’s value-added/cutting-edge strengths are not actually elsewhere, and whether a greater impact could not be had from offering medium-to longer-term, more consistent field-level activities, reaching out to as many people as possible, in an as systematic as possible way.



## 2.2 NDC Sarajevo

### Introductory comments on NDC Sarajevo

In the above mentioned period, NDC Sarajevo, like the other NDCs, carried out a great number of activities through seminars and roundtables, and through reaching out to a wider audience throughout BiH. NDC Sarajevo geographically covered big parts of Central and Eastern Bosnia, including some very difficult localities. While the office is based in Sarajevo, the focus on work in the field is explained by the fact that, unlike Mostar, Sarajevo is not a „divided city“, and it makes sense to extend the activities to an area outside the capital. In this way, NDC has, over the years, gained a deeper insight into and knowledge of the geographic region of Central and Eastern Bosnia, and has now focused its activities on limited hot-spots, i.e. the municipalities of Bratunac and Srebrenica. The nature of the activities carried out in these municipalities is also a logical continuation of previous activities, i.e. those carried out in partnership with OSCE targeting teachers in segregated schools (implemented from 2002 to 2004).

NDC Sarajevo has taken on board the recommendations from 2003, which advised a “further increase [in] activities directed towards public structures, teachers, municipality officers, political party representatives and informal leaders; focus primarily on areas of BiH outside the capital and reduce scope and range of activities to ensure better quality, and follow up on core activities”, as well as recommendations from the 2005 evaluation, which also highlighted the need for streamlined activities and an increased focus on field-level activities.

NDC sees its strength in being from the outside, from the capital, and in being impartial. However, various interview partners have expressed their concern with the work being carried out from the distance, in particular where it related to work with youth, which would require a permanent presence, given the difficult character of this work specifically for the youth involved who participate in the activities often in opposition to their parents and teachers, and political leaders in the different communities. Beneficiaries have in general remarked on the need for a more frequent, preferably permanent, presence on the ground, given that Bratunac and Srebrenica are among the most difficult municipalities in BiH, and that any progress/success might otherwise be off-set by local hardliners and conflicts kept latent by political leaders not interested in change. Interview partners see the need for close day-to-day work with people whose capacity could be developed into that of trainers, and who, then, would be able to transfer their skills to others.

NDC sees a difference between itself and local NGOs, in that NDC is specializing on dialogue, not on physical-level (i.e. reconstruction, income generation) projects. NDC feels that instead of implementing projects, they are acting as catalysts, forging contacts and links between people. This self-assessment is confirmed by participants, who see the difference to other NGOs in NDC not working on resolving issues such as infrastructure problems, but in contributing to the improvement of the overall quality of living by bringing together people from different communities and ethnic backgrounds.

### General comments on activities and results

Since 2006, NDC Sarajevo is focusing its activities on the municipalities of Bratunac and Srebrenica in Eastern Bosnia. The aim is to make a contribution to facilitating the return process through the integration of refugees and displaced persons, and through activities that support the establishment of a dialogue between the municipal institutions and different ethnic groups. During the programming phase, NDC has been using its experience, and contacts, gained in previous years of involvement in the Eastern Bosnian region. This previous involvement has proven useful in that

NDC's profile has been known to the target audience (representatives from the municipal institutions, NGO activists, returnee representatives, and representatives of youth groups) from before, thereby making it easier to initiate the activities on the ground.

The activities in Srebrenica and Bratunac appear to now have the support of the municipal authorities, while initially met with resistance. The Head of the Municipal Assembly Srebrenica, who has participated in NDC activities since 2004, initiated a resolution that, once passed by the Municipal Assembly, would formalize its full support for NDC to carry out its activities. A similar resolution is expected to be passed by the Municipal Assembly of Bratunac. Activities in both municipalities are decided upon, and overseen, by Co-ordination Boards consisting of representatives of the different ethnic groups. NDC's work with the Co-ordination Boards has until now, focused on capacity-building and facilitating communication between Board members. The work with the Boards is planned to be taken forward in 2008, based on a systematic needs and capacity assessment.

The methodology of work of NDC appears to be well recognized by all involved on the ground: interview partners were generally able to identify the core features of NDC's approach as being dialogue building between different ethnic groups; dialogue is seen as the precondition for making life easier for all in the community. NDC is credited with being a neutral mediator in the dialogue-building process. While NDC does not shy away from working with hardliners, participants are being selected with a specific attention to involving those that have an active interest in bringing about change in the municipality. While in 2006, NDC appears to have been seen by other organizations as jumping on the bandwagon (there has been an increased focus, in recent years, on Srebrenica and Bratunac, with a special envoy for the region, and substantial amounts of money coming in for economic development), and as somewhat of an "intruder" in this geographic area, this assessment has gradually changed, and NDC is now seen as adding value.

The geographic focus on Bratunac and Srebrenica was motivated by the fact that both municipalities are deeply divided along ethnic lines, with Serbs (many of who displaced persons from other parts of BiH) on the one hand, and Bosniaks (many of whom returned to their pre-war homes) on the other hand. Given that both municipalities have been the theatre of one of the biggest atrocities in the conflict, the level of inter-ethnic distrust and division is particularly high.

NDC collects information about the situation on the ground in different ways: first, through evaluation questionnaires at the end of activities, which are then being analyzed and summarized; second, information is gathered through direct contact during field visits to both municipalities; third, information is systematically collected through mass media (print and electronic). NDC Sarajevo appears to have, over the past couple of years, put efforts into developing indicators to gauge changes brought about by its intervention. NDC is trying to exercise a holistic approach to analyzing impact. There are questionnaires put out to different strata of the population, including representatives of the municipalities, returnees, teachers, youth; all groups are also being involved in informal feedback discussions. Indicators are qualitative and quantitative: NDC has started to compile the numbers of actual participants in activities, the increase, in numbers, of representatives of ethnic minorities in municipal institutions etc.; there are also ongoing assessments of the level of communication between participants of activities etc. From the point of view of NDC, the importance lies not within the activities themselves, but in having established networks, and the quality of relations in these networks.

The assumption is that the improvement of the inter-personal relations of participants in its activities will lead to increased interethnic communication and co-operation, and more personal and inter-ethnic relationships. This improvement NDC is trying to bring about through the transfer of basic skills of inter-ethnic dialogue, and through making available a neutral space for this dialogue,

as well as through support to initiatives which are a result of this dialogue, and which will be useful to individuals as well as to the community as a whole.

Given the volatility of the political situation, the evaluators feel that there should be a specific strategy of dealing with crisis situations and in particular how they influence progress or setbacks of activities. Any strategy of action needs to reflect how progress will be safeguarded against events at the higher political level, or, for example, at times of local elections when there is a proneness to setbacks caused by fabricated conflicts and the re-animation and increased use of enemy images etc. Responses would have to include mechanisms on how to provide a powerful counterweight to political rhetoric, and how to provide, or maintain, space for public dissent and reduction of fear.

### Dialogue Seminars for Human Rights (Dijaloški seminari za ljudska prava)

NDC Sarajevo implemented this project between 2002 and 2004 in co-ordination with the Regional Centre of OSCE in Tuzla. Geographic focus of activities was Central and Eastern Bosnia (specifically Fojnica, Kiseljak, Bugojno, Foča, Goražde, Jajce, Vitkovići)..

The seminars were held for teachers of segregated schools, and included topics such as tolerance, human rights, peacebuilding. At the same time, seminars aimed at teachers establishing contacts among each other. OSCE had direct influence over the selection of participants and suggested the locations for the seminars. In 2004, NDC received additional funds from the European Commission, and was able to extend the scope of these seminars to cover all of BiH; the two other BiH NDCs were part of the implementation of this phase. The seminars were designed with assistance from the Zagreb-based NGO “Small Step” (Mali korak). The quantitative indicators of the project are impressive: it covered 40 municipalities, 49 locations (towns and villages), 54 schools (in both entities); 266 teachers were trained (41% Bosniaks, 24% Serbs, 26% Croats, 8% of other ethnic groups). Potentially, there was an indirect benefit to 40.000 students.

OSCE has judged these seminars to have been of great importance for the initiation of extra-curricular activities, which led to the step-by-step involvement of different ethnic groups. It is difficult to independently verify this – given that OSCE was one of the main initiators behind it, it is somewhat natural that they would consider this to be a success. But what precisely has been achieved, and how these achievements have been measured is not necessarily clear at all.

### Cycles of Roundtables

In 2005 and 2006, NDC implemented a cycle of roundtable discussions targeting two groups: teachers, and returnees to the Eastern Bosnia (Bratunac, Srebrenica, Foča, Zvornik, Goražde, Tuzla, Bjeljina). Topics covered were: the relationship between local authorities and returnees; inter-ethnic dialogue among young people, the return process, the implementation of legislation on education and other. The roundtables were attended by representatives of the municipalities, NGO activities, representatives of returnees and displaced persons, and young people.

For many participants, the seminars appear to have been the first post-war encounter with representatives of other ethnic groups in a public space, and which provided them with the possibility of real participation in a dialogue about key questions. Participants seem to particularly recall the emotional impact the seminars left by making attendees talk about their memories, stories, and feelings.

## Activities in Bratunac and Srebrenica

The municipalities of Bratunac and Srebrenica have seen a substantial number of returns of refugees and displaced persons, despite the fact that these two municipalities have seen the worst atrocities during the war. In comparison, the situation seems to be more complex and difficult in Srebrenica, which is partly due to the qualification, by ICTY, of the events of 1995 as genocide. External events like this have direct repercussions for the realities on the ground. For example, in the area of education, in Bratunac municipality, there exist two completely segregated primary schools: while the primary school in Kravice is exclusively attended by Serb children, while 10 kilometres away, in Konjević Polje, the primary school is attended exclusively by Bosniak children.

NDC Sarajevo is, since 2006, implementing three projects in both municipalities: “Dialogue between the Municipality and Returnees”, “One School for All”, and “Youth Dialogue – Facing the Past”.

Each project selected participants through a personal interview. On the basis of this, focus groups were created for each project; each group counts 16 to 20 people. For each of the three projects, two specific training seminars were designed and held, in accordance with the target group and aim of the project in question. The structure of the seminars was broadly the same: lecture, discussion, group work on topics relevant for the target audience. While the first of each seminar was held outside (in Sarajevo, Tuzla and Gradačac, respectively), the follow-up seminars took place in the municipalities themselves. The trainers came from the Zagreb-based NGO “Small Step” and from the Nansen Academy in Norway, but also included staff from the NDC Sarajevo.

Achievements to date (identified by NDC through their semi-annual and annual reports) have been mainly at the level of the individual participants in the activities. This tie in with the objectives identified by NDC in their planning documents which acknowledges that, given the difficulty of the terrain, any progress would inevitably be slow, with a specific challenge posed by the overall volatile political situation and its impact on the ground, including on the beneficiaries. It is too early to say what medium- to long-term impact there will be of the activities in both municipalities, given their recent nature. Much depends on the availability and prospect of multi-annual funding.

So far, the achievements can be summarised as follows:

Participants in the Municipality-Returnee Dialogue project reported to having, through their involvement with NDC, changed their attitude towards the other ethnic group. In some cases, they have reported a decrease in their personal reluctance to resort to local public services. Beyond the individual level, participating in a study trip to Lillehammer has forged the participants’ sense of belonging to a group of like-minded people, and contacts have extended beyond the seminar with participants, albeit in a limited way, now socialising on a regular basis. According to the NDC, there is a sense of “Nansen identity” among participants. NDC’s work is also being supported, though not at the institutional level, by senior members of both municipalities. Members of the Co-ordination Board have been acting together in response to the political crisis in Spring 2007, by presenting its work for the municipalities.

In the “School for All” project, all teachers from the elementary school have gone through a dialogue-building seminar. A Co-ordination Board has been established involving both teachers and parents of the two ethnic groups. A small-scale rehabilitation project funded with additional resources by the Norwegian Embassy allowed for the refurbishment of two classrooms, one in each part of the school. The refurbishment was done in a joint effort of Bosniak and Serbian parents. The classrooms were foreseen to accommodate extra-curricular activities, part of which started at the end of 2007 (IT classes), and will be extended by English classes in 2008. Although NDC reports the

contact and lines of communication initiated through the above as still very limited, this must be seen as progress in a municipality such as Bratunac. Maintaining the momentum beyond the framework of the implementation of the physical reconstruction project will be important to safeguard the progress made.

With regards to NDC's involvement with youth, 67 participants have been trained in nine seminars in the course of 2006 and 2007. Participants report a change in their own attitude towards the other ethnic group; returnees have testified to a change in attitude towards them. Inter-ethnic contacts have improved among young people in that there has been increased socialising between the two ethnic groups. NDC seems to have tapped into a real need in that they have provided space and opportunity to communicate, sometimes against the expressed will of the participants' parents.

### Dialogue between the Municipality and Returnees (Dijalog Opština-povratnici)

This project started its implementation through the thematic seminar "The Need for Inter-Ethnic Dialogue in the Local Community". The target audience were municipal workers, representatives of the municipal assembly, representatives of the returnee population, local NGO activities, representatives of the social services, the health services, and the directors of the local kindergartens.

Until now, the project has made some initial progress: inter-ethnic dialogue on questions of joint interest has started, two multi-ethnic Co-ordinating Bodies on the initiative of seminar participants, and contacts between participants have been established.

In the context of a volatile situation such as that in Srebrenica, any progress risks the danger of being undermined by political events. In response to the political crisis in Srebrenica in the first half of 2007, NDC together with the two Co-ordinating Bodies organized a number of events, such as a roundtable discussion on the topic of "Which Way for Srebrenica? (*Kuda ide Srebrenica?*)", an inter-ethnic dialogue seminar with a focus group of 16 participants from Srebrenica, which was held in Sarajevo, and a public presentation of the work of NDC and the Co-ordinating Bodies about the work in the local communities. While the roundtable discussion was a high-profile event, and in response to a specific situation that had emerged on the ground, the evaluators do have questions regarding the format. Two of the events took place in Sarajevo, not on the ground in Srebrenica or Bratunac. And while there was high-level participation, it could be argued that it might have been more sensible to organize or think of responses on the ground, in order to protect the small progress that had been made from being set back.

### One School for All (Projekat Škola za sve)

This project started through the thematic seminar "Upbringing and Education for Human Rights (*Odgoj i obrazovanje za ljudska prava*)". The project's target audience are: the school administration, teachers, parents and students of the primary school in Kravice, and the school branch in Konjević Polje in the municipality of Bratunac.

Both Bratunac and Srebrenica are very sensitive areas for the implementation of projects in the education sector. Despite the fact that the Law on Basic Education prescribes the inclusion in the School Board of representatives of parents from all nationalities, the primary school is unable to meet these demands at the school level. Instead, there is a School Board made up exclusively of Serbs in the Kravice branch of the school, and one made up exclusively of Bosniaks in Konjević Polje, although both are part of the same school.

The impressions gained during the interviews are that there are some small, yet encouraging steps. The school administration in both locations supports joint project activities, and on the level of parents, first contacts have been established, with parents having recently become involved in repairing a classroom for each school location which will be serving as a venue for extracurricular activities (IT cabinet and English language training).

### Youth Dialogue-Facing the Past (Dijalog mladih – suočavanje s prošlošću)

This project targets young people from both the Bosniak and the Serb communities in Bratunac and Srebrenica. The aim of the project is to open an honest dialogue between the two groups about what happened during the war in both municipalities, to open a space where young people of both nationalities can meet, and to aim for an increase in the multi-ethnic membership of the local youth organization.

NDC Sarajevo is working with a local NGO, “Odyssey”, on this project. “Odyssey” has been working for a number of years already on questions relating to dealing with the past. They have been the first group in the region to start dialogue-building activities between different ethnic groups, which is one of the reasons for which they have been subject to a lot of pressure from the local authorities and the community as a whole. “Odyssey” has, together with NDC, participated in two seminars organized by the Sarajevo-based Centre for Non-violent Action.

## 2.3 NDC Mostar

### Introductory comments on NDC Mostar

NDC Mostar has conducted a great number of wide-ranging activities related in the broadest sense to its mission. These activities have been very different in format, topics dealt with, as well as in terms of number of participants and geographical focus. The majority of the activities had an inter-ethnic component, and aimed at involving participants from different municipalities, cities, and even regions. Part of the 2004 and 2005 activities was conducted in co-operation with NDCs from Banja Luka, Sarajevo, Serbia, and Montenegro.

NDC Mostar has implemented recommendations from the 2003 evaluation in that the overall portfolio of activities has become more focused, while less relevant activities have mainly been cut. The 2005 evaluation recommended that a focus on specific parts of the Hercegovina be considered, this recommendation has also been taken up with a geographic focus now being on Stolac.

From the point of view of the evaluators, NDC has, in particular in its Mostar-based activities, secured a neutral space in which different stakeholders can meet face to face and engage in honest and open communication, break down prejudices about one another, and increase their understanding of the situation, interests and needs of others. NDC has conducted, and is recognized for, its activities with a clear emphasis on building respect for democratic principles, human rights, and peaceful conflict resolution as a precondition to achieving progress in the community. NDC Mostar has developed a discernible profile among the local population as well as international organizations, which associate NDC clearly with the creation of a multi-ethnic space, and as promoting dialogue and peaceful conflict resolution, and facilitating inter-ethnic co-operation in Mostar.

Participants credit NDC Mostar staff with a high degree of professionalism and skills, who have clearly earned the trust of their beneficiaries, in particular, so several interview partners, since NDC has understood the need of people for more information and better education on key issues. NDC's

work with civil society on education issues in the framework of uniting Mostar's *gymnasium* – as well as other Norwegian-funded assistance – has, according to a survey carried out by OSCE in 2007, contributed to a high level of awareness of citizens on education reform issues.

What seems a particular strength of NDC Mostar is that the staff itself is, to a great extent, able to facilitate and conduct relevant training and workshop activities. For selected seminars, trainers from outside are being engaged.

Despite the overwhelmingly positive assessment by participants and partners of NDC Mostar's activities, there is considerable difficulty in making conclusions about the overall impact, including of earlier activities. While there has been a high intensity of activities, some basic information was not readily available, for example on the number of participants (the annual activity report on the “Dialogue for Democracy” project for 2007 gives an indicative number of 30 participants per event). Also, it was difficult to gain conclusive insight into the structure of questions and problems discussed, and which indicators were applied to measure progress. While topics selected for the high-profile public events, there also seems to be a tendency to spread relatively thinly and on a very wide range of subjects.

### General comments on activities and results

The current portfolio of activities is, to a great extent, a continuation of programmes/activities that have, over the years, acquired a discernible public profile, and thus, give NDC the basis for judging to be on the “right track”. In the framework, for example, of the “Dialogue for Democracy” programme line with its different projects, “hot topics” are being opened up for discussion, and citizens are given the possibility to debate and pose questions to influential personalities during roundtable discussions, etc. Topics chosen are such that are deemed very important and pressing for participants and the wider public. On a monthly basis, 2 to 3 events are held, which is an indicator of how busy NDC is, given that these are being organized in parallel to other activities.

The selection of topics appears to be demand-driven: NDC is flexible in that it can pick up emerging issues, as well as responding to requests from the public for specific issues to be put on the agenda. Inter-ethnic dialogue and reconciliation appears to be the thread running through all public events, explicitly or implicitly. NDC seems not to keep records of who attended these meetings, although an analysis of such records could, over time, yield some insight into the structure of the recipients/audience for the activities (for example whether attendees are broadly the same people, or whether specific topics attract specific people/specialists/professionals involved in these issues that could then bring about change), and be used to further inform programming choices. One of the interlocutors expressed substantial scepticism over the choice of format—while NDC's profile was very visible in the public, it was also judged to be “working with TV stars”, and attracting people that are anyway more sensible/normal”, while the activities did nothing to influence/change hardliners.

Tentative progress seems to have been made with the secondary school project in Stolac. The target group appears to have been carefully selected, in order to ensure that this group can carry the weight of becoming a model that could serve as the basis for the breaking down of barriers between the two ethnic communities and facilitate the establishment of one unified curriculum.

NDC says that its work in the education sector in Stolac is building on experience gained through co-operation with the Regional Centre of OSCE, through joint seminars dealing with the education of teachers, yet it is not entirely clear what this precisely means. OSCE is currently working in the Stolac school with students' councils and parents' councils, bodies that have been introduced

through legislation (Framework Law on Primary and Secondary Education, adopted in 2003)..NDC Mostar is working with OSCE through a partnership agreement.

### Dialogue for Democracy

From 2004 to 2007, NDC Mostar continued activities under the programme line “*Dialogue for Democracy (Dijalog za demokratiju)*”. In the framework of this programme line, NDC has developed 4 projects: “NDC Presents (*NDC Predstavlja*)”, “Two-Way Street (*Dvosmjerna ulica*)” “*Instant response activities*” (“*Reagovanja*”) and “*Stop Violence against Returnees*” (“*Stop nasilju nad povratnicima*”).

NDC Mostar is basing its choice of projects under this programme line on the complex and difficult situation in the city characterized by a lack of communication between elected politicians and the people, the lack of co-operation between specific target groups on the one hand, and institutions that are in charge of resolving their problems, on the other hand, a lack of information of vital interest for citizens (such as on social reforms), a lack of knowledge on issues relating to European integration, and a general lack of constructive initiatives that could bring about changes in Mostar. Given the wide media coverage of some of the events, NDC is also trying to select topics that have a broader appeal to an audience outside of Mostar.

The activities took different formats: seminars, round-tables, workshops, lectures held by influential personalities, such as politicians, representatives of NGOs, the media, regional and international organizations (such as the Office of the High Representative, and the Organization for Security and on issues that were judged to be of interest to all ethnic groups in Mostar. All events receive wide media coverage.

### NDC Presents (NDC Predstavlja)

NDC Presents is a project the objective of which is to inform ordinary citizens about their rights, as well as about how the state and the international community functions, and how to ascertain citizens' rights in different spheres of life. The overall objective of NDC Presents is to help the protection of human rights of all citizens of BiH. Topics covered in 2007 were, for example, “The Role of NGOs in the community as a catalyst for changes in BiH society”, “The Role of the Hague Tribunal in the Process of Reconciliation of all Peoples of BiH” etc.

### Two-Way Street (Dvosmjerna ulica)

“Two-Way Street” is a project in which influential individuals from the local community, such as well-known politicians, entrepreneurs, representatives of international organizations etc. are invited to answer questions of students from both universities in Mostar, and from representatives of NGOs about the reform of the higher education system. A result of these activities was the establishment of more contacts between the two universities with the aim of exploring the possibilities for joint projects.

Trying to gauge the impact of “Dialogue for Democracy” with its different project-level activities from a long-term point of view (the programme line is being implemented since 2001) as to whether it has contributed to positive changes in the political and societal relationships in Mostar is not straightforward. NDC has managed to bring people from both communities together through dialogue on different relevant questions, such as from the education field (contacts between representatives of the two universities, linking of primary schools from East and West Mostar).



For many interview partners met in the framework of the evaluation, these activities have been very useful. Given the deeply divided character, to this day, of Mostar, the fact that NDC has been able to facilitate contacts between the East and the West can not be overestimated. In particular, former participants have credited NDC with bringing influential individuals and politicians closer to the public by creating fora where citizens can ask questions. However, due to the fact that a number of players – local and international– is at work in Mostar, it is difficult to extrapolate the exact contribution of NDC in bringing about progress. The above quoted assessment of the role of Norway (including activities funded through NDC) by OSCE on raising awareness on education reform issues in Mostar does, nonetheless, testify that NDC is a discernible and important player in the changes brought about in recent years..

### Stop Violence against Returnees (Stop nasilju nad povratnicima)

Since 2004, NDC is directly involved in supporting the issue of return of displaced persons and refugees, as well as that of the “floaters”. In the framework of the project “Stop Violence against Returnees (*Stop nasilju nad povratnicima*)”, in co-operation with the two other NDCs, there has been a campaign for citizens to sign a petition urging the authorities to undertake steps to prevent violence against returnees. Since 2006, this project has been incorporated into the existing “NDC Presents” in order to expose the issue of return to debate in the wider public through roundtables and public debates. Through its activities and logistical support, NDC supported, in 2007, the creation of the foundation “My house (Moj dom)”, which is trying to assist floaters to reconstruct destroyed housing and so to facilitate the return of this group of people.

Members of the association noted the impact NDC had on highlighting their case to the wider public, and to the local authorities. As a result, some destroyed houses have been rebuilt. NDC has, in particular, been credited with being the interlocutor/interface between the floaters and the local authorities, and in sensitizing the public and the media for their problem.

It is difficult to say something meaningful about the impact of the various activities carried out in the framework of this project. We have no information on the impact the public campaign has had. While it is not disputable that there is a need to have public debates about return, this is probably one of the questions that has been debated a lot in the media, since the end of the conflict in 1995, so it is not clear that this fills a niche, or a specific need. Helping the work of a local organization is a laudable undertaking, as long as it is not a strain on NDCs resources, and as long as it is kept in mind that this is not, strictly speaking, the mandate of the organization.

### School of Political Dialogue and Skills.(Škola dijaloga i političkih vještina)

This project consisted of a series of events during which 10 young politicians (representing 5 political parties) had the opportunity to receive theoretical and practical experiences in terms of leading dialogue and acquiring political skills, with the overall objective of improving their overall level of competence in their own environment. The activity lasted three months (from May to July 2005), and took place in Mostar. This local school was a follow-up to a 2004 activity with NDC Montenegro, in the framework of which young politicians from Montenegro and the Hercegovina participated in two 5-day seminars.

The results of the school were part of an evaluation questionnaire, as well as NDC's following the work and activities of the participants. A number of participants were interviewed in the framework of this evaluation, and confirm that the skills and knowledge received have been useful for their work, and they attribute their success in the local elections very clearly to the experience of the school. The school is also credited for having facilitated the contact between politicians of the younger generation of different political parties.

## “Orkdal” project

Since 2003, NDC is a partner in various co-operation projects between the City of Mostar and the Municipality of Orkdal in Norway. In the framework of this co-operation, different initiatives have been developed to link schools in East and West Mostar. These have been projects aiming at the education of primary school children through debates, roundtables, campaigns and various performances highlighting the importance of the fight against drugs (2005-2007), ecology (specifically Mostar – an Ecologic City/Mostar ekološki grad), as well as projects including kindergarten children. Each project involves children of both ethnic groups.

NDC Mostar's role in these projects is the monitoring of activities and the financial resources, as well as ensuring overall implementation of the project plans. NDC organizes meetings, workshops, conferences etc., which are attended by representatives of the Norwegian side and the municipalities of Mostar and Konjic.

The results of this activity are the establishment of contacts between students of different ethnic groups and a contribution to the overall improvement of the education system in Mostar. NDC's role in this process is acknowledged by the community, in particular by teachers, students and their parents, as well as by the local authorities. Participants in the activities credit NDC for their competence in selecting the right target audience, as well as their commitment to the work which is transferred to the people that participate in the activities themselves. In itself, this seems to be a rather untypical NDC project, in that it is very specifically concerned with project implementation and, to a great extent, NDC's role seems to be that of providing logistical support. It certainly seems to have substantially contributed to NDC's visibility, as the project is well-known in the public.

## Stolac

NDC's focus on Stolac municipality comes as a result of the need (as expressed in the two different evaluations) to streamline and consolidate activities in order to maximize impact.

Since 2006, NDC has focused its activities on the problems of education and integration of the secondary school in Stolac, which currently teaches two different curricula (Bosniak and Croat). The main objective is the improvement of inter-ethnic relations in the divided school and the opening up of a space for dialogue on “burning issues” caused by the “two schools under one roof” system. Given NDC's track record on working with similar, education-related, issues in Mostar, NDC received (for the moment only verbal) support of the Cantonal Ministry of Education, which makes it easier to operate in the municipality.

The first three seminars on the topic of “Education for Human Rights” took place in 2006 in Stolac, Konjic and Neum. The objective of the seminar was to establish better co-operation and understanding between teachers and students. Throughout 2007, activities were carried out with a group of teachers representing both curricula. The three seminars in 2006 were held by trainers from the Zagreb-based NGO “Small Step”, and Steinar Bryn. Since 2006, trainings are mainly conducted by staff from NDC Mostar.

NDC Mostar has started trying to develop indicators of success progress with particular regard to this activity, in the form of a rough baseline questionnaire. While at the first seminar participants almost unanimously stated that there is no need for increased communication between teachers of the two strands of the education system, this picture had changed by year's end in that around 40% felt there was such a need.

When NDC started the project, the Bosniak and Croatian teaching staff, although sharing the same premises, neither communicated, nor knew each other, according to the 4 teachers of the secondary school the evaluators spoke to. There has been a process of getting to know each other and currently, both sides discuss joint project ideas and possible methods of implementation. One teacher admitted for the first time getting to know her counterparts from the other ethnic group.

While it is too early to make judgements about the medium and long-term impact of the activities, its importance for return and inter-ethnic relations is significant, given that perceived and real discrimination and segregation along ethnic lines in education, along with high unemployment rates among returnees have been a powerful disincentive against return.

Teachers and the school director have, during a two-day seminar in Neum in late 2007 expressed interest to work on joint projects which would be of benefit to all children of the school. A number of tentative proposals have been elaborated, and will be decided upon jointly and in order of priority for the school

## 2.4 Kosovan Nansen Dialogue (KND)

### Introductory comments

The Nansen presence in Kosovo goes back to the establishment of the Kosovo Initiative for Democratic Society (KIDS) in 2000. This institute had as its overall objective to strengthen the civil society in Kosovo. For this purpose, KIDS initiated LOGO, a think-tank doing policy-oriented research and analysis. Initially, KIDS was more concerned with intra-ethnic dialogue among Kosovan Albanians than with inter-ethnic dialogue, and the KIDS office was exclusively staffed with Albanians. This was criticised by the 2003 evaluation which strongly recommended a reorientation towards inter-ethnic activities and a sharper focus on these types of activities, as for example the whole issue of returning minorities to their former domiciles.

At the time of the 2003 review, a second office was kept in the North as the Nansen Dialogue Mitrovica with sub-offices on both sides of the river, the “dividing line” between the Serbian-dominated North and the Albanian-dominated South. These two offices were officially merged in 2003 and the name changed to Kosovan Nansen Dialogue (KND). The 2003 review concluded by recommending minority returns and minority rights as prioritised areas for action.

These recommendations were followed up by KND, but the 2005 review questioned the continued co-operation with LOGO and judging by the quality of some of its outputs, recommended that the project should be discontinued. This recommendation has been followed as there are no signs of LOGO in more recent plans of action. The 2005 review recommended termination of other activities that are not explicitly linked to the three municipalities. It also recommended recruiting a Kosovan Serb to the Pristina office which has been accommodated by the secondment of a staff member from the Mitrovica north office to work on FKP minority returns.

The current project portfolio comprises three projects that all deal with dialogue at the municipal level; first, returnees and the receiving community in Fushe Kosovo/Kosovo Polje; secondly, with joint IT and English classes in Obiliq/Obilic and thirdly, with similar classes in Mitrovica north. Both the second and third projects are components of an on-going dialogue at the municipality level in both towns.

## General comments on activities and results

We find that the Kosovo portfolio presents a varied picture. While the return to the Fushe Kosovo – Kosovo Polje (FKP) project appears to be well-grounded, considering the series of KND dialogues between returning and receiving communities, the other projects are more tenuous and precarious. Both the Obilic and Mitrovica north projects have opted for courses in IT and English similarly to the Jegunovce municipality project in Macedonia, but in contrast to the Macedonia project which have accumulated years of experience, these two are at their infancy and hence very much untested.

Higher-level dialogue in Mitrovica did not result in operational plans and education dialogue between Serb and Albanian students has not yet got off the ground. Some dialogue evenings have been organised for Kosovan Serbs, but the team has not seen any minutes of these meetings, so cannot make any judgment about outcomes.

The return to FKP project is now in a mid-phase in which the first batch of returnees has arrived and preparations are on-going for the second phase, not yet commenced. The contribution of KND, as acknowledged by many of the interviewees, has been in preparing the ground for return, not in the material sense, but in the psychological, mental sense. But with the actual arrival of returnees, focus and attention will inevitably shift to the more urgent day-to-day concerns of the two communities and KND may have to see themselves as social workers as much as experts in dialogue. For this project as for other projects involving returning and receiving communities, KND (and its Dialogue for Returns team, which existed up to the end of 2007), partners with other organisations, so the degree of success or failure can hardly be attributed to KND alone. There is no doubt that KND contributions will be vital in the time to come and KND must assure they have the necessary human resources to respond to this fully. One staff member from the Mitrovica north office has been seconded to the FKP returns project and KND should be flexible in assigning staff to deal with the workload in FKP as it arises.

This project has obviously been yielding results, but one can only speculate about the sustainability of the project, both in terms of actual return, whether returnees will stay or whether they will be self-sustaining in the future or dependent on welfare and social services. These concerns go well beyond the KND contribution and relate to the overall sustainability of Kosovo as an entity (and now as a state). The KND contribution will be to maintain a local presence and to be flexible in response to current and emerging situations and concerns. Having earned the confidence of both municipal level officials and the communities, they may indeed have a role to play, even if the role may be different from what it was. But the general political uncertainty and the effects of the declaration of independence may still call for dialogue in order to continue the returns process and convince returnees to stay.

In addition, there are on-going dialogues with the Kosovan Serb community in the North as well as a programme on dialogue in education, both of which are at a very preliminary stage and hence will be left out of the review.

Furthermore, KND has also been involved in the return of Romas to their part of Mitrovica South, called Roma Mahala. This activity is not reflected in recent plan documents, such as the 2007 Plan of Action, making it difficult to form an opinion of KND contributions and results. This work is led by the Norwegian Church Aid. The 2005 review mentions the involvement of KND in the Dialogue for Returns programme, but while the overall programme on returns is on-going, KND involvement lasted up to the end of 2007. Information received indicates that KND partnered with NCA in the 2006-2007 period and was funded by the OSCE mission to Kosovo previous to that.

## Returns to Fushe Kosovo/Kosovo Polje (FKP)

The NDC engagement in FKP is basically related to the return of displaced Serbs caused by the 1999 war which saw both Albanians displaced and in a later phase, Serbs. The process of preparing the ground for return has been ongoing since 2002. The NDC involvement has been in organising dialogue meetings as part of this preparation process, both with the returning community as well as with the receiving community. At the time of visit, the first batch of returnees had arrived, giving the team the opportunity to get first-hand impressions from both communities.

The municipality was established in 1998, covering approx. 100 sq. km and with about 50,000 inhabitants. an ethnically mixed population, with about 45,000 Albanians, 2500 Serbs and 3000 Roma/Ashkalis. There are two villages involved in the returns project. Altogether 30 houses were rebuilt – 20 in Lismir/Dobridub and 10 in Nakarade. Lismir/Dobridub is ethnically mixed and consisting of two parts – the old village which is basically Albanian – and the new village – which is ethnically mixed. The new village is closer to Fushe Kosovo Polje town and people were moving to the new village to better avail themselves of the opportunities of being closer to town. The adjoining village of Nakarade has approximately 30 per cent Serbs and Romas, the remainder being Albanian.

The first phase has been funded by the Govt. of Kosovo through its Ministry for the Communities and Return under UNDP management. Total costs are 850,000 Euro with average costs per house 14 – 18,000 Euro and acreage from 40 – 90 sq. metres, depending on family size. European Perspective has been responsible for construction work. The actual distribution was 20 Serb and 2 Albanian houses for the first phase in Lismir/Dobridub and 10 Serb houses and 2 Albanian houses for the first phase in Nakarade. In addition, each household was provided with 2000 Euro for income generation purposes. For the second phase, the following distribution is planned: 28 Serbian houses and 4 Albanian houses in both villages, 32 in all as against 34 in the first phase. After the 1999 war and the bombing raids, most Albanians returned in summer 1999, after three months. Support for rebuilding of houses started in 1999/2000.

The team had the opportunity to meet with the partners on several occasions, both local authorities, representatives of returning and receiving communities and agencies involved in the return process. The team had a meeting with municipality officials who emphasized that there has been a long cooperation with the Norwegian state: Norwegian KFOR soldiers were there as a peace-keeping force. There has also been cooperation on schools. Kommunenes Sentralforbund (KS) has been involved in training, organising visits to Norwegian municipalities and with capital investments. There's also been a long cooperation with KND. It started with training and capital investment and the building of a multi-ethnic street. This resulted from earlier dialogue meetings and KND partnered with NCA in this project. Dialogue meetings between Albanians and Serbs (and Romas) in Kosovo, Macedonia (Ohrid) and Norway served as an instrument to break the ice and to start the process of cohabitation and reconciliation and create the opportunity for return and a more peaceful atmosphere. At the first meeting in Ohrid with nine Albanians and nine Serbs, there was hardly any communication, but gradually more interaction, more human communication. These views are corroborated by Serb municipal officials who find there's been a good cooperation with Norway. The KND dialogue has been of importance in achieving return. Others had tried to establish dialogue, like CARE, but could not bring people to the same table. The team met with representatives of both the receiving and returning communities and the role of KND as facilitator was duly recognised, though present economic concerns loomed larger in their everyday life.

## Schooling in Obiliq/Obilic

Obilic is a town and municipality roughly mid-way between Pristina and Mitrovica and it was heavily affected by the events of 1999 and 2004. It was Serbian- dominated before 1999 with approx. 70 per cent being Serbian, but now less than one per cent is remaining in the town itself. For the municipality as such, approx. 5000 out of a total population of 32,000 are non-Albanian, out of which more than 4000 are Serbs and the rest mainly Romas. The Serb population is mainly clustered in smaller villages, such as Plemetina and Babi Most. The 1999 war led to 352 Serb families being displaced, some of them temporarily shifted to a camp in Plemetina while others moved to the northern Serbian enclaves of Kosovo and yet others to Serbia.

The main employer in the past, the local power plant, was providing jobs to about 7000 Serbs, but now there is reportedly not a single left. The work force has been halved to about 7000 in all. There is less opportunity for Serbs in the private sector and most Serbs are working in the Ministry of Returns. Local unemployment in the Serbian villages, such as Plemetina, is reportedly 90 per cent, but an allowance of 100 Euro per month is provided by the Serbian government.

Norwegian assistance to the municipality has been multi-sectoral with Norwegian engineers involved in the planning of a water and sewage system in Plemetina village, large parts of which have been funded from bilateral Norwegian allocations, the opening of a business incubator, local health care, medical equipment and road-building and community work with returning Romas through Norwegian Church Aid. The team met with municipal officials who had participated in dialogues locally and in Lillehammer, with representatives of the Lillehammer municipality also taking part on some occasions. One result of these consultations has been the utilisation of a local community office. The purpose of these meetings was to identify possible areas of cooperation.

The chosen area of cooperation for KND, after extensive consultations with the municipal authorities, turned out to be the education sector. The situation in Plemetina village was that Serb students had a proper compound whereas Albanian students were lodged in mobile containers. These fixed and mobile compounds serve both as primary and secondary schools. As schooling is arranged in separate shifts, with primary Albanian classes and secondary Serbian classes in the morning shift and primary Serbian classes in the afternoon shift and Albanian secondary pupils going elsewhere, there is no interaction in the school yard. While there may have been interaction at the nearby indoor sports hall, at the time of visit the teams were Serbian only. To offer an opportunity for interaction between the groups, computer and English classes were suggested at the Community Centre next door to the sports hall. This centre is reportedly run by a Serbian “syndicate”, a trade union at the power plant, though formally owned by the municipality.

At the time of visit, a computer room was installed with machines, but due to the irregularity of power supply, the machines had to be fitted with generators to work at all. As the locals normally do not pay for their electricity supply, it’s highly likely that shortages will remain for the foreseeable future. In the longer term, there are visions for a joint school in the municipality, but at this stage, the main accomplishment has been to get a foot in the door at the Centre, as a very first step towards a possible deeper engagement in the future. There are, as mentioned, precarious practical problems in the short term, notwithstanding the larger precariousness of return of displaced to their previous domiciles.

## Dialogue in Mitrovica

The KND engagement in both parts of Mitrovica is again related to dialogue with and among municipal officials as part of a project on Dialogue with Municipalities. This dialogue goes back to 2003 with a meeting in Denmark on “The Danish-German Borderlands Experience and the Ethnic

Divide in Kosovo". Although an evaluation is mentioned in the documentation available to the team, it is not clear what experiences can be drawn from the Danish example and how it can be adapted to conditions in Kosovo. Dialogue meetings took place in Ohrid, Macedonia (3-5 June 2005), in Tivat, Montenegro (27 September-1 October 2005) and finally in Lillehammer (14-28 January 2006). Perusing the minutes of the meetings, it is striking that the discussions are frequently pitched at a high political level, possibly too high for a group of municipal officials. It may be highly doubtful whether issues of this sort can be in any way resolved without much higher political back-up. Public utilities and the distribution and sharing of public services were also brought up, in particular electricity and water, without ending in any determinate plan to improve the regularity and quality of these services. The meetings in Norway were both at the municipality level in Lillehammer and at the state level in Oslo, with meetings in various government ministries as well as with the municipality of Oslo. While this visit no doubt has had an important social function in bringing an inter-ethnic group together for a couple of weeks, it is less clear what models and experiences the group may have brought back with them to Kosovo and in what ways they can be adopted to the Kosovo reality.

It is clear from KND documentation that these dialogues did not make any headway towards concrete proposals and operational plans so the KND office decided to change tack and focus their attention on specific target groups inside Mitrovica. The area of Mikro Naselje – Kodra Minotareva – was selected as a neighbourhood in Mitrovica North in which to work. The team had the opportunity to meet with both Albanian and Serbian spokesmen for the community.

### IT and English classes in Mitrovica North

This particular area was chosen for several reasons; it was still a mixed community of 800 people, of which 60 per cent Serbs and 40 per cent Albanians. It was relatively unaffected by the war and it has been less affected by out-moving Albanians than other parts of town. Only 15-20 Albanian houses have been sold after the war. The Bosnacija Mahala and Three Towers areas were practically wholly Albanian before the war, but are now reduced to 10-15 per cent as Albanians are selling their houses to Serbs moving in from other parts of Kosovo. In the view of local community leaders, their area is somewhat of an exception with better security and better neighbourly relations. Their experiences with NGOs have been mixed, but they report good relations with Norwegian Church Aid. NDC has been a more frequent visitor than other NGOs and a study trip to Norway was organised for them and others from the community. Pressed on whether a trip was in any way essential for the group, one responded that the group might have got on as well with each other in any other place. Nonetheless, the idea of arranging IT and English classes for youngsters and adults came up during this study trip. A small movable container has been provided for this purpose and computers set up with blackboards in a fairly cramped space. It was not clear to the evaluator whether these facilities had yet been used.

Apart from this micro-project in Mikro-Naselje, two dialogue evenings were held with Kosovan Serbs in Mitrovica North in the first part of 2007. The team did not have the chance to meet with any of the participants so we cannot form any opinion on what came out of these evenings. Dialogue has also been attempted in the education sector between universities in Pristina and Mitrovica, but as the semi-annual report for 2007 bears out, no actual meeting has taken place yet as student associations apparently had decided to cancel at the last minute.

### Returns of Romas in Mitrovica South

While visiting Mitrovica south, the team had also a briefing on KND involvement in the return of displaced Romas to the Roma Mahala District of town. KND involvement goes back to 2003 and has comprised "go and see" visits with the receiving community and has also produced reports

about social services for Romas as well as holding workshops in 2007. The brunt of the material work has been implemented by Norwegian Church Aid and the Danish Refugee Council (while the Norwegian Refugee Council was involved at an earlier stage). Reconstruction of apartment blocks (44 families) and private houses (44 families) is completed and there are applications for funding of two further blocks and 30-40 further houses with EU and SIDA..School services have been reinstated in Mitrovica North with UNMIK funding while school services in Mitrovica South are reportedly on hold due to uncertainty about transfers of funds from UNDP to the municipality.

While it appears that KND is still involved in the returns process, there is not a single mention of it in the KND plan of action for 2007, causing one to wonder whether it is a part of KND activities officially. As the team did have a briefing with both local and international NCA staff, it might be thought that KND did indeed have a part and would thus merit some paragraphs in the plan of action. As these interventions were funded by OSCE initially and NCA at a later stage, it may have been the idea that activities not funded from the regular annual MFA budget should not be included in the plan document. In any event, an assessment of KND contributions would be difficult without considering the whole project, including their NGO partners. From information received, it is clear that KND was involved up to the end of 2007 and monthly progress reports have been produced by the joint project.

## 2.5 NDC Skopje

### Introductory comments

The Skopje office was established in 2000 and was one of the early offices in the Nansen Dialogue network. From the outset, it was multi-ethnic in composition and remains so. Initially the brunt of NDC Skopje's activities centred on youth as a target group, whether it was youth NGOs, high school youth, leadership development courses or young political leaders attached to political parties. While the 2003 evaluation found a lot of potential in the on-going programmes, particularly the young political leaders programme, it nonetheless recommended a reorientation towards targeting burning issues and inter-ethnic challenges in Macedonia and a shift towards the inclusion of more strategically chosen target groups, including older and more influential segments of local communities. In brief, this recommendation suggested a move away from a course emphasizing the capacity development of civil society in general towards a much more localised approach targeting inter-ethnic hotspots with a view towards finding ways and means of joint benefit to the whole community.

### General comments on activities and results

The work of NDC Skopje can be divided into two clear phases, first work with political organisations centrally with a focus on youth. This work has generated an interest among previous beneficiaries to have it continued, in particular the School for Young Politicians, even if funding will have to be sought from other sources than hitherto.

The second phase is a shift to municipalities with a focus on the education sector. This phase has proceeded in a piece-meal, step-by-step manner, first by providing classes in subjects that might be regarded as useful for further education, then gradually working towards the final goal of a joint school. This work has been slow in generating results and as of writing, the school is not yet in operation, though most of the technical obstacles appear to have surmounted. However, the school reconstruction is not yet funded, and it touches upon some of the same problems as the new school project in Osijek in Croatia. As lots of efforts are put into working towards a goal and expectations are built accordingly, the uncertainty of funding may generate a backlash against the organisation



making promises. However, we do see opportunities for funding in the longer term if NDC continues along the path of municipal-level interventions. We understand from talking to NDC staff that they plan on continuing along this path by considering engaging in border municipalities with Kosovo.

The term “role model” was used by several of the interviewees, suggesting that the work done in Jegunovce might be replicated in other municipalities. But, as the saying goes, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The school would have to be put into operation and to have run for some years before conclusions can be drawn about whether the model is truly worthy of replication. In any case, the use of cabinets for IT and English and for Albanian and Macedonian language classes appear to have caught on.

The results obtained do also speak to the advantages of having an on-going presence and to cooperate closely with local authorities and direct beneficiaries. This has been made possible by assured funding and it is hoped that this presence may be continued as funding shifts into project mode. Confidence-building may be a protracted affair, and it is not always crowned with success. In this case it appears to have paid off by concentrating on efforts that are perceived to be of joint benefit to all.

### School for Young Politicians

The 2003 recommendations were followed by the NDC Skopje office which subsequently reoriented its programme towards working with municipalities and terminated its engagement in more general civil society support. One programme thus terminated was the “School for Young Politicians” which held four courses altogether. The purpose of these courses was to educate students about the formal political system of Macedonia and politics at the international level, but also about specific political skills as for instance how to deal with media and how to observe diplomatic procedures and protocol.

Talking to former participants, they saw a purpose in bringing people of different ethnic backgrounds together. The gradual opening up towards other students and the development of more tolerance earned new friends who might later find themselves in government positions. In fact, both of the former participants were in government positions, one at the municipal level as a counsellor in urban planning in Skopje and the other in the Ministry of Agriculture and Education. The first classes covered a wide span of topics; viz. EU integration and law, public relations and marketing, political and security system of Macedonia, personal identity and peaceful conflict resolution and the training of party spokesmen. All were reportedly satisfied with the curriculum except certain topics were missing and for the second class, diplomacy and protocol and election campaign management were added. The team did also meet with another former participant, now with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As he is dealing with EU relations, he found that the courses had contributed to some degree towards better knowledge about EU and EU principles such as cohabitation and neighbourliness. Now knowledge of EU is better among target groups and media tend to write more about EU internal affairs and EU-Macedonia relations.

NCD Skopje is linked through the National Youth Council (UNITAS) with this type of political training. More recently, training on public relations was organised in Ohrid. This training session focused on political marketing (press releases, press conferences) and electoral campaigning (nomination, promotion, different tactics for national and local elections). There is a clear interest among parties in continuing the School. German foundations (FES, FNS) have offered courses for specific parties, but these tend to be not very much adapted to local conditions. The foreseen School will continue with the same topics as before, but offer more room for flexibility in that the main topics will be allotted less time in order to make room for more specialised training on topic of

interest, such as public relations. NDC has a project proposal, but it appears that the proposal cannot be accommodated within their usual budget and that funding would have to be sought elsewhere.

Clearly, the participants did see these courses as useful both in the sense of learning about the domestic as well as the international political and security system as well as being imparted with practical skills as aspiring politicians. It is as clear that these courses address elites (or at any rate, coming elites) and not the common village dweller and secondly, address issues that are not inter-ethnic in character, but aiming at improving the effectiveness of civil and political society. These topics may indeed be very topical for systems in which inter-ethnic tension is no longer an urgent issue to deal with, and improvements in overall governance are the main concerns among political elites. However, as from 2004-5, municipal-level intervention has been the main focus of the Skopje office.

### Schooling in Jegunovce municipality

The target area was the Jegunovce municipality, an area that was strongly affected by the internal conflict back in 2001 and which is characterised by ethnic segregation in primary schools. The overall objective of the NDC office right from the beginning was to establish a model of a mixed ethnically integrated school in a community marked by an ethnically segregated educational system. This project is on-going to date. The primary education system in Jegunovce is divided into three primary schools. First, the Semsovo primary school is further subdivided into Zilce, Ratae, Preljubishte, Tudence, Sirichino and Kopance schools, all offering Macedonian classes, and Semsevo, Ozormishte and Kopance, all offering Albanian classes. Secondly, there is the Jegunovce primary school which is all Macedonian. Finally, there is the Vratnica primary school which is the only ethnically mixed school in the municipality, with 60 percent Albanians and 40 percent Macedonians. As can be seen, the entire system is ethnically segregated with the exception of one school. The entire primary school system enrolls 1100 pupils, with 600 in Semsevo, 120 in Jegunovce and 380 in Vratnica. For secondary school, pupils will either have to go to nearby Tetovo or to the capital of Skopje, approx. half an hour away by vehicle.

The strategy of the project is to reach the objective of interethnic schooling in a two-phase operation. First, as an opening to bring pupils together, classes in IT and English and in Albanian and Macedonian languages were offered from 2004-5. Groups of 12 pupils were put together from 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade, comprising the 10 – 14 years of age range. The pattern was two groups per day with 2 x 45 minutes for each group. Classes ran for the entire school year, from 1 September to 31 December and from 21 January to 10 June. In order to attract a group of ethnically mixed pupils, IT classes were held in Semsevo (Albanian-dominated) and English classes in Ratae (Macedonian-dominated) and the cabinets in which these classes were held very soon proved to be too small to accommodate 80-90 students vying for classes with a capacity for 50-60. Soon courses were expanded with English offered at Preljubishte, IT and Albanian language in the Macedonian village of Zilce (60 students for IT, 45-50 for Albanian) and Macedonian language in the Albanian village of Semsovo (40-50 students). There is a possibility that weekend courses will be offered for post-8<sup>th</sup> grade students in IT and English as it would be relevant for high school requirements, and Albanian and Macedonian languages, too, given sufficient capacity.

All of this is a first phase for an eventual joint school which is expected to commence in September 2008. Opening was delayed for a year for technical reasons as the selected school building in Preljubishte would have to be reconstructed to make room for the extra activities. Due to education regulations, core curriculum will still be held in separate classes, but extra-curricular activities will be jointly conducted. The difference will be that all core and non-core activities will be under the same roof with an emphasis on doing sports and IT and homework jointly and having lunch breaks jointly. Teachers' salary will be paid for by the Ministry of education while it is hoped that

reconstruction costs will be covered by NDC Skopje directly or indirectly by facilitating donor support through the Ministry of European Affairs.

The team had consultations with local government officials, education authorities and with teachers and parents. The team met with the Mayor of Jegunovce who clearly saw a need for this type of activity as the region is a “fragile region”. With decentralisation, the responsibility for primary education has shifted from the central government to local government. Before, central government had to approve funds for the municipalities, but as from 2007 allocations are given as block grants and the municipalities decide on how this is to be distributed. However, 2005 and 2007 saw considerable reductions in allocations, though local government still managed to survive with past savings. He regarded decentralisation as a necessity as mayors take more care of local schools and it would simplify decision-making. The municipality is unfortunately in no position to finance the new school, but the financial aspects are in his view not the most important. Establishing peaceful relations are of higher importance. He sees the school as a continuation of the IT and English cabinet classes and hopes it may become a role model for other municipalities in the region. Apparently, there is an interest by other municipalities for similar projects to be initiated. He expects that funding by way of a NDC application may be available from the Norwegian MFA to cover interior reconstruction and additional construction. The Ministry of Education will provide movable interiors such as desks and computers and the municipality is ready to finance running costs, funding for pupils/students while the village of Preljubishte will be responsible for cleaning and maintenance.

The regular curriculum will be separate for the two Macedonian and Albanian language groups while the extra-curricular part will be jointly. It will be up to headmasters, teachers and parents to determine the actual contents, keeping in mind that the school will start with 1<sup>st</sup> graders. There will also be some flexibility in how the regular curriculum is taught and IT and English will be taught from 1<sup>st</sup> grade onwards. The school will have to go through a trial period before any conclusions about discernible changes and results can be drawn.

The Director of the Zilce school does see the school project as a potential “role model” and would like it to be advertised more broadly. There is a request from Tearze municipality (of 60 per cent Albanian and 40 per cent Macedonian population) to have cabinets opened in 2008-9 and preliminary meetings have been held in Zhelino municipality. Requests have been coming from the OSCE mission in Tetovo. He sees the project as a way of restoring confidence after 2001 and places a high emphasis on learning how to socialise.

