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Executive summary

Material gathered during the evaluation is precious and it was shared with the evaluators with the passion, thoughtfulness, and dedication, which could jointly attest to the project Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia success. Gathered thoughts embrace such a variety of attitudes, experiences and voices that could be shared in its integral form to provide for even better and clearer picture about Atina’s shared vision and values, Atina’s staff intentions and efforts, as well as valuable and undeniable impact, than this report is. Because of this, and because of all their work and endeavors, the evaluators would like to express their gratitude and to congratulate Atina, UNTF, women and girls – refugees and asylum seekers, professionals and activists, and all other women who have been shaping Atina’s approach throughout the years.

Thank you for this opportunity,
Aleksandra and Marijana

This report presents the final ex-post evaluation of the project Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia, implemented by the Citizens’ Association for Combating Trafficking of Human Beings and All Forms of Gender-based Violence – Atina from September 2018 until November 2021 in Serbia. The project, supported by the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (UNTF) was aimed at eliminating violence against women and girls by ensuring that the refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia were safer and better protected against VAW/G.

Project context

Being on the transit route between Turkey and Central and Western Europe, Serbia experienced a mass influx of refugees since the beginning of the so-called refugee crisis in 2015. At the time of project proposal development, there were 4,200 officially registered refugees and migrants residing in Serbia, out of which 95% were accommodated in one of the 18 reception and asylum centers, with an average duration of stay of 15 months. Women and children made up the majority (55%) of this population, while the dominant countries of their origin were Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq (83%). With the growing evidence of the frequent incidents of VAW/G and the lack of capacities among the engaged actors to provide effective support to violence survivors, the project was implemented to reflect the need of women and girls, refugees for a gender-sensitive, timely and effective protection against VAW/G in Serbia.
**Project design**

Within its three pillars designed to: 1. Improve the access to information of refugee women and girls, 2. Improve their access to services, 3. Empower women and girls for active participation and leadership; Atina was implementing a series of activities intended to strengthen the position of refugee and migrant women and girls in general, but especially the VAW/G survivors, to support them in overcoming the consequences of the violence experienced, to improve the skills of the professionals working in the field. With its informative and empowerment-related groups of activities (including economic empowerment and empowerment for self-advocacy and public advocacy), the project was targeting women and girls residing in the asylum and reception centers throughout Serbia, at the same time providing comprehensive support to all women and girls VAW/G survivors through the direct assistance program (safe accommodation, Reintegration Center service package) and building capacities of the professionals mandated and/or professionally engaged in the protection field, and also, women and girls accommodated in Atina’s safe house.

**Purpose, objectives, and scope of the evaluation**

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the project processes and results achieved based on OECD-DAC+ evaluation criteria, so to inform the implementers, the donor, and the involved stakeholders and to enable learning, and improvements in the design, planning, and implementation of future actions, as well as to additionally empower and provide support to the primary beneficiaries.

The objectives of the evaluation were to evaluate the entire project against the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability, and impact criteria, as well as the cross-cutting gender equality and human rights criteria, and to identify key lessons and promising or emerging good practices in the field of ending violence against women and girls, for learning purposes.

The evaluation addressed 39 months of project implementation (from 1st September 2018 until 30th November 2021), the whole territory of Serbia, and particularly all areas/locations in which Atina’s primary beneficiaries had been residing in the period of evaluation implementation: Krnjača, Bosilegrad, Adaševci, and Belgrade, with the Atina’s safe accommodation and the Reintegration Center.

**Evaluation methodology**

The evaluation was organized and implemented by the Evaluation Team, with full technical and operational support of Atina’s Evaluation Task Manager, program manager, and coordinators of different program components, as well as expert support from UNTF.
It was designed in line with evaluation criteria defined in ToR and grounded in the UN Trust Fund Guidelines for Final External Project Evaluations and with the standards of a feminist evaluation framework and principle-based evaluation. Criteria included: effectiveness, relevance, coherence, efficiency, sustainability, impact, knowledge generation, gender equality and human rights, organizational principles.

The evaluation utilized a mix of methods, combining secondary data review and primary data collection, with a post-test without comparison group modality. The case study was used in the analysis to allow for deeper insights into the processes and achievements of the project per each evaluation criterion and triangulating qualitative and quantitative (to some extent) data gathered from different primary beneficiary sub-groups, other involved stakeholders (secondary beneficiary group), Atina’s staff, wider network of actors, as well as secondary data relevant for contextualizing gathered information. In addition, direct observation of the activity(ies) that had been implemented at the same time as the evaluation assessment and evaluators’ diaries were used to present another layer of meaning and create additional reference points for the contextualization of evaluation findings. Finally, additional action aimed at validation of findings was implemented in a form of ongoing consultations with Atina’s staff. A total number of respondents (including observation method) was 143 (91% female, 9% male).

The evaluation was designed and implemented utilizing ethical data collection standards and focusing on the additional empowerment of participants.

Evaluation findings

Overall

- Project Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls, funded by the UNTF and implemented by Atina from 2018 to 2021 in Serbia, was very successful in achieving its goal and outcomes, with most of the results exceeding planned targets. The project provided a framework, piloted, and established successful practices for the empowerment of women and girls – refugees, contributed to their increased awareness of women’s human rights, gender-based violence, and the protection mechanisms, and improved quality and general access to services for the protection against VAW/G.
- As fully embedded into Atina’s strategic orientation and general programmatic logic, the project also resulted in sustainable partnerships and short-term and long-term effects, as well as wide recognition of Atina as a credible and reliable actor in the field (sub-sector) of women and girls refugees’ protection in Serbia, which itself is an important sustainability anchor.
- With the contextually innovative practices of women’s empowerment – such as economic empowerment program with its key pillar – Atina’s social enterprise Bagel Bejgl, as well as its dedication to the full and informed participation of the primary beneficiaries, individualized approach to services delivery and focus on beneficiaries strengths and capacities, the project helped in creating momentum for women refugees’ advocacy
actions, by supporting their efforts and emancipating reception (on the decision-making and institutional sides).

- With the relevant and effective adaptations to the COVID-19 pandemic and emerged challenges, this project once again highlighted the importance of donors’ responsiveness and adaptability and in that sense, enabled UNTF’s approach and Atina’s and UNTF’s cooperation to become an important aspect of the project’s success.

**Effectiveness**

- The project was highly effective with most of the results (outputs and outcomes) exceeding planned targets. During the project implementation, Atina managed to create, plan, and implement new and/or adapted and improved approaches and strategies by employing its full organizational-, instead of initially planned project-capacity and delivered results that had been in its zone of proximal development in the initial proposal planning period and thus, achieved project results even beyond the proposed theory of change. However, the MEL system and instruments, including proposed and adapted indicators, did not offer an adequate framework for measuring envisioned changes and need further elaborations and support.

- The project significantly benefited both primary and secondary beneficiary groups. Depending on the program and activities in which primary beneficiaries had been participating, they gained relevant knowledge about the topics covered in the workshops and peer support groups meetings, skills to act and react in the situations of crisis and/or violence in general, as well as capacities for engagement in the peer support processes, self-advocacy and finally – public advocacy. Beneficiaries felt safer and better protected against VAW/G and valued significantly all provided services. Professionals in the field gained practical knowledge and skills and made necessary connections within the sector.

Evaluation recognized the need for an additional set of activities enabling women beneficiaries to effectively transfer the knowledge and know-how to their families and partners, but also activities targeting and involving men in the gender equality struggle.

- Obstacles to achieving results were numerous yet overcame during the project implementation. The most significant obstacle was the circumstance that for most women and girls - refugees Serbia is not envisioned as a country of final destination. Furthermore, the structure of beneficiaries had been changing constantly, with the new women and girls entering the program and some of them leaving it (both willingly, as the need for support ceased to exist, or due to other circumstances, such as voluntary or involuntary leaving the territory of Serbia). Also, the environment within the asylum/reception centers can be considered disabling for women’s empowerment and independence. Finally, such disfavorable conditions additionally worsened after the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

- The evaluation found that the highly participatory approach to program delivery, high level of the staff and consultants’ expertise in participatory methodologies, as well as intrinsic yet operationalized ethics of care which characterize Atina’s work, could be
considered as main factors influencing the outcomes and the ones that enabled successful mitigation of obstacles.

Relevance

- The project design and choice of activities continuously reflected beneficiaries’ needs. The project had been based on the continuously assessed needs of the primary beneficiaries and planned and implemented with their full and informed participation, making the relevance dimension its grounding principle. Moreover, it was addressing policy and institutional constraints and related insufficient capacities of the secondary target group to provide adequate and relevant answers to the women and girls survivors’ needs even in the long run (by promoting sustainable measures based on the best protection practices).
- While the general reasoning behind the ToC could be considered adequate on the level of outputs to outcomes logic, several sets of actions directed towards different target groups are missing to provide for a more (potentially) coherent ToC even on this intervention logic level. The same applies to the outcomes to goal logic and the expectations from the impact of the intervention of such coverage.
- Atina’s adaptations to the changes in the context, including the circumstances that emerged from the COVID-19-pandemic and related measures are assessed as very relevant for both groups of beneficiaries and additionally allowed for Atina’s capacity development – the creation of new/adapted content, procedures, and formats.
- COVID-19 pandemic worsened the position of the women and girls, beneficiaries and conditioned Atina’s additional adaptations to the newly emerged circumstances and beneficiaries’ needs – from accepting a higher number of beneficiaries into direct assistance program, through organizing online psychosocial support programs, to organizing online capacity building events for the secondary beneficiary group. Yet, all the expected outputs were delivered, and results were achieved (and some even exceeded).

Efficiency

- The project was implemented efficiently with the allocated resources spent adequately. The majority of the project activities were implemented on time, with the optimal use of resources, with the minor delays in implementation of a few activities, due to COVID-19-related restrictions and measures introduced in Serbia. Even the timeliness of the adaptations to the consequences of the pandemic reasserted Atina’s high efficiency. Significant results were achieved with the exceeded targets and the staff’s dedication and engagement significantly beyond initial expectations.
- The fact that Atina was already well established and widely recognized organization within the field of prevention of VAW/G and the protection of VAW/G survivors within the population of refugees and asylum seekers, largely contributed to the high level of efficiency in: a) reaching out to such a high number of final beneficiaries; b) reaching and/or exceeding initially set targets; and finally, c) achieving project results.
• Atina’s systems, management, including financial management and administration are assessed as highly efficient, both based on the documentation revision and the findings from the interviewees with the UNTF Portfolio Manager and the engaged administrative and program staff from Atina.
• The utilization of resources was maximized and the circumstance that Atina had other resources available at the time of project implementation, together with the significant expertise in financial administration, contributed to the economical use of resources, but also to smooth adaptations and high cost-effectiveness.
• It might be concluded that the adaptations made to the respond to COVID-19 pandemic ‘crisis’ in Serbia did not reduce the quality of the project performance, but rather added another layer to Atina’s already established and recognized credibility within the sub-sector of protection of women and girls on the move.

**Sustainability**

• Program built around beneficiaries’ strengths and capacities produced values for beneficiaries and the sustainable benefits for them individually by helping them to overcome VAW/G consequences, empowering them to own and voice their agency, and by continuously supporting them to express their concerns and advocate for the improvements of their own treatment, but also – improvements on the structural level. Also, the project positioned the very topic on the protection agenda in Serbia and activated and motivated a wide range of actors to invest their resources into programs and actions aimed at providing support to women and girls refugees and asylum seekers, in a structured and adequate manner.
• Atina’s approach to economic empowerment, implemented as an integral component of the comprehensive direct assistance program is recognized as the key innovation in the approach to combating VAW/G and assessed as the most sustainable action for future work.

Motivated by Atina’s actions, different stakeholders continued cooperation in the provision of direct support to beneficiaries in need of multisectoral assistance. Partially overcame prejudices between the CSOs and institutions could hopefully influence improvements in general cooperation between the sectors in the future.
• The project with its adaptations allowed for a systematization of key steps as a reaction in any similar/crisis: rapid assessment, action planning, introduction of a set of new/adapted measures, creation of relevant procedures, and/or adaptation of the existing ones, agility in implementation.

**Impact**

• Although it is not possible to assess the impact of intervention right upon its finalization, there is evidence that the project influenced changes/impact on the individual and relational level with almost all population of female refugees in Serbia. However, the impact on the individual level (and even to some extent on the relational) – increased knowledge and agency – was largely evident with the beneficiaries who stayed in Serbia
for more than 6 months. At the same time, 11 beneficiaries had been formally employed, and with the approach Atina utilizes, it’s highly likely that all beneficiaries would become economically independent in the recent future (40 from this project). All beneficiaries who had been provided with comprehensive direct assistance exited violence, changed the environment, and used provided opportunities to overcome trauma, become healthier and more independent in the future. The impact on their lives is immeasurable, since the very fact that they got the needed support to escape violence, could be considered sufficient to rationalize the efforts.

- Asylum-seeking women, empowered by the project, started voicing their concerns publicly and in front of the responsible institutions, while the full impact of this practice is yet to be seen in the future.

- Capacity building component of the project made a permanent change in the prioritization of the involved institutions’ functions and activities, motivating them to stay dedicated to the identification of VAW/G victims and their referral to adequate services, which would potentially be seen as a generally improved functioning of the state in the field of VAW/G prevention and victims’ protection. Yet, to integrate such changes into general institutions’ operations and the policies that guide them, constant efforts need to be invested to sustain current and produce additional systemic improvements.

- Evaluation concluded that the effects and the pace of recovery, number of affected beneficiaries, as well as dynamic of their empowerment and the volume of the space for exhibiting agency, would be even higher in different and more stable circumstances, while not jeopardized by the pandemic, due to Atina’s effective adaptations and high efficiency.

**Knowledge generation**

- Atina’s approach to learning and process management could be considered as the initial resource for potential replications, as it already proved to be effective in building the basis of Atina as a learning organization. However, some of the functions of Atina’s learning approach (i.e., monitoring and documentation) also call for further development.

  Also, the project introduced and practiced relevant innovative solutions in the field of provision of direct assistance services to the VAW/G survivors. All introduced practices would benefit from a scaling-up, first through detailed and structured documentation and presentation of the concepts and the effects of their implementation in different program phases, precise guidelines for implementation, as well as a description of the procedures for their implementation.

- Lessons learned from the pandemic are numerous and could help Atina and organizations with a diverse mission direction in the future. Atina already developed relevant material that focuses on the lessons learned and the additional efforts in wide distribution and promotion of the material should be made in the recent future.
Gender equality and human rights

- Atina’s actions, including the activities within this project could be considered as, not just fully in line with the international human rights and gender equality standards, but also the contribution in their future development and adaptations.
- The project successfully addressed emerging gender equality and human rights issue, by entrenching the intersectional lenses, utilizing necessary resources to respond to the needs of multiple-discriminated and marginalized groups, and creating horizontal connections across the civil society sector.

Also, the project provided a framework for the integration of international standards into Atina practice and, through Atina’s collaborations, practices of other local actors in Serbia.

Organizational principles

- Atina’s approach and application of organizational principles have been highly meaningful to beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholder groups. A participatory approach to program delivery, applied ethics of care, as well as Atina’s uncompromising dedication to women’s rights, were widely recognized as crucial and critical factors for the achievement of the project results. Thus, Atina’s feminist perspective to VAW/G and the practices which successfully operationalized this perspective were the only guarantee that the root causes of the violence were considered and addressed, and consequently, that the action contributed to reshaping the existing patriarchal paradigm and the structural dimensions of inequality.

Recommendations

Effectiveness

- Multiyear projects that aim at the long-term effect through various comprehensive intersecting activities should engage additional MEL expertise, both through developing implementing organizations’ capacities and through the engagement of external MEL experts from the very beginning. External MEL experts should support internal structure for monitoring and evaluation to create a sustainable monitoring mechanism for the organization. In addition to this, engagement of the external MEL support from the very begging would ensure that the evaluation structures and systems are properly set from the very begging and aligned with the donor’s and implementer’s practices.

Accurate, evidence-based reporting that would inform management and decision-making to guide and improve project/program performance throughout the project implementation is necessary in order to ensure effective and meaningful project implementation.

- Even though the main target group of the project is women and girls from the refugee and asylum-seeking population who have survived VAW/G, the participation of men is necessary to adequately reach the goal of the project. Gender-related social constructs reinforce and support the structures of male power and stereotyped masculinities, which
lead to VAW, and multiple discrimination towards women and girls. To address these social norms that create preconditions for VAW/G, the engagement of men is essential. Project interventions that aim to deconstruct masculinities, encourage the practice of men in care roles, develop knowledge on women’s rights illustrate the positive impacts on human rights and equality, both for men and women, and support men and boys to address VAW/G in a more nuanced and positive manner. To do so, it is advisable that Atina either create and implement specific programs targeting men from the refugee and asylum-seeking population, or even better – identify and support CSOs that would deliver such initiatives with Atina’s support.

- Advocacy actions should continue towards the institutions mandated with the implementation of the employment-related legislation using the previously developed participatory approach. A set of organized actions aiming to influence public policies, societal attitudes, and socio-political processes where beneficiaries speak for themselves are necessary for the sensitization of the institutions. The main goal of advocacy actions should be broader with an intersectional approach and oriented towards women's labor rights and a variety of issues women face based on their identity categories (such as refugee, asylum-seeking, LGBTI+, Roma, class, ethnicity, etc.). Also, a multisectoral approach is necessary to create effective advocacy actions, and the inclusion of various national and international protection actors can be done through specific coalitions where beneficiaries of the project would have an equal and leading role.

**Relevance**

- Taking into consideration that the number of women refugees and asylum-seekers staying in Serbia for a longer period of time is increasing, additional efforts should be invested into re-thinking and creating integration policies, piloting comprehensive integration practices, and advocating for sustainable changes of the national legislative and strategic framework to allow for successful and sustainable integration. Being an organization aware of the intersectional character of discrimination and all aspects and full dynamic of the position of the multiple-marginalized groups, Atina is in a good position to initiate this discourse and focus on the integration of women and girls with an intersectional approach – looking at different aspects of their needs based on class, legal status, race, ethnicity, etc. In that manner, women refugees and asylum-seekers could be seen as equal members of the local community, and not as a special category which often is the very reason behind the discrimination.

**Efficiency**

- To develop comprehensive services throughout the country, empowerment of the local women's organizations, including non-formal groups, is necessary. Atina could be the nexus between local women's organizations and donors. This would lead to more efficient project implementation since the members of Atina organizations would not have to travel to provide services to women and girls outside of Belgrade. Also, members of the community or to be specific women's organizations would develop enough capacity to
provide services to both the local population and the population of refugees and asylum-seekers. This would cost less, create employment opportunities in local communities, support the development of women-focused programs throughout the country, and decrease travel and thus even contribute to the environmental impact. Finally, beyond the efficiency dimension, this approach would allow for wider investment into supporting women’s leadership and building a stronger and self-reliable women’s movement.

**Sustainability**

- Donors should develop specific approaches which would allow for improving sustainability prospects of the grantees beyond asking about grantees’ already developed sustainability strategies and plans. Namely, it would be beneficial for the CSOs worldwide to provide them with the possibility to invest a certain (at least 5% for the beginning) percentage of the total budget for the improvement of the sustainability prospects.
- Specifically important element of sustainability of organizations engaged in the provision of services to survivors of VAW/G is usually a very high turnover rate, due to burnout and related reasons. It would be highly beneficial for the CSOs to be able to budget specific HR/staff retention-related expenses which would be then financed by the donors willing to invest into the strengthening women’s movement. As linked to the knowledge generation and organizational principles dimensions, such budgets could include costs for: professional development, individual and group supervision, other strategies of care for staff.

As an organization recognized as a leader in the Serbian women’s movement and a sub-sector (refugees’ protection), Atina should invest in creating relevant partnerships within the sector (on the global level) and with the relevant donors, and initiate negotiations with the donor community to improve sustainability prospects of the civil society sector and particularly, women’s organizations on the national and global level.

**Impact**

- Since it is difficult to assess the impact of any project right upon its finalization, to get adequate insight, an impact evaluation should be done at least 3 to 5 years after the project implementation. To plan for effective impact assessment, preparatory actions should start from the evaluation. That would allow for the collection of relevant baseline data – e.g., beneficiaries’ perceptions on gender norms and hierarchies, behavioral patterns, and level of their economic in/dependence, perceived levels of empowerment, etc.
- Structurally complex changes, such as in this project cannot be achieved (at least) without addressing power imbalances and social inequalities based on gender (in this particular case – interculturally and cross-culturally, which makes it even more demanding) on all levels (with the general public, professionals, VAW/G survivors), and without specific actions aimed at institutionalizing new and improved practices, such as service of cultural
mediation, programs of inclusion in the labor market for refugees and asylum-seekers, etc. In order to bridge the gap, two solutions are recommended:

- To allow the development of projects that intend to have an impact on system and framework change, with a more complex structure and a longer period of implementation (at least 5 years), or
- To simplify the project structure, so that the expected impact is in the zone of direct service provision, while the projects could still tackle root causes of problems and changes of behaviors.

- Even though the project has influenced changes that reflect in improved institutions’ response to VAW/G, to sustain these changes to become permanent way of institutional response to VAW/G on operational and policy level, ongoing monitoring of institutional response and advocacy actions need to be continued. Also, the additional improvements are needed – both introduction of state-run services and/or state financing of the necessary comprehensive and individualized support services for VAW/G survivors (among the refugees and asylum-seekers).

- Licensing of services that Atina provides (Shelter, Reintegration Center), represents a crucial point for the development of programs, as well the possibility for sustainable funding by the government. However, programs should be continuously improved with the support of external experts, as well based on the feedback from beneficiaries that should be (as currently is) collected on a regular basis. In that way, Atina will be able to fully achieve its strategic orientation – to pilot innovative programs and strategies, build capacities of various national actors to implement and institutionalize such programs and strategies, provide expert support, and ensure beneficiaries’ participation throughout the implementation and monitor the implementation and recommend improvements, and start a new cycle of programs and strategies development.

Knowledge generation

- Through this project, different materials and products have been developed that tackle the issue of VAW/G. All project products could be shared and considered as relevant for further replication. With the resources specifically allocated for such purposes, CSOs worldwide should be additionally supported to engage in such practice – developing and sharing. Since the UNTF is a donor dedicated to and practically supporting exchange between the grantees and their participation in global processes, this approach could be shared (and advocated for) with the wider donor community in the future. Also, lessons learned from the project implementation during covid19 pandemic could be useful to share among grantees.

- All introduced practices would benefit from a scaling-up, first through detailed and structured description of the concepts, standardization of the best implementation practices, analysis of the effects of their implementation in different program phases, creation of guidelines and procedures for their implementation. Finally, documentation and wider presentation of the standardized practices could be organized, and the products shared with the professional and activist community.
Donor’s support for this specific purpose would be beneficial for Atina’s further growth, but also for the improvements of the national protection system (with the additional capacity building based on the fully conceptualized practices and rounded knowledge), and potentially – for other CSOs and protection systems (by wider distribution and additional contextualization of the generated knowledge).

- Although already being applied to the great extent and fully based on the extensive experience in participatory program conceptualization and project management, Atina’s learning approach, presented in the evaluation report, including the function of the group supervision within it, needs to be further elaborated (conceptualized/adapted based on the offered evaluators’ presented extrapolation), operationalized and completely integrated into the existing systems and operations. Besides, some of the functions of Atina’s learning approach (i.e., monitoring and documentation) also call for further development in terms of staff’s technical expertise and the clarification of the position of the function within the (learning) organizational system.

**Gender equality and human rights**

- As an organization perceived as a leader in the field of protection from VAW/G in the region, Atina could further develop its functions to support small, local women’s organizations and initiatives, both formal and informal and in that sense serve as a sort of empowering point and a nexus between initiatives and donors. Also, Atina should continue supporting and even set additional structures for the function of supporting feminists’ voices within the organization and within the Serbian society.
I. Context and description of the project

In order to assess the project *Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia* overall success against the set of project outcomes across three project pillars, Citizens' Association for Combating Trafficking of Human Beings and All Forms of Gender-based Violence – Atina initiated an external evaluation to reach conclusions about the projects’ effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, (road to) impact, sustainability, knowledge generation and gender equality and human rights standards applied and to provide recommendations to inform Atina’s future programming.

The project was funded by the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (UNTF) and implemented in Serbia by the Association Atina from 1 September 2018 to 30 November 2021. Ex-post external evaluation was also supported by the UNTF and implemented in the period 24 September 2021 to 28 February 2022.

Atina was founded in 2004 as a response of feminist activists in Serbia to the problem of human trafficking, and non-existence of adequate programs of long-term support for the women, victims of human trafficking and help in their social inclusion. From 2004, Atina has been actively engaged in direct assistance to women, girls and children, survivors of VAW/G, human trafficking and exploitation, prevention of VAW/G, policy analysis and monitoring, and public advocacy for improvement of the survivors’ position and gender equitable policies and practices. With its aim to support the transition process in Serbia towards development of society which will fully respect the rights of women and children, Atina stands for establishment of equal status of all members of society in public and private spheres, through identification of, and struggle against, gender-based marginalization, discrimination and violence, and provision of direct assistance and support in reintegration of victims of trafficking and sexual and labor exploitation.

1. Context of the project

The project *Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia*, reflects Atina's basic principles in assisting survivors of VAW/G, human trafficking, and exploitation – that all women in need for systematic and structured support should have access to all available services in Serbia, disregarding of their ethnic or legal status, as well as that age and gender-neutral mechanisms are destined to fail in the process of integration of refugee women and girls.

Despite the general actions by the state authorities in Serbia, initiated to eliminate VAW/G, at the time of project proposal development, there was still a lack of a systematic and effective response to the protection and support of refugee women and girls, including the lack of safe spaces, of long-term support programs, etc. Therefore, the project focused on the weak response of the system to eliminate the consequences and potential risks, and specifically on creating support programs for VAW/G survivors to make informed decisions and participate in decision-making.
processes regarding their future. Within its three pillars designed to: 1. Improve the access to information of refugee women and girls, 2. Improve their access to services, 3. Empower women and girls for active participation and leadership; Atina was implementing series of activities intended to strengthen the position of refugee and migrant women and girls in general, but especially the VAW/G survivors, to support them in overcoming the consequences of the violence experienced, to improve the skills of the professionals working in the field.

Being on the transit route between Turkey and Central and Western Europe, Serbia experienced a mass influx of refugees since the beginning of the so-called refugee crisis in 2015. As of March 2016, and the closure of the borders on the route, refugees were forced to stay in the transit countries, including Serbia.

At the time of project proposal development, there were 4,200 officially registered refugees and migrants residing in Serbia, out of which 95% were accommodated in one of the 18 reception and asylum centers, with the average duration of stay of 15 months. Women and children made up the majority (55%) of this population, while the dominant countries of their origin were Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq (83%). Many of the refugee women and girls have had experienced some form of violence or exploitation: family violence, forced and child marriage, forced prostitution, rape, sexual harassment, human trafficking (HT), physical assaults, threats of honor killings, revenge marriages, and survival sex (for food, shelter, protection). According to a 2017 survey implemented by the Association Atina, over 50% of refugee women stated that they experienced violence in their country of origin, 65% stated they survived violence while on the move, while 77% said they had witnessed violence against other women. The same research showed that the perpetrators were police officers and employers working in humanitarian response, members of the family, other refugees and migrants, traffickers, and smugglers, but also that the women survivors showed high tolerance on pain and violence, often did not recognize the violence they were suffering from, that certain violent acts were not even considered as an abuse, but rather as an acceptable practice.

Although state institutions authorized to prevent and prosecute violence against women and girls (VAW/G) in Serbia, at the time of project proposal development, had taken certain measures in order to protect refugee women and girls from violence and to decrease risks they were exposed to, such as legal provisions on distancing the perpetrators from victims, or the introduction of the related standard operational procedures, the refugee crisis induced new challenges to the local actors, which additionally incapacitated already fragile system. Basically, neither adequate systemic nor practical solution for addressing the violence against women and girls – refugees were introduced and/or operationalized at the time of project proposal development.

Furthermore, the project Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia was significantly influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic which deepened already profound gender gaps grounded in patriarchal structures and cultures and additionally worsened already fragile
position of the people from various marginalized and vulnerable groups, including women and girls - refugees.

Atina’s rapid assessment during the COVID-19 crisis and particularly, during the lockdown in Serbia, noted examples of drastic violations of human rights of the NGO’s project primary beneficiary group – women and girls within the refugee population in Serbia. According to the assessment from 2020, women and girls, victims of trafficking and violence were losing their jobs, they were deprived of the rights which were otherwise provided by the social protection system, including psychological and psychosocial support and even basic supplies within the state-run shelters, and at the same time, were expected to participate in the court proceedings, etc. Majority of women and girls who participated in the assessment reported the reactivation of the trauma they initially suffered from during the period of exploitation or other types of victimization. Refugee women and girls were deprived of any type of assistance provided by the civil society organizations, and the institutions specialized for providing residential care for women victims of violence/exploitation formally denied the rights to the services to the newly-referred beneficiaries.

2. Description of the project

2.1 Project synopsis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>NGO ATINA - Citizens' Association for Combating Trafficking of Human Beings and All Forms of Gender-based Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Initials</td>
<td>ATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Grant Award</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>1_21_18742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Duration</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date - actual</td>
<td>1 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date - planned</td>
<td>31 August 2021, 30 November 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-cost Extension Period</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area</td>
<td>Refugee Crisis Window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Level</td>
<td>Single Country Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Implementation</td>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-region of Implementation</td>
<td>Central and Southeastern Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Implementation</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grant Amount</td>
<td>$ 499,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution by Grantee</td>
<td>$ 584,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Budget</td>
<td>$ 1,084,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget Year 1</td>
<td>$ 172,282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget Year 2</td>
<td>$144,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget Year 3</td>
<td>$182,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure to date</td>
<td>$493,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>$5,882.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2. Forms of violence addressed by the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence in the Family</th>
<th>Intimate partner violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmful practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence in the Community</td>
<td>Trafficking in women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Perpetrated/Condoned by the State or at the State Level</td>
<td>Sexual and gender-based violence in refugee/internally displaced persons (IDPs) camps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3. Project beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Family Refuges/Internally displaced persons/asylum seekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000, 10-19 adolescents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120 young women, 20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120 women/girls victims of sexual exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,240 estimated total beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Members of civil society organizations (including NGOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social/welfare workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniformed personnel (i.e., police, military, peace-keeping officers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Number of Primary Beneficiaries</td>
<td>2,240 estimated total beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4. Key Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Institutions</th>
<th>Commissariat for Refugees and Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of the Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Labor, Employment, Social and Veteran Affairs and its institutions: Center for the Protection of Trafficking Victims, Department for Family and Child Care, Centers for social work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>(Not specified in the proposal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Agencies</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNFPA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Organizations</th>
<th>Catholic Relief Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2.5. UN Trust Fund strategic results areas addressed by the project

| Improved access for women and girls to essential, safe, and adequate multi-sectoral services to end VAW/G | Specialist support services are set up or improved to help women and girl survivors and those at risk. | Multi-sectoral services and/or systems are set up to improve provision of services to women and girl survivors or those at risk. | Women and girl survivors or those at risk are able to access services through improved ease of accessibility. | Cases of violence against women and girls are more effectively and/or often reported, investigated and/or prosecuted. |
### 2.6. Project theory of change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia have increased agency to respond and prevent VAWG by the end of the project</td>
<td>1.1. 2000 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia have information on their rights and increased knowledge on how to do self-advocacy by the end of the project</td>
<td>1.1.1. Two Atina’s mobile teams organize 36 workshops for 2000 refugee and asylum-seeking women girls in Serbia on women rights and available services for protection of VAW/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. 30 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia to gain skills to be economically empowered after each activity</td>
<td>1.1.2. Atina organizes 6 peer support groups of refugees and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia and facilitates 36 peer group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAWG have better access to support services by the end of the project</td>
<td>2.1. 240 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAWG have better access to support services by the end of the project</td>
<td>2.1.1: 90 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G supported through safe accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Good practices on access to services for refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAWG are shared among institutions/organizations and policy makers by the end of the project.</td>
<td>2.1.2: 240 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G supported through cultural mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia empowered for active participation and leadership for decision-making on the issues of the importance for the position of women and girls in their communities by the end of the project.</td>
<td>3.1. 30 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia gain skills and have the space to advocate for their rights after each activity</td>
<td>2.1.3: 240 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G supported through case management including referrals to community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.4: 42 trainings organized for 240 professionals from 48 institutions/organizations and 12 policy makers are trained to implement participatory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. 30 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia gain skills and have the space to advocate for their rights after each activity</td>
<td>2.2.1: Research with 5 case studies on access to services for refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia conducted by Atina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2: Printed Research disseminated among 100 institutions/organizations and policy makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3: Organization of public promotion of the Research and the final conference with 60 institutions/organizations and policy makers and refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 3.1.1: 12 workshops held for 30 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia to increase their communication and advocacy capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 3.1.2: 21 meetings with institutions organized with participation of 30 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia to develop and implement 6 joint actions to promote refugee integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope

The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the project processes and results achieved based on OECD-DAC+ evaluation criteria. The evaluation considered the whole project cycle by focusing on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and (the road to) impact of project activities organized around three outcome areas, and key learnings on approaches and experiences to inform future programming. Two additional criteria provided in the ToR – knowledge generation and gender equality and human rights were also considered as important aspects throughout the assessment and analysis and guided the evaluation process at the same time.

In addition, the evaluation is set to reflect on an additional layer of a (potential) meaning in the global struggle for full equality – principles of work of the implementing organization. As such, the evaluation determined the meaningfulness, degree of adherence to and the results and impacts of adherence to the grounding principles (and values) that drive Atina’s work.

Finally, it is intended to inform the implementers, the donor, and the involved stakeholders and to enable learning, and improvements in the design, planning and implementation of future actions, as well as to additionally empower and provide support to the primary beneficiaries.

1. Evaluation objectives and scope

The evaluation addresses 39 months of project implementation (from 1st September 2018 until 30th November 2021), the whole territory of Serbia, and particularly all areas/locations in which Atina’s primary beneficiaries had been residing in the period of evaluation implementation: Krnjača, Bosilegrad, Adaševci, and Belgrade, with the Atina’s safe accommodation and the Reintegration Center.

Evaluation considers attitudes and experiences of the key stakeholders: primary beneficiaries (adolescent, young and adult women refugees and VAW/G survivors), secondary beneficiaries (CSOs’ members, health professionals, social/welfare workers, uniformed personnel), broader range of stakeholders engaged in the prevention of and the protection from VAW/G, as well as the implementing organizations/agency - Atina’s team and UNTF Portfolio Manager.

In addition, the evaluation focuses on the existing evidence produced by the project, such as the narrative and financial reports, training evaluations, standards of work and described methodologies and approach to assistance to VAW/G survivors, capacity building, advocacy, peer

---

1 The information about the locations was received in the process of an initial orientation with the Atina’s staff, prior to the Inception report approval.
support, self- and group-advocacy, monitoring tools and documents, policy briefs, (shadow) reports, etc. COVID-19-related adaptations and related documentation are also considered, together with the Atina’s other relevant products developed to reflect organization’s general approach, that inevitably influenced project results and the organization’s position/credibility to act as a supporter/mediator/advocate for the improvements in the area of EVAW/G.

Finally, activities under the output 2.2, as well as short-term results achieved by its implementation, which were implemented by the end of November 2021, at the same time as the evaluation assessment, are also taken into consideration as directly observed.

Evaluation objectives are as follows:

- To evaluate the entire project against the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability, and impact criteria, as well as the cross-cutting gender equality and human rights criteria.
- To identify key lessons and promising or emerging good practices in the field of ending violence against women and girls, for learning purposes.

Apart from the objectives envisaged by the ToR, an additional evaluation objective is to assess the meaningfulness, the adherence to and results and impacts of adherence to Atina’s/project principles.

2. Description of evaluation team

The evaluation team consists of the two experts: Aleksandra Galonja, lead evaluation expert and Marijana Jović, youth and women’s participation expert. The lead expert was responsible for overall design of the evaluation methodology, the analysis and drafting evaluation report. The youth and women’s participation expert supported the lead expert in all stages of the evaluation and was primarily responsible for conducting interviews and ensuring adherence to the ethical standards and moreover, that all activities involving girls and women refugees had been actively promoting women’s/girls’ informed participation and agency. Both experts were engaged in extracting the lessons learnt from the project implementation and presenting it to the key stakeholder groups. The evaluation team was supported by cultural mediators and interpreters for Farsi, Urdu, Pashto, and Arabic languages.

Aleksandra Galonja, feminist evaluation expert, has more than 15-year experience in robust program development and management, organizational development and ex-ante and ex-post evaluation, qualitative and participatory research, development, and implementation of MEL frameworks. In addition, she has advanced knowledge about women’s rights, refugees’ rights, social justice policies and practices, as well as global and national migration policies and programs. Aleksandra is a feminist and activist.
Marijana Jović, participation expert, has more than 10-year experience in creating frameworks and supervising programs for youth and women’s participation and specifically, participation of the most vulnerable groups of youth and women – women with (mental) disability, women suffering from VAW/G, etc. She also has proven skills in organizing and implementing participatory research and community actions. Marijana is a feminist and activist.

Evaluation was organized and implemented with full technical and operational support of Atina’s Evaluation Task Manager, program manager and coordinators of different program components, as well as expert support from UNTF.
### III. Evaluation criteria and questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>A measure of the extent to which a project attains its objectives / results (as set out in the project document and results framework) in accordance with the theory of change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes, and outputs (project results) achieved and how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Has the project achieved results in accordance with the expected theory of change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To what extent has the project directly benefited primary and secondary beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What were the challenges/obstacles to achieving the expected results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What were the main factors influencing the outcomes of this project, either negatively or positively?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which the project is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group and the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do the achieved results (project goal, outcomes, and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Have the project design and choice of activities and deliverables properly reflected and addressed the needs of the beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. To what extent have the planned and actual activities and outputs of the project been consistent with the intended outcomes and impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Has the project been able to adjust to the changes in the context and needs of the primary beneficiaries that occurred during the implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. How has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced the activities, outputs, and outcomes of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which refers to whether the project was delivered cost effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent was the project efficiently and cost-effectively implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Were the results achieved on time and to budget? Were all activities organized efficiently and on time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. How was the difference between planned and actual expenditure justified (if any)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Have the human and financial resources been used in the best manner possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. To what extent the resources were used economically? How could the use of resources be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Has COVID-19 pandemic caused reduced efficiency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of a project are likely to continue after the project/funding ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent will the achieved results, especially any positive changes in the lives of women and girls (project goal level), be sustained after this project ends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project, including external and internal, such as Atina’s approach and practices (capacity building, participatory advocacy, Bagel shop, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. How is the stakeholders’ engagement likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated, or institutionalized after funding ceases?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Road to) Impact</td>
<td>17. How has the project, and especially adaptations to the pandemic, built-in resilience to future risks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the project contributed to ending violence against women, gender equality and/or women’s empowerment (both intended and unintended impact)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. What real difference/changes has the activity made to the lives of the primary stakeholders, how they perceive that change, and how many of them have been affected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. How has the access to necessary services for refugee and asylum-seeking women been improved by the project? How was their agency improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced (potential) project impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. How did the project impact and improve the operation of the institutions involved in the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge generation</th>
<th>To what extent has the project generated knowledge, promising or emerging practices in the field of EVAW/G that should be documented and shared with other practitioners.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Was any knowledge generated which could be further used in work with other vulnerable groups or with other institutions in the protection and support system? What is the new, innovative knowledge that the project has generated, that builds on evidence from other projects, and/or has potential for replication or scale up in future projects, or different contexts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. What are the lessons learned from the pandemic, and how can they be utilized for knowledge-generation and future practices?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Equality and Human Rights</th>
<th>To what extent human rights based and gender responsive approaches have been/were mainstreamed/incorporated into the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. To what extent was a human rights-based approach and gender equality incorporated in the design and implementation of the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. How responsive has the project implementation been to gender and human rights issues emerging during the course of the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Principles</th>
<th>How have organizational (Atina’s) principles been affecting processes within and the effects of the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. How meaningful have Atina’s principles been to the relevant stakeholder groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. To what extent has the project been adherent to Atina’s principles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. What are the results (and to some extent the impact) of the adherence to the principles?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As envisaged by the ToR in the section operationalizing gender equality and human rights questions, gender/intersectionality is integrated into all aspects of the evaluation, including gender sensitive data collection and presentation.*
IV. Evaluation methodology

1. Evaluation design and methodology

1.1 Overall evaluation design

The evaluation methodology and approach are developed considering the evaluation purpose and objectives as defined in the ToR, as well as the standards defined in the UN Trust Fund Guidelines for Final External Project Evaluation.

The final evaluation utilizes a mix of methods, combining secondary data review and primary data collection, with a post-test without comparison group modality, commonly used in the ex-post evaluations for which it is not ethically and/or logistically feasible to randomize. The case study is used in the analysis to allow for deeper insights into the processes and achievements of the project per each evaluation criterion and triangulating qualitative and quantitative (to some extent) data gathered from different primary beneficiary sub-groups, other involved stakeholders (secondary beneficiary group), Atina’s staff, wider network of actors, as well as secondary data relevant for contextualizing gathered information. Also, direct observation of the activity(ies) that had been implemented at the same time as the evaluation assessment provides for a richer insight into the practices, processes and the effects of the project, especially in its strive to promote beneficiaries’ participation and agency. To complement observation notes and reports, evaluators’ diaries are used to present another layer of meaning and create additional reference points for the contextualization of evaluation findings. Finally, additional action aimed at validation of findings was implemented in a form of ongoing consultations with the Atina’s staff.
frameworks – the Feminist Evaluation\(^2\), Utilization-Focused Evaluation\(^3\), and Principle-Focused Evaluation\(^4\), at the same time benefiting from standards and practices of the OECD-DAC normative framework, as envisaged in the ToR. To that end, projects’ effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, (road to) impact, and sustainability, as well as proposed additional (cross-cutting) criteria – knowledge generation and gender and human rights – are main components that were assessed. As presented in the previous section, additional criteria – organizational principles – consistent with the principle-focused evaluation practices and the feminist approach to evaluation, is incorporated into the evaluation design.

In addition, evaluators’ extensive experience in Theory of Change design and robust MEL systems’ development is utilized to provide for additional learning and development.

The overall approach to the evaluation is characterized by the following quality assurance and ethical standards:

- A focus on ensuring a good understanding of the socio-political context in which the project was implemented, through the careful selection of the respondents, prior analysis of relevant documents, etc.;
- Highest possible degree of *integrity*, ensured through a transparent methodology and triangulation of facts and opinions;
- A participatory approach through which the evaluator aims to involve and consult with the representatives of all stakeholder/target groups, regardless of their age, gender, sexual orientation, and other characteristics, and gather the inputs in all evaluation phases – from the tools’ development, through data collection, to the report finalization and presentation of the results;
- A utility-focus through which consideration is paid to ensure that the evaluation is of direct value to all relevant stakeholders. Efforts were made to ensure that all communication relating to the evaluation was characterized by clarity, brevity, and the avoidance of unnecessary technical language.

Grounding tenets of the feminist evaluation approach, as framed by the Donna Podems\(^5\) are particularly considered through the evaluation process:


• Acknowledging and taking into account that evaluation is a political activity; evaluator’s personal experiences, perspectives, and characteristics come from and lead to a particular political stance;
• Contextualizing evaluation because knowledge is culturally, socially and temporally contingent;
• Generating and using knowledge as a powerful resource that serves an explicit or implicit purpose;
• Respecting multiple ways of knowing;
• Being cognizant that research methods, institutions and practices are social constructs;
• Framing gender inequities as one manifestation of social injustice. Discrimination cuts across race, class, and culture and is inextricably linked to all three;
• Examining how discrimination based on gender is systematic and structural;
• Acting on opportunities to create, advocate and support change, which are considered to be morally and ethically appropriate responses of an engaged feminist evaluator.

Application of these principles also implies that all the actions throughout the evaluation had or aimed to have additionally empowering effects to (re)balance of power within each structure involved. Approval of the evaluation report will also be followed by the additional evaluator’s initiatives aimed at presenting results to all involved stakeholders, interpretation of the results and (pro)active promotion of the lessons learned through the evaluation and project implementation process.

Apart from implementing actions aimed at supporting further development of Atina’s managerial and monitoring practices, through providing detail guidelines for structuring, documenting and presenting documentation from the project implementation, while making it available across the organization, and through proposing additional methods for data collection, sets of indicators and discussing the place of monitoring in organization’s and program management; evaluators have been dedicated to providing additional value for the primary beneficiaries who had been actively involved in Atina’s work and evaluation assessment. A summary of the conclusions from the latter process is available as Annex I to the evaluation report.

1.2 Data sources

Following data sources informed the final evaluation:
• Project documents, including project proposal, progress and annual narrative and financial reports, correspondence with the Portfolio Manager, monitoring reports, activity reports with methodologies and evaluations, etc. (list of documents is available in the Annex F);
• Primary data collected during the project (material collected for the MEL purposes, minutes from the meetings, individual plans of services, economic empowerment plans, etc.;
• Other relevant documents and products developed by Atina within the same and/or compatible program components;
• Contextually and politically relevant publications, research, legislative and strategic documents, including institutions’ and CSOs’ reports;
• Workshops/meetings with the Atina’s project team;
• Interviews/workshops with representatives of primary beneficiary group;
• Interviews with representatives of secondary beneficiary group;
• Interviews with other stakeholders relevant for contextualizing project results.

1.3 Data collection and analysis

Data collection and analysis process started with the orientation sessions/workshops organized online with Atina’s project/program team and an initial desk review of the documents provided. In the next evaluation phase, all relevant documents and materials were analyzed employing elements of a content analysis to structure data in an adequate and purposeful way and clear-out the evaluation focus. **Desk review and content analysis** is used for collecting/analyzing other relevant documents throughout the course of evaluation – international standards in the area of women and girls' refugees’ protection from violence and exploitation, national normative and regulatory standards/documents, best international practices in this area, but also for project implementation documents and other material considered relevant by other involved stakeholders.

To answer evaluation questions in the effectiveness, relevance, and knowledge generation domains, and to stay truth to its feminist basis, the evaluation also analyzed **project theory of change**, both utilizing recommendations provided by the evaluation theoreticians\(^6\) and consulting Atina’s team and beneficiaries and proposing improvements and adaptations for future use.

Primary data is collected using:
• Semi-structured online interviews with the key informants including Atina’s project/program team (10 professionals), Project Portfolio Manager (1), policy makers who had been targeted by the women refugees in their advocacy actions (8), key informants from CSOs and international organizations (10), institutions (health, social protection, uniformed personnel (4);
• Two (2) online focus group interviews with the stakeholders targeted by Atina’s capacity building group of activities: representatives of national and international CSOs (9), social welfare system, health institutions from the whole territory of Serbia (6);
• Follow up online interviews with Atina’s staff to validate conclusions from the desk review and focus group interviews (6 interviews with three program coordinators);
• (Empowering) focus group interviews/workshops with the representatives of a primary beneficiary group – beneficiaries of Atina’s pillar 1 project actions aimed at improving

women’ and girls access to information, accommodated in two asylum centers in Serbia (2 workshops/focus group interviews with 8 girls (age 18 and 19) – 4 accommodated in Krnjača and 4 accommodated in Bosilegrad, 3 workshops/focus group interviews with women and young women accommodated in Adaševci (4), Krnjača (6) and Bosilegrad (8) – 1 workshop/focus group per asylum center);
- Semi-structured in-depth interviews with the women and girls - refugees, survivors of VAW/G, beneficiaries of Atina’s pillar 2 project actions aimed at improving women’s and girl’s – refugees’ access to services (5 interviewees with women accommodated in the Atina’s safe accommodation and beneficiaries of Reintegration Center’s services and 4 online interviewees with ex beneficiaries who live in the EU countries);
- Semi-structured interviews with the refugee women participating in Atina’s pillar 3 actions aimed at empowering women and girls – refugees for active participation and leadership (5 women);
- Observation of the processes and the results emerged from the final round of project activities, primarily – an online conference that gathered 109 participants from all beneficiary groups, as well as other relevant stakeholders. Observation provided for a reflection on the level of primary beneficiaries’ participation in all stages of the activity implementation, and the roles they play in regular organizations’ functioning, but also, in promoting and advocating for the improvements in the area of refugee women protection;
- Evaluator’s diaries, which provided insights into the evaluation lens as an integral key for full understanding and interpretation of the evaluation findings.

Due to the complexity of the implementing organization’s approach and the comprehensiveness of a project/program intervention, respondents from the primary beneficiary group – girls and women refugees have been participating in either one, several or even all interventions (project activities). Therefore, the instruments were developed to allow for optimal reflection on Atina’s general approach reflected in the project interventions. Additional questions and probing provided the opportunity for capturing positive deviance and unique experiences, which showed to be a solid base for further learning.

Data analysis is exercised according to established benchmarks against the set indicators, using a combination of a deductive thematic coding and narrative analysis, so to allow for stratification of the data according to OECD-DAC criterion, the respondent group, as well as gender and/or another relevant respondent’s characteristic. Data obtained from the primary beneficiaries is analyzed using interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA), designed to assist in deeper understanding of personal experiences of the beneficiaries and is fully subject centered.

It is important to note that all the data obtained from the primary beneficiaries, either from Atina’s documents (e.g., individual plans of services), or from the interviews, is anonymized according to ethical protocols with respect to confidentiality, anonymity, and privacy. In addition, to respect the confidentiality and anonymity standards, the list of respondents (with the
anonymized data on the primary beneficiaries) is shared with Atina with the internal evaluation matrix created to allow for easier communication and better coordination of all evaluation activities and interventions.

1.4 Sample and sampling design

The sample is purposive and includes several categories of respondents:
- representatives of implementing organization(s), employees that have been directly involved in project implementation or have significant links with the project
- representatives of a primary beneficiary group(s) – from each age stratum targeted by the project, participating in each project pillar (a. Access to information, b. Access to services, c. Empowering for active participation and leadership)
- representatives of a secondary beneficiary group, including representatives of all targeted sectors: local CSOs, international organizations, law enforcement, health, and social protection system, participating in the pillar 2 activities
- representatives of policy making structures and the institutions/organizations that had been participating in the pillar 3 activities
- representatives of wider stakeholder groups relevant for understanding deeper culture and political framework, together with the primary and secondary beneficiaries, participants in the final conference.

Respondents were selected based on the available project reports and with the Atina’s team active participation, taking into account additional factors:
- The very nature of a migration phenomenon and specifically, high fluctuation of the project’s primary target group – women and girls – refugees
- Discretion enjoyed by institutions mandated with managing asylum/reception centers, but also managing process of authorization for participation in public actions/research (for the institutions’ representatives)
- Availability of technology which was used for online surveying

The sample is presented in detail in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atina’s team</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee women and girls – adolescent girls (10-19) accommodated in Krnjača and Bosilegrad</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee women and girls – young women (20-24) accommodated in Adaševci, Krnjača, Bosilegrad, Atina’s safe accommodation, beneficiaries of</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All respondents from primer beneficiary group are female (cis and trans). Atina’s program team has 1 male team member, while the percentage of female respondents in the secondary beneficiary respondent group (social welfare system representatives, CSOs and international organizations representatives, health workers, uniformed personnel, policy making structures’ representatives) is 91%.

1.5 Limitations of the methodology

As already mentioned, some of the key limitations are related to the sampling process which was dictated by the very nature of the phenomenon that was addressed by the project. Namely, since the primer beneficiary group consists of women and girls ‘on the move’ and since the vast majority does not plan/want to stay in Serbia longer than necessary, it was not possible to target or reach a higher and/or more relevant sample of population assisted by the Atina from 2018. Furthermore, the majority of the ex-beneficiaries’ current whereabouts were unknown and thus, they also could not be reached. In addition, rules, and standards of work, as well as discretion enjoyed by the institutions accommodating refugees in Serbia conditioned full dependence on the implementing organization in reaching out to the primer beneficiaries, which potentially could have created bias in respondents’ selection. However, evaluators were able to reduce the bias by additionally discussing the issue of beneficiaries’ selection with Atina’s field workers and even reaching out to interested women in the asylum/reception centers using snowballing method in the field.

Another limitation is related to COVID-19 pandemic and a partial switch to online working mode, which included conducting online interviews with the secondary beneficiary group. However, adequate, and widely accessible communication tools were used (Zoom platform, Skype, telephone), and the respondents were additionally supported to use them by the evaluators and the implementing organizations. More information about the safety and ethical protocols for online interviewing and COVID-19-related measures are available in the next section of the evaluation report. The switch to the online working mode was particularly limiting for the
observation of the final conference, but the arrangement to organize participation/observation with one group of primary beneficiaries (7 beneficiaries) in Atina’s Reintegration Center, helped in mitigating this challenge.

Due to intrinsic limitations of the qualitative research/methodologies, additional efforts were invested in a triangulation use of contradictory evidence and already available quantitative data. Also, participation of various stakeholders with diverse backgrounds and experience, as well as detailed analysis of the monitoring reports and other data collected to verify the intervention logic, were used as a way of quality assurance. However, due to the specific construction of the project management instruments and lack of reliable project-based baseline data, most relevant data was obtained from Atina’s research practice, and the monitoring, evaluation, and learning system, and some missing information (baseline data, target values per indicators) were carefully reconstructed in close collaboration with the Atina’s staff tasked with related areas, which provided the opportunity for an additional support.
V. **Safety and ethical considerations**

The evaluation is conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation”. Therefore, all ethical principles and standards related to working with children, youth and women were respected, including feminist principles of working with survivors of VAW/g, human trafficking, and sexual exploitation.

The protocols and instruments that used in this work are based on the following principles:

- **Voluntary participation** in the evaluation process and **informed consent**. All participants in the evaluation process received the necessary information on the evaluation methodology (duration of the process, key activities, and use of evaluation findings), their personal role in the following process (adapted to each target group individually) and the ethical principles on which this evaluation is based. Subsequently, they had the opportunity to decide on participation in the process and to sign the consent form. Although prepared in the inception phase of the evaluation, instruments, and standards for work with children and young people involved in the process were not used, as all respondents were older than 18. However, instruments are available in the Annex D of the evaluation report.

- **Anonymity and confidentiality** of data collected in the evaluation process. Due to its importance and the possibility that non-compliance with this principle is reflected in the evaluation findings, special attention is paid to these principles. This is especially true for the primary beneficiaries of the project. The principles of anonymity and confidentiality imply the collection of data without the possibility to connect the obtained answers with specific persons. Instead of personal information, distribution of the respondents from the primary beneficiary groups per type of accommodation is presented, to fully protect their anonymity. Information on the principles had been given orally to all participants and were presented in the introductory text of the consent forms. In relation to communication with users that requires the participation of interpreters / cultural mediators, interpreters / cultural mediators first attended the initial meeting to establish a basic trust among the team members (evaluators and interpreters) and to explain all the roles in detail.

- **Impartiality** from the process of participation in the evaluation means that the respondents do/did not have any additional/personal interest in participating in the evaluation, as well as that they did not have any consequences after the participation. The role of the evaluator was to confirm her independence in the mentioned process through the introduction at the very beginning of each interview.
• **Cultural sensitivity.** During the implementation of evaluation activities, interviews with the primary beneficiaries were held in familiar spaces in which they felt relaxed, and which reflected their way of life as much as possible. The interviewees were conducted in the beneficiaries’ language(s) with the support from cultural mediators and translators.

• **Participation** in the process of preparation and implementation of the evaluation process and an active role in the analysis of the obtained results and the ability to influence the final course and outcome of the evaluation. This principle implies the adaptability of work during the evaluation process, to increase the level of participation of primary beneficiaries.

• **Meaningful participation.** This principle implies mutual empowerment as an additional product of communication during the evaluation process. Trained evaluators who base their work on a feminist approach and have experience in communicating with VAW/G survivors adjusted their approach, manner of communication and work dynamics and were constantly aware of the participants’ needs. This principle was particularly important and operationalized during the evaluation activities conducted with employees and primary beneficiaries.

• **Do no harm** – a key principle derived from the various protocols on the protection and safety of evaluation participants, applies to both respondents and the team conducting the evaluation process. For each potential risk-situation, the principle was specifically operationalized to prevent the exposure to potential risks. This principle simultaneously includes a physically and emotionally safe environment. Viewed in this way, ‘do no harm’ principle is also based on the feminist ethic of care, which implies care for oneself and care for others. In relation to this principle, the procedures for entering institutions or collective accommodation facilities were both followed and shared with all participants in a timely manner, in accordance with the valid epidemiological measures related to covid-19 pandemic.

• **Emotional gain** is one of the key principles resulting from the feminist approach to the evaluation process. It means that the participants in the process benefit more from participating in the evaluation process compared to the potential challenges they are exposed to. The practical implementation of the principle is based on a respectful approach nurtured by evaluators trained to work with specific, multi-sensitive target groups. It also indicates preparing a set of safety measures, including support persons, and informing participants about the measures in advance.

• **Additional empowerment** – a principle that is reflected in the general approach to interviewing and communication with the primary beneficiaries throughout the evaluation process. Viewed through the prism of a feminist approach, empowerment also implies expression of evaluators’ clear view of the experience, violence, and discrimination that
women experienced. It also entails support to women in focusing on their own strengths, and provision of additional information relevant for their wellbeing.

All relevant protocols and forms are available in the Annex D of the evaluation report.

Finally, to ensure safe and ethical online data collection evaluation used guidelines for internet-mediated research, to ensure user-specific authentication, real-time encryption of meetings, and saving the backup recordings to online remote server networks or local drives without recourse to third-party software. To provide safe online space and to follow ethical methods evaluation used the following measures:

- Setting a password for each individual meeting;
- Allowing only signed-in users to participate in the meetings;
- Preventing others to join a meeting before the host;
- "Locking" the meeting as soon as every expected participant arrived;
- Disabling share screen options for the participants;
- Choosing a randomly generated ID for meetings;
- Using the Waiting Room feature as a way to screen participants before they enter a meeting;
- Disabling the file-sharing feature of meetings.

Taking into consideration the possible technical difficulties that can occur, especially when using Zoom in the areas with the low Internet bandwidth, outdated hardware, or limited webcam and/or microphone functionality, evaluators provided the participants with all necessary technical support. To provide for a safe online space and to follow ethical methods evaluators also:

- Provided participants with the consent form and relevant information ahead of time;
- Reviewed the consent information orally with the participants before starting the interviews;
- Asked participants specifically whether they had any questions about the online aspect of the evaluation and answered them;
- Confirmed that participants give permission to record the interviews;
- Reminded participants throughout the evaluation, at the start of each subsequent interview, about the consent information, provided them with opportunities to ask questions, and reaffirmed their willingness to continue the process.

Additional COVID-19-related protocols had been implemented in all cases of direct contact with respondents. The evaluation was conducted following World Health Organization and Institute for Public Health “Dr Milan Jovanovic Batut” measures for prevention of spreading of COVID-19:

- Provide the participants with the clear instruction in regard to the measures for prevention of spreading of COVID-19;
• Secure maintaining at a safe distance from each others (at least 1 meter);
• Secure wearing of a mask in public and indoors;
• Choose open, well-ventilated spaces over closed ones. Open a window indoors;
• Provide masks and hand sanitizers based on 70% alcohol;
• Provide refreshments during the meeting in original packages.
VI. Evaluation Findings

1. Effectiveness

Within the effectiveness dimension, it was assessed to what extent short and medium-term changes (project results) were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, considering their relative importance. The following aspects were considered: level of achievement of the planned targets, main factors influencing the outcomes of this project, either negatively or positively, medium-term benefits produced by the project for primary and secondary beneficiaries, the relevance of the theory of change for the relative project effectiveness, and the challenges/obstacles to achieving the expected results.

Project effectiveness is evaluated based on project progress reports, monitoring data, internal evaluation data, such as beneficiaries’ evaluation statistical overviews and reports, as well as based on the interviews with the key project stakeholders. Initial points for the analysis are the evidence provided against the proposed theory of change – comparison between reported achieved and target values per each projected indicator.

*Level of results’ achievement with the benefits for the main target groups*

*EQ 1:* Has the project achieved results in accordance with the expected theory of change?
*EQ 2:* To what extent has the project directly benefited primary and secondary beneficiaries?
The project was highly effective with most of the results exceeding planned targets. Atina managed to create, plan, and implement new and/or adapted and improved approaches and strategies by employing its full organizational-, instead of initially planned project-capacity and delivered results which had been in its zone of proximal development in the initial proposal planning period and thus, achieved project results even beyond the proposed theory of change. However, the MEL system needs further elaborations and support, to allow for better monitoring and understanding of the results in the future.

The project significantly benefited both beneficiary groups. Depending on the program and activities in which primary beneficiary had been participating in, they gained relevant knowledge about the topics covered on the workshops and peer support groups meetings, skills to act and react in the situations of crisis and/or violence in general, as well as capacities for engagement in the peer support processes, self-advocacy and finally – public advocacy. Beneficiaries felt safer and better protected against VAW/G and valued significantly all provided services.

Professionals in the field gained practical knowledge and skills and made necessary connections within the sector. Yet evaluation recognized the need for additional set of activities enabling women beneficiaries to effectively transfer the knowledge and know-how to their families and partners, but also activities targeting and involving men into the gender equality struggle.

Project managed to achieve or even exceed almost all initially proposed targets, by:

- Reaching primary and secondary beneficiaries – women/girls – refugees and asylum seekers, women/girls refugees/asylum seekers trafficking and sexual exploitation survivors (100%, 111%, and 137% of the target respectively), and representatives of CSOs and social workers (162%, 118%, and 88% of the target respectively). Numbers of the target vs. reached primary and secondary beneficiaries are presented in the tables 1a (primary) and 1b (secondary).

- Achieving beyond planned targets for most of the goal, outcomes, and output indicators. Achieved results are presented in table 1.

The target group which was underrepresented was uniformed personnel due to their strict procedures and relatively lower capacities to participate in the online events (due to the COVID-19-related restrictions, all capacity building events were organized online).
**Table 1a: Primary beneficiaries reached by the project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary beneficiaries</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Achieved annually</th>
<th>Achieved total</th>
<th>% target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>Y3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female refugees/asylum seekers</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Adult women (25-59)</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young women (20-24)</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescent girls 10-19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/girls victims of trafficking</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Adult women (25-59)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young women (20-24)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescent girls 10-19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/girls victims of sexual exploitation</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Adult women (25-59)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young women (20-24)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescent girls 10-19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1b: Secondary beneficiaries reached by the project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary beneficiaries</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved annually</th>
<th>Achieved total</th>
<th>% target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations (including NGOs)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81 (68 female, 13 male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/welfare workers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118 (85 female, 33 male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformed personnel (police, asylum authorities)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44 (21 female, 23 male)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the only output indicator target that was not achieved was a number of individual plans of services (85% of the target achieved – 204 instead of 240 plans were developed within the course of the project). The latter can be explained by three main reasons: a) a number of beneficiaries stay in the assistance program for a very short period of time which is not sufficient for the creation of a comprehensive assistance program reflected in the individual plan of service, b) some of the individual plans of services cover more than one beneficiary (i.e. plans for beneficiaries with children age 0-3), c) some beneficiaries are referred to Atina's comprehensive assistance program for a simple intervention and/or isolated activity.

**Table 2: Achieved project results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Indicators*</th>
<th>Targets*</th>
<th>Achieved total</th>
<th>% target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia are safer and better protected against VAW/G, especially VAW/G survivors</td>
<td>Number of supported refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls throughout the project activities</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of women and girls that feel safer and better protected</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>118%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perspective of women and girls on their safety and protection (% of</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
beneficiaries that can name at least 3 relevant (re)actions to violence, including reporting/relevant institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>% target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC 1. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia have increased agency to respond and prevent VAWG by the end of the project</td>
<td>OCI 1.1. Percentage of refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls WHO FEEL empowered to make informed decisions</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCI 1.2. Number of refugee and asylum-seeking women who report to have gained skills through economic empowerment vocational trainings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC 2. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia have increased agency to respond and prevent VAWG by the end of the project</td>
<td>OCI 2.1. Number of refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls provided with support services who report satisfaction in quality of service received from project</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCI 2.2. Percentage of women and girls who find provided shelter adequate and safe</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC 3. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia have increased agency to respond and prevent VAWG by the end of the project</td>
<td>OCI 3.1. Number of advocacy actions initiated by refugee women and girls who have been part of the project.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCI 3.2. Percentage of women and girls who feel empowered for advocacy after participating in project activities.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>% target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OP 1.1. 2000 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia have information on their rights and increased knowledge on how to do self-advocacy by the end of the project</td>
<td>OPI 1.1.1. Number of refugee and asylum-seeking women informed on the available services</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 1.1.2. Level of knowledge of women and girls regarding available services for protection of VAW/G (% increase)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>143%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 1.1.3. Percentage of women and girls who have better understanding of their rights</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP 1.2. 30 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia to gain skills to be economically</td>
<td>OPI 1.2.1. Number of women skilled through economic empowerment practices</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 1.2.2. Level of skills and knowledge gained (% increase)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>173%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
empowered after each activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OP 2.1</th>
<th>240 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G have better access to support services by the end of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPI 2.1.1</td>
<td>Number of individual plans of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI 2.1.2</td>
<td>Number of professionals trained for provision of participatory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI 2.1.3</td>
<td>Level of knowledge of professionals regarding participatory services increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OP 2.2</th>
<th>Good practices on access to services for refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G are shared among institutions/organizations and policy makers by the end of the project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPI 2.2.1</td>
<td>Number of publication copies disseminated to relevant professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI 2.2.2</td>
<td>Number of representatives of institutions, organizations and policy makers attending the conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI 2.2.3</td>
<td>Number of representatives of institutions at promotional round table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OP 3.1</th>
<th>30 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia gain skills and have the space to advocate for their rights after each activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPI 3.1.1</td>
<td>Number of refugee women and girls attending the meetings and workshops for taking the active role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI 3.1.2</td>
<td>Number of meetings with refugee women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI 3.1.3</td>
<td>Percentage of women and girls project participants who feel that they have access to space that can allow them to advocate for their rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Target values that were not set in the proposal development/adaptation period are formulated with the project team during the evaluation process. In addition, indicators that were not precisely defined and described in the initial result framework matrix were additionally discussed with the Atina’s program team and presented to better reflect Atina’s MEL system.

“Atina was the best thing that ever happened to me! If it wasn’t for them, I would never be the person I am today – from a victim of a family violence who was afraid of her own shadow, I’m fully independent now.”

Ex-beneficiary from Afghanistan, currently living in Sweden, a final year psychology student

To achieve a project goal - *Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia are safer and better protected against VAW/G, especially VAW/G survivors* – Atina conceptualized an action around three preconditions for improved protection from and prevention of VAW/G and the outcome areas:
• Access to information (about the women’s human rights and the ways to exercise them in Serbia/Europe)
• Access to services (for the protection against VAW/G)
• Empowerment for (proactive) participation and leadership

These central elements of the project’s theory of change can be at the same time seen as the main anchors of enhanced women’s (and women refugees’) agency and as such will be further elaborated in the Impact section of the evaluation report.

As presented in the Table 2 and based on the UNTF-approved goal indicators, Atina managed to reach out to 2002 primer beneficiaries (as planned), women and girls – refugees and asylum seekers in Serbia throughout the project implementation, which was 96.4% of all registered women refugees and asylum seekers in Serbia in the given period (1 September 2018 to 30 November 2021)⁷ (See table 1a). Such coverage could be considered as one of the preconditions for the effectiveness. Namely, the vast majority of interviewed stakeholders from all stakeholder groups state that Atina is the only women’s/feminist organization active in this field (some of the respondents referred to the ‘field’ as a ‘migration policy area’, some referred to it as a ‘women refugees’ protection’, some as ‘protection against GBV’) and that fact makes Atina’s interventions both unique and essential and the high coverage a precondition for improved protection of the rights of women and girls refugees, especially protection against VAW/G.

Furthermore, 94% of all beneficiaries participating in safe accommodation and a comprehensive service for survivors of VAW/G (denominator: 260) felt safer and better protected against VAW/G, based on Atina’s report from the direct assistance program enter and exit survey. The percentage of women and girls – refugees and asylum seekers who gained relevant knowledge about the mechanism(s) for the protection against VAW/G in Serbia is similarly high – 92% of all women and girls who participated in the workshops organized in the asylum and reception centers in Serbia (denominator: 2002) managed to name at least three different (re)actions to violence, that they were learning about during the workshops. Based on the Atina’s workshops evaluation report,

“We have been supporting organizations to implement gender-responsive actions and/or to mainstream gender within their approaches. However, Atina’s perspective is completely unique within our sub-sector – women are their absolute priority, and it makes all the difference. They are always here to ask questions and advocate for women’s rights, so that these rights cannot be overlooked or deprioritized.”

Respondent from an international organization

⁷ Based on the statistical overviews for 2018, 2019, and 2020 provided by the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia, available at: https://kirs.gov.rs/lat/migracije/migracioni-profil-republike-srbije and monthly overviews provided by the UNHCR, available at: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations, 2076 women entered asylum procedure/were registered/expressed the intention to submit asylum application in Serbia in the period 1 September 2018 to 30 November 2021.
distribution of the answers to an open-ended question is as follows: report the violence to Atina (62%), tell other woman from the center (58%), report it to any CSO present it the center (49%), report it to asylum center authorities (36%), report it to the police (28%), other relevant answers (71%).

All interviewed beneficiaries recognize Atina’s efforts in providing them with the safe environment for the exchange with other women, understanding European culture and customs, learning about their rights and how to take responsibility for their lives, and more importantly – specific support and a network for protection against VAW/G. However, depending on the length of their stay in Serbia, level of the effects varies. For most women and girls – refugees who have had been or currently reside in Serbia, Serbia actually is not an envisioned country of final destination but is still rather perceived as a transit country. At the same time, the structure of beneficiaries has been changing constantly, with the new women and girls entering the program and some of them leaving it (both willingly, as the need for support ceased to exist, or due to other circumstances, such as voluntary or involuntary leaving the territory of Serbia). As a reflection of these conditions, there was an obvious difference in perception of Atina’s activities’ effectiveness/self-perception of safety and strength between the four groups of beneficiaries (post-differentiated for the analytical purposes to the groups 0-3 months in the program, 3-6, more than 6, and more than 6 in the comprehensive assistance program), where the level of self-perceived safety, strength/power significantly rises with the time spent in the Atina’s program. However, even the beneficiaries who participated in one or two workshops organized in one of the asylum/reception centers covered by the evaluation, recognized the importance of participating in the activities that target only women and provide relevant information and support.
In such a challenging circumstance, Atina managed to create a very flexible, yet comprehensive and scalable program structure, so as to produce effects for all participants, whether they benefit from one or two workshops, or from a multi-year complex support scheme (for the violence survivors).

In addition, integral to Atina’s overall approach is to maximize the effects through the creation of more sustainable solutions for the protection of women and girls – victims of VAW/G (also within the population of refugees) – by transferring the know-how to all relevant actors mandated and/or engaged in the protection field, standardizing successful practices and models, and finally, promoting and advocating for the policy advancements. Although not formulated as such in the project result chain, a deeper level of a structural change produced by described approach has been recognized in the evaluation process and will be further elaborated in the Impact section of the evaluation report.

In relation to the previous conclusion about the Atina’s capacity to offer comprehensive and well-rounded programmatic solutions even in challenging situations, evaluation concluded that the proposed intervention logic/theory of change provided for notable short- and mid-term effects, and moreover, Atina’s reach beyond the proposed ToC allowed for a significant contribution to the long-term structural changes on the level of the organizational culture (of the targeted institutions) and the policy level. That being said, it was also noted that the MEL system, structure, and instruments, including proposed and adapted indicators, need further elaborations and support, so as to provide for Atina’s further development into a learning organization. However, in the context of a project evaluation, Atina’s approach to MEL cannot be fully distinguished from the UNTF’s approach to MEL, since the tools used to measure project progress and effects are the ones initially provided through the UNTF-funded scheme.

Since the evaluation methodology envisioned additional capacity building, both with the project beneficiaries and with the implementing organization, during the evaluation process, Atina’s programs’ (direct assistance, economic empowerment, peer support and advocacy, and policy) coordinators were advised on possible advancement of their monitoring mechanisms and processes. More details and recommendations for MEL improvements are available in the Annex H of the report.

It was crucial for me that someone believed in me in the moments when I myself did not believe that I had the capacity to get out of certain situations, and I received that kind of support from Atina. I feel safer now because I know that there is a place where I can turn for help and support if needed. But I can also count on myself!

Beneficiary of the comprehensive support program, survivor of a partner violence
First project outcome - Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia have increased agency to respond and prevent VAWG by the end of the project – with its related outputs, was fully achieved, based on the reported results per indicators. Since the indicator OCI 1.1. cannot be considered fully relevant for measuring related achievements, all three goal indicators’ achievements, as well as related outputs data and reports, and the evaluation findings, attest to this outcome achievement.

Within this project component and related to the output 1.1 Atina’s mobile teams implemented 261 workshops (instead of initially planned 36), additional 22 online workshops during the period of the asylum and reception centers’ close-down due to the COVID-19-related restrictions, as well as 36 peer support groups meetings for and with 2002 women and girls – refugees and asylum seekers in the asylum centers in Krnjača (Belgrade), Bogovađa (Lajkovac) and Banja Koviljača (Loznica), as well as in the reception centers in Preševo, Bujanovac, Bosilegrad and Vranje (Southern Serbia), and Šid (Vojvodina, Northern Serbia).

Following topics were covered on the workshops and peer support meetings: key things about Europe (you did not know about), prejudices and stereotypes, women’s rights, mechanisms for the protection of women’s rights, VAW/G and protection measures in place, trafficking in human beings – risks and protection mechanisms, cultural norms – similarities and differences, gender roles, reproductive rights and reproductive health, human rights and activism, marital relations and rights, parenting and active fatherhood, etc. Additional sets of workshops were organized to support women and girls in organizing mutual support (groups and activities), self-advocacy and public advocacy. Average rates per topic covered and other internally evaluated workshops’ aspects are presented in the figures 1a and 1b, based on the internal narrative evaluation reports.

Figure 1a: Average rates per evaluated workshops’ aspects (1-5)
As presented, beneficiaries evaluated all workshops’ aspects with the very high marks, with the (relatively) lowest mark for the applicability of the training content (3.64) and the highest for the trainers’ and cultural mediators’ approach (4.78) and the overall atmosphere during the workshops (4.75).

**Figure 1b: Average rates per workshop topic (1-5)**

Furthermore, beneficiaries showed a high level of satisfaction with the workshops’ content and both the pre-planned (based on previous project cycles data) content and the content agreed in the participatory process with the beneficiaries received relatively high rates during the internal evaluations organized by Atina upon finalization of each workshop. Nevertheless, content of the workshops implemented with the beneficiaries who had stayed longer in the support program and participated in the workshops aimed at initiating peer support processes, improving self-advocacy and finally - public advocacy capacities, was evaluated with the comparatively highest marks (communication, presentation skills, human rights and activism, self-advocacy, networking, and public advocacy).

During the recent evaluation process, interviewed Atina’s beneficiaries from the asylum/reception centers, though, expressed particular appreciation for the knowledge and
insights about the women rights they never talked about in their communities and recognized the following women’s rights/topics as the most important for their empowerment and activism (peer support group members):

- The right to work and have own earnings
- The right to choose in general and to decide for oneself, without being under the constant control of the husband or some other man – brother, relative, etc.
- The need to love yourself and take care of yourself
- Freedom of movement
- The right to have your own goal, independent from the children and husbands
- The possibility of a woman to divorce if she suffers from violence or simply does not want to stay in the relationship
- Sexual violence and rape and the mechanisms for protection
- Women’s mutual solidarity and support, regardless of their age, religion, language, living conditions

They also stated that the knowledge acquired during the workshops showed to be much more applicable than they previously thought.

Respondents from the asylum/reception centers, as well as the institutions’ representatives also recognized the need for additional set of activities enabling women beneficiaries to effectively transfer the knowledge and know-how to their families and partners, but also activities targeting men, so that they can also learn about women’s rights and practice new ways of behavior – from taking responsibility for domestic work, through practicing assertive and supportive marital relations, to active and non-violent fatherhood.

As with the self-perception on safety and personal strengths, women’s knowledge about the topics covered on the workshops and peer support groups meetings, skills to act and react in the situations of crisis and/or violence in general, as well as capacities for engagement in the peer support processes, self-advocacy and finally – public advocacy, significantly increased with the time spent in the Atina’s program. However, even beneficiaries from the asylum and reception centers who participated in three to five workshops recognize the importance of the majority of workshop topics whereas referring to the human rights issues more generally, but also recognize the oppressed position of women in general, while women who participated in the whole cycle of workshops recognize the ways of realization of women's human rights and the importance of

“Here I learned that a woman is not just for sex, babysitting and cleaning the house.”

Beneficiary from the asylum/reception centre
personal empowerment in general and also in forming different relationships with husbands, children and family. At the same time, empowerment and women’s rights issues are automatically associated with women’s choice to wear or not wear a hijab or headscarf, by all respondents, regardless of the time spent in the program, and the number of respondents stated that they knew women who had been in the asylum/reception centers for a long time and stopped covering themselves. Asked about the reasons behind such a frequent and almost instinctive relation they were making between the issue of covering and women’s rights, interviewees recognized that this topic is “widely controversial in Europe”, but more importantly, they attribute this association to Atina’s substantive efforts to contextualize their approach, make it culturally appropriate and thus, relevant to their beneficiaries.

*Figure 2 Workshops’ and peer support groups’ members per country of origin*

Based on the analyzed methodologies/described program concepts, evaluation reports, the interviews with the primary beneficiaries, as well as direct observation of Atina’s approach to organizing final conference, the evaluation found that the highly participatory approach to program delivery, high level of the staff and consultants’ expertise in participatory methodologies, as well as intrinsic yet operationalized ethics of care which characterize Atina’s work, could be considered as another building block of the project effectiveness. Diverse coverage
regarding beneficiaries’ countries of origin (presented in the figure 2), their mother tongues, and cultures, together with the evidence of self-perceived empowerment, feelings of safety, as well as increased level of knowledge about women’s rights, VAW/g prevention and protection mechanisms, lead to the conclusion that the very approach of the Atina and its strategies and tactics provide for the relevant effects. Moreover, Atina’s mobile teams and the staff engaged in workshops’ delivery and outreach to women and girls – refugees in general are provided with the comprehensive orientation, training, and materials (including Atina’s manual for workshop delivery) and have additional support from Atina’s general staff for at least six months from the period of initial engagement, and furthermore if needed.

“I was present at their workshops several times. We, as a Commissariat have a mandate to check what is being delivered to all asylum and reception centers’ beneficiaries. Despite of our occasional disagreements, I have to say that Atina’s workshops and other support activities are incomparable to any other actor’s in this field. To illustrate this, I’ll share a story when a man from Afghanistan approached one of my colleagues telling him that his wife’s behavior changed a lot in the last six months and that, when he asked her about that, she told him that she learned she had rights now when they reached Europe and that he should act differently. That is a serious success as I see it.”

Respondent from Commissariat for Refugees and Migration

The environment within the asylum and reception centers cannot be considered enabling for women’s empowerment and independence, due to both basic and structural conditions – overpopulation, lack of adequate infrastructure, lack of systemic focus and understanding of the concept of family and gender roles out of traditional patriarchal discourse. Such unfavorable conditions for potentially empowering endeavors additionally worsened after the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, with the full close-down of the centers. However, Atina’s prior investment into peer support mechanisms, as well as timely switch to online working mode, together with the continuous coordination of the support efforts with and between the actors active in the protection field, and finally – a watchdog role towards state institutions and decision makers allowed for even greater influence and unparallel recognition of its efforts by all relevant stakeholders, including their principal constituency – beneficiaries. The evaluation thus concluded that the success of the approach applied during the project implementation as a reaction to COVID-19-related restrictions and measures described in the document Promising practices shared with the UNTF during the project implementation, is undoubtedly recognized widely by the supported women and the professional community in Serbia.

Project ToC placed the concern about the refugee and asylum-seeking women’s economic position under the first project outcome, aimed at preventing VAW/g, indicating Atina’s well-established struggle to reshaping societal power balance and tackle the root causes of VAW/G.
At the same time, Atina’s approach to economic empowerment of their beneficiaries, implemented as an integral component of their comprehensive direct assistance/(re)integration/inclusion program is recognized as the key innovation in the approach to combating VAW/G, including partner violence, sexual exploitation, and trafficking in human beings by all relevant actors, and assessed as the key factor in overcoming violence and exercising human rights, by the beneficiaries.

The project managed to support 40 (instead of initially planned 30) women in gaining necessary skills and knowledge for accessing the labor market in Serbia. Results achieved per the output 1.2. indicators OPI 1.2.1. and OPI 1.2.2. (table 2) – exceeded target in number of beneficiaries and the increase of 52% (instead of planned 30%) in level of beneficiaries’ skills and knowledge relevant for the economic independence and the access to the labor market – are just indications of the intermediate effects, while the evaluation recorded evidence of the deeper level of effects achieved by Atina in this area – full independence of women supported by this project component.

“I find the Bagel as one of the best things in our civil society. Atina thought of a program which linked their final beneficiaries with their organization’s sustainability. I don’t know about any similar or similarly successful idea here.”

Respondent from the CSO

As presented in the figures 3a, 3b and 3c, Atina’s social enterprise – Bagel bakery and shop plays the central role in the technical application of the economic empowerment program. As per the implementing methodology, economic empowerment program component is one of the building blocks in the Atina’s approach to VAW/G prevention and the VAW/G survivors’ protection and the results in this area go hand in hand with the numerous results not captured by the result framework. Specifically:

- All 40 beneficiaries supported by this project component received comprehensive support organized within the case management system
• All 40 beneficiaries also received support in resolving legal issues related to civic status and working permits (either directly by Atina or referred by Atina to the relevant legal support service and supported by the cultural mediators throughout the process).
• 9 beneficiaries’ children were enrolled into formal education system.
• 5 beneficiaries were also supported to finalize their formal education.

Atina’s EEP is evaluated as one of the most successful elements of the project, both in terms of short and mid-term results achieved, and the quality of the methodological approach.

Finally, one of the unintended successes of the project, due to Atina’s investments in project implementation, on one hand, but also – negotiation with the relevant institutions and decision-makers in the employment field, on the other hand, is that 11 Atina’s beneficiaries have had been formally employed during the project implementation (figure 3c). As a precedent in the refugees/asylum seekers protection/integration in Serbia, this result could potentially lead to a longer-term and structural change in this field in the future. However, additional advocacy interventions and sensitization of the institutions mandated with the implementation of the employment-related legislation, should be also continuously implemented with a wider network of beneficiaries, local and international organizations engaged in the protection field, but also engaged in a process of re-thinking and advocating for the women’s’ labor rights in general. As already initiated by Atina, through the sets of practical interventions and bilateral and multilateral collaborations with the mandated institutions, future advocacy actions in this area would benefit from documented experiences and Atina’s advocacy approach focused on the beneficiaries’ agency and actions.

Second project outcome – Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G receive appropriate and adequate service by the end of the project - was fully achieved, based on the reported results per indicators. Specifically, based on the result framework matrix and the final narrative report, a total of 260 (instead of initially planned 240, OCI 2.1.) refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls were provided with direct support aimed at protecting VAW/G survivors (victims of trafficking in human beings, partner violence, and sexual exploitation). Services are provided as holistic and highly individualized packages with the assistance focused on the case management principle/system and the implementation of the IPSs.

“I had numerous opportunities to participate in the case conferences with Atina’s case managers. They are really capable to support the beneficiaries throughout the support process, knowledgeable about the institutions’ mandates, rules and practices, and at the same time – ready to share all the information with other organizations.”

Respondent from the CSO
In recent years, from the opening of a “Balkan migration route” in 2015, case managers have had closely collaborated with the cultural mediators, so as to be able to adequately assist women and girls with diverse cultural, linguistic and life experiences. During the project implementation, 251 out of 260 supported women and girls were provided with the cultural mediation support, while 243 had been referred to other (Atina’s and external) services, including 91 safe accommodation services. All beneficiaries provided with the safe accommodation evaluated this service as adequate and safe (OCI 2.2).

All other services from Atina’s comprehensive direct assistance program – from providing food, hygienic products (and COVID-19-related protection products – masks, gloves, antibacterial gels), clothes, through organizing psychological support, counseling and peer support, medical assistance, assistance in resolving civil and legal status, legal counseling and representation, assistance in enrolment and/or continuing formal education, economic empowerment, to providing support to beneficiaries’ children and other family members – had been organized, supervised and monitored by the case managers. One of the mentioned aspects of Atina’s work – dedication to comprehensiveness in their work and addressing obstacles to women’s independence and equality – influences some of the technical specifically, support to children and other family members (relevant for beneficiaries’ recovery, overcoming trauma and finally – full inclusion and proactive (political)

---

**Figure 4: Direct assistance program beneficiaries per country of origin**
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participation), is the reason for a slight underperformance per OPI 2.1.1. (204 IPSs instead of initially planned 240). However, this could lead to a conclusion about sub-optimality of the indicator, rather than the actional underperformance in this area.

After the close-down of the state-run shelter for the women trafficking survivors in August 2020 Atina’s program had become additionally burdened, since Atina’s safe accommodation was the only other available program of this type in Serbia. Although a highly challenging position with most specialized services for women and girls - refugees, survivors of VAW/G uniquely implemented by Atina, this position provided Atina with the opportunity to gain specific recognition within the sector. Hence, services to women and girls – survivors of VAW/G are the aspects of Atina’s work by which it is fully recognized both among women refugees and asylum seekers and among relevant institutions and organizations. And even more specifically, all interviewed actors refer to Atina’s firstly established service – safe accommodation for women, trafficking and violence survivors, as Atina’s comparative advantage and a key difference between Atina and other organizations engaged in the protection field.

Atina currently runs the only shelter accommodating victims of trafficking in Serbia and is the only actor within the sun-sector that provides safe accommodation for all the women and girls – refugees, VAW/G survivors in need for this type of support. Furthermore, Atina is available 24/7 for a provision of urgent support, including accommodation for women and girls in need.

Evaluation found that the benefits from the outputs within the second outcome on the beneficiaries are apparent and the beneficiaries emphasized the following as the most relevant for their wellbeing and integration into Serbian/European society (as an answer to an open-ended question about the most beneficial support provided by Atina):

- Safe accommodation (all women and girls addressed this as a primary issue)
- Support in accessing other relevant services (e.g., Belgrade Center for Human Rights, organizations dealing with art, donors who provided funding for the project of an informal group of women)
• Support in health care
• Psychological support
• Economic empowerment and providing connections and support in communication with the employers, which for most of them resulted in getting a job
• Support with enrolling children into education system (kindergartens and schools) and additional support with children regarding their education/mediation with educational institutions
• Participation in peer support and advocacy workshops.

To support Atina’s strategic logic affirming that even the greatest quality services, when isolated, cannot produce sustainable change in the quality of life and level of independence of women survivors of VAW/G, project ToC envisaged addressing proved lack of institutional capacity to provide participatory and gender sensitive services to women and girls – refugees and asylum seekers, VAW/G survivors by the same outcome. Although not measured on the outcome level (e.g., pre- and post-surveying the level of beneficiaries’ satisfaction with the services provided by supported service providers/Atina’s capacity building program participants), results presented per output indicators were fully achieved – 247 (instead of 240 professionals trained, OPI 2.1.2.) and the 48% increase in knowledge on the participatory services (instead of 30%, OPI 2.1.3.). To further advance institutional and structural capacities and expertise, Atina created and shared a publication presenting good practices on access to services for refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G (disseminated 1000 copies, instead of 500, OPI 2.2.1.) and organized two events (conferences) that gathered 309 participants, including beneficiaries, representatives of institutions, decision-making structures, CSOs, IOs, foreign embassies, Atina’s staff and evaluators.

About participation in peer support workshops:

“I think these workshops are very important for women’s emancipation and empowerment! We were speaking our language, which I found particularly liberating and relevant and had been meeting regularly to provide each other support and to receive support and information from women who have had been in Serbia and Atina for a long time and have more developed informal support networks or more information about opportunities within the system.”

Beneficiary of the comprehensive support program, member of the advocacy group
The trainings reached 247 representatives of the institutions and CSOs located in the regions/cities where asylum/reception centers are positioned, as follows: Subotica, Sremska Mitrovica, Sombor, Kikinda and Šid (Vojvodina, Northern Serbia); Belgrade (AC Krnjača, Miksalište), Bogovadja, Lajkovac, Ljig, Ub (Central Serbia); Vranje, Bujanovac, Preševo, Pirot and Bosilegrad (Southern Serbia); Banja Koviljača, Loznica, Šabac, Valjevo, Sjenica and Tutin (Western Serbia).

Due to the COVID-19-related restrictions, a total of 9 trainings were organized online and covered following topics: Standard operating procedures for prevention and protection of refugee population from gender-based violence; Perspective of early recognition and referral to relevant services; Victim-centered approach; Implementation of legal framework regarding gender-based violence; Preventing trafficking in human beings and violence against women and girls in the context of global migration.

Characteristics of the Atina’s approach to the capacity building that are found to be most relevant for the training effectiveness and the most beneficial for the secondary target group are presented in the table 3.

"I got acquainted with new regulations and activities in this area, heard the experiences of colleagues from other organizations, got new ideas. Everything was great!"

*Training participant, internal evaluation*
Table 3: Most beneficial aspects of Atina’s capacity building approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity building perspective</th>
<th>Evaluation finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminist perspective in opening all relevant questions</td>
<td>Evaluation respondents stated that Atina was/is the only organization that focuses specifically on women’s human rights and has comprehensive knowledge about protection mechanisms and the practical ways of mechanisms’ implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active involvement of the final beneficiaries</td>
<td>As stated by the training participants in the internal evaluations and reaffirmed in the interviews, beneficiaries and ex beneficiaries/current advocates’ active involvement in the process of trainings’ preparation and delivery is also Atina’s unique quality within the Serbian context, and allows for more effective sensitization and decentration of the professionals, on one hand, and poses good strategy for additional empowerment of final beneficiaries’, promotion of women’s agency and new feminist leadership, on the other hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of usefulness and applicability of the content</td>
<td>Topics covered by Atina’s capacity building interventions are seen as the most relevant for actual participants’ work in their respective fields. Practical examples, reflection on the challenges and the concrete ways to overcome challenges, personal stories, and the relevant practitioners’ insights, are recognized as key structural elements credited for the trainings’ usefulness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness and relevance of the content</td>
<td>Atina is described as an organization with the extensive expertise in the area of VAW/G prevention and protection of women and girls, VAW/G survivors. Also, Atina’s engagement in policy monitoring and shadow reporting is recognized as an anchor for organization’s credibility and a sort of guarantee of the content relevance and adequacy (e.g., capacity building event organized to discuss and facilitate creation of relevant mechanisms as per General Recommendation of the CEDAW Committee no. 38 of 2020).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Choice of lecturers and presenters                     | Trainers were professionals from the Public Prosecutor Office, Ministry of Justice/Prosecutor’s Office, Commissariat for Refugees and Migration, National Anti-trafficking Coordination Office (MoI), Asylum Office (MoI), Save the Children, etc. Evaluation respondents from the state institutions state that they appreciate a possibility for exchanges and learning from their more experienced
colleagues and can related to ‘the institutional narrative’ much better, while the respondents from the CSOs value Atina’s intention to introduce them to the institutions and Atina’s capacity to re-frame the ‘institutional narrative’ and contextualize it using intersectional feminist lens.

As mentioned, beneficiaries and ex-beneficiaries’ lectures were greatly appreciated and highly rated by the target group of this output.

### Adequacy of the training format and methods used

Although implemented online during the period of COVID-19 outbreak in Serbia, Atina’s capability to organize online trainings was emphasized by the evaluation respondents. Namely, trainings are assessed as adequate in terms of time-used, clear, and efficient facilitation, practicality, and relevance of the exercises (joint problem solving based on the model case study), tools (e.g., Mentimeter) and clear guidelines and support in using it.

### Already demonstrated dedication to follow up and needs-based capacity building programs implementation

Evaluation respondents highly value Atina’s dedication to a long-term partnership and collaborations and find it positively correlating with the trainings’ effectiveness.

Atina’s capacity building activities are also seen as an effective and even impactful way for influencing structural changes (changes on the institutional and even policy level) and this will be further elaborated in the Impact section of the report.

As per the output 2.2., Atina developed, printed and distributed publication to inform institutional and CSOs’ approach to prevention and protection from VAW/G that presented the five case studies covering following specific aspects of the general topic:

- Access to preschool education (for the VAW/G survivors’ children)
- New employment paradigm (focusing the needs of VAW/G survivors and labor rights of women refugees and asylum seekers)
- Trafficking in human beings and the right to asylum
- Access to justice of a VAW/G survivor
- Right to asylum of a VAW/G survivor

With the detailed description of the context and circumstances, challenges, opportunities, needs and capacities of 5 beneficiaries and ex beneficiaries willing to participate in the research and

“Many thanks to the great team of Atina, which always throws light forward and lights the way for others.”

*Training participant, internal evaluation*
presentation of the results; well-structured and positioned policy-related and the questions and challenges related to the institutional performance; presented and emphasized relevant normative and strategic framework; formulated instructive conclusions and recommendations for the future work of all engaged institutions; publication will inform future approach, and practical actions and the very course of action in the field of prevention of VAW/G and survivors’ protection.

Two events aimed at sharing good practice examples to advance the system for prevention and protection from VAW/G and more importantly, to promote women refugees’ agency and support new feminist leadership, gathered 309 participants (instead of initially planned 60, OPI 2.2.2.), representatives of CSOs, state institutions, civil rights defenders, women and girls advocates, professionals working in the areas of combating violence and human trafficking, providing protection and support to refugees and migrants, etc.

Atina’s approach to organization of public events is, based on the evaluation assessment, characterized by:

- Optimal to maximal response. More than 90% of invitees attend Atina’s public events, because of the learning opportunities, anticipated effective networking, and the most cited – friendly and constructive atmosphere.
- Active participation of the beneficiaries (and ex-beneficiaries in new roles – as activists, professionals, etc.). Evaluation respondents recognize that the beneficiaries are “just other fellow participants”, and that they are involved in preparation and implementation of the events, etc. – and thus, have the opportunity to further develop capacities, connect, discuss, advocate, etc.

Public events, thus, showed to be highly effective in achieving the main goal, by presenting the relevant and applicable content focused on the innovations and new developments in the field of prevention and protection from VAW/G, on one hand, and by displaying very models that are being advocated for, on the other hand – from full and informed beneficiaries’ participation, through collaborative and sharing approach to all issues’ dimensions – from the problem analysis, through the improvement of practical solutions for service delivery, to the policy making.

Finally, the third project outcome – Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia empowered for active participation and leadership for decision-making on the issues of the importance for the position of women and girls in their communities by the end of the project - was fully achieved, based on the reported results per indicators. Specifically, during the project implementation, 43 women and girls (instead of initially planned 30, OPI 3.1.1.) had been involved
in the advocacy group organized by Atina, 21 meetings (as planned, OPI 3.1.2.) with the relevant organizations and institutions were organized to discuss issues important for the position of refugee women and girls and their access to rights and services, 72% of beneficiaries participating in this activity group (instead of initially planned 50%, OPI 3.1.3.) recognized that they had the access to the political sphere (“space that can allow them to advocate for their rights”, as defined in the indicator) and finally, 85% of them (instead of proposed 70%, OCI 3.2.) by the end of the project stated that they have been feeling empowered for advocacy.

Advocacy group’s participants from Iran, Afghanistan, Nigeria, and Burundi (figure X) entered activities within the third project pillar (OC 3.) either through the informative workshops and related activities (OC 1.), or through the direct assistance activity group (OC 2.). In both cases, they expressed interest to join an additional cycle of workshops, aimed at further advancing their self-advocacy and public advocacy capacities. In addition to the workshops mentioned within the Outcome one section of the report, namely – Human rights and activism, Communication, Presentation skills, Networking, Self-advocacy, Public advocacy – they were also provided with the basic (in the initial phase of project implementation) and more advance (in the later stages of the project implementation) knowledge about the existing policy frameworks in the human rights and women’s human rights area, refugee/asylum seekers protection, protection from VAW/G, as well as skills – negotiation, effective presentation, and conflict resolution.

Members of the advocacy group have had been actively involved in both internal and external program development, awareness raising, reporting and policy making processes and are recognized as key reference points in this field by the most relevant actors interviewed during the evaluation assessment (e.g., UNHCR, Danish Refugee Council, Belgrade Center for Human Rights, etc.), which attests to the high level of effectiveness.

As assessed, preconditions for the effectiveness of the third outcome were:

1. Beneficiaries’ trust in Atina and Atina’s values and credibility
2. The continuity of Atina’s work in the women’s rights field
3. Significant and specific expertise in prevention of VAG/W and protection of victims within the population of refugees and asylum-seekers

Figure 6: Advocacy program beneficiaries per country of origin
4. Established collaboration and good relations with various relevant institutions and organizations in this area

Beneficiaries primarily recognize their benefits in establishing personal relations with the numerous individuals and professionals, institutions’ representatives, etc. Furthermore, they are certain that their (and the group) problems became more visible, and as such, potentially solvable in future. However, some of them stated that their expectations from the results of such engagement were higher at the beginning of the process. With the knowledge of the political structure and mechanisms, as well as from the direct experience in advocacy, their expectations also altered, but the motivation for the engagement stayed very high.

“I believe that we can achieve some results. But at the same time, there is a wall behind which we cannot go further. One can move and move, even run, but at some point, one reaches the wall. And my expectations were higher at the beginning. Now I think that there may be a chance that wall will collapse, but I’m not 100% sure. In the end, the result of our action can be achieved or not, but this experience is precious in both cases. I will always be an activist.”

“When we started with the advocacy, we talked about our culture and what it looks like to come here. And then we connected with the decision makers, we told them about how we see the system, how it denies us rights, how people in Serbia treat us and we asked them to do something about it. We wanted to talk about problems. We also wanted to talk about what it looks like to be a Muslim in this environment, what it looks like to be a woman alone in those conditions... Without Atina, we would not have such opportunity.”

"For me, it was important that they enabled us to talk and communicate with people who make decisions. Sometimes nothing will happen, but sometimes you will come across someone who will be touched and influenced by your story. You never know ... For example, we had the opportunity to talk directly to the Commissariat. We talked to the police, to those who make the laws. For example, I told the Commissariat: ‘You know what, you can't tell me that anymore, I've been here for almost 5 years, and I know what my rights in Serbia are! I recommend the Group to all women I meet.”

*Beneficiaries, member of the Advocacy group*
Along with the beneficiaries, all interviewed actors rated Atina’s competences and capacities very highly and the ability to involve and activate beneficiaries, as well as other constituencies is recognized as one of the aspects of Atina’s work that sets Atina apart from other organizations in this field (as mentioned, economic empowerment package and the safe accommodation are other areas specifically emphasized as Atina’s unique traits). Evaluation respondents from the institutions and CSOs believe that the active participation of refugee women is crucial in educating employees in institutions and decision-making structures, building empathy, and shifting the protection paradigm within the system.

**Obstacles and challenges**

**EQ 3:** What were the challenges/obstacles to achieving the expected results?

Obstacles to achieving results were numerous yet overcame during the project implementation. The most significant obstacle was the circumstance that for the most women and girls - refugees Serbia is not envisioned country of final destination. Furthermore, the structure of beneficiaries had been changing constantly, with the new women and girls entering the program and some of them leaving it (both willingly, as the need for support ceased to exist, or due to other circumstances, such as voluntary or involuntary leaving the territory of Serbia). Also, the environment within the asylum/reception centers can be considered disabling for women’s empowerment and independence. Finally, such unfavorable conditions additionally worsened after the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The most apparent challenges Atina had been facing during the project implementation were related to circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic:

“I won’t be the shadow of me any longer. I have people around me who care about my experience!”

*Beneficiary, member of the Advocacy group*

“We kind of regularly operate under the state of emergency, so maybe that’s why we managed to adapt so quickly and efficiently.”

*Atina’s program coordinator*

Groups/structures of pandemic-related challenges (figure 7) are extrapolated from Atina’s detailed reports and documented beneficiaries’ perspective and

---

8 Since Atina had been extensively reporting about the challenges and mitigation strategies and tactics related to COVID-19, the overview shared in this section rather focuses on the extrapolation of the next level conclusions from the material already shared.
presented vis-à-vis Atina’s response, mitigation strategy, or set of actions.

Figure 7: Challenges related to COVID-19 pandemic

Inadequate state (general) response and specifically, disordered measures and public reactions, lack of timely planning and effective communication, transparency, drive and mechanisms for civic participation and the participation of the most vulnerable groups, among many other issues, created an unstable and disabling environment for CSOs’ actions in general and particularly, actions aimed at supporting already multiple-marginalized groups, such as refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls, VAW/G survivors. As reported globally, women in Serbia also made up the majority of those who were most exposed or whose position generally worsened due to the epidemic. “The epidemic highlighted, sharpened and intensified the existing inequalities and pointed out the true meaning of the term ‘vulnerability’. The most disadvantaged are those who are usually not visible in the system, the poor, the unemployed or informally employed who belong to vulnerable groups, with most of them being women. The state measures were not sufficiently aimed at supporting these categories of population or recognizing the existing inequalities.”

Rapidly deteriorating position of the multiple-marginalized groups have not been (formally) recognized or addressed and furthermore, the issue was not welcomed into the public discourse, meaning that the relevant protective measures were lacking, as were the incentives for their conception and introduction. Logical consequence of such a general political attitude was a deterioration in the institutional practices and culture, already not favorable for the refugees and asylum seekers in general, and the women and girls VAW/G survivors, in particular. As

---

comprehensively reported by Atina, institutions mandated with the accommodation and protection of refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls, VAW/G survivors’ rights introduced restrictive measures (i.e., lockdown in asylum/reception centers, Home for children without parental care; close-down of the Emergency shelter for victims of human trafficking, etc.) deprivin their beneficiaries of Atina’s services, the only of that kind in the given period (from March 2020). At the same time, as noted globally, Atina’s beneficiaries accommodated within the state institutions had also been informing about the re-traumatization due to the stress of COVID-19 and the increased need for relevant services – in the first place, psychological counseling, and medical assistance. In addition, even the beneficiaries and ex-beneficiaries who managed to overcome consequences of the VAW/G they had suffered from and who exited Atina’s programs as independent and strong women, suffered from the COVID-19-related effects on the society as a whole and had urgent and/or exhaustive needs for Atina’s support – from basic needs provision to the support in job placement, etc.

Atina also switched to online working mode in implementing actions aimed at building capacities of the institutions and organization to integrate gender-sensitive and participatory approach into their work and to promote good practices in the field of prevention and protection of VAW/G survivors within the population of refugees and asylum seekers. This adaptation resulted in increase in both the reach and the short- and mid-term results (increase in knowledge of the participants).

Atina and other stakeholