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## Glossary of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAR</td>
<td>European Agency for Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOK</td>
<td>Employment and Skills Observatory in Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>European Training Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographical Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDPC</td>
<td>Human Development Promotion Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Local Employment Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED</td>
<td>Local Economic and Employment Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEEDAK</td>
<td>Local Economic and Employment Development in Albania and Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>Project Cycle Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REA</td>
<td>Regional Enterprise Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToRs</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREFACE

This document is the interim evaluation report for the LEEDAK project (Local Economic and Employment Development Albania and Kosovo).

The interim evaluation report covers the period from the beginning of the project (October 2003) and mid-February 2005. The evaluation process was undertaken between 1st of February and the 15th of April 2005. Briefing and debriefing sessions were organised by the European Training Foundation (ETF) in Turin on the 4th of February 2005 and 15-16 April 2005 respectively.

Fact-finding missions in the two countries were completed as follows:
- Kosovo: 14-20 February 2005
- Albania: 21-27 February 2005

The members of the evaluation team were:
- Mr Conor Kearney (EU expert)
- Mr Eugen Perianu (EU expert)
- Mr Meti Jetullahu (Kosovo Local member of the Evaluation team)
- Ms Valdet Sala (Albanian Local member of the Evaluation team)

The authors of the report are Mr Conor Kearney and Mr Eugen Perianu. The views herein expressed are those of the evaluation team.

The evaluation team wishes to express thanks to all who supported the evaluation mission: representatives of the ETF and local contractors (Human Development Promotion Centre in Albania and the Employment and Skills Observatory in Kosovo) and members of the local partnerships and their foreign advisors.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction
Both Albania and Kosovo share many of the needs common to transition countries in relation to economic re-structuring, public institution capacity building (particularly at the local level) and designing and implementing employment and vocational education and training strategies that provide an effective response to changing market needs. In particular, there is:
- inadequate capacity at local level to meet the challenges of local development;
- inadequate knowledge and no experience of using partnership structures to address local problems;
- poor development of the vocational education and training capacities at local level and weak links with market needs.

Against this background, the aim and objective of LEEDAK are as follows:

a) Aim: to contribute to economic development, employment creation and social inclusion in South Eastern Europe by way of innovative policies, strategies and measures in selected municipalities for replication to other areas in the region;
b) Objective: to establish a model framework and tools for local partnership building and to determine the effectiveness of local partnership building as a feature of local governance in addressing local economies and jobs borrowing on practice and experience from the EU and transition economies.

Specifically, the LEEDAK project supports local partnership building in:
- The Region of Lezha (Albania)
- The Municipality of Kamenica (Kosovo).

The project started in September 2003 and its intended completion date is June 2006.

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETF funds</td>
<td>€80,000</td>
<td>€75,000</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
<td>€255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Trust Fund</td>
<td>€120,000</td>
<td>€140,000</td>
<td>€150,000</td>
<td>€410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>€200,000</td>
<td>€215,000</td>
<td>€250,000</td>
<td>€665,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Provisional figures for 2005
The following implementation arrangements were made for LEEDAK:

- The ETF – provides overall project co-ordination and contracts experts for service delivery to the two partnerships;
- The OECD, through its LEED network, provides local development expertise and advice to the project;
- The Employment and Skills Observatory in Kosovo – acts as local contractor;
- The National Observatory in Albania – acted as local contractor until June 2004, when it was replaced by the Human Development Promotion Centre (a local consultancy);
- Two OECD LEED Advisors provided support for partnership building.

Methodology

The interim evaluation exercise comprised the following phases:

- Preliminary desk study (project document reading);
- Kick-off meeting in Turin (4th of Feb 2005);
- Missions in Kosovo and Albania (13-10 Feb 2005 and 20-27 Feb 2005 respectively);
- Preparation of the draft report and a “Key Issues” paper;
- Comments by the ETF on the draft report;
- Final Meeting in Turin – Debriefing Workshop (14-15 April 2005) attended by:
  - representatives of the Kamenica and Lezha partnerships;
  - representatives of the ETF;
  - the OECD LEED advisor to the partnership in Kamenica;
  - a representative of the OECD LEED programme;
  - the two independent evaluators.
- Preparation of a revised draft report, taking into account feedback from the debriefing meeting.

Main activities completed under the LEEDAK project

**Setting up the partnership**

The different stakeholders at local level were brought together to discuss and decide the form of the partnership, its aim and objectives, its operational procedures. Partnership Agreements were signed.

**Study Visits to Italy and Ireland**

This was an opportunity to see how other partnerships operate – Ireland (Tullamore) and Italy (Sicily)

**Training**

Partnership members were trained in topics relevant for their activity – e.g. identifying local development priorities, preparing project fiches, project cycle management, accessing funds.

---

1 Attendance list is attached as Annex IV.
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Preparation of basic toolkits for the partnerships
Partnerships were assisted to develop operational tools and procedures – e.g. project cycle management tools, geographical information system, participatory approach to local development.

Preparation of a Local Development Strategy
The two partnerships have prepared Strategies for Local Development (Economic and Employment Development) and have then selected and started to implement a number of local projects.

Networking and Dissemination
A number of meetings have taken place: between the partnerships in Lezha and Kamenica to exchange experience, at national level attended by stakeholders from central level administrational and other donors (in both countries).

Assessment
The LEEDAK project was initiated at a time when the need for institutional support during the economic reform process was acute in both countries (Kosovo and Albania). It has provided direct support at local level, where institutional capacity was particularly weak. In spite of its limited resources, LEEDAK has been successful in delivering good quality support to the two partnerships – Lezha and Kamenica. The key results are
a) a significantly increased organisational capacity in both locations,
b) local economic and employment development plans in place and under implementation,
c) local awareness and strong appreciation of the learning made possible through the project. The partnership framework has demonstrated in the two locations its value as a tool for better local governance. Synergy between local stakeholders has been achieved that would have otherwise not been possible.

Learning-by-doing has been a key feature of LEEDAK's approach. So far, much has been learnt by all of the parties involved in the implementation of LEEDAK, both on content (how to develop local economic and employment development partnerships) as well as on method (how to best organise and implement this type of projects).

Project implementation has benefited from a good co-operation with the OECD and its experts from the LEED network. In hindsight, the decision to co-operate with the OECD and to draw on their expertise in local development has been sound.

Overall, this interim evaluation considers that the impact of the project is very good. With a year still remaining in the project schedule, LEEDAK has already achieved several of its expected outputs and the likelihood of achieving its objectives fully by the end of the project is high. Sustainability of the achievements to date is good.

Capacity building needs in the two countries remain enormous. It is clear that further support is crucial and engagement of wider expertise and donor support will be
necessary. ETF’s possible further involvement in promoting employment and workforce development initiatives at sub-national level will be important. It is argued here that supporting VET reform at local level is equally important to supporting it at central level.

**Recommendations**

A number of 25 recommendations have been made by the evaluation team. The full list of recommendations is set out in Annex II to the report.

In summary, it is recommended to:

a) review the structure of the two partnerships and decide whether the current membership could be further enlarged; decide which legal status is most suitable for each of the partnerships;

b) develop further the toolkit – in particular, prepare a set of "tangible" tools and procedures for sustainability reasons;

c) if the LEEDAK approach is to be replicated elsewhere, then the two partnerships have to prepare a specific statement of the LEEDAK approach and how is it effective and different from other approaches;

d) prepare and monitor a set of indicators of achievement for the remainder of the project;

e) clarify the implementation arrangements – i.e. the role and responsibilities of each of the parties involved in implementation of the LEEDAK project;

f) review the frequency, content and structure of the progress reports;

g) explore possibilities for further financial support. In particular, at least one of the projects launched should be finalised by the end of LEEDAK;

h) initiate a benchmarking process with other partnerships.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The concept for the LEEDAK project was formulated by the ETF in June 2003. The aim and objective of LEEDAK are as follows:

a) **Aim:** to contribute to economic development, employment creation and social inclusion in South Eastern Europe by way of innovative policies, strategies and measures in selected municipalities for replication to other areas in the region;

b) **Objective:** to establish a model framework and tools for local partnership building and to determine the effectiveness of local partnership building as a feature of local governance in addressing local economies and jobs borrowing on practice and experience from the EU and transition economies.

1.2 Specifically, the LEEDAK project supports local partnership building in:

- The Region of Lezha (Albania)
- The Municipality of Kamenica (Kosovo).

The project started in September 2003 and its intended completion date is June 2006.

1.3 Following an open call procedure, a local group from the Kamenica municipality area was chosen as the pilot partnership for Kosovo. The group consists of representatives of: Kamenica Municipality, the local Business Association, the Regional Enterprise Agency (REA) Gjilan, the Employment Office Kamenica and the “Andrea Durrsaku” Technical School. Kamenica is the most easterly municipality in Kosovo, situated about 75 km from Pristina.

1.4 In Albania, the Region of Lezha was selected to participate in the LEEDAK project. The Region of Lezha comprises three districts (Lezha, Kurbin and Mirdita); five municipalities (Lezha, Mamurras, Laç, Rubik, Rreshen); 16 communes and 32 villages. The Municipality of Lezha acts as regional centre. The membership of the partnership in Lezha is the following: Regional Council, Prefecture, 5 Municipalities; Regional Employment Office, Independent Women Forum, Entrepreneurs Association, Trade Unions, Lezha Chamber of Commerce, Swiss Cooperation, World Vision International.

1.5 The project is jointly funded by the ETF and the Italian Government. A breakdown of the funding is specified in the Table 1.
Table 1 – Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005 (provisional)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETF funds</td>
<td>€80,000</td>
<td>€75,000</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
<td>€255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Trust Fund</td>
<td>€120,000</td>
<td>€140,000</td>
<td>€150,000</td>
<td>€410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>€200,000</td>
<td>€215,000</td>
<td>€250,000</td>
<td>€665,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 The following implementation arrangements were made for LEEDAK:
- The ETF – provides overall project co-ordination and contracts experts for service delivery to the two partnerships;
- The OECD, through its LEED network, provides local development expertise and advice to the project;
- The Employment and Skills Observatory in Kosovo – acts as local contractor;
- The National Observatory in Albania – acted as local contractor until June 2004, when it was replaced by the Human Development Promotion Centre (a local consultancy);
- Two OECD LEED Advisors provided support for partnership building.

1.7 The objectives of this interim evaluation are to:
   a) determine how the existing project objectives are being met;
   b) propose how achievement of objectives can be enhanced by way of project management, approach and activities with consideration of adjustments to the orientation of the project, as appropriate;
   c) propose options with recommendations as to next phase developments.

1.8 This evaluation report is structured as follows. Firstly, the methodology undertaken for the evaluation is outlined followed by a consideration of the relevance of the project to the countries concerned set against national and EU policies. Next, each of the core components of the project is assessed with an identification of key achievements and constraints. The report then provides an overall assessment of the project efficiency before addressing issues of project management and project sustainability.

1.9 For each of the key findings, the report makes one or more specific recommendations which relate to the remaining life time of the project or post-project period.

1.10 The report then closes with a number of principal conclusions and key recommendations.
2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 The interim evaluation exercise comprised the following phases:

- Preliminary desk study (project document reading);
- Kick-off meeting in Turin (4th of Feb 2005);
- Missions in Kosovo and Albania (13-10 Feb 2005 and 20-27 Feb 2005 respectively);
- Preparation of the draft report and a “Key Issues” paper;
- Comments by the ETF on the draft report;
- Final Meeting in Turin – Debriefing Workshop (14-15 April 2005) attended by:
  - representatives of the Kamenica and Lezha partnerships;
  - representatives of the ETF;
  - the OECD LEED advisor to the partnership in Kamenica;
  - a representative of the OECD LEED programme;
  - the two independent evaluators.
- Preparation of a revised draft report, taking into account feedback from the debriefing meeting.

2.2 Following their appointment, the authors of this report examined the documentation supplied and prepared a short note for discussion at the kick-off meeting in Turin on 4th February. This note pointed out that interim evaluation or process evaluation relates to how a programme/policy is being implemented. Appropriate databases and indicators usually provide a basis for interim evaluation. However process evaluation should consider also the quality of policy delivery. The main evaluation questions relate to:

- the delivery of the programme (i.e. is the programme delivery consistent with the aims? Are all of the programme elements delivered adequately? Which actors are involved in the programme delivery? What are the times and quality of delivery?);
- the identification of variations in the programme delivery;
- the organisation of the programme (What are the main models of programme organisation and delivery? How well do different staff/actors involved in delivery work together?);
- the programme resources (Is programme staffing and funding sufficient to ensure appropriate standards? Are programme resources used efficiently and effectively?);
- participant experience of the programme (How were participants involved in the programme? Do participants understand the nature of the programme? Are they satisfied with their interaction with delivery staff, procedures, services received?)

2.3 The general approach that was proposed and subsequently adopted was straightforward and:

---

2 Attendance list is attached as Annex IV.
was based the evaluation on both documentation and interviews. While background documentation is a crucial source of context information, documents are a poor source to assess commitment or capacity and need to be supplemented by extensive interviewing;

- utilised semi-structured interviews, with a very simple structure and ample room for open interviewing. However ensure that key evaluation questions are systematically raised;
- evaluated against the originally stated project objectives and expected outputs;
- used the kick-off meeting to establish a clear list of actors to be interviewed, but would allow some room for unexpected interviews or documentary material.

2.4 Following the fact-finding missions, the evaluators shared the information gathered in the two countries, discussed their views during three meetings and in numerous e-mails and were thus able to evaluate achievements against a common framework. The report was jointly prepared and reflects the common views of the evaluators.

3. ASSESSMENT

3.1 Relevance of LEEDAK

Relevance to Albania and Kosovo

3.1.1 Both Albania and Kosovo share many of the needs common to transition countries in relation to economic re-structuring, public institution capacity building (particularly at the local level) and designing and implementing employment and vocational education and training strategies that provide an effective response to changing market needs.

3.1.2 Public finances are, in general, extremely limited and tend to be concentrated at the central level. Consequently, funding required for taking and sustaining public initiatives of any type often needs to be sourced from external agencies (international or bi-lateral).

3.1.3 The precise form, responsibilities and capacities of local public administration in Kosovo are in a state of substantial change and development. The new Kosovar administration was established only in 2002; a local Government Reform Framework document was endorsed by the Kosovar Government in July 2004. A Ministry of Local Government was established on the basis of a Regulation of December 2004. However, the precise responsibilities and procedures of the Ministry are still being elaborated. The basic capacities of the local government institutions are still being developed. At present, local government institutions do not have detailed responsibilities and authority in
relation to local economic development but it is intended that these should be established over the next year or two within the framework for Government reform.

3.1.4 The implementation of LEEDAK in Kosovo was influenced by recommendations of a peer review undertaken by an international team of experts in 2002 at the request of the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare and the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. The recommendations of the peer review noted that “cross stakeholder partnership, joint planning, cooperation and development of measures to address the large scale industrial reform and plant closures will be a critical first step”. The review emphasised the role of local communities in addressing issues of national importance stating that “local solutions will be all the more necessary given that macro economic measures will take time to impact at grassroots level.”

3.1.5 Albania is also in the process of economic reform. Devolving responsibility and authority for local development is on-going. Many of the pre-requisites to creating adequate conditions for local economic development are in place.

3.1.6 A national strategy exists (National Strategy for Social and Economic Development – Millennium Development Goals). The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is leading the process to develop development strategies based on the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) framework. This is done at national level (with support from the World Bank) as well as at regional level (with support from the UNDP) for all of the regions in Albania. The Region of Lezha completed its MDG Strategy in March 2005.

3.1.7 The basic legal framework seems now to be adequate, although learning how to enforce it takes time. A process is ongoing to issue additional legal packages, whereby more responsibilities, authority and resources are gradually transferred to local levels.

3.1.8 An administrative organisational structure exists at local level, but there is need to clarify various roles and responsibilities and to build capacity, as well as to define the cooperation framework between different institutions. According to present legislation, Regional Councils are responsible for local economic development. Their scope of work will be enhanced with more clear responsibilities to implement projects in different sectors and funding will gradually be made available.

3.1.9 So far, foreign funding has been directed primarily to central level. Just 4% of such funding in Albania was directed to local authorities, and only 1% was directed to capacity building and public participation in local development.

3.1.10 Prior to the implementation of LEEDAK, the culture of involving stakeholders for better local governance was largely non-existent in both locations. Only now is the seed of this idea being sown. The general public is not at all used to being involved in such activity after so many years under the past regime. The Albanian National Strategy does

---

5 op cit.
not speak explicitly about involving stakeholders, but the civil servants involved in drafting it recognise the importance of involving stakeholders and state that they have attempted to do so even at national level.

3.1.11 In summary, the main problems when LEEDAK was initiated, were:
- inadequate capacity at local level to meet the challenges of local development;
- inadequate knowledge and no experience of using partnership structures to address local problems;
- poor development of the vocational education and training capacities at local level and weak links with market needs.

3.1.12 Against this background, the approach taken by LEEDAK is obviously relevant. LEEDAK provides support at local level, at a time when local level structures are confronted with increased responsibility, but suffer from inadequate capacity. LEEDAK addresses an area that is crucial for local development - i.e. employment and skill promotion linked to the local economy through a partnership framework. Partnerships are a useful means to address local development needs, as demonstrated by years of experience in EU countries (see following section). It is not too early for Albania and Kosovo to learn how to use this form of co-operation (i.e. partnerships) and it is expected that once their added-value is proven, both countries will launch coherent efforts to replicate partnerships as a tool for local development in other areas. Not least, partnerships can be a useful demonstration of both the methods and advantages of democratic governance in countries where democracy has been suppressed for the past half a century.

Relevance to EU Policies

3.1.13 The EU has a longstanding concern with employment issues. In 1993 the "White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness, and Employment" suggested the development of a LED approach, which was then tested and promoted during the second half of the 1990s. A series of pilot programmes was initiated (e.g. Territorial Employment Pacts, preparatory measures and various innovative actions).

3.1.14 At the Lisbon Summit in 2000 the EU Heads of Government agreed a 10-year strategy to achieve an overall employment rate of 70% across the EU (compared to 61% at that time). It was also recognised by the European Council that the delivery of this target by each Member State was dependent on local and regional action:

"A fully decentralised approach will be applied in line with the principle of subsidiarity in which the Union, the Member States, the regional and local levels, as well as the social partners and civil society will be actively involved using variable forms of partnership".  
6

---

3.1.15 The European Union now promotes local employment development by three main routes:
   - a policy framework based on the policy principles of the European Employment Strategy;
   - the development of LED concepts at local level through pilot programmes (e.g. Local Action for Employment - LAFE) and Innovative Actions;
   - financial resources through the Structural Funds and Community Initiatives (e.g. URBAN II, INTERREG III, EQUAL and LEADER+).

3.1.16 In this regard, it is suggested here that the Lisbon concerns, backed up by the Council Regulation establishing the CARDS programme which emphasises sustainable economic and social development, provide an ample basis for demonstrating the relevance of the LEEDAK project in the countries concerned with its focus directly on local partnership building with a view to improved economic and employment development.

3.1.17 Finally, given the political signals by the European Union regarding future membership of the European Union and the emphasis of the EU’s Stabilisation and Association Process for the partner countries in the Western Balkan region in bringing them closer to the standards and practice of economic and social governance, the LEEDAK project has taken one step towards promoting an inclusive, cross-stakeholder approach to local governance where jobs and economic well-being are central to the LEEDAK partnership concerns.

Relevance to the ETF

3.1.18 ETF's founding regulation specifically tasks the agency with supporting vocational training development in its partner countries. It further encourages the agency to develop pilot projects and joint ventures for development of vocational training. In this regard, the cooperation with OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) in the two pilot projects in providing expertise from their local development network is well placed.

3.1.19 While the ETF regulation does not specifically refer to economic development and employment, by inference one can assume that the linkages and contribution of vocational education and training to employability and the economy are clear. In the regard, LEEDAK project is well supported by the ETF regulation.

---

9 Council Regulation No. 1360/90 of 7 May 1990 (Establishing the ETF). Art. 3c
Relevance to the Italian Trust Fund

3.1.20 The LEEDAK project is relevant in the context of the bilateral cooperation agreement that has been active between Italy and Albania for the past 10 years. The agreement aims to support Albania in its effort to develop the economic and social environment, which should, among others, prevent migration towards Italy. Local development is part of the Italian co-operation approach in Albania, as seen in a similar bilateral-financed project in the region of Skhoder.

3.2 Main Activities

3.2.1 The main activities of the LEEDAK project (foreseen and actually completed) are summarized below, separately for each partnership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Foreseen</th>
<th>Description of actual achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up the Partnership</td>
<td>Partnership first formally convened in December 2003 (3 months after the start of LEEDAK). The partnership became operational. Office established. Members start to grasp the meaning and benefits of working together and there is a strong sense of ownership. Two Working Groups established and partnership registered as an NGO. Business Association established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Visits</td>
<td>Visit to Ireland in Nov 2003 and to Sicily in Dec 2003. A second study visit to Ireland (originally unplanned) was completed in March 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2003 - two visits by the foreign expert. Confined to familiarisation and initial TA rather than formal training. 2004 - further visits and training by the foreign expert. Training of Partnership and support staff delivered by foreign expert. Representatives of the Partnership attending the LEED (Local Economic and Employment Development) seminar in Trento, Italy (Nov 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit</td>
<td>New tools, systems and practices are being adopted by the Partnership (e.g. PCM tools, participatory approach to local development etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Preparation</td>
<td>Strategy elaborated, translated and printed.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Training course for electricians completed. Barley production project launched. Apple orchard development application completed for EAR project (IMC) and accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking and Dissemination</td>
<td>Seminar in Kamenica &amp; Pristina attended by Partnership members, potential donors and other stakeholders. Meeting with UNDP local partnership in Gjakovë. Meetings in Albania in April &amp; September.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Main Activities in Lezha, Albania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Foreseen</th>
<th>Description of actual achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Setting up the Partnership | - Significant efforts invested to identify stakeholders, meet them, talk to them, bring everyone at the table. Partnership Agreement signed in Feb 2004.  
- The partnership is becoming operational. Members start to grasp the meaning and benefits of working together. The Regional Council takes up responsibility, there is a strong sense of ownership |
| Study Visits Training     | - Visit to Ireland in Nov 2003 and to Sicily in Dec 2003.  
- Training on Local Development and drafting Project proposals  
- Several subjects covered (e.g. Local Governance, Techniques for Local Devl, Data Gathering and Analysis, EU Policies, GIS systems, Donor funding etc.).  
- Core Group of Trainees - approx 16 people (Local Development Agents)  
- Representatives of the Partnership attended the LEED seminar in Trento. |
| Toolkit                   | - New tools, systems and practices are being adopted by the Partnership and particularly by the Programming Department in the Regional Council (e.g. PCM tools, participatory approach to local development, GIS etc.) |
| Strategy Preparation      | - Strategy Prepared, appreciated by the Partnership as a key learning opportunity.  
- A list of 84 priority projects was identified. |
| Implementation            | - Four key projects identified – Project Fiches Prepared.  
- Steering committee established, working on a VE Policy Orientation Paper for the Region. Information on best practices (experience exchange with the VE School in Durres). Curricula Adapting and Development initiated for the Tourism sector |
| Networking and Dissemination | - Experience exchange with Kamenica twice, in Lezha and in Kosovo (Prishtina + Kamenica).  
- Ad-hoc experience sharing with other regions in Albania  
- Seminar in Tirana attended by Partnership members, potential Donors and other stakeholders. |

3.3 Assessment of achievements to date

Achieving Objectives
3.3.1 The objective of LEEDAK as defined within the ETF project concept note is as follows:

*To establish a model framework and tools for local partnership building and to determine the effectiveness of local partnership building as a feature of local governance in addressing local economies and jobs borrowing on practice and experience from the EU and transition economies.*
3.3.2 While the project objective could not yet have been fully achieved (LEEDAK is still on-going), substantial progress has been made to its achievement. Partnership frameworks have been established, and a significant number of tools have been developed to help them to operate effectively. Very useful experience has been gained through the LEEDAK exercise itself, new skills have been learned and concrete benefits have been obtained at local level. There is also a strong sense of appreciation and local ownership within the two partnerships.

3.3.3 In judging the effectiveness of the local partnerships, the authors have relied on satisfactory anecdotal evidence and local reports that a number of outputs delivered under the partnership framework would not have been possible outside these frameworks.

3.3.4 For the remainder of the project, further work is needed (and foreseen) to support the two partnerships with training and advisory services. The work to develop "toolkits" will continue and the interest of the OECD in working further with ETF and the two partnerships in the tool-kit development, as agreed at the debriefing meeting, should provide more impetus to this component of the project. If the current plans are implemented and if no untoward events occur LEEDAK objectives will be achieved by the end of the implementation period.

3.3.5 Whether the partnership frameworks established in the two locations can in future become a "model framework" for other similar communities in their respective countries depends on their demonstrable final success as well as on the quality of their co-operation with the national authorities. National authorities in each of the two countries are the legitimate bodies to adopt the successful experiences of the two partnerships and may be in a position to incorporate aspects of the policy learning from the projects to replicate in other regions or municipalities. The central level interest in the projects is already there.

Achieving Expected Outputs

Output 1 - Local partnerships: establishment of 2 community partnerships for local employment and economic development in selected municipalities in Albania and Kosovo.

3.3.6 Two local partnerships have been established and are operational. Achieving this in places where such an approach was completely novel has required months of dedicated and sustained work. There is a high sense of local ownership and appreciation of the results obtained so far. More concretely:

- partnership membership has been identified and partnership agreements have been signed;
- strategies for local economic and employment development have been drawn up;
- a number of operational procedures have been established;
- the learning process within the two partnerships has been sustained;
- operational plans were drawn up and local projects are being implemented.
3.3.7 In spite of the inherent difficulties in building something completely new in two different localities, and in spite of the limited resources, LEEDAK has succeeded in establishing two operational partnerships. Learning how to operate effectively and efficiently under this framework will be a continuous process. Turning the pilot experience that LEEDAK created into "local habit", identifying, understanding and appreciating the full benefits of such an approach will also take time. A very good start has been made, the building blocks have been provided, and with the enthusiasm that exists within the two partnerships there are sufficient reasons to believe that both localities will continue to develop the existing partnerships as well as successfully establish future partnerships for their local development.

3.3.8 The two partnerships have different structures and legal status. While NEP Partnership (Kamenica) has an NGO status, the partnership in Lezha has been formalised only by signing an agreement. Certain issues remain to be resolved, or at least clarified, as to whether either partnership has the most appropriate institutional arrangements and working procedures.

3.3.9 In Lezha, the project and the partnership it created is often referred to as ‘the first concrete and useful project in years’. All of the partnership members that have been interviewed have stated their satisfaction with the new approach to local priorities that the partnership framework has made possible. Although the partnership in Lezha has an unusual structure (the Public Administration members of the Partnership – i.e. municipalities and the Regional Council – were already "partners" under the Regional Council umbrella, so there seems to be a duplication) this does not detract from its value. On the contrary, given the novelty of the exercise it is argued that choosing this set-up was a sound decision. The idea of being members of a partnership provided motivation and energy that would have been difficult to achieve otherwise. There is (still) too little involvement of stakeholders other than public administration. This is understandable during a pilot phase. Understanding what such a partnership can bring to them and what are their responsibilities towards the partnership takes time. Care should be taken that such stakeholders do become more involved in the remainder of the project.

RECOMMENDATION 1
The involvement of stakeholders (other than representatives of the public administration) in the partnership framework in Lezha should be enhanced.

3.3.10 The partnership in Kamenica was initially selected using a more "bottom-up" approach than that adopted in Albania. While the involvement of partners from the private business and vocational training sectors was a relatively new idea, it has been established. The Kamenica partnership also has found that the initiative it took to establish working groups on technical matters was helpful. The partnership has been
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established in a much more fluid overall institutional context. Its NGO status provides a basis for sustainability (e.g. in respect of obtaining outside funding). Some substantial and effective efforts have been made to develop a wider partnership basis (through the establishment of the business association) and further efforts in this direction are envisaged. Issues regarding the precise relationship of the partnership, its office holders and its working groups to the local public administration could be further clarified.

RECOMMENDATION 2
The issue of specifying any relevant institutional principles (e.g. optimum legal status and administrative structures of partnerships) should be addressed in a systematic fashion by both partnerships and ETF in the closing phase of LEEDAK. Since this is a pilot project, it should result in the establishment/clarification of some distinctive principles, standards and/or lessons.

Output 2 – Partnership capacity building: enhanced understanding of why and how employment and skills promotion should be integrated into local economic development plans and the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder in that process.

3.3.11 A clear demonstration of this enhanced understanding is found in the exercise of preparing the local development strategies, which include provisions for employment and skill promotion at local level. These documents could be improved in future programming periods, but the learning acquired by the two partnerships in preparing them is invaluable.

3.3.12 It is suggested here that enhanced understanding has been not only a result of training and mentoring but also a planned side-effect of the concrete “success stories” of this experience for each local partnership. This experience is still relatively limited and such enhanced understanding can be expected to develop further over time. We believe that the second aspect of this output (relative roles and responsibilities) should be addressed by the project in a more detailed and explicit fashion.

3.3.13 There are several substantial achievements in Lezha, directly related to this output. A Policy Orientation Paper for the Vocational Education and Training (VET) sector in the region is under preparation. The adjustment of curriculum (subject of tourism) for the vocational school in Lezha is under preparation. Key stakeholders in VET (Local Labour Office, VET School in Lezha) have been actively involved in the process and now understand better their role and responsibility in local development.

3.3.14 In Kamenica too there have been substantial achievements with regard to capacity building. Local actors were fully involved in the development of the strategy, three investment/training projects have been implemented and there is a growing awareness of the real needs of the partnership. Inevitably, in both locations, administrative and technical procedures could be further developed and strengthened.
RECOMMENDATION 3
Each partnership should review its current administrative and technical procedures and improve them if necessary, introducing standards and guidelines as appropriate. Some explicit statement of basic principles of partnership should be produced as an overall output from (a distinctive characteristic of) the project.

Output 3 - Partnership portfolio: guidelines and working tools to assist the partnerships in ensuring employment and skills are integrated into the local economic planning cycle, including mandates and responsibilities for each partner (municipality, employment services, training providers, business support institutions, civic interest groups, community organisations, etc.)

3.3.15 A combination of study visits, training, mentoring and “learning by doing” has significantly increased relevant local capacities in a subject area that was largely unknown previously in both project locations. Significant experience has been gained in the elaboration of development strategies and project proposals, with the strong support from foreign experts.

3.3.16 New systems and practices that have been introduced to the partnerships include:
  - a participatory approach to local development;
  - SWOT (Strengths and Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis and strategy elaboration;
  - the preparation of project proposals;
  - Donor approach techniques;
  - Project Cycle Management tools;
  - GIS systems (in Albania).

3.3.17 Working relationships between the various partners in a very new approach to the design and delivery of local employment. Training measures have been established. In Lezha, for instance, well-organised cooperation between the local labour office and the vocational school in Lezha under the umbrella of the partnership has yielded positive outcomes, as described in the previous section.

3.3.18 In Kamenica, the approach adopted has followed the approach of "learning by doing" even more closely. Many of the skills have been developed in the context of preparing and making applications for and managing specific concrete projects.

3.3.19 Further work is required to continue to build capacity and ensure that the achievements to date are sustainable. In particular, further experience needs to be built in project implementation and in the monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes.
RECOMMENDATION 4
It is recommended that the project measure (tool-kit) be followed through with the objective of preparing an overall set of techniques, procedures and guidelines (a “toolbox”) - both to obtain a more objective assessment of the value of the tools used and to enhance the sustainability of the project’s impact.

Output 4 - Implementation plan: strategic plan and work programme, with detailed capacity building measures of each LEEDAK partnership including costs for implementation in a second phase.

3.3.20 Both partnerships have prepared local economic and employment development strategies. The documents produced in both locations and the experience of producing them have been very useful.

3.3.21 In Lezha, the strategy has been prepared after extensive consultation with the main stakeholders inside and outside of the partnership. Members of the partnership, particularly the Regional Council, have been actively involved in the consultation process and in information gathering and analysis. For the partnership, the whole process of preparing the strategy has been a very important learning exercise. Learning was achieved by two main means – learning by doing and formal training sessions on the subject of preparing local strategies, delivered by the EU advisor. Final editing of the document was completed by the EU advisor which was necessary given the limited experience of the partnership in preparing such documents. In future, when the strategy is updated, the Regional Council in Lezha should perform the actual document writing itself, as this is the only means to learn in a sustainable manner.

3.3.22 As a result, a paper entitled "Local Economic and Employment Development in Lezha Region" has been prepared during Phase 1 of the Project. It includes a list of 84 projects identified by the partnership as being important. The Paper is a draft. Its role is more of a "means to an end" than an end in itself. The paper's role as "building block" or "input to" the subsequent Millennium Development Goals Strategy (prepared under a UNDP-funded programme) was acknowledged and appreciated by the Partnership.

3.3.23 Four projects were selected as key priorities in Lezha, namely:
  ▪ Building a depot for the collection of solid waste;
  ▪ Establishing a Public Information Centre at the premises of the Regional Council;
  ▪ Construction of a rural road;
  ▪ Reconstruction of a rural school.

3.3.24 There are four task forces (one for each project) that are currently working to manage these projects. The task forces have started by preparing detailed project fiches for each of the projects. They will continue with the detailed design, identifying funding and implementing the projects. Managing the design and implementation of development
projects is the core learning process for the partnership. It is therefore very important that
the partnership receives support in Project Cycle Management for these projects. Even if
not all of them would be finalised by the end of LEEDAK, it is crucial that at least one
should be. The Partnership could thus be able to learn from a full PCM cycle and would
be able to see the very concrete benefits of a Partnership framework.

3.3.25 In Kamenica, a strategy paper was prepared entitled “Better business, better jobs,
a better future: progress through partnership in Kamenica,” NEP Partnership Strategy
(2005-2007). It is the result of several months of sustained and dedicated work carried
out by the NEP Partnership. Numerous working sessions and extensive dialogue amongst
the local stakeholders have taken place. The strategy includes a local economic profile,
based on which aims, objectives and action plans for local development were identified
and described in the document, in detail. It further identifies a mission statement for the
NEP Partnership, in an effort to provide a well-established, longer-term framework for its
functioning. Preparing this strategy was an invaluable learning opportunity for the NEP
Partnership. The quality of the strategy paper demonstrates that the partnership has
attained a level of institutional capacity and preparedness that allows it to undertake this
type of task independently, in future. Twenty one different local projects are identified in
the paper and these range from quite broad (“establishing the partnership”, “building
capacity”) to very specific (“electrician courses”) activities. Three of the more specific
projects that have been implemented are:

- a training course for young electricians;
- a barley production scheme, in association with a local brewery, to engage
  local farming community into commercial production; and,
- a project for the development of commercial development of apple production
  in association with a local brewer that has won support from a CARDS
  project.

There is a widespread appreciation among the partners that the experience of involvement
in concrete project implementation has been vital in generating a deeper and wider
awareness of the value of the partnership approach. This activity has also been useful in
demonstrating the real demands of project design and delivery and of obtaining financial
support. To build on the value of this achievement a sustained adoption of project cycle
management techniques would be useful – including monitoring and evaluation; and,
eventually, a second-generation strategy updated in light of the experience of
implementing the first.

**RECOMMENDATION 5**

It is recommended that the strategy papers and implementation plans prepared are
included as inputs to a final evaluation of the LEEDAK project in each location and that
revised plans for future activity are produced at the end of the project.
Output 5 - Networking: partnership co-operation as a basis for wider municipal networking and exchange on local employment and economic development within EU and OECD networks for further knowledge sharing and exchange of experience.

3.3.26 Numerous activities have been completed in support of this output, with very good impact:
- experience sharing between Kamenica and Lezha has taken place;
- ad-hoc exchange of experience with other regions and projects in both Albania and Kosovo has taken place;
- the OECD-LEED seminar in Trento in November 2004 provided an opportunity to learn from the experience of other countries in Western Balkans as well as to disseminate the experience of the two partnerships;
- Two study visits in Ireland and Sicily have helped the two partnerships to get a better understanding of how others are preparing and implementing local development plans.

3.3.27 There has been substantial networking between the Kamenica partnership and OAK Partnership in Ireland, after the study visit. This resulted in the signing of a twinning agreement between the two partnerships. The agreement creates a structured framework for further co-operation between the two partnerships. It includes, inter alia, provisions for bilateral support, exchange visits, preparation of joint applications for project funding and promotion of networking with partnerships in the EU, Western Balkans and OECD countries. The agreement is a good basis for continued learning and capacity building for both partnerships, as pre-quisites for successful local economic and employment development. It also demonstrates and underlines the commitment to learning of the NEP partnership. Although there is no clear evidence of a similar cooperation between the partnership in Lezha and the visited partnerships, this element does not detract from the value of their study visits. The key benefit of study visits, it is argued, is the possibility to learn how others operate. This, in itself, is a key learning exercise, regardless of whether it leads or does not lead to further co-operation between the counterpart organisations.

3.3.28 By the end of the project there will be at least one more meeting at each national level to disseminate the experience of the LEEDAK project as well as an international meeting in Kamenica to disseminate LEEDAK experience to other Western Balkan countries. Such an action is very important for sharing experiences at regional level and enhancing awareness at central level administration of the successes recorded by local initiatives. It would create a platform for further policy development and would provide a good start for building best practices in local economic and employment development throughout the region of Western Balkans.

---

11 The full text of the Twinning Agreement is attached as Annex IV.
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**Output 6 – Dissemination:** diffusion of knowledge, competences and learning tools developed in the project to other countries in the South Eastern Europe region (FYROM, Serbia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Croatia).

3.3.29 Dissemination of information on the project has occurred and is planned through the networking activities mentioned in relation to Output 5 above. The two partnerships have maintained contact with their national authorities who are aware of the results obtained so far by the LEEDAK pilot project. At the end of the project, both partnerships should prepare a presentation of LEEDAK’s achievements and present these to the range of stakeholders at central level with a view to prompting policy interest in promoting partnerships for local economic development and employment. Donors should be engaged into the process. This would increase the chances that central level decision-makers and donors to learn the lessons from the pilot experience and that the approach is then replicated elsewhere.

**RECOMMENDATION 6**

It is recommended that the two partnerships develop a more specific statement and account of precisely what is distinctive about the LEEDAK approach. What are the characteristics that make LEEDAK different from other local economic and employment development initiatives?

### 3.4 Efficiency

3.4.1 The objectives of LEEDAK were very ambitious in the contexts where the two pilot partnerships were located and given the project resources available. Building two operational partnerships, in countries which had almost no experience with local development processes and certainly no experience in using partnerships is a task that requires more resources than were originally allocated.

3.4.2 The project management realised this early in the process and corrective measures were taken. In the case of Kamenica, a choice was made to concentrate on “learning by doing” - focusing on building an experience in elaborating a strategy and preparing proposals for investment projects, while in the case of Lezha a decision was made that the local strategy should be focused on key priorities only.

3.4.3 As the project has proceeded, use has been made of the lessons learned from experience, for example to specify for Phase 2 a better match between the outputs expected and the resources available.

3.4.4 The broad number of project achievements to date, in spite of the resource limitations described above, demonstrate a high level of efficiency and dedication of all involved. The contribution of the foreign experts in terms of quality and commitment has drawn widespread praise. ESOK provided administrative and logistical support to an extent that has been described as “beyond the call of duty”. The local contractor in Lezha (HDPC) has performed very well, has demonstrated a high level of professionalism and
has often gone beyond the requirements in the ToR to provide the best possible support to the Lezha Partnership.

3.4.5 With the benefit of hindsight, a key lesson learnt is that any future similar projects, with equally ambitious objectives, require more carefully targeted (and arguably more) inputs. Establishing a working partnership is a very demanding task that needs to be supported adequately. A particular lesson learnt is that in order to allow a better evaluation of their efficiency, study visits as a learning tool need to include more clearly formulated and measurable objectives. A more general lesson is that a systematic and comprehensive retrospective breakdown of expenditure by activity is necessary if any meaningful evaluation of efficiency is to be possible (see recommendation 11 below).

**RECOMMENDATION 7**  
In future, the ETF should define more realistic project objectives and outputs, in relation to the available resources.

3.5 **Project Management**

3.5.1 The original project design for LEEDAK was sound. It included key elements of good design – Project Objective, Outputs Expected, Activities. It was also well connected to the needs of the beneficiaries. What would have added to the quality of design was the early definition of Indicators of Achievement (IoA).

3.5.2 The IoA are a key tool for project managers, increasing chances to achieve the desired objectives. Their role should by no means be confined to (external) project evaluation. Used well, IoA serve to define better the activities required to achieve objectives and for project monitoring purposes – i.e. detect slippage and take corrective measures as early as possible.

**RECOMMENDATION 8**  
The ETF, together with the two contractors in Albania and Kosovo, should define and monitor a set of indicators of achievement for the remainder of the project.

3.5.3 It is argued here that the project implementation arrangements (see 1.6) might have been clearer. More precisely, the 3-tier structure – donor, project co-ordination, contractor – should have been more clearly defined. Whilst it was clear who the donors are, it was not clear whether the observatories were acting as Project Co-ordinators or as Contractors. Officially they were contractors since they were bound by terms of reference, but in reality they also fulfilled the task of project co-ordination. This may have resulted at times in gaps in the provision of adequate technical assistance. In future this type of overlap should be avoided.
3.5.4 How to prepare project progress reports has obviously been a learning exercise for contractors in Kosovo and Albania\textsuperscript{12}. More work is needed to improve this key area of project management.

3.6 Ensuring Sustainability

3.6.1 Clearly, sustaining achievements to date and further development of the partnerships will be important for both Lezha and Kamenica.

3.6.2 The organisational capacity that has been developed at the two partnerships has very good chances to be sustainable after the end of the project. Further work is required to this end. The crucial issues in this respect are sustained awareness, knowledge and skills in the two localities on how partnerships work as an instrument, the tools and systems that are of use to them, and a continued ability and willingness to work in such an arrangement. In this regard, a number of recommendations are put forward, whose aim is to increase the chances that the achievements are sustainable when the project ends.

\textsuperscript{12} With the notable exception of the HDPC, whose reporting was of an obviously superior quality from the outset.
RECOMMENDATION 11
The Partnerships should identify any necessary future sources of support and funding for their further development (post LEEDAK).

RECOMMENDATION 12
A serious effort should be made as soon as possible to present the experience of the LEEDAK to relevant EAR and EU Delegation officials and explore the possibility of support from for similar activities in future, in view of the importance of EU as a provider of assistance.

RECOMMENDATION 13
Co-ordination with both OECD and UNDP should be maintained during the remainder of the project. Drawing on OECD experience and expertise should facilitate the drawing of pertinent lessons from the LEEDAK pilot experience, while communication with UNDP should explore the possibility of support from that body for co-operation in any future similar activities in the region.

RECOMMENDATION 14
During the remainder of the LEEDAK project, sufficient resources should be devoted to fully implementing a limited number of concrete actions in each partnership area. The implementation experience to date has already been identified by local partners as having been of crucial value as a learning tool. This should be used as a vehicle to ensure the establishment of adequate implementation mechanisms and accompanied by continuing relevant training in project cycle management skills. Ideally, each partnership should fully implement at least one complete project by the end of LEEDAK.

RECOMMENDATION 15
Taking up responsibility and leadership for the whole learning process, by the 2 partnerships, is crucial. The process whereby responsibility and leadership have been gradually transferred to the partnerships should be continued.

RECOMMENDATION 16
The involvement of stakeholders (other than representatives of the public administration) should be enhanced. In Lezha, the involvement of municipalities should be enhanced and consideration should be given to involving the commune level in Phase 3. Consideration should be given to whether LEEDAK could be used as a training vehicle for the SCA (Savings and Credit Associations) members at commune levels.

RECOMMENDATION 17
The partnerships should develop further their co-operation with partnerships in EU countries (not necessarily the ones that they have visited).
**RECOMMENDATION 18**
Partnership in Lezha should not get legal status, for two main reasons: a) this partnership is just a means to an end, an instrument, with a limited life-span and b) the current membership of the partnership is somewhat unusual (see 3.3.9) and legalising it would serve to perpetuate the confusion.

**RECOMMENDATION 19**
Provision should be made for the key players (representatives of the partnerships, ETF and OECD) to get together at the end of this on-going phase as well as at the very end of the project, to share conclusions and lessons learnt.

**RECOMMENDATION 20 (see 3.4.1, 3.4.3)**
Taking account of the resources that remain in each partnership location, a costed schedule of specific capacity-building activities for the remainder of the project should be agreed by the contractors and partnerships in each location as soon as possible.

**RECOMMENDATION 21 (see 3.3.19, 3.3.24, 3.3.25)**
Particular attention should be devoted to
- the preparation of "tangible" tools (e.g. new systems and practices in the form of identifiable documents or software) to avoid loss of capacity if certain partnership members are leaving their current posts;
- building capacity inside the partnership to identify and access funding sources (e.g. Government funding, donor funding, local contributions).

### 4. BENCHMARKING

4.1 Benchmarking is a new concept for the two partnerships. Given recommendations by the evaluators on indicators of achievement and benchmarking, an introductory exercise to both was included in the 2 day de-briefing meeting in Turin. More specifically, the meeting:

- Provided the two partnerships an overview of the concept of benchmarking, supplemented by a case study;
- gave the partnerships an opportunity to identify appropriate indicators of achievement for the remainder of the project, bearing in mind the connection between IoA and benchmarking;
- explored possibilities for the two partnerships to initiate benchmarking for their own activities.

4.2 As follow up, Annex III sets forth the list of actions identified by the two partnerships for the remainder of the project, which includes indicators of achievement. While it was too early to decide at the debriefing meeting which indicators of achievement could constitute the basis for benchmarking, the very fact that indicators of achievement have been identified is a first learning step towards a future utilisation of benchmarking as a performance improvement tool.
RECOMMENDATION 22
During the last phase of LEEDAK, the two partnerships should make provision for monitoring and ex-post evaluation using a number of indicators. Consideration should be given to initiating a simple yet relevant benchmarking process. The OECD expertise on the subject should be utilised when identifying the indicators that would constitute the basis for benchmarking, and these indicators should be agreed with the ETF.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
5.1 This section provides the overall conclusions of the interim evaluation exercise and a limited number of general recommendations for the remainder of the project and for future. Detailed recommendations have been formulated in the previous Chapters. A list of all recommendations formulated by the evaluators is attached as Annex II. During the debriefing meeting in Turin the two partnerships identified concrete corrective actions for the remainder of the project. These are attached as Annex III.

5.2 The LEEDAK project was initiated at a time when the need for institutional support during the economic reform process was acute. It has provided direct support at local level, where institutional capacity was particularly weak. In spite of its limited resources, LEEDAK has been successful in delivering good quality support to the two partnerships – Lezha and Kamenica. The key results are a) a significantly increased organisational capacity in both locations, b) local economic and employment development plans in place and under implementation, and c) local awareness and strong appreciation of the learning made possible through the project. The partnership framework has demonstrated in the two locations its value as a tool for better local governance. Synergy between local stakeholders has been achieved that would have otherwise not been possible.

5.3 Learning-by-doing has been a key feature of LEEDAK’s approach. So far, much has been learnt by all of the parties involved in the implementation of LEEDAK, both on content (how to develop local economic and employment development partnerships) as well as on method (how to best organise and implement this type of projects).

5.4 Project implementation has benefited from a good co-operation with the OECD and its experts from the LEED network. In hindsight, the decision to co-operate with the OECD and to draw on their expertise in local development has been sound.
RECOMMENDATION 23
It is recommended that OECD LEED is further engaged as an advisor and sounding board, throughout the remainder of the Project. In particular, its advice on how to introduce benchmarking to the two partnerships is essential.

5.5 Overall, this interim evaluation considers that the impact of the project is very good. With a year still remaining in the project schedule, LEEDAK has already achieved several of its expected outputs and the likelihood of achieving its objectives fully by the end of the project is high.

5.6 Capacity building needs in the two countries remain enormous. Administration at local level in particular needs continuous support. The reform process and its accompanying devolving of responsibility toward local level generate high pressure to develop as quickly as possible, in order to cope with such greatly enhanced responsibilities. It is clear that further support is crucial and engagement of wider expertise and donor support will be necessary. ETF’s possible further involvement in promoting employment and workforce development initiatives at sub-national level will be important. It is the opinion of the evaluation team that that developing the vocational education and training sector cannot neglect the local level. It is argued particularly that supporting VET reform at local level is equally important to supporting it at central level.

RECOMMENDATION 24
It is recommended that providing further support through similar projects is appropriate for the ETF, provided that, as in LEEDAK, the project design includes a specific focus on development of local employment and vocational education and training area as a function of demand of the local economy.

5.7 Further disseminating the lessons learnt from the pilot LEEDAK experience to other regions in the two countries, as well as to other countries in the Western Balkans, is very important for the overall learning and development process in the Region.

RECOMMENDATION 25
Project management should ensure that the dissemination activities planned under the project are implemented as foreseen.
Interim Evaluation of the LEEDAK Project

Annexes

Annex I List of Interviews
Annex II List of Recommendations
Annex III List of Actions identified by the two Partnerships for the Remainder of the Project
Annex IV Twinning Agreement OAK Partnership – NEP Partnership
Annex V Attendance List – Debriefing Meeting in Turin, 14-15 April 2005
Annex VI Recommendations for post-project developments
## Annex I

### List of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Francesco Panzica</td>
<td>LEEDAK Project Manager for Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Anthony Gribben</td>
<td>LEEDAK Project Manager and Country Manager for Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Lida Kita</td>
<td>Assistant to Country Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sylvain Giguere</td>
<td>Deputy Director, the LEED Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Anton Gojani</td>
<td>Head of Vocational Training Division, Ministry of Labour &amp; Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Hysni Terziu &amp; Mr Izer Arifi</td>
<td>Ministry of Trade &amp; Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Lulieta Belegu, Ms Demjha, Ryve Prekorogu &amp; Ms Radica Berishaj</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Shaip Surdulli</td>
<td>President of Kamenica Municipality and Chairman of NEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mustafe Borovici</td>
<td>Deputy Chairman of NEP and Member of Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gani Pireva</td>
<td>Director of Gjilan Regional Enterprise Agency and Member of NEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Fehmi Kastrati</td>
<td>Director of Technical Vocational School and Member of NEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Zijah Lenajani</td>
<td>Member of NEP and of Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Nexhmjie Kollaba</td>
<td>Member of Education &amp; Training Working Group and Kamenica Municipality Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Eshtref Selishta</td>
<td>Member of Education &amp; Training Working Group and on staff of the local employment office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ilmi Demi</td>
<td>Member of Enterprise &amp; Employment Working Group and on staff of Gjilan Regional Enterprise Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Agrani</td>
<td>Ex-coordinator of NEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Vedat Macastena</td>
<td>ESOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Valeria Patruno</td>
<td>UNDP, Democratic Governance Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Winsor Lewis</td>
<td>Employment Regeneration Programme (EAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Allan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Adrian Civici</td>
<td>Director, the Secretariat for the National Strategy for Social and Economic Development – Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Maksim Konini</td>
<td>Secretary General, Vocational Education, Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Xhelil Cibaku</td>
<td>Director of the Decentralisation Department, Ministry of Local Governance and Decentralisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Bardhi Rica</td>
<td>Head of the Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Llesh Hila</td>
<td>Director of Programming and Co-ordination Department, Regional Council of Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Bardhok Ndreca</td>
<td>Expert, the Programming and Co-ordination Department, Regional Council of Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Nikoleta Marku</td>
<td>Staff member, the Programming and Co-ordination Department, Regional Council of Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ndrec Gjini</td>
<td>Staff member, the Programming and Co-ordination Department, Regional Council of Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Dylbere Meshi</td>
<td>Staff member, the Programming and Co-ordination Department, Regional Council of Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Pashk Biba</td>
<td>Director, Department of Services, Regional Council of Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gazmor Dervishi</td>
<td>Regional Labour Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Zef Nikolli</td>
<td>Director, Vocational Education School in Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Dila Frani</td>
<td>Regional Education Department responsible for VET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Terezina Bilaci</td>
<td>The Chamber of Commerce, Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Linda Maci</td>
<td>Director, Foreign Relations Department, Regional Council of Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Martin Deda</td>
<td>Director of Information, Regional Council of Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Representative of the Rubik Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Xhemal Haxhiu</td>
<td>Lezha Prefecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Besim Denizi</td>
<td>Head of the Entrepreneurs Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albania</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Edmond Hoxha</td>
<td>Director, the Albanian Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Elfiori Miho</td>
<td>Project Officer, the Albanian Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Stela Luzi</td>
<td>Project Director, Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Alessandro La Grassa</td>
<td>EU expert, Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ylli Cabiri</td>
<td>President, the Human Development Promotion Centre (HDPC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Lindita Xhillari</td>
<td>Executive Director, the HDPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Arjan Rukaj</td>
<td>GIS expert, LEEDAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Armand Frangu</td>
<td>IT expert, LEEDAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Donors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albania</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Zana Konini</td>
<td>Executive Director, the Rural Credit Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kalyan Pandey</td>
<td>Chief Technical Advisor, Local Governance Programme, the UNDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex II    List of Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 1
The involvement of stakeholders (other than representatives of the public administration) in the partnership framework in Lezha should be enhanced.

RECOMMENDATION 2
The issue of specifying any relevant institutional principles (e.g. optimum legal status and administrative structures of partnerships) should be addressed in a systematic fashion by both partnerships and ETF in the closing phase of LEEDAK. Since this is a pilot project, it should result in the establishment/clarification of some distinctive principles, standards and/or lessons.

RECOMMENDATION 3
Each partnership should review its current administrative and technical procedures and improve them if necessary, introducing standards and guidelines as appropriate. Some explicit statement of basic principles of partnership should be produced as an overall output from (a distinctive characteristic of) the project.

RECOMMENDATION 4
We recommend that the project measure (tool-kit) be followed through with the objective of preparing an overall set of techniques, procedures and guidelines (a “toolbox”) - both to obtain a more objective assessment of the value of the tools used and to enhance the sustainability of the project’s impact.

RECOMMENDATION 5
We recommend that (no matter how far experience has diverged from the plans) the strategy papers and implementation plans prepared are included as inputs to a final evaluation of the LEEDAK project in each location and that revised plans for future activity are produced at the end of the project.

RECOMMENDATION 6
It is recommended that the two partnerships develop a more specific statement and account of precisely what is distinctive about the LEEDAK approach. What are the characteristics that make LEEDAK different from other local economic and employment development initiatives?

RECOMMENDATION 7
In future, the ETF should define more realistic project objectives and outputs, in relation to the available resources.

RECOMMENDATION 8
The ETF together with the two Contractors in Albania and Kosovo should define and monitor a set of indicators of achievement for the remainder of the project.
RECOMMENDATION 9
For the last phase of the Project, the implementation arrangements should be clearly defined - the respective roles and responsibilities of the different organisation involved in project management should be made clear to all of them.

RECOMMENDATION 10
For the remainder of the project, as well as for future projects, it is recommended that a clear standard structure should be defined for progress reports. Reporting frequency should be agreed and be the same for both Kosovo and Albania. Retrospective financial reporting by activity should be included in the progress reports.

RECOMMENDATION 11
The Partnerships should identify any necessary future sources of support and funding for their further development (post LEEDAK).

RECOMMENDATION 12
A serious effort should be made as soon as possible to present the experience of the LEEDAK to relevant EAR and EU Delegation officials and explore the possibility of support from for similar activities in future, in view of the importance of EU as a provider of assistance.

RECOMMENDATION 13
Co-ordination with both OECD and UNDP should be maintained during the remainder of the project. Drawing on OECD experience and expertise should facilitate the drawing of pertinent lessons from the LEEDAK pilot experience, while communication with UNDP should explore the possibility of support from that body for co-operation in any future similar activities in the region.

RECOMMENDATION 14
During the remainder of the LEEDAK project, sufficient resources should be devoted to fully implementing a limited number of concrete actions in each partnership area. The implementation experience to date has already been identified by local partners as having been of crucial value as a learning tool. This should be used as a vehicle to ensure the establishment of adequate implementation mechanisms and accompanied by continuing relevant training in project cycle management skills. Ideally, each partnership should fully implement at least one complete project by the end of LEEDAK.

RECOMMENDATION 15
Taking up responsibility and leadership for the whole learning process, by the 2 partnerships, is crucial. The process whereby responsibility and leadership have been gradually transferred to the Partnerships should be continued.

RECOMMENDATION 16
The involvement of stakeholders (other than representatives of the public administration) should be enhanced. In Lezha, the involvement of municipalities should be enhanced and
consideration should be given to involving the commune level in Phase 3. Consideration should be given to whether LEEDAK could be used as a training vehicle for the SCA (Savings and Credit Associations) members at commune levels.

RECOMMENDATION 17
The Partnerships should resume their co-operation with partnerships in EU countries (not necessarily the ones that they have visited).

RECOMMENDATION 18
Partnership in Lezha should not get legal status, for two main reasons: a) this Partnership is just a means to an end, an instrument, with a limited life-span and b) the current membership of the partnership is somewhat unusual (see 3.3.9) and legalising it would serve to perpetuate the confusion.

RECOMMENDATION 19
Provision should be made for the key players (representatives of the partnerships, ETF and OECD) to get together at the end of this on-going phase as well as at the very end of the project, to share conclusions and lessons learnt.

RECOMMENDATION 20
Taking account of the resources that remain in each partnership location, a costed schedule of specific capacity-building activities for the remainder of the project should be agreed by the contractors and partnerships in each location as soon as possible.

RECOMMENDATION 21
Particular attention should be devoted to:
  a) the preparation of "tangible" tools (e.g. new systems and practices in the form of identifiable documents or software) to avoid loss of capacity if certain partnership members are leaving their current posts;
  b) building capacity inside the partnership to identify and access funding sources (e.g. Government funding, donor funding, local contributions).

RECOMMENDATION 22
During the last phase of LEEDAK, the two partnerships should make provision for monitoring and ex-post evaluation using a number of indicators. Consideration should be given to initiating a simple yet relevant benchmarking process. The OECD expertise on the subject should be utilised when identifying the indicators that would constitute the basis for benchmarking, and these indicators should be agreed with the ETF.

RECOMMENDATION 23
It is recommended that OECD LEED is further engaged as an advisor and sounding board, throughout the remainder of the Project. In particular, their advice on how to introduce Benchmarking to the two Partnerships is essential.
RECOMMENDATION 24
It is recommended that providing further support through similar projects is appropriate for the ETF, provided that, as in LEEDAK, the project design includes a specific focus on development of local employment and vocational education and training area as a function of demand of the local economy.

RECOMMENDATION 25
Project management should ensure that the dissemination activities planned under the project are implemented as foreseen.
Annex III  List of actions identified by the two partnerships for the remainder of the project (15th of April 2005)

The Lezha Partnership
List of Actions for the remainder of the LEEDAK Project

Capacity Building
- Continue Training
- Involve Communes
- Create "permanent" toolkit – for each subject taught, a Booklet containing Practical Guidelines will be prepared

Indicator of Achievement                          Target                                      Deadline
N° of persons trained 15 Local Agents                By the end of Phase 3 of LEEDAK
N° of Communes involved 4                             
N° of Trainees Trained at municipal/commune level 5
N° of subjects taught 5                               
N° of Practical Guidelines Booklets One for each subject taught

Enhance Capacity to access funds

Indicator of Achievement                          Target                                      Deadline
N° of Project Applications to the State budget 30  Sept 2005
N° of Project Applications to Donors 2-3  End of Phase 3
N° of approved Project Applications (State budget) 15
N° of approved Project Applications (Donors) 1

Revise Partnership Agreement

Indicator of Achievement  Deadline
Revised Partnership Agreement signed by Partners by the end of Phase 2
Decision on possible Partnership extension (new, relevant Partners) by the beginning of Phase 3
Interim Evaluation of the LEEDAK Project

**Continue co-operation and strengthen links with Central Government**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator of Achievement</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a Concept for a National event (Dec 2005) - attended by National Stakeholders + OECD</td>
<td>Concept by June 2005</td>
<td>The Partnership and Mr Francesco Panzica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Local Labour Market</td>
<td>Beginning of Phase 3</td>
<td>Partnership in collaboration with Offices of Central Govt at local level (Labour, Education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improve co-ordination with the OECD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator of Achievement</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participate at 3 OCED-events (2 reps of the Partnership per event)</td>
<td>End of Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a Concept and take a decision on a possible 1-week, OECD-supported event</td>
<td>Concept by May 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Realise at least one complete Project Cycle for one project**

By the end of Phase 3.

**Benchmarking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator of Achievement</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A preliminary set of proposed Indicators</td>
<td>mid-June 2005</td>
<td>OECD and the ETF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators checked and finally agreed with the Partnership</td>
<td>Oct/Nov 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Counterparts for Benchmarking</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with the Counterpart and start applying the Benchmarking process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responsibility for all of the Actions rests with the Partnership in Lezha.**
Where additional responsibility for certain actions has been taken on by other parties, this was specified in the text.
List of Actions for the remainder of the LEEDAK Project

Agreement between ETF, ESOK and NEP Partnership to finalise Terms of Reference and 2005 work programme

ESOK will contract to support NEP Partnership to undertake the following actions:

- Hold regular Board meetings
- Appoint a Treasurer, Secretary and Public Relations Officer
- Expand Board with three new members representing women, minorities and youth
- Rotate the position of Chairperson
- Hold an Annual General Meeting to effect these decisions
- Provide training for Board members in these competencies
- Contract a new Project Manager
- Retain the existing Project Manager on a month by contract
- Contracting of experts local (NEP with ETF agreement) and international (ETF)
- Procure project finance management software and training for project manager and Board members
- 3 day training programme for Board members on Procurement and Financial procedures
- Technical assistance (local/international)
  - Project management skills (Board, Working Groups, Staff)
  - Annual programming training
  - Elaboration of a capacity building plan
- Promote participation in regional and European networks
- National dissemination event in association with OECD
- Establish a NEP website
- Training for Employment Project (20 unemployed people to be trained and employed by local businesses (Business Association members) by Dec 2005
- English language training for NEP
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- Self employment training by REA
- Evaluation of barley production project and if successful expansion of pilot to more local farms
- Ongoing support, monitoring and evaluation of the fruit production project supported by ERP
- Development of milk production project in association with Kabi and Heifer International
- NEP will design a proposal for the Quick Employment Project
- Develop a computer training project for local unemployed people
- Full project management cycle approach to be adopted for the Training for Employment Project
Interim Evaluation of the LEEDAK Project

Annex IV  Twinning Agreement OAK Partnership – NEP Partnership
International Twinning Agreement

between

North West Kildare / North Offaly Partnership Company Ltd,
Ireland hereinafter called ‘OAK Partnership’

and

NEP Partnership, Kamenica, Kosovo hereinafter called ‘NEP Partnership’

This twinning agreement (three pages in total, in the English language) builds on international contacts developed between OAK Partnership and NEP Partnership under the LEEDAK Project 2003/2004 funded by the European Training Foundation and the Italian Government.

1. OAK Partnership, Ireland and NEP Partnership, Kosovo hereby agree to engage in an international twinning arrangement for the mutual benefit of both organisations for an initial period of 2 years.

2. Under the terms of this agreement both organisations agree to engage in a range of activities aimed at building their respective capacities to engage in local economic, employment and social development within their geographic areas. The Partnerships also commit under this agreement to engage in joint initiatives to develop networking among local development partnerships from the European Union, Western Balkans and OECD countries.

3. Jointly the partners to this agreement will seek funding and other non financial support to develop this twinning agreement with a view to enhancing the capacity of local development in the OAK Partnership and NEP Partnership areas and in building understanding between Ireland and Kosovo of the social, economic and cultural diversity that is required to develop successful, inclusive and integrated local development partnerships involving all local stakeholders.
4. OAK Partnership hereby agrees to fully engage in this twinning arrangement and will provide the following:

- ongoing staff support in Ireland to NEP Partnership through off-site mentoring, assistance with donor proposals and management of joint initiatives, where appropriate;
- opportunities for the staff and Board of NEP Partnership to undertake exchange visits to Ireland to study and engage in work experience in local development settings;
- Board and staff members to engage in exchange visits to NEP Partnership, Kosovo to learn from the Kosovo experience and to provide advice and technical assistance to NEP and other local development partnerships, where appropriate;
- Assistance in attracting international donors through advice on donor proposals, references and testimonials and joint applications, where appropriate.

5. NEP Partnership hereby agrees to fully engage in this twinning agreement and will provide the following:

- Board and staff members to engage in exchange visits to OAK Partnership, Ireland to learn from the Irish experience;
- Opportunities for the Board and staff of OAK Partnership to visit Kosovo and to engage in study visits and work experience to learn from the experiences of NEP Partnership in developing a pilot local development partnership in the Western Balkan region;
- Advice and technical assistance to OAK Partnership and other local development partnerships in Ireland, particularly in addressing the needs of asylum seekers, migrant workers and refugees and issues affecting ethnic minorities in Ireland.

6. The commitments of OAK Partnership and NEP Partnership within this agreement will be subject to ongoing availability of financial and other resources to the partnerships in Ireland and Kosovo.

7. Both partners to this agreement further undertake to engage in the following joint activities:

- Public relations including the publication of articles, press releases, television, radio and film articles;
- Presentation of materials at seminars, conferences, briefings for national and international stakeholders, joint training programmes and other events;
- Preparation of joint applications for funding programmes aimed at improving networking, local economic and employment regeneration, social inclusion and cultural diversity.
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8. We hereby agree to participate in this twinning arrangement for the mutual benefit of OAK Partnership and NEP Partnership for the following period:


This agreement may be extended or revised upon mutual agreement between the parties.

FOR NEP PARTNERSHIP

Signed: 

Shaip Surdulli
Chairperson, NEP Partnership (Kosovo)

Dated: 18 November 2004

Witnessed by:

Yiber Shaban
Director, Employment and Skills Observatory of Kosova

Dated: 18 November 2004

FOR OAK PARTNERSHIP

Signed: 

Eamonn McCormack
Chairperson OAK Partnership (Ireland)

Dated: 18 November 2004

Witnessed by:

Malachy Mangan
Director, OAK Partnership (Ireland)

Dated: 18 November 2004
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**Annex V**  
*Attendance List – Debriefing Meeting in Turin, 14-15 April 2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Bardh</td>
<td>Rica</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Regional Council Lezha</td>
<td>Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Llesh</td>
<td>Hila</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Programming and Coordination in the Regional Council of Lezha</td>
<td>Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Maci</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Foreign Relations Department</td>
<td>Lezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Maksim</td>
<td>Konini</td>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>Tirana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Lindita</td>
<td>Xhili</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Human Development Promotion Center</td>
<td>Tirana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Ylli</td>
<td>Cabiri</td>
<td>Experts Team Leader of the LEEDAK Project</td>
<td>Human Development Promotion Center</td>
<td>Tirana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Shaip</td>
<td>Surdulli</td>
<td>NEP PARTNERSHIP Chair - Mayor of Kamenica</td>
<td>Municipal Assembly of Kamenica</td>
<td>Kamenica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Fehmi</td>
<td>Kastrati</td>
<td>NEP PARTNERSHIP Member - Director</td>
<td>Technical School of Kamenica</td>
<td>Kamenica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Mustafe</td>
<td>Borovci</td>
<td>NEP PARTNERSHIP Member - President of Business Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kamenica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Vedat</td>
<td>Macastena</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment and Skills Observatory of Kosovo</td>
<td>Prishtina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Naim</td>
<td>Behluli</td>
<td>Adviser to Minister</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Government</td>
<td>Prishtina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Miljane</td>
<td>Mejzini</td>
<td>Coordinator of Sustainable Local Development Strategy</td>
<td>Municipality of Gjakove</td>
<td>Gjakove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46
## Interim Evaluation of the LEEDAK Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>HOFER</td>
<td></td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>38100 Trento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Arjen</td>
<td>Vos</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>10133 Torino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Francesco</td>
<td>Panzica</td>
<td>County manager for Serbia</td>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>10133 Torino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Gribben</td>
<td>Country manager for Kosovo and Montenegro</td>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>10133 Torino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Lida</td>
<td>Kita</td>
<td>Assistant Project Manager</td>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>10133 Torino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Outi</td>
<td>Kärkkäinen</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Officer</td>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>10133 Torino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex VI

LESSONS FOR POST-PROJECT DEVELOPMENTS

- Project implementation structures have to be clearly defined from the outset – their respective roles and responsibilities should be made clear for all of the parties involved in implementation.

- Adequate provision needs to be made for systematic financial accounting.

- Project design documents should include Indicators of Achievement from the outset.

- The actual implementation of local training/employment projects is of major value in developing partnerships and should be an integral part of the design of projects to develop partnerships.

- The most important feature and benefit of a pilot project is the learning that takes place through its implementation. To this end, adequate provision should be made for concrete, formal learning events throughout the life of the project.

- Local ownership of the project is a key ingredient for effective learning, leading to increased chances of sustainability.