In a meeting with a former MP and a member of the Parents’ Council and School Board, the problem of low budgets for inter-ethnic municipalities was emphasized, particularly for education. He appreciated the NDC for working in mixed villages and for their perseverance in overcoming initial scepticism and their close and transparent relationship with the villagers. Asked about what experiences he drew from the study trip to Norway, he would emphasize parents’ involvement in decision-making in primary school and he saw definite potential for improvement of the Parents’ Council in this regard. He did not see multi-ethnic schools as being readily transferable as the Norwegian setting consists largely of refugees and asylees differently from the Macedonian setting of ethnic groups born on the territory..

Talking with a MFA official, there was a clear sense that NDC focus on municipalities was strategically advantageous as it ties in with official policies of decentralisation and as human and financial resources were more likely to be lacking at the local level. This priority was confirmed by a visit to the Secretariat for European Affairs which is the official agency for dealing with foreign donors. One area of priority for EU funding is Cross Border Cooperation among neighbouring countries and arrangements are in place for such cooperation with Bulgaria and Greece. However,

opportunities are available for such preparatory funding by engaging with the NDCs in Pristina and Bujanovac. This funding would be for municipal capacity-building through training. Preparatory funding would be provided by the Ministry of External Affairs (50,000 Euro) with the possibility of one million Euro from the EU-IPA budget annually from fiscal year 2009.

## 2.6 NDC Osijek

### Introductory comments

NDC Osijek was established in May 2001 as the eighth of the NDN offices. Initially it had a varied portfolio aimed at handling three challenges: divided society; empowering people to take an active role in the development of civil society; and education for the society of equal and responsible people". The MFA 2003 evaluation found that only the first of these three "challenges" had a specific interethnic focus whereas the latter two covered such wide-ranging matters as law students' debating skills and children's learning skills. It recommended a tighter programmatic focus on projects addressing inter-ethnic relations and a more widely defined target group comprising persons of local influence, whether they are politicians, teachers or municipal officers. Furthermore, office strategy should be forward-looking in the sense of addressing issues of joint concern within the community.

The follow-up 2005 evaluation noted that the 2003 recommendations had been acted on by the office, resulting in a tighter focused program on inter-ethnic relations, but had some doubts about a documentary produced by the office as well as an office-managed web site as part of a network project on "Divided Communities". Both were given to rather simplistic analyses of the causes of the conflicts in the region, according to the evaluation, taking a somewhat primordial view of the sources of the conflicts.

### General comments on activities and results

The NDC has a fairly small portfolio, in which the most important part, at least as far as this evaluation is concerned, is the New School project. Most of this section is focused on assessing progress towards the objectives of this project.

The team finds that the long-going New School project is well anchored with the educational authorities, both at the national and municipal levels and with teachers' training facilities locally. The main stumbling block appears to be local political authorities, though they are slowly coming around. The role of NDC in this process has been partly as an instigator, partly as co-ordinators and facilitators. In this manner, the project has found ownership both among teachers and parents who have assumed the driving seat in taking the project forwards.

Yet, the project throws up some issues of concern, not with the content, but with the components. As long as dialogue projects remain with the "software" of human resources, it can easily be accommodated within the budget constraints of the annual allocations. However, once they involve "hardware", they would necessitate extra resources beyond the budget limits. The danger of raising expectations that may not be fulfilled can cause disappointment and generate a backlash against NDC. At the time of visit, finance was not secured, and according to NDC information, there is a concerted attempt by the Croatian government to seek funding from the Norwegian bilateral assistance to Croatia. This would of course assure the future sustainability of the project.

The idea of an elective subject on the spiritual and cultural heritage has already caught on with other schools in the region, even though the New School is expected to be launched this year. This shows

the idea to have had some impact on the educational curriculum in the Vukovar and neighbouring communities, opening the possibility for further replications in yet other schools with significant minority communities. As future funding will shift towards project mode and multi-year financing, it is more likely that planned activities can be backed up by adequate funding in the medium term.

The team is of the opinion that multi-ethnic education is squarely within the NDC mandate as we see it and is highly feasible as it is forward-looking and offers benefits to the community across ethnic boundaries. The planned Bogdanovci project can be conceived of along the same path and is in that sense both relevant and feasible, on the precondition that local issues are not overshadowed by power politics. Staying localised may protect to some degree against the vagaries of national politics, although the political problems appear to be more at the local than at the national level.

The team did not have a look at the two remaining projects (Dealing with the past; Identity and Embrace), partly from the decision to focus on the school project, partly due to the difficulty of tracing the impact of these projects which are both on-going. With the school project, there are at least verifiable results to be observed (or progress towards project objectives) so that preliminary conclusions can be drawn even if the project is still on-stream.

The NDC 2007 programme can briefly be divided into four main components:

1. The New School
2. Dealing with the past through examples of good
3. Municipality Bogdanovci
4. Identity and embrace

Projects 1 and 3 can be described as forward-looking in the sense of addressing current concerns which may impact on future community relations. Projects 2 and 4 are perhaps mixed; dealing with the past is likely to influence people's ways of thinking and acting in the present time and in the future, but the cause – effect linkages are inevitably harder to trace. Projects like these may forge a change in attitude and in behaviour, but there are no easy ways of verification except accepting individual accounts of changes of attitudes and perceptions at face value.

While these may indeed be relevant to the NDC Osijek mission in the broader sense, we do feel that these projects are harder to evaluate in terms of changes on the ground and community impact as these changes will be filtered through individual perceptions and hence only have an indirect relation to changes in community practices and relations. For that reason, we have left them outside the scope of this evaluation.

Project 3 – dealing with the municipality of Bogdanovci – is “collectively” focused as it addresses the fact of segregation and non-communication between the three villages making up this municipality. Bogdanovci is predominantly Croatian with an Albanian minority, Petrovci is more evenly mixed with high numbers of Ruthenian and Ukrainian extraction, but with smaller numbers of Serbs and Croats and Svinjarevci has a Croatian majority, but a significant Serb minority.

As the NDC Osijek 2007 action plan argues that there is a “feeling” that the village of Bogdanovci does not care about other two villages on the financial level and there is a perception that the village of Bogdanovci, as the almost ethnically pure Croatian village, is intolerant towards the national minorities in two other villages; furthermore, that there is no communication on the official level – with local government representatives – and on the informal level – between inhabitants of the villages – with the formal municipal leader. At this stage, it is of course premature to have any reliable opinion on what will come out of this project. Nonetheless, we do think that it's highly relevant for what the NDC should be doing. At this point, it's not clear whether potential funding

implications can be accommodated within the NDC budget. In all likelihood, extra-budgetary funding may have to be sought.

As indicated above, the main focus of the field work consisted of familiarisation with the New School project. The project, which is still on-going, goes as far back as 2003.

### New School project

The school project tries to respond to the fact of community segregation in education in Vukovar. The situation at the time of settlement in 1997 was that minorities were offered classes in their own language, but either in separate buildings or in different shifts within the same building. Applicable law in Croatia provides for three models of minority education:

- **A model** – education in the language and scripture of the national minority, where the obligatory public statutory plan and curriculum of the primary education is translated into the national minority language
- **B model** – bilingual education, which implies that the social science school subjects are conducted in the national minority language, whereas the natural sciences subjects are conducted in the official language
- **C model** – nurturing of the mother tongue and culture implies additional classes for the children who are national minority members in the amount of five periods a week.

For the Serb minority in Eastern Croatia, model A is followed whereas for other minorities, Ruthenian, Hungarian, Ukrainian and Slovak, model C is followed. The minorities concerned can select the model best suited to their needs and interests. In order to assess the opinions of parents towards the different models, a survey was organised and conducted in Vukovar, covering 256 parents in the October 2004 – January 2005 period. The point of the survey was not only the assessment of the models, but also the quality of schooling. The latter questions uncovered a great deal of dissatisfaction about the curriculum, teachers' competence and style of teaching and communication and school – parent relations, among those answering these questions. The survey clearly showed that there was a strong interest in having some form of joint schooling established. Yet the survey also disclosed considerable ignorance among parents about the different education models to choose from.

### Mid-term evaluation

An evaluation of the second phase of the New School Project was carried out in 2006 with a view to assess progress towards the goals identified above. The evaluation found that NDC Osijek was able to strike a balance between the different aspirations and expectations of the community. They proposed a model which was close to model C above, yet differed in certain respects. In this process they kept in constant contact with their target groups as well as promoted the project through public appearances in various media. The evaluation found that continuous presence in the field and the ability to be flexible and to react promptly to circumstances and to take a step-by-step approach were positive factors in the NDC approach.

The evaluation found that the opportunity to work out of a curriculum was regarded as positive as teachers could invest their professional competence in this new curriculum. There were some withdrawals from the teachers' group, particularly teachers from Vukovar itself, but vacancies were filled by new recruits. The work with parents was centred partly on informing them about the education options and on involving them in public advocacy for joint schooling. The latter would give parents a much stronger sense of ownership of the project and a parents' club was set up to give parents the opportunity to meet regularly and informally to discuss amongst themselves.

Within this group, there were also withdrawals, due partly to the perception that personal engagement was not likely to influence local politics to any degree.

Regarding impact on interethnic relations in the municipality, dialogue seminars were arranged and one of the purposes was to identify issues that would require joint action in order to be put into motion. Joint schooling was one such issue and the evaluation found that the new school project did have some personal impact in terms of higher tolerance, yet impact in the larger community was not very significant. While there was some reluctance against outright support, there was at least a higher interest in joint initiatives that could overcome ethnic division.

Regarding the improvement in quality of the educational process, the evaluation did find that the process of planning was very inclusive, given the main parties – teachers and parents – a sense of belonging to and ownership of the school project. The proposed new subject – the cultural and spiritual heritage of the region – would provide for integration of subjects already taught, but offered as an elective subject. Parents were initially sceptical as they thought this would burden their children with extra work.

The review team met a cross-section of stakeholders in the project – parents, teachers, education officials at the municipal level, teachers' training agency and teachers' faculty at the academic level. The purpose was to get a sense of progress, expectations, risks and status of the project in the wider environment of the Croatian educational system.

The team met with *three members of the Parents' Club* in a hotel in Vukovar where they have a meeting room for their regular disposal. The Club now comprises about 30 members and they do not intend to widen it significantly more. There are many more interested and supportive – but for those already having children in school, there is less of an interest, though some may want to shift if the quality of the school is high. For parents, the reason for support is not only the opportunity for children to grow up together, but also to offer a better service. There is dissatisfaction with the present system of primary education due to the lack of co-operation with parents, unmotivated teachers and nationalist tensions between teachers.

They are aware that there are interethnic schools in Vukovar, but most follow the A model. However, the model of the cultural and spiritual heritage has been taken up in Barena County and by three villages in Vukovarska – Srijemska county Vukovar, Beli Manastir, Korodj, Markusica – showing the exemplary effect of the Nansen model. They would prefer classes to be small (10 – 15) and the school to be confessionally neutral. The elective subject of heritage should be manifold – participation of representatives of ethnic groups, festivals of local traditions, story-telling and the celebration of holidays.

The team had the opportunity to meet with the *head of the Department of Education, Sport and Culture in Vukovarska – Srijemska County*. For Vukovar, Serbs generally insist on the A model while some villages of minority populations (Hungarians, Ukrainians, Ruthenians) have chosen the C model. The A model entails separation and minorities frequently go to high school somewhere else and then remain there. He's generally supportive of the C model which provides for integration without assimilation. He views the Nansen model as the best to bridge the gap between Serbs and Croats. It is a test model that will have to be tried out. But the county administration cannot impose any particular model on the minorities. The choice has to be theirs.

The team did also try to elicit the perspectives of *teachers* involved in the project. One teacher is dividing teaching duties between Markusica village and Vukovar and is planning to teach geography at the New School. A survey among 6<sup>th</sup> grade pupils at Markusica revealed that about half was interested in the subject. As this is one of many elective subjects, parents would have to be

informed and get involved. The involvement of parents is crucial for this subject, but general experience with parents is not satisfactory. Teachers appear to be positive on balance, though some may object as it involves extra work and new learning and some may object on nationalist grounds. The subject would also imply higher activity from pupils themselves, in line with Croatian educational policies where pupil to pupil teaching is gaining importance.

Finally, the team elicited the views of *teachers' training* and academy facilities. The Education and Teachers' Training Agency offers help to developing curriculum at the primary, secondary and pre-school level. The Agency got involved with teachers and NDC about the curriculum, including a meeting at Lillehammer and based on the discussions there, the Ministry of Education was notified about the plans for the New School. Twenty to thirty teachers were engaged to develop the idea further. Although the School would be public, the Headmaster would not be appointed by a public agency. The state would pay the wages of teachers whereas the county would cover the running costs of the school. The ideal would be 25 pupils per class, less than the maximum, though considerably more than small municipalities with divided schools enrolling as little as 7-8 pupils in certain places. Due to less enrolment, there is no longer the need to hold two shifts due to lack of space.

The content of the elective subject was further elucidated in a meeting with Anelka Peko, dean at the *Teachers' Faculty* in Osijek. She became involved in the NDC project in curriculum development. The accent is on presenting the subject in practical ways through simulation, role plays, case studies, project teaching, volunteer work in multicultural communities and dramatisation. On religion, children can choose classes and she finds more and more children to prefer IT classes, possibly a sign of increasing secularisation. She finds the climate better for dialogue and children are more aware of the future, so the timing is better than before.

## 2.7 NDC Activities in Somalia and the Middle East

In the above sections on the individual NDCs, we have pointed to instances where ideas and services are being replicated across projects or geographic areas and in some instances, across countries as well. In the instance of Osijek, the idea of offering an elected subject on the cultural and spiritual heritage of the Eastern Slavonia region has been picked up by several schools in the wider Vukovar area. Similarly, the school project in the Jegunovce municipality in Macedonia has generated interest among neighbouring municipalities there. The idea of offering IT and English classes as a kind of stepping stone to a deeper engagement in a locality has been taken up in Kosovo, Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Training for mediation in school is on the agenda of various NDCs.

Replicability can also mean the extent to which lessons and experiences are being utilised in entering new ground – launching dialogue initiatives in countries and regions in which NDN has no prior experience. Beyond their concentration on the countries of the Western Balkans, NDN has in recent years expanded their activity into Somalia and the Middle East. While it would be premature to have any opinion about what these projects may accomplish, it is possible to see whether previous project experiences are being utilized in the design of new interventions.

The project “Dialogue and Peace-building for Somalia – Norway and Mogadishu” is at a pilot stage in which training sessions are taking place at the Nansen Academy in Lillehammer. The idea is to work with the Somali expatriate community in Norway, in particular the G 10 Mogadishu Peace Group, with a view to enable them to contribute to future peace-building in Mogadishu, the capital of Somalia. The first stage involves training of trainers, organised as a series of workshops. The second phase will consist of training sessions in Mogadishu and the trainers will try to pick from



groups consisting of leaders, teachers, students, women and journalists. At one point in the project document, a reference is made to previous work in the former Yugoslavia in which “dialogue has been used to build relationships across ethnic lines. From initially being a space for discussion the dialogues have also led to concrete, interethnic, cooperative projects. The dialogue work has increasingly been focused in institutions such as schools and municipalities and has therefore also led to institutional changes that positively affect the lives of local communities. In several places in the Balkans projects are underway to integrate schools and to improve institutional performance of public services.”

While of course dialogue is the common denominator for both projects, there are still major differences in approach between the Somali project and the Balkans interventions. First, the Somali project works with the ex-pat Somali community in Norway as potential agents for change in Somalia. None of the Balkans projects has to our knowledge engaged expatriate communities of people from the Balkans in Norway in such a way. The method has been to bring contingents of people from the Balkans to Lillehammer, Oslo and other municipalities, to meet on neutral ground and to gather experiences which could be applied in their home countries. Second, the dividing lines in the Balkans have been ethnically based whereas Somalian dividing lines by and large go between clans. Members of a clan are more closely tied to each other than members of the same ethnic group which may differ in all respects except ethnic identity. In the circumstances, working with clan structures is probably more difficult as the degree of social and political control is stronger than within ethnic groups and structures are more hierarchical with strict top-down control. Third, most of the interventions in the Balkans have been at the municipality level and rarely at the capital level with the partial exception of Mostar, while not a capital is at least a regional centre in Bosnia Herzegovina. Dealing with a capital sounds like a more complicated task than with the smaller municipalities with which most of the NDCs are engaged in the former Yugoslavia. Considering these differences, it is hard to see how the Balkans experiences can be replicated in this context. The project will have to be justified on the basis of its own merits.

The project in the Middle East comprises one Israeli NGO, *Other Voices. The Association for the advancement of the individual through media*, and one Palestinian NGO, Women, Media and Development, in cooperation with the Nansen Dialogue Network. The idea is to use the medium of film as a point of contact between the two communities and to target peripheral communities in both Israel and the Palestine, communities well away from the major urban centres. The project, known as *Palestine, Israel On-the-road Film Festival*, was initiated with a team-building phase in which the team was put together, localities were selected and contacts made in the selected localities. Most of 2007 was allocated to the actual film festivals with all activities expected to be wrapped up by the end of the year. The assumption is that film in conjunction with other cultural activities may lead to dialogue between Israeli and Palestinian communities and contribute towards changing perceptions of the Other.

Some of the NDCs in the Balkans do engage in media, most notably NDC Banja Luka and to some extent, NDC Osijek which has for years been working on a film which is still not completed. There was also an ambulant film festival in Bosnia-Herzegovina back in 2002, organised by NDC Sarajevo. Generally speaking, media have not been a major instrument for inter-ethnic dialogue in the Balkans so it is hard to argue that this project replicates previous experiences. It appears to have the character of a one-off activity unless the cultural experience gathered can be mobilised into initiatives for social change. Or so the project document hopes.

In any case, it is hard to see any distinct continuity from the work in the Balkans to this project in the Middle East so it is equally difficult to sustain an argument about replicability, if replicability is meant to be anything more than having dialogues in two different places. This project will similarly have to be justified on its own merits.

## 3. Conclusions and recommendations

### 3.1 Conclusions

This review has attempted to answer a range of questions about the immediate and longer-term results of NDC interventions in the countries of former Yugoslavia..

The key points in the review are whether the NDN has achieved its immediate objective of having "influenced attitudes of ethnic politics and mistrust and contributed to improved ethnic relations and practical cooperation in conflict-ridden communities". Secondly, the review should try to establish whether the NDN has contributed towards its long-term objective of "having contributed to sustainable peace and reconciliation in the Western Balkans by promoting inter-ethnic dialogue"

The first point deals with *outcomes*, understood as the likely or achieved short term and medium term effects of an intervention's outputs. The team finds that the NDN has quite clearly contributed towards this objective, in most cases by influencing the attitudes and actions of strategic individuals at the community levels. In some cases, this contribution has also led to changes at the institutional level by offering opportunities for inter-ethnic cooperation beyond the space for dialogue. More basically, the NDN has contributed towards recreating and restoring communities by working with other partners to secure the return of displaced people.

The latter question deals with *impact*, understood as the positive, negative, primary and secondary effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. These are results that lie beyond immediate outcomes or spheres of intervention. Here, statements can only be tentative at best. This is so for at least two distinct reasons. Activities are on-going, hence allowing little scope for assessment of long-term effects. Secondly, activities may have terminated, but there are scanty records of what these potential long-term effects may have been, leaving reviewers with little substantial evidence to build on. Nonetheless, we believe that activities aimed at changing institutional practices are likely to have an impact at the community level. However, we do find that the political and social environment in many instances is so volatile that solid predictions about impact are not going to be very reliable. Activities may be delayed, suspended, disrupted and recommenced owing to events and forces in the environment, and these are forces over which the NDN has very little control and that would require a much larger, stronger presence to deal with.

In general, we have found that results basically stem from changes in ways of thinking and acting of key individuals and groups targeted by the activities. In some instances, some of the larger projects have attempted to effect changes at the community level by offering opportunities for inter-ethnic cooperation at the institutional level and possibly at the social level as well. But larger-scale changes are still channelled through dialogue and processes of persuasion and conviction. Targeting strategic individuals is a way of influencing and hopefully changing opinion in specific local settings, but these ways and means are always vulnerable to the balance of forces in the larger-scale political environment, over which NDC centres have very little control. It has to be borne in mind that the entire political, military and aid effort in the Western Balkans has not succeeded conclusively in changing opinion on the ground, so the efforts of the NCDs should be viewed against the background of the entire aid effort over the years and their variable success rates.

In Annex 3, we have given a condensed summary of six projects, one for each of the six offices we have visited. The summaries cover the following key terms; background/ justification;

risks/opportunities; inputs; target groups; outputs; outcomes and impact. For outcomes, projected or actual have been distinguished. For impact, the same distinction has been applied and a further distinction has been made between level of impact; individual, institutional and social.

One important aspect of this review has been to determine whether there is any explicit or implicit *theory of change* behind NDC interventions, to see whether there is any core methodology guiding their work.. We find that there are certain key assumptions underlying the NDC approach to dialogue in the Western Balkans. These assumptions relate to how change can be brought about in their areas of operation.

Activities are being carried out with “strategic individuals” (representatives of the municipal administrations, teachers, journalists, NGO representatives), i.e. people that are selected for their position in the respective community on the basis of their potential influence and outreach to a wider strata of the population. By working with these individuals, including the transmission of specific skills, it is anticipated that a change of attitude will take place in these individuals, and, as a result, they will transmit or multiply this new attitude to a wider community; this will result in a broader change in the affected communities.

Bringing people physically together in a neutral space, through neutral topics that are relevant across communities (such as IT training, English language classes in BiH, Kosovo, Macedonia), members of these communities will become more comfortable in each others presence, will break down prejudices and barriers they might have, and might eventually engage in other issues of common concern and broaden and deepen their co-operation.

The lack of basic skills on non-violent communication and lack of knowledge on human rights is an obstacle to progress on inter-ethnic dialogue and reconciliation, and by transferring such skills, beneficiaries will be better equipped to engage in contact with other ethnic groups, leading eventually to greater integration of different ethnic groups in different locations.

There is a sense that dialogue and reconciliation activities need to be facilitated from the outside and by bringing people from different ethnic groups to spend time in Norway visiting different institutions, they will be presented with a potential model to aspire to and will realise that co-operation across communities is possible and necessary for the common good.

By taking people out of their familiar environments and to an unfamiliar environment such as Norway, they will be put in a situation where they cannot “escape” and have to confront uncomfortable issues that they would be able to run away from at home; given the assumption that confronting the past is a pre-condition for a peaceful future.

Overall, it is the assessment of the team that NDCs have been able to meet their immediate objectives of changing attitudes among target groups. We are less certain about longer-term impact beyond the specific focus group, through in some instances NDC initiatives have generated interest beyond the project domain. We find the activities to be relevant as regards the selection of localities to intervene as well as specific activities to launch, but we would like to note that it takes time and persistence to be recognised locally, given the level of distrust in many of the localities. Activities are politically and institutionally sustainable in some areas, but in the short term not highly financially sustainable. We are concerned about one-off activities and would recommend longer-term engagement with core groups and on selected issues. Activities have been replicated in a few instances, but we do not find clear evidence that Balkan experiences can be replicated in new areas of NDC interventions beyond the Balkans. We think there would be more efficiency gains from concentrating on core mandate issues, developing a stronger field presence and overall capacity-building in NDC areas of expertise. We do not find project management overhead costs to be

excessive, but this is based on what is taken to be the relevant base of comparison. We find that for knowledge- and research-based institutions such as CMI, overheads are not excessive, but we cannot state with confidence whether they are excessive compared with other types of NGOs.

We have specific observations about their work regarding the main terms of reference. With reference to *effectiveness*, NDC activities in general meet their immediate objectives. All the different types of interventions had some impact on the *individual* participants involved in them. The majority of participants confirmed having been taught skills they had not had before, or having experienced a new way of confronting the past through joint activities with members of other ethnic groups, or having understood the necessity to trying to approach issues of common concern through working together beyond ethnic divides for the sake of their children's' future, or having had the chance to hear alternative perspectives on current policy issues through the media or roundtables etc. Objectives are also being reached at the programme level with the distinct caveat that NDC programming has so far rarely gone beyond 12 months at a time, essentially excluding any contrasting of achievements against medium to long-term plans or indicators of success.

Baseline and progress indicators are being used in plan documents, but not in any systematic way to measure progress towards objectives. Information is given on baseline and progress, but largely in a somewhat constructed manner. Monitoring is basically provided through the annual and mid-year plan documents. Evaluations are produced on individual projects and have been referred to where available. The problem of attribution varies across the NDCs. In Kosovo in particular, KND cooperates closely with other organizations in the return of displaced people, largely Serbs, and assessments of achievements would have to be at the level of the full project, in which KND plays only a part. In some other areas, NDCs work through third-party organizations responsible for implementation.

It is difficult to give a definite answer as to whether NDC interventions provide a more secure environment as conditions differ across the countries in which the NDCs are engaged. In some countries (Croatia, Macedonia), tensions remain, but violence is largely a thing of the past. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, violence erupts on an occasional basis, but largely ad-hoc, in response to particular events. In Kosovo, however, and in particular in the Northern Serb enclaves, the situation is volatile and precarious, particularly in the aftermath of the Declaration of independence of Kosovo. These are trends beyond NDC control, of course and NDC interventions will remain vulnerable to larger-scale political events. In their specific areas of intervention, it is fair to say that inter-ethnic relations have improved, among those specifically targeted.

With reference to *impact*, it is difficult to conclusively ascertain the impact of NDC interventions beyond the narrower framework of the respective activities, or the annual programmes, at most. First, there is a lack of medium to long-term perspective in NDC's operations, due, in part, to the specifics of the funding cycle. Operations are planned and carried out on an annual basis, which, for the objectives of the organisation, is too short a timeframe, making for an ad-hoc, fragmented character of many activities; and secondly, the relative recent nature of ongoing NDC interventions allows only for unsubstantiated assessments on their possible success or failure. For some interventions, impact can be seen in terms of "role models" being replicated in other areas, particularly in the field of education.

With regard to the *scale of impact*, NDC does operate in environments with substantial international presence, and many of the actors have much more powerful mandates, an incomparably stronger field presence, resulting in substantially more human and financial resources: NDC is, by comparison, too small to realistically shift any picture significantly on its own, and it might be putting too high expectations on the local NDC offices expecting them to do so. As we observed above with regard to effects, the operating environments of NDCs vary substantially. While in BiH

and Kosovo, incremental, local-level, small achievements are persistently under threat from being undermined by strong, central-level nationalist politics, in Macedonia and Croatia, on the other hand, the need for improvement of inter-ethnic relations has been understood and, at least in part, been embraced at central level, thereby providing an facilitating environment for the type of activity NDC is pursuing in contrast to BiH and Kosovo where the NDCs face an almost quixotic task of working against official politics.

At best, NDCs activities have had a lasting impact on the individuals involved in the various activities. In a number of cases, individuals confirmed having successfully transmitted skills and knowledge to a wider group of people – in particular schoolteachers (projects in BiH/Prijedor and Sanski Most municipalities). While discipline and achievements improved as a result of students' improved skills, this is, of course, no indication of the way in which this has, or might, benefit inter-ethnic communication and dialogue in a wider sense. Some of the “strategic” individuals reported having put dialogue skills to use in their day-to-day work at the level of the local administration, and, for example, during pre-election campaigning.

Many of the activities do not seem to have had any consistent, discernible impact if compared with its programming assumptions. We were able to confirm *in some cases* that the work with “strategic” individuals might have had some of the intended multiplier effects. We were much less able to confirm that visits to Norway led to a change of attitude and working habits at the municipal level, and that taking different stakeholder groups out of their familiar environment have made any difference to these groups coming together at home to continue dialogue (with the potential exception of participants of a reconciliation seminar from Prijedor); rather than stirring up ambitions to strive for a similar level of wealth and democracy as in Norway. We do not deny that important decisions have been made at outside dialogue meetings that have had implications for progress towards project objectives, and that meetings in Norway and elsewhere have made significant contributions. We are less sure whether short study visits to Norway are enough to draw conclusions about whether Norwegian models and experiences can be transposed to a Balkan setting and made applicable there. We'd like to think that two further conditions may apply; first, long-term follow-up with each group visiting and secondly, some sort of twinning arrangements with Norwegian institutions to make transfer and exchange of knowledge and practices more regular and systematic. In the absence of both, a short visit is only able to provide “snapshots” of other models and practices.

Assessing the impact of “neutral” spaces for “neutral subjects”, it is not clear that this has led to an increased contact of groups outside these spaces. At worst, activities might do, or have done, harm by raising expectations with target groups or increasing cynicism and contributed to a general fatigue about the futility of many efforts by the international community to effect changes in the face of nationalist politics. This is of course a view of the risk environment faced by any intervention from the outside and interventions would have to make a realistic assessment of the risks and opportunities before them. In Annex 3, we have included a column on risks and opportunities to provide a perspective on what can be accomplished under which circumstances.

The question of *replicability* appears to be a leading question. The type of activities, with the obvious reservations about the fact that each environment is specific and that interventions need to factor in these specificities, can be replicated elsewhere, if expectations on what can realistically be achieved are being adjusted accordingly. In post-conflict environments, or environments with a lingering/latent ethnic conflict, there will always be a need to address the lack knowledge of human rights, for skills of non-violent communication, and often, there will be a need for reconciliation activities in the narrower sense. The real question lies in trying to argue in favour of the legitimacy of such efforts being brought to countries from the outside, and particularly when such activities do not complement ongoing local or national efforts/policies. However, in one particular case, the

Nansen Dialogue Network works with ex-pat groups of Somalis in Norway in order to train them as peace-builders for future work in the capital of Mogadishu in Somalia. The context is too different to expect that project experiences can be easily replicated from the Western Balkans.

Regarding *relevance*, the NDCs had a comparatively long time to develop its own profile of operations. The portfolio of interventions has been somewhat consolidated following the 2003 and 2005 evaluations, yet, there still is considerable arbitrariness in the way NDC's mandate is interpreted by the respective local offices, and in general, there appears to be a reflex to conduct highly visible events with high-profile participation and ensuring media coverage as opposed to an emphasis on sustained dialogue-building activities in the communities. The evaluators feel that NDC can be strong where it engages with communities, while conducting roundtable discussions, media events/debates, and participating in NGO networking activities dilute its profile, and somewhat divert human and financial resources away from activities in favour of ethnically divided communities and local-level events. These activities do seem relevant, while at the same time, more consideration has to be given to responsible implementation and to ring fencing expectations on their possible impact.

As to the broader question of relevance, it does appear that NCD objectives are aligned with the Norwegian model for peace and reconciliation with its emphasis on long-term willingness to assist, its close co-operation with Norwegian NGOs as entry points to peace and reconciliation processes and the general objective of being a peace assistant, not a peace-maker. The official policy is to assist the parties to find a peaceful resolution to a conflict, while maintaining that the overall responsibility has to reside with the parties themselves. In this sense, NDC work can be seen to be facilitating resolution and reconciliation amongst the parties through the medium of dialogue.

As we have observed above, the recognition of NDC as a partner varies among the authorities in the countries concerned and persistence, patience and the willingness to be in for the long haul has gradually led to recognition in the specific communities. But, as the documentation has borne out, some areas are harder, more risky and more unpredictable than others. As for analytical capacity for conflict analysis and its relevance, it is difficult to come up with a general answer as conditions vary across countries. Some projects do address urgent concerns, such as the return and reintegration of displaced people while other projects look to the longer term as for instance multi-ethnic schools or the training of young politicians while a third group of projects looks to the past with a view to initiate processes of healing and reconciliation. What is the more relevant of these types depends on the perspective of the observer and the comparative importance of the past, present and future and we have no sound basis for judging what is the more relevant..

Regarding *sustainability*, we find that for the activities surrounding local schools in ethnically mixed/divided communities in Croatia and Macedonia, there is a prospect of them having model character, and continuing beyond the individual municipality they are currently being "piloted" in; the same statement would seem to be less certain, at this stage, for the efforts that have been undertaken in Stolac or Bratunac/Srebrenica (maybe due to the recent nature of these activities).

Sustainability is, of course, closely linked to the depth of impact of the interventions. As the picture is much less clear, it is then equally difficult to say anything definitive about it. A number of recent/ongoing activities would appear to need sustained support that could eventually lead to some sort of sustainable outcome, in particular, we are thinking of the work with a group from Prijedor on conflict resolution (the group has generated ideas on how to bring their experience to involve and benefit the wider community, but feel that they need outside assistance to facilitate this process), but also with regard to community work in Bratunac//Srebrenica. The fate of other activities is probably grimmer: the BL TV shows would probably be suspended, lest another donor could be identified, while the efforts in Obiliq/c and Mitrovica might also have to be discontinued.

The question of *efficiency* has to be seen in relation to effectiveness. As indicated above, NDC has had--compared to other organisations--a relatively long grace period to experiment with various interventions before trying to settle with a more distinct, specific profile resulting from the recommendations made by previous evaluations, which pointed to the lack of impact and results of earlier interventions. A consolidation has happened in all offices, possibly with differing outcomes, which should result in a more streamlined use of resources available. However, we feel that in several cases, resources might be shifted to better reflect the core direction of NDCs work as being primarily field and dialogue-based. At the moment, there is a slant of people working in the central locations while comparatively few staff is spending time in the field. We have another question mark as to whether NDCs have consistently been able to develop, over the years, skills and expertise to conduct relevant dialogue-building activities themselves, or whether their role will always be confined to coordinating and organising activities that then, in turn, have to be procured from outside and third organisations. Consolidation on core activities and more reliance on their own expertise are likely to result in efficiency gains.

There may be efficiency gains to be had from cutbacks in infrastructure and overall network management. Some NDCs have moved to less expensive offices without any noticeable effect on project implementation, the main effect less space for meetings with partners on the office premises. Cutbacks have implied less funding for the network parts of the Nansen Dialogue Network, including the project management team in Norway which is in the process of being decimated. This has to be seen as part of a process of making the individual NDCs more self-reliant in the future, in which each office will apply for their own funding. Under this scenario, the network as such will have less significance. This may have efficiency gains as co-ordination costs will decrease, but conceivably at the cost of coherence.

We are of the opinion that project management costs in Norway are not excessive given an organization of this kind which has to deal with activities in the Balkans and remote management from Norway. Administration costs to total costs are approximately 1:4 and there is a slight falling trend in overhead costs over the 2004 – 2007 period with centre activities increasing relative to total costs. Costs are not unreasonable compared to similarly situated NGOs in Norway. However, the base of comparison is with knowledge- and research-based institutions of the type of CMI and not with humanitarian NGOs. NDN can possibly be situated somewhere between these two types of organizations.

Table 1. Costs of Nansen Dialogue Network by main categories

Activity/Year	2004		2005		2006		2007 x)	
Project management – home	3 308	21%	1 467	9 %	1 711	10 %	1 117	7 %
Project management – field			1 956	12 %	1 799	11 %	1 858	12 %
Shared costs	903	6 %	595	4 %				
Centre level activities	8 992	57 %	10 179	64 %	11 714	71 %	10 727	72 %
Network projects	2 700	17 %	1 665	10 %	1 319	8 %	1 295	9 %
TOTALS	15 903	100%	15 862	100%	16 543	100%	14 997	100%

However, generally speaking, dialogue activities are notoriously hard to measure. As the DAC Guidance paper argues, it is hard to attribute results to dialogue activities, not the least because an evaluation would need to try to measure things that are not quantifiable, such as personal relationships and attitude change that may become operative in specific contexts. If results are hard to measure, then it is even harder to form an opinion about efficiency. Nonetheless, we would note

that “inefficiencies”, in the sense of long-term engagement and persistence and patience, may yet yield results in the end.

In Annex 4, we have provided cost summaries for all projects for all NDN offices in the 2005-7 period. Of course, cost summaries do not give any direct measurement of efficiency as projects are too diverse to make a strict comparison. However, they may give an indication of which projects are expensive and which are not. This information can be seen against the qualitative assessments of results elsewhere in the text. We have added summaries for each office and computed averages for each project and each office to give an indication of relative cost.

As can be seen from the tables, those three offices we did not select are all fairly inexpensive in the sense that total costs are well beneath the average costs for the NDN offices. Of the remaining six, both the Mostar and Banja Luka offices are beneath the average costs as well. The four others, Sarajevo, KND, Osijek and Skopje are well above the average costs per office.

Looking at offices individually, the Skopje office has a small portfolio in which one project dominates. This is the Jegunovce project, which is the single most expensive of all over the three-year period. This is a project that we see as bringing results and having potential for replication in other municipalities, thus perhaps justifying the expenses. KND is the most expensive office of all over the period and it is the dialogue with the three municipalities which constitute the largest budget items. Again, given the nature of the dialogue, the potential for achieving results is clearly there. The Mostar office has a large portfolio with many small activities in 2005, but there has been a scale-down and a sharper focus on education in the last two years, with the school project in Stolac the largest budget item. With a sharper focus, it might be easier to detect results, though the Stolac project is at an early stage as yet. For the Sarajevo office, there has been a similar sharpening of focus on activities in the Bratunac-Srebrenica area, practically consuming the entire budget in 2007. The Banja Luka office is one of the “inexpensive” offices with a fairly small portfolio dominated by activities in Prijedor – Sanski most and the BUKA TV show. There is a slight scale-down of the former activity over the period. Finally, the Osijek office has a fairly small portfolio with the new school project the largest one.

Looking at the period as such, there is a sense of increasing focus over time, with fewer activities which may be regarded as a positive development. But it would be farfetched to make any strong statements about efficiency. One possible conclusion may be that activities likely to bring tangible results tend to be more expensive..

### 3.2 Recommendations

The evaluators believe that the value-added (or niche) of NDC is in its very local-level activities involving members of ethnically mixed/divided communities. More efforts should be undertaken to fully realise the potential of this work. This might mean to withdraw, in an even more concise way, from high-profile, highly visible events such as roundtable discussions with politicians etc. There is no shortage of such activities in the countries, and while NDC could affiliate itself with it, resources might be spent better on community-level interventions.

Results take a long time to come by, and after a protracted period of short-term interventions in various locations (in particular in the case of BiH), NDC should sustain presence and efforts in areas where interventions have recently started and see processes through with the maximum of efforts and resources. Otherwise, we feel that there is a potential to doing more harm than good in these locations. Under the principle of “Do No Harm”, we urge NDC field operations, and NDN PM, to reflect on whether the promises that are being made to potential beneficiaries can really be



delivered upon, or whether NDC staff has the qualifications to get involved in issues that are better addressed by other organisations.

There is a continued need to work on professionalisation/development of skills and expertise of staff. While brokering of assistance and provision of logistical and organisational support is important, ideally, the majority of NDC staff should be able to conduct dialogue-building activities themselves. There is also a need for more systematic learning from previous experience and activities, and for incorporating lessons learned into future activity design.

We would argue that a local approach – small areas with problems that are amenable to NDC intervention and are manageable given capacity and resources are a better option than large-scale operations and open-ended roundtables for achieving results. Large-scale operations are only feasible in the partnership of larger organizations with recognized competence and experience. Secondly, we would think NDC work would be strengthened if projects were able to specify operational objectives and results that address issues beyond changing the mindsets of individual beneficiaries with a view towards establishing services and/or changing institutional practices. Thirdly, we would argue for medium-level dialogue – in the sense of avoiding issues that the NDCs and their constituents are not likely to solve without higher political backup. If the environment is conducive to tackling these issues, then it may be worth trying, but in a volatile environment, the risk of expending lots of effort on an uncertain outcome is too high to ignore. Fourthly, we would make the case for long-term engagement with a core group of people. One NDC advantage, recognized by many interviewees, is their staying capacity and local presence – to come in and dig in when other agencies come and go. This is an advantage which should be exploited further.

Finally, while many projects address past injustices and wrong-doings, we see an advantage in projects that can benefit the entire community independently of ethnic belonging – with the long-term vision of making ethnic distinctions more and more irrelevant for local community decision-making. For instance, when parents are concerned with the quality and usefulness of education, these considerations may override ethnic issues, leaving an open, neutral space for interventions, as we have seen in the IT and English classes offered by various NDC projects. However, this does not disqualify activities that deal with the treatment of the past. We cannot conclusively determine what is the most relevant of past, present or future concerns for NDC activities.

If these considerations can be given precedence in future programming, there is good reason for continued MFA support.

Questions should be asked at the level of the donor what realistically can be achieved with a limited budget and limited human resources, in a limited geographical area. At the same time, the possible futility of NDCs efforts in such environments does not argue against them: we feel that there is a value to be had in being on the ground and demonstrating alternative models to local communities. For interventions of the type NDC is pursuing to be successful, we find that time—and continuity of funding—is key: in order to engage in a meaningful way, project staff needs to have the possibility of ensuring to potential beneficiaries that theirs is not a one-off engagement in a specific community, but that they are there to stay and pursue their efforts.

With regard to overall discussions on aid ownership, we feel that there should be some reflection on the role of an outside donor in providing assistance that cuts deep into the social texture of a society: while not questioning the need for reconciliation activities in the region, we feel that in order to be genuinely successful, it would help if they are grown and driven from inside the respective society, and that their importance is recognised at the official level. Outside assistance can only facilitate such a process, but the true responsibility would have to remain with the parties themselves.

# Annex 1: Terms of Reference

.....

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **for a Review of**

### **the Nansen Dialogue Network**

### **Community based peace building**

#### **1. Background**

- **Short description of the Nansen Dialogue Network**

In 1995 the first 12 week course at the Nansen Academy in Lillehammer was implemented for participants from the former Yugoslavia. The training programme was a joint project between the Nansen Academy, Norwegian Red Cross, Norwegian Church Aid and the International Peace Research Institute (PRIO), with financial support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA), the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration and the Lillehammer Olympic Committee. The Lillehammer project targeted potential leaders and the intention was to try to change attitudes and thereby actions, through transfer of knowledge about democracy, human rights and peaceful conflict resolution, combined with practical work with dialogue. The basic idea was to stimulate the participants for building a democratic civil society in their native countries.

After some time it became evident that it was necessary to integrate what had been learned at Lillehammer into concrete action in the local communities of the participants. The first Nansen Dialogue Centre was opened in Pristina in 1997 and became a model for the formation of other NDN offices. Today the Network comprises 8 dialogue centres localised in Sarajevo, Mostar and Banja Luka in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Skopje in Macedonia, Belgrade/Bujanovac in Serbia, Podgorica in Montenegro, Osijek in Croatia and Pristina/Mitrovica in Kosovo. The seminars taking place at the Nansen Academy have continued and have played a vital role in the recruitment to the Nansen Dialogue Centres, as almost all staff working at the centres has participated in these seminars.

Since 1995 NMFA has contributed with NOK 154 654 288 to the NDN of which NOK 148 494 288 to the Balkan programme and the rest for smaller activities in Somalia (NOK 900 000) and the Middle East (NOK 5 260 000).

The overall objective of the Nansen Dialogue Network (NDN) in the Western Balkans is to contribute to sustainable peace and reconciliation by promoting inter-ethnic dialogue. The immediate objective is to influence attitudes of ethnic politics and mistrust that still dominate political and social life throughout the region, and contribute to improved inter-ethnic relations and practical cooperation in conflict ridden communities.

- **Why the review is initiated**

The long term cooperation with NDN and the substantial funding of the programme, indicate the importance with which the programme has been regarded by the NMFA. A review was carried out in 2003, with a positive recommendation for continued support. This was "a review of the status and future challenges of the project, with primary focus on the centres in the field". Assessments

were made of the profile of each centre in terms of strengths and weaknesses, as well as their potential for further development. The review was carried out by two former employees of the NMFA, who had dealt with the NDN and naturally had extensive knowledge about the programme, albeit from the donor's perspective.

A rather different angle is envisaged for this review with more emphasis on impact and sustainability after 11 years of funding. Furthermore, the previous review report stated that "the network represent a clear potential for further development." This review should assess if this potential has been realised and to what degree the recommendations from the previous review have been followed up. Finally, the review should assess if the NDN programme represents a model that could be implemented in other post-conflict societies.

## 2. Purpose and intended use

The main purpose of the review is to assess to what extent the Nansen Dialogue Network has achieved its immediate objective of having "influenced attitudes of ethnic politics and mistrust and contributed to improved inter-ethnic relations and practical cooperation in conflict ridden communities". The evaluation should also endeavour to establish to what extent the network has contributed to its long term, overall objective of having "contributed to sustainable peace and reconciliation in the Western Balkans by promoting inter-ethnic dialogue".

The review should furthermore recommend possible programme adjustments and consider how the lessons learnt from the dialogue programme in the Western Balkans has been or could be implemented in other post-conflict areas.

The findings and recommendations from the review will provide inputs to decisions regarding possible future support to NDN in the Western Balkans and in other post-conflict areas.

The primary users of the review results will be the NMFA, but the review should also be a useful learning process for the NDN.

## 3. Scope of work

The review shall consist of the following major components and underlying questions:

- Effectiveness:

An assessment of the results of the programme at the local level.

To what extent has the programme achieved its immediate objective(s)? Are there any baseline data and indicators to measure the achievements made? To what extent can effects at local level be measured? To what extent are the established monitoring and evaluation mechanisms being used? To what extent can results be attributed to the programme? Does the effort prompt people increasingly to resist violence and provocations to violence? Does the effort result in an increase in people's security and in their sense of security? Does the effort results in meaningful improvement in relations among groups in conflict?

- Impact:

An assessment of the possible long term effects of the programme.

Are there any indications that the programme is reaching its long term objectives? Are there any indirect or unintended effects of the programme?

- Relevance

An assessment of the relevance of the programme.

To what extent are the objectives and results of the programme in line with Norwegian policies for peace and reconciliation?. To what extent are the seminars at Lillehammer relevant for the situation prevalent on the ground in the different local communities?

How are the Nansen Dialogue Centres regarded by the authorities of the different countries and by the local communities at large?.

Are the NDN activities based on an accurate analysis of the conflict? Do they, therefore, address causes of conflicts, key dynamics and driving factors or key driving constituencies of the conflict? Are they working on the right issues in this context at this time (i.e. is it up-to-date)? Are the stated goals and objectives relevant to issues central to the conflict? Has the effort responded flexibly to changing circumstances over time?

- Sustainability:

What efforts have been made with regard to securing the sustainability of the programme both in terms of personnel involvement and economically? To what extent is it likely that the effects of the programme will remain beyond the programme period? Which steps have been taken or are planned to create long-term processes, structures and institutions for peace building? Will new institutions designed to address conflicts survive? Are they being used? Will hard-won improvements in inter-group relationships persist in the face of challenges?

- Efficiency:

Are the investments and running costs of the programme justifiable in terms of the results? How economically/efficiently are resources/inputs (financial, human and material) converted into results/outputs? Could the same results have been achieved with less funding?

The review shall comprise the following steps:

- Map and categorize the activities of the NDN.
- Select a number of NDN offices and local communities that will be studied in depth (which localities and number should be discussed and decided on as part of the inception report, see 6.)
- Identify the program theory(ies) of the dialogue approach (s in question). Are the assumptions underpinning the approaches and projects evidence-based or from where do they come.
- Assess the effects of the activities.
- Assess for conflict sensitivity
- Assess relevance, sustainability, efficiency
- Discuss effects in relation to the broader context..
- Provide recommendations for: a) (to NDN) improvements to be made in the NDN. programmes b) (to NMFA) regarding future funding/ alternatives?
- Assess whether the Nansen Dialog concept represents a model that could be replicated in other post-conflict areas. NDN has implemented interventions in Somalia and the Middle East. On the basis of secondary data and interviews with relevant personnel at NDN and NMFA, these interventions should be assessed...

#### **4..Sources of information and methodology**

A mix of qualitative and quantitative methods should be employed, as well as a combination of theory-based and results-based evaluation approaches. Case studies shall be used to illustrate the likely extent, or not, of the results of the NDN dialogue projects and practices. It will be up to the consultant to suggest the method that can best answer the review questions and to deal with challenges related to establishing *when* and *how* the dialogue objectives have been achieved. In doing so the consultant should use relevant and recently developed guidance and/or other similar evaluations as references for developing an approach (See for example CDA Approach paper to developing a DAC Guidance on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peace building, and the forthcoming draft version of DAC Guidance on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peace building). Linear, cause and effect thinking contradicts the understanding of how processes occur in open systems where many different actors are involved. Given the multifarious and abstract nature of dialogue activities, it is up to the evaluation team how it will attempt to isolate NDN activities from other factors that exert influence on inter-group relations and the overall progress towards

reconciliation. In the analysis the review team shall separate between inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes.

*Guiding principles:* triangulate and validate information, assess and describe data quality in transparent manner (assess strengths and weaknesses and sources of information). Highlight data gaps. Assessments shall be based on factual findings. Findings shall be based on reliable and credible data and observations.

A document review of proposals, plans, progress reports, internal monitoring and review reports and other relevant should also be undertaken.

In addition to the in depth studies of a selected number of local communities, staff at NDN headquarters in Oslo and at the Nansen Academy in Lillehammer should be interviewed as well as relevant personnel in NMFA.

### **5..Review Team**

In view of the former review of NDN having characteristics of an internal exercise, this review should be external and impartial. The team should consist of at least two members. The team leader should have a professional background from social science and extensive experience from conducting evaluations/reviews, especially evaluating reconciliation and dialogue processes. Furthermore, the team must possess knowledge and experience from the Western Balkan region and experience from conducting focus group and in-depth interviews. Local consultants should be included in the team as long they do not compromise the impartiality of the exercise..The team should be representative in terms of gender and at least one member should have experience in gender related issues.

### **6. Reporting**

Within two weeks of signing the contract an *inception report* outlining the methodological approach and a detailed work plan shall be submitted to the NMFA, Section for Western Balkan Affairs for approval, before initiating the review. The actual review, including fieldwork and report writing, should not take more than 15 calendar weeks in total. A *draft report* is to be submitted to the Section for Western Balkan Affairs for comments. Lastly, a *final report* is to be handed over to the Section within two weeks after receiving comments to the draft report. The final report should not exceed 40 pages, including an executive summary. The reports shall be written in English.

Throughout the process the Section for Western Balkan Affairs will consult with a reference group which will be established for the review..

## Annex 2: List of people met

### List of people met other than NDC staff

#### International organizations

##### *Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE):*

Mr Trevor Williams, Director, Democratization Department

Mr Luc Lietaer, Education Department

Ms Radmila Trifković, Press Officer Banja Luka

Ms Sanja Arapović, Education Officer, Mostar

Mr Nihad Mešić, Education Officer, Regional Office Tuzla

##### *Office of the High Representative (OHR):*

Mr Archie Tuta, Deputy Head of Political Department

Mr Anatoly Victorov, Head of Region, Mostar

##### *European Union Policing Mission (EUPM)*

Mr Tobias Flessenkemper, EU Co-ordinator

#### International NGOs

##### *Quaker Peace and Social Witness*

Mr Goran Bubalo, Sarajevo

#### Local NGOs

##### *Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina*

Mr Srđan Dizdarević, President

Mr Aleksandar Živanović, Helsinki Committee Banja Luka

Ms Stana Medić, predsjednica NVO "Sara", Srebrenica

Mr Vladimir Gatarić, predsjednik NVO "Odyssey", Bratunac

Ms Stanojka Tešić, President, NGO "Forum of Women of Bratunac"

Mr Adnan Đuliman, President of the NGO "Novi Val" Blagaj, Mostar

##### *Centre for Non-Violent Action (CNA)*

Ms Sanja Deanković, Sarajevo

Ms Tamara Šmidling, Sarajevo

#### NDC Activity Participants

Ms Gordana Dukić, MoP Republika Srpska National Assembly

Mr Vlatko Vukotić, now Alternativna Televizija Banja Luka

Mr Vladimir Blaha, Association of National Minorities in the RS, President of the Czech Association in Banja Luka

#### Banja Luka/Prijedor/Sanski Most

Mr Darko Maričić, Chief Inspector at the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Banja Luka, Project Manager "Police in the Local Community"

Ms Azra Pašalić, President of Prijedor City Assembly

Mr Đorđo Jez, Municipality of Prijedor, Prijedor local community advisor, NGO representative for refugee issues  
 Ms Senka Jakupović, teacher, director of NGO “Dijakom”, NGO trainer and activities, NDC alumni member, Sanski Most  
 Ms Anesa Hadžić, class teacher Primary School “Peti oktobar”, Sanski Most  
 Mr Rezak Hukanović, director and owner of independent TV “101”, Sanski Most  
 Ms Zlata Muhardarević, employed at newspaper “Oglas”, previously secretary of the humanitarian organization “Merhamet”, Banja Luka  
 Ms Nadežda Savjak, specialist, clinical psychologist, Banja Luka  
 Ms Azra Novkinić, Director Youth Center Hambarine, Prijedor  
 Mr Aleksandar Drakulić, freelance journalist, Prijedor  
 Mr Nenad Knežević, journalist, correspondent of ATV Banja Luka in Prijedoru  
 Ms Tijana Tinovac, student, Prijedor/Banja Luka  
 Mr Nikola Dukić, student, Prijedor/Banja Luka  
 Mr Elvir Draganović, Prijedor

#### Mostar

Mr Božo Ćorić, Head of the Department for Public Activities, City Administration, Mostar  
 Ms Seada Kuštrić, Director IV Primary School, Mostar  
 Mr Ivica Čavar, Project Manager, NGO Centre for Civil Initiatives, Mostar  
 Mr Adnin Hasić, Counsellor of the City Council (SDA), Mostar  
 Ms Anita Zovko, Journalist, FTV, Mostar  
 Mr Željko Asić, Representative of the House of Peoples of the Federal Parliament (HSP Đapčić-Jurišić)  
 Mr Muradif Kurtović, President of the Association “Moj Dom”, Mostar  
 Mr Miro Šutalo, Secondary School teacher, Stolac  
 Mr Zvonko Perić, Main Advisor of the HDZ 1990 Youth, Stolac  
 Mr Alen Turković, parent, Stolac  
 Ms Žana Radoš, student and member of the student council, Secondary School, Stolac  
 Ms Kristina Goluža, biology teacher, Secondary School, Stolac  
 Ms Ivana Marić, teacher of Croatian and English, Secondary School, Stolac  
 Mr Mustafa Hodžić, sociology teacher, Secondary School, Stolac

#### Srebrenica/Bratunac

Mr Radomir Pavlović, Head of the Municipal Assembly, Srebrenica  
 Ms Svetlana Marković, Head of the Department for General Administration, Srebrenica  
 Mr Mustafa Golić, Deputy Mayor of Bratunac Municipality  
 Mr Milivoje Veselinović, Head of the Department for Urbanism and Spatial Planning, Bratunac  
 Ms Fija Avdić, teacher of chemistry, Secondary School Centre, Srebrenica  
 Ms Nada Jovanović, Director “Business Centre”, Srebrenica  
 Ms Zijada Halilović, Senior Counsellor for Return to Srebrenica Municipality  
 Mr Savo Milošević, Director Primary School “Petar Kočić”, Kravice, Bratunac Municipality  
 Ms Anđelka Obrenović, music teacher, Primary School “Petar Kočić”, Kravice, Bratunac Municipality  
 Mr Goran Đurić, geography teacher, Primary School “Petar Kočić” Kravice, Bratunac  
 Mr Munib Karić, IT teacher, Primary School “Petar Kočić”, Kravice, Bratunac  
 Ms Snežana Stojanović, Public Health Centre, Bratunac

#### Bi-lateral partners

##### *Norwegian Embassy Sarajevo*

H.E. Mr. Jan Braathu, Ambassador

**Others**

Ms Leigh Brown, Psychologist, Belfast/UK

Mrs Alexandra Stiglmayer, European Stability Initiative (ESI), Brussels

Ms Helene Holm-Pedersen, European Commission, Cabinet of Enlargement Commissioner O. Rehn, Brussels

Ms Joanna Harvey, United Nations, Department for Peacekeeping Operations, New York (via e-mail)

**Kosovo**

Mr. Burim Berisha, Mayor of Fushe Kosovo/Kosovo Polje Municipality

Mr. Milan Djelic, former Serb Vice-President of FKP Municipality

Ms. Sladjan Lazic, Municipal Returns Office, FKP

Mr. Sabit Hyakolli, former Albanian Vice-President of FKP Municipality

Mr. Lorenzo Chianeze, international coordinator for returns, European Perspective, in charge of reconstruction and selection of beneficiaries

Mr. Sverre Johan Kvale, head of Norwegian Liaison Office

**Representatives of receiving and returning communities in FKP Municipality****Obiliq/Obilic**

Mr. Hajriz Bekteshi, Albanian Vice-President of the Municipality

Mr. Ljubomir Jakovljevic, former Serbian Vice-President of Municipality

**Mitrovica**

Mr. Nebojsa Maric, Serb community leader in Mikronaselje/Kodra e Minatoreve

Mr. Driton Gerguri, Albanian community leader in Mikronaselje/Kodra e Minatoreve

Mr. Zarko Kovacevic, Team leader for Norwegian Church Aid

Mr. James Nunan, head of EU Preparation Team in Mitrovica North

Ms. Nevenka Medic/Tatjana Lazarevic, NGO activists, Mitrovica North

Mr. Thomas Zettner, OSCE team coordinator, Mitrovica North

Mr. Agron Deda/Ms. Vivi Gramm, Norwegian Church Aid, return of Romas project

Mr. Mustafa Plana, former CEO of Mitrovica South Municipality, NDC dialogue participant

Ms. Aferdita Tahiri, Project assistant, Catholic Relief Service

Mr. Sadri Ferati, Minister of Local Government, NDC dialogue participant

**Macedonia**

Mr. Burhan Ejupi, Director of the central school, Semsovo

Mr. Gligorco Rujkov, Director of the Zilce school

Mr. Patko Ristovski, parent, Zilce village

Mr. Ljupco Trpevski, parent, Zilce village

Mr. Bekim Nuhiu, Lecturer in advanced IT course and parent

Mr. Muhamed Zilbeari, parent in Ozormiste village, head of post office in Tetovo

Mr. Kire Kromidarovski, parent and member of Parents' Council, Semsovo

Ms. Dashurie Rexhepi, teacher of English course in Preljubishte village

Mr. Mensur Mamuti, teacher of IT course in Preljubishte village

Mr. Selajdin Shaqiri, doctor in Semsovo village and parent

Mr. Toni Koceski, Mayor of Jegunovce Municipality

Mr. Selajdin Shaqiri, former MP and member of parents' and school council

Mr. Rade Lazarevski/Aleksandar Dilje, members of youth organisation of political parties



Mr. Boris Mircevski, participant in NDC activities and currently at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ms. Nina Sulovic-Cvetkovska, UNDP office in Skopje  
Mr. Jovan Despotovski, Secretariat for European Affairs

Mr. Carl Wilbye, Norwegian Ambassador to Macedonia

Ms. Valbona Kamberi,  
Ms. Olgica Naumoska,  
Mr. Mito Stefanovski, all Bureau for the Development of the Educational System, Tetovo

### **Osijek**

Ms. Liljana Gehrecke, Director of the European House in Vukovar  
Ms. Prodanic Nevenca, Parents' Club, Vukovar  
Ms. Sofija Despotovic, Parents' Club, Vukovar  
Ms. Biserka Mitic, Parents' Club, Vukovar

Mr. Grgo Krajina, head of the department for education, sports and culture in Vukovarsko – Srijemska County  
Mr. Noviva Gajic, teacher, involved in the New School project  
Mr. Domagoj Hajdukovic, teacher, also involved  
Mr. Marinko Uremovic, teacher, also involved

Mr. Miroslav Klaic, head of Education and Teachers' Training Agency, Osijek branch  
Ms. Anđelka Peko, Dean of Teachers' Faculty, Osijek

## Annex 3: Select project summaries

Projects	Context/Justification	Risks/opportunities	Inputs	Target group
<p><b>NDC Banja Luka</b></p> <p>Activities in Prijedor/Sanski Most municipalities</p>	<p>Municipality experienced severe level of war crimes and ethnic cleansing during the war; substantial number of Bosniak returns of the pre-war population to Prijedor; communities live alongside each other, as opposed to with each other</p>	<p>Opportunities: Substantial returns have happened, some economic recovery has taken place, making this a good time to confront less tangible issues such as war-time atrocities; presence of moderate personalities of both ethnic groups in the Prijedor municipal administration.</p> <p>Risks: uncertainty of funding might not allow sustained work with the group and initial momentum might dissipate</p>	<p>NDC BL staff (identification of target group, preparation, implementation and follow-up of 1st seminar in BiH; preparation, part of implementation and follow-up of Lillehammer seminar)</p> <p>Nansen-Academy Lillehammer (implementation of Lillehammer seminar)</p>	<p>Group of influential people from both municipalities and representing the different ethnic Groups</p>
<p><b>NDC Sarajevo</b></p> <p>Activities in Srebrenica/Bratunac</p>	<p>Municipalities were theatre of worst war time events (genocide and ethnic cleansing); making progress on reconciliation and inter-ethnic dialogue in both municipalities will have a bearing on overall reconciliation in BiH</p>	<p>Opportunities: Bosniaks have returned to their pre-war homes</p> <p>Risks: Population on both sides highly susceptible to events in the wider political context and hardline politicians and rhetorics, resulting in any progress being fragile;</p> <p>uncertainty of NDC funding, resulting in initial lack of medium-term strategy/planning of activities with target groups, which carries risk of momentum dissipating</p>	<p>- NDC Sarajevo staff (identification of 3 strands of activities in both municipalities, i.e. working with youth, pedagogues/school managers, and municipal authorities and returnees; identification and establishment of working relations with respective counterparts; initial activities in schools, with pedagogues/school managers, and municipal authorities and returnee representatives)</p> <p>- NDC Lillehammer staff (facilitation of seminars on inter-ethnic dialogue in Bratunac and Srebrenica)</p>	<p>Group of influential people/multipliers for all three project lines: representatives of municipal authorities and of returnees, students and parents; young people</p>

Projects	Context/Justification	Risks/opportunities	Inputs	Target group
			- Additional funding by embassy (for school rehabilitation)  - Input from local and Sarajevo-based NGOs	
<b>NDC Mostar:</b>  “NDC Presents/NDC Predstavlja”	Mostar is still divided city dominated by hardline nationalist politics; there is need to offset nationalist rhetorics by providing alternative views to citizens	Opportunities: NDC recognised as creating neutral space for dialogue  Risks: Fora organised by NDC do not feed back into political debate, but run merely parallel to it; events reach out to the same group of already likeminded people	NDC Mostar staff (selection of topics for discussion, organisation/ implementation of discussion fora, follow-up)	Wider public of Mostar and surrounding areas
<b>Kosovan Nansen Dialogue</b>  Returns to Fushe Kosovo/Kosovo Polje (FKP)	FKP, a town outside Pristina of mixed ethnic heritage, Albanians displaced during 1998 war, Serbs displaced in the aftermath of the war; huge material damages  The objective is to facilitate the return of Serbs	Opportunities: Facilitate dialogue between returning and receiving communities  Risks: Receiving community negative; returning community too insecure to return	NDC/KND staff-series of dialogue meetings to prepare the ground for return; practical support during and after actual return  Govt. and other agencies assuring and delivering material facilities and monetary support	Returning and receiving communities of FKP
<b>NDC Skopje</b>  Jegunovce project	Jegunovce, municipality outside Skopje, strongly affected by the 2001 war between Albanians and Macedonians; Resulting in widespread interethnic distrust	Opportunities: Providing space for interethnic classes for primary school children  Risks: Influential people in a position to stop or boycott facilities for interethnic education	NDC Skopje: steady presence to convince target groups of the desirability of interethnic education; regular cooperation with municipal and educational authorities	Students, parents, teachers, school administration, municipal government
<b>NDC Osijek</b>  New school	Vukovar, the town most affected by the Serbian-Croatian war:  Many years of occupation and extensive material damage  Strong and abiding interethnic distrust	Opportunities: Establish a new school in line with official educational policies and with national support  Risks: active/passive resistance by local municipality	NDC Osijek staff  facilitating/co-ordinating with target group; lobbying with public and authorities at local and national level	Students, teachers, parents, educational authorities, municipal government

Projects	Outputs	Outcomes actual/projected	Impact (a) actual/projected (b) individual/institutional/social
<p><b>NDC Banja Luka</b></p> <p>Activities in Prijedor/Sanski Most municipalities</p>	<p>Two seminars involving the target group trying to establish a dialogue about each member's war time experience</p>	<p>Projected: forging of a sense of community of the group through: better understanding between individual members of the group through acknowledgement of each others war time experience and the reasons for his/her action/non-action, empathy with the others account of events; forgiveness and asking for forgiveness</p> <p>- coming out of the above process, the group will be able to give an example to the how to work together and will be a force in fostering inter-ethnic relations in the wider community</p> <p>Actual: Group has established a strong sense of belonging, as well as a will to continue working together and to share their experiences with the wider community. Follow-up is needed to guide and support this process and to maintain the positive momentum.</p>	<p>a) Projected: Inter-ethnic relations will have noticeably improved in Prijedor municipality. Actual: Too early to say-- seminars took place in autumn 2007</p> <p>b) Individual: Participants involved experienced dialogue seminar as painful and cathartic experience, and as an eye-opener; all participants stress the importance of Lillehammer seminar to adopting new attitudes and communication skills; at the level of the group, participants are keen on continuing to work together and on passing on their experience to others in their municipality Institutional: difficult to assess at this point in time</p>
<p><b>NDC Sarajevo:</b></p> <p>Activities in Srebrenica/ Bratunac</p>	<p>Presentations on work of NDC</p> <p>Several seminars on inter-ethnic dialogue and reconciliation</p> <p>Establishment of Co-ordination Boards that will advise direction of work in both municipalities</p> <p>Physical rehabilitation of classrooms for extra-curricular IT and English classes for students IT classes</p>	<p>Projected: Facilitating inter-ethnic dialogue through teaching skills of non-violent communication; through establishment of bodies that bring together representatives of different groups to discuss issues of common interest; through creation of space and around a non-politicised issue (IT) to bring together representatives of both ethnic groups</p> <p>Actual: Initial progress has been made on the above</p>	<p>a) Projected: There will be lasting improvement of inter-ethnic relations in both municipalities; actual: too early to tell.</p> <p>b) Individual: Participants acknowledged usefulness of activities so far Institutional: too early to tell Social: too early to tell.</p>
<p><b>NDC Mostar:</b></p> <p>NDC</p>	<p>Monthly public debates on issues of current interest</p>	<p>Projected: Creation of a space where alternative views can be heard and debated;</p>	<p>a) Projected: By providing public with alternative views on current political issues, the public will be able to influence the</p>

Projects	Outputs	Outcomes actual/projected	Impact (a) actual/projected (b) individual/institutional/social
Predstavljaja/NDC Presents		Actual: NDC is recognised as creating alternative space for debate.	<p>debate by feeding back their views to decision-makers.</p> <p>Actual: No evidence that political debate has changed as a result of people attending NDC events.</p> <p>b) Individual: little systematic evidence; however, debates are well attended and might have shaped individuals views and attitudes.</p> <p>Institutional: difficult to verify, as no analysis as to whether officials attend debates and how content of debates might be fed into institutional practice.</p>
<b>Kosovan Nansen Dialogue</b>  Returns to Fushe Kosovo/Kosovo Polje (FKP) t	Actual returns of displaced and their settlement in FKP – First phase completed	Restoration of FKP and village communities as they were before the war; rejuvenation of interethnic cohabitation and cooperation	<p>Projected: Role model and source of inspiration for returns of displaced in other parts of Kosovo</p> <p>b) individual and social impact through the recreation of disrupted communities</p>
<b>NDC Skopje</b>  Jegunovce school project	<p>Establishment of interethnic classes at village school – not yet reached</p> <p>Interethnic classes in IT, English, Macedonian and Albanian classes have run for several years with full capacity</p>	<p>Interethnic classes have prepared the ground for an interethnic school and made it more acceptable to the local communities</p> <p>Parents willing to take a higher interest in the education system</p>	<p>Projected and partly actual: The idea of interethnic schools spreading to other municipalities in the region</p> <p>b) Individual and institutional: changes in interethnic behaviour patterns and the education system</p>
<b>NDC Osijek</b>  New school	Actual establishment of school – possibly 2008, though not yet assured	<p>Creating institutional space for interethnic cooperation and generating knowledge about regional peoples and cultures</p> <p>Raising quality of education</p>	<p>Actual: The idea of the ethnic and cultural traditions of the region has been taken up by other primary schools in the area</p> <p>b) individual and institutional impact if realised; symbolic significance at the social level.</p>

## Annex 4: Project costs 2005 – 2007

<b>Summary of costs of projects, Nansen Dialogue Network 2005</b>				
<b>1. Centre level projects</b>				
<b>Centre</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Costs (EUR)</b>	<b>Costs (NOK)</b>	<b>Sum centre (EUR)</b>
Belgrade	Vojvodina	... 19 336	....159 524	
Belgrade	Sandzak	... 32 189	....265 563	
Belgrade	South Serbia	... 37 155	....306 528	
Belgrade	UN conference on conflict prevention	.... 8 167	.....67 374	
Sum				.....96 847
Bujanovac	LBPP	... 30 389	....250 713	
Bujanovac	Local Politicians & Municipality	... 54 720	....451 441	
Bujanovac	Schools	... 12 166	....100 366	
Bujanovac	Hapi/Korak	.... 2 009	.....16 577	
Bujanovac	Education of Buj. Youth	... 37 161	....306 582	
Sum				.....99 284
Skopje	Jegunovce	.. 114 709	....946 350	
Skopje	Arseni Jovkov	... 47 154	....389 022	
Skopje	UNITAS	.... 5 047	....41 640	
Sum				..... 166 911
Montenegro	Public Activities on Interethnic Issues	... 21 501	....177 382	
Montenegro	Development of Dialogue and CSN in Ulcinj, Tuzi and Plav	... 17 744	....146 385	
Montenegro	IE Relations & Cross Border act. in Sandzak	... 12 122	....100 005	
Montenegro	Training Local Authorities & NGOs	.....-	..... -.	
Montenegro	Workshops on Conflict Management	.... 4 923	....40 615	
Montenegro	Communication School	.... 3 563	....29 398	
Montenegro	Public Activities on Political Issues	... 16 005	....132 038	
Montenegro	School of Democratic Leadership	... 19 490	....160 789	
Montenegro	School of Nansen Dialogue	.... 7 306	....60 277	
Montenegro	Friends of Public Service	.... 1 188	.....9 799	
Montenegro	Campaign on Conscientious Objection	.... 3 426	....28 261	
Sum				..... 107 267
KND	Interethnic Dialogue in Municipalities	.. 144 209	...1 189 724	
KND	Dialogue on Return	.... 8 653	.....71 391	
KND	Interethnic Dialogue on Education	... 48 935	....403 714	
KND, Belgrade	Kosovar Serb Community	... 27 495	....226 831	

KND	UN conference on conflict prevention	... 3 709	....30 596	
KND	International Human Rights film festival	... 3 972	....32 773	
KND	Other projects	... 1 085	.....8 953	
Sum				..... 238 059
Mostar	Dialogue Seminars for Teachers	... 18 881	....155 770	
Mostar	Orkdal	... 4 735	....39 065	
Mostar	Gymnasium	... 16 099	....132 820	
Mostar	School of Human Rights for education	... 3 409	....28 127	
Mostar	School of Dialogue and Political Skills	... 21 235	....175 187	
Mostar	Mostar – Norway	... 1 894	....15 626	
Mostar	2 way street	... 9 069	....74 816	
Mostar	NDC Presents	... 13 879	....114 502	
Mostar	Instant Response Activities	... 10 503	....86 653	
Mostar	Stop Violence Over Returnees	... 7 408	....61 115	
Mostar, MN	Motion in Triangle	... 17 154	....141 523	
Sum				..... 124 267
Sarajevo	Return Through Dialogue	... 72 727	....600 000	
Sarajevo	Upbringing and Ed. for HR	... 32 021	....264 177	
Sarajevo	P2C United for Multicultural Action	.....-	..... -.	
Sarajevo	ALBUM	... 10 629	....87 690	
Sarajevo	Immediate Response	... 4 911	....40 513	
Sarajevo	Tuzla field office	... 11 703	....96 550	
Sum				..... 131 992
Banja Luka	Prijedor	... 43 786	....361 231	
Banja Luka	BUKA	... 26 506	....218 677	
Banja Luka	Instant Response	... 14 161	....116 832	
Banja Luka	Upbr. and Education for Human Rights	... 8 176	....67 453	
Sum				.....92 629
Osijek	The New School	... 81 216	....670 032	
Osijek	Never Ending Stories	... 30 477	....251 433	
Osijek	Identity And Embrace	... 6 684	....55 144	
Osijek	Direct Actions	... 1 866	....15 397	
Osijek	Peacebuilding and Public Policies	... 19 166	....158 124	
Sum				..... 139 410
	<b>Total costs of Centre level projects</b>	<b>1 233 826</b>	<b>10 179 069</b>	.....1 233 826
	<b>Average</b>	<b>... 22 033</b>	<b>....181 769</b>	..... 132 963

<b>Summary of costs, Nansen Dialogue Network 2006</b>				
<b>Centre level projects</b>				
				<b>Sum centre (Euro)</b>
<b>Centre</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Costs (EUR)</b>	<b>Costs (NOK)</b>	
Belgrade	Vojvodina	... 19 100	....155 668	
Belgrade	Sandzak	... 34 232	....278 990	
Belgrade	GPPAC	... 10 736	....87 499	
Belgrade	South Serbia Teachers	... 62 618	....510 334	
Sum				..... 126 686
Bujanovac	Municipal Development	... 43 456	....354 169	
Bujanovac	IE Dialogue in politics	... 37 101	....302 370	
Bujanovac	Integration of women	... 16 662	....135 796	
Bujanovac	Roma politicians	... 15 879	....129 412	
Bujanovac	Education of Buj. Youth	... 26 350	....214 749	
Sum				..... 139 447
Skopje	Jegunovce *	.. 236 267	...1 925 577	
Skopje	Arseni Jovkov high school	.... 8 011	....65 293	
Skopje	Other/UNITAS	.....771	.....6 280	
Sum				..... 245 049
Montenegro	Publ Act on IE&Pol issues	... 21 914	....178 597	
Montenegro	Dialogue in Ulcinj, Tuzi and Bar	... 26 759	....218 088	
Montenegro	Sandzak	... 27 580	....224 780	
Montenegro	School of Democratic leadership	... 24 922	....203 114	
Montenegro	Nansen school of dialogue	... 23 601	....192 345	..... -.
Sum				..... 124 776
KND	Municipality – FKP	... 55 167	....449 615	
KND	Municipality – Mitrovica	... 51 595	....420 502	
KND	Municipality – Obilic	... 52 866	....430 859	
KND	Dialogue in Education	... 24 587	....200 387	
KND	KS Serb Community	... 26 252	....213 955	
KND	Divided Community	.... 5 373	.....43 788	
Sum				..... 215 841
Mostar	Education	... 67 655	....551 390	
Mostar	School of Dialogue&Pol. Skills	... 26 501	....215 981	
Mostar	Dialogue for Democracy	... 36 673	....298 888	
Mostar	Orkdal	.... 6 170	.....50 289	
Sum				..... 137 000
Sarajevo	Municipality – Returnees Dialogue	... 61 294	....499 548	
Sarajevo	School for All	... 59 262	....482 986	
Sarajevo	Youth Dialogue	... 46 599	....379 781	



All BiH Centres	Is there somebody forgotten	... 4 993	....40 696	
Sum				..... 172 149
Banja Luka	Prijedor&Sanski Most	... 23 991	....195 526	
Banja Luka	Jajce	... 28 384	....231 330	
Banja Luka	BUKA TV shows	... 33 535	....273 307	
Banja Luka	Upbringing & Education for Human Rights	... 13 459	....109 691	
Sum				.....99 369
Osijek	The New School	... 71 163	....579 977	
Osijek	Dealing with past through examples of good	... 40 450	....329 664	
Osijek	Identity and Embrace	.... 7 942	....64 726	
Osijek	Bogdanovci	... 31 170	....254 037	
Osijek	One on One	... 19 227	....156 700	
Osijek	Peacebuilding and Public Policies	.... 7 135	....58 148	
Sum				<b>177 086</b>
	<b>Total costs of Centre level projects</b>	<b>. 1 437 403</b>	<b>..11 714 832</b>	<b>1 437 403</b>
	<b>Average cost</b>	<b>... 35 059</b>	<b>....285 728</b>	<b>.....143 740</b>

<b>Revised summary of costs, Nansen Dialogue Network 2007</b>			
<b>Centre level projects</b>			<b>Total per centre (EUR)</b>
<b>Centre</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Costs (EUR)</b>	<b>Costs (NOK)</b>
Belgrade	Vojvodina	... 21 951	....183 290
Belgrade	Sandzak	... 38 955	....325 275
Belgrade	South Serbia	... 40 795	....340 639
Belgrade	GPPAC	.... 2 838	.....23 695
Belgrade	Bujanovac municipality	... 19 864	....165 866
Sum			..... 124 403
Bujanovac	Municipal Development	... 36 871	....307 874
Bujanovac	IE Dialogue and modern political menag. in interethn.communities	... 25 977	....216 912
Bujanovac	Interethnic dialogue and perspective	... 22 519	....188 037
Bujanovac	Education of Buj. Youth in interethnic cooperation	... 20 061	....167 512
Sum			..... 105 429
Skopje	Jegunovce.	.. 139 294	...1 163 107
Sum			..... 139 294
Montenegro	Publ Act on IE&Pol issues	... 21 564	....180 056
Montenegro	Dialogue in Ulcinj, Tuzi and Bar	... 29 845	....249 208
Montenegro	Sandzak	... 30 704	....256 382
Montenegro	School of Democratic leadership	... 27 504	....229 662
Montenegro	Nansen school of dialogue	... 26 045	....217 478
Montenegro	SEEMF	.... 4 141	.....34 576
Sum			..... 139 804
KND	Municipality – FKP	... 49 390	....412 408
KND	Municipality – Mitrovica	... 38 390	....320 558
KND	Municipality – Obilic	... 47 868	....399 700
KND	Dialogue in Education	... 37 197	....310 599
KND	KS Serb Community	... 12 078	....100 852
KND	Dialogue on Return project	... 12 556	....104 843
KND	Divided Communities	.... 4 185	.....34 948
KND	Inter-Religious Dialogue NCA Program	.... 2 093	.....17 474
Sum			..... 203 758
Mostar	Education-Stolac	... 89 185	....744 697
Mostar	Dialogue for Democracy	... 37 004	....308 981
Mostar	Orkdal*	.... 5 025	.....41 957
Sum			..... 131

				214
Sarajevo	Municipality – Returnees Dialogue	... 58 624	....489 513	
Sarajevo	School for All	... 56 060	....468 103	
Sarajevo	Youth Dialogue	... 42 753	....356 986	
Sum				..... 157 437
Banja Luka	Prijedor&Sanski Most	... 36 249	....302 679	
Banja Luka	Jajce	... 30 678	....256 163	
Banja Luka	BUKA TV shows	... 33 685	....281 268	
Banja Luka	Banja Luka Activities	... 11 935	....99 661	
Sum				..... 112 547
Osijek	The New School	... 75 303	....628 776	
Osijek	Dealing with past through examples of good	... 47 446	....396 171	
Osijek	Identity and Embrace	.... 7 570	.....63 210	
Osijek	Bogdanovci	... 40 472	....337 943	
Sum				..... 170 790
	<b>Total costs of Centre level projects</b>	<b>. 1 284 678</b>	<b>..10 727 059</b>	<b>.....1 113 887</b>
	<b>Average cost</b>	<b>... 33 807</b>	<b>....282 291</b>	<b>..... 142 742</b>

## Annex 5: List of relevant literature

Anderson, Mary. *Do No Harm. How Aid can Support Peace and War*. Boulder, Co., Lynne Rienner, 1999.

Ashton, Caroline. *Mostar Gym Evaluation Report*. March 2007

Austin, Alex, Martina Fischer and Oliver Wils, *Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment. Critical Views on Theory and Practice*. Wien, Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2003.

Bloomfield, David, Martina Fischer and Beate Schmelze (eds.), *Social Change and Conflict Transformation*. Wien, Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2006

Bognar, Ladislav, Osijek and Sanja Spanja, Vukovar, *Skolovanje u Multietnickim Podrucjima Istocne Slavonije*. n.d.

Bush, Kenneth. *Hands-on PCIA. Part 1. A Handbook for Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment*. October 2003

CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. *Has Peacebuilding Made a Difference in Kosovo? A Study of Peacebuilding and the march 2004 Riots*. Cambridge, Mass., 2006

Church, Cheyanne and Mark M. Rogers. *Design for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. Washington DC, Search for Common Ground, 2006.

Cleven, Erik. *Internal Evaluation Report. Nansen Dialogue Project*. October 2005.

European Union. Commission to the European Communities. *Bosnia and Herzegovina Progress Report*. Commission Staff Working Document. Brussels, 6.11. 2007.

FAFO. *Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building Activities*. A Report prepared for the OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation and the DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation (CPDC). Oslo, FAFO, June 2006.

Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. *Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment. Methodological Guidelines*. n.d.

Hoffmann, Mark. *Peace and Conflict Assessment Methodology*. Wien, Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2004.

Hushagen, Anne and Ingrid Wiik. *The Western Balkans. Community-based Peacebuilding. A review of the Balkan Dialogue Project*. 2003.

*Imagining Coexistence: Assessing Refugee Reintegration Efforts in Divided Communities*. Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, July 2002.

INCORE. *The Evaluation of Conflict Resolution Interventions. Framing the State of Play*. University of Ulster and United Nations University. October 2002.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Meeting with Community leaders from the Receiving Community in the Villages of Lismir/ Dobridub, Nakarad/Nakarade and Miradi e Epërme/Gornje Dobrevo*. 21 April 2006, Fushë Kosova / Kosovo Polje.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Plan of Action 2007*.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report from Dialogue Meeting on Returns in FKP municipality*. Ohrid, 2-4 March 2007.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report from Dialogue Meeting on Returns in FKP municipality*. Brezovica, 21-23 September 2007.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report from Dialogue Workshop on Returns in FKP municipality*. 5 September 2007, FKP, Kosovo.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report on Seminar (summary) Representatives of Mitrovica municipality*. 27th September – 1st October 2005, Tivat, Montenegro.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report on Seminar*. 3-5 June 2005, Ohrid Macedonia.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report. Human and Minority Rights. Return and Reintegration for community representatives*. 6-7 May 2006, Prishtina, Kosovo.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report. Interethnic Dialogue Meeting of Receiving and Returning Communities and Municipal Officials (seminar 2)*. 26-28 October 2006, Ohrid, Macedonia.

Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Seminar Mitrovica municipal officials*. 28th September 2005.

Lederach John, Reina Neufeldt and Hal Culbertson, *Reflective Peace-Building. A Planning, Monitoring and Learning Toolkit*. The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame.

Lund, Michael and Natasha Wanchek. *Effectiveness of Participatory Community Development in Managing Conflicts: Local Democracy, Social Capital, and Peace. Lessons from a Literature Review and Three-Country Study* July, 2004. Washington, US AID.

Nansen dialognettverket. *Midtveisrapport, januar-juli 2006*.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Osijek, *The Research on The Attitudes of Parents on The Quality of Education of the Children in Vukovar. The report on the quality research*. September 2005.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Osijek. *Municipality Bogdanovci Research*. 2008.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Osijek. *The New School Project*. September 2007.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Banjaluka. *Plan of Action 2007*.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Banjaluka. *Reintegration of IDPs, returnees, refugees and domestic population", inter-ethnic / theater dialogue forum in Prijedor region*.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Banjaluka. *Report on political situation in the municipality of Jajce*. October 2006 – February 2007.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Banjaluka. *The Prijedor report. Report on socio-political situation in the city of Prijedor, located in the western part of Bosnia and Herzegovina.* November 2004-January 2005.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Banjaluka. *Update of the Prijedor report.* 2006.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Mostar. Agreement between the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe and Nansen Dialogue Centre for the Implementation of Student Activism Program, n.d.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Mostar. *Annual Plan of Action 2007.*

Nansen Dialogue Centre Osijek. *Annual plan of action for 2007.*

Nansen Dialogue Centre Osijek. *Evaluation of the second phase of NDC Osijek's The New School Project.* Report compiled by Danijela Galovic. Osijek, 2006.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Osijek. *Review of Plan of Action for 2007 from 1st of January to 30th of June.*

Nansen Dialogue Centre Sarajevo. *Annual Plan of Action – semi-annual reviews, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007.*

Nansen Dialogue Centre Sarajevo. *Dialog Bratunac and Srebrenica. Forgotten Future? A Work in Interethnic Dialogue of Nansen Dialogue Center Sarajevo,* n.d.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Sarajevo. *Final narrative report. European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights. Upbringing and Education for Human Rights.* 2005.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Sarajevo. *Qualitative/quantitative data from 2003,* n.d.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Sarajevo. *Report on the Project Dialogue Seminars for Human Rights. Sarajevo,* 5 February 2004.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Sarajevo. Survey of Targeted Public Opinion on Journal for Literature and Culture «ALBUM» 11- 25.05.2005.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Sarajevo. What is ALBUM. n.d.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Skopje. *Annual plan of action for 2006, 2007.*

Nansen Dialogue Centre Skopje. *Concept Paper. Cross Border Co-Operation Macedonia – Kosovo – Serbia.* N.d.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Skopje. *Evaluation of the First Phase of NDC Skopje Program for the Support of Local Self-Government (Jegunovce).* Report compiled by Daniela Galovic. January 16 – 20, 2006.

Nansen Dialogue Centre Skopje. *Final Report of the Project "School for Young Politicians 4".* 2004.

- Nansen Dialogue Network. *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Nansen Dialogue Network*. 2007.
- Nansen Dialogue Network. *Narrative report 2006*.
- Nansen Dialogue Network. *Project Development, Monitoring and Evaluation. A Workbook*. 2006.
- Nansenskolen/Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report on seminar from Lillehammer 14-28 January 2006*.
- Nansenskolen/Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report on Seminar. Interethnic Dialogue Meeting of Municipal Officials*. 4-6 September, 2004, Ohrid, Macedonia.
- Nansenskolen/Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report on Seminar. Interethnic Dialogue Meeting of Municipal Officials*. 1-3 October 2004, Ohrid, Macedonia.
- Nansenskolen/Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report on Seminar. Interethnic Dialogue Meeting of Municipal Officials*. 25 – 27 February, 2005, Ohrid, Macedonia.
- Nansenskolen/Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report on the Seminar. Interethnic Dialogue Meeting of Municipal Officials*. 18-20 February 2005.
- Nansenskolen/Kosovan Nansen Dialogue. *Report on the Seminar. Interethnic Dialogue Meeting of Municipal Officials*. 24-26 June 2005, Ohrid, Macedonia.
- Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. *Norwegian Peacebuilding Activities. Lessons Learnt and Challenges Ahead*. Evaluation Report 2/2004.
- Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. *Towards a Strategic Framework for Peace-Building: Getting Their Act Together. Overview of the Joint Utstein Study of Peacebuilding*. Evaluation Report 1/2004.
- OECD DAC. *Guidance for Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities. Working Draft for Application Period*. 2008.
- OECD/DAC, *The DAC Guidelines Helping Prevent Violent Conflict*. 2001.
- OSCE. *Highlights of Public Opinion Survey on Education in BiH: Citizen Opinion*. December 2006.
- OSCE. *Lessons from Education Reform in Brcko. A Report prepared by the OSCE Mission to BiH Education Department*. October 2007.
- OSCE. *Tailoring Catchment Areas. School Catchment Areas in Bosnia and Herzegovina. A Status Report by the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina*. September 2007.
- Paulsen, Inger. *"De kan ikke bare komme her og lage fred. Motdiskurser og strategiske valg blant en gruppe unge i Mostar, Bosnia og Herzegovina*. MA Thesis in Anthropology, University of Bergen, fall 2007.
- PRIO and Nansenskolen, *Report on Project "School for Young Politicians Semester 3, 2004*.

Pfaffenholz, Tania and Christoph Spurk. *Civil Society, Civic Engagement and Peacebuilding*. World Bank. Social Development Paper No. 36, October 2006.

Røhr, Heidrun Sørli (red.), *Dialog – mer enn ord. Jubileumsskrift for Nansen Dialog*. Lillehammer, Nansenskolen, 2005.

Savija-Valha, Nebojsa, Nansen Dialogue Centre, Sarajevo, *Challenges of Interethnic Dialogue in Post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Draft, n.d.

Schmelze, Beate. *New Trends in Peace and Conflict Assessment (PCIA)*. Wien, Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2005.

Taylor, Mark B. and Kathleen M. Jennings. *In Search of Strategy. An Agenda for Applied Research on Transitions from Conflict*. Oslo, FAFO, Report 480, 2004.

UNHCR. *Return Statistics* (Bosnia and Herzegovina), quarterly reports, several years.

Vlada Republike Hrvatske. *Nacionalni Plan Aktivnostiza Prava i Interese Djece OD 2006. DO 2012. Godine*. Zagreb, 2006.

World Bank. *Civil society and Peace-Building*. Social development Department. June 19, 2006.

Aarbakke, Vemund, *Mutual Learning. Facilitating Dialogue in Former Yugoslavia*. Oslo, PRIO, Report 2, 2002.





## SUMMARY

The review considered whether NDN activities have contributed to improved ethnic relations and to sustainable peace and reconciliation in the Western Balkans by promoting inter-ethnic dialogue. The review found that NDN has clearly contributed to better ethnic relations by influencing the attitudes and actions of strategic individuals at the community level, but also at the institutional level by offering opportunities for interethnic cooperation beyond the space for dialogue. The review found it harder to draw definite conclusions about overall contributions towards sustainable peace as NDN activities are subject to the volatility of the larger political environment, over which NDN has very little influence and has few resources to deal with. It should be borne in mind that the entire aid effort in the Western Balkans has not succeeded conclusively in changing opinion on the ground and any potential or actual NDN impact would have to be seen against this general state of affairs. By concentrating on local interventions, however, NDN has succeeded in gaining trust in specific communities and the review recommends continuing this type of activities in the future, drawing on the joint advantage of inside knowledge and long-term engagement.

**Printed version: ISSN 0805-505X**

**Electronic version: ISSN 1890-503X**

**Printed version: ISBN 978-82-8062-321-8**

**Electronic version: ISBN 978-82-8062-322-5**

Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) is an independent, non-profit research institution and a major international centre in policy-oriented and applied development research. Focus is on development and human rights issues and on international conditions that affect such issues. The geographical focus is Sub-Saharan Africa, Southern and Central Asia, the Middle East, the Balkans and South America.

CMI combines applied and theoretical research. CMI research intends to assist policy formulation, improve the basis for decision-making and promote public debate on international development issues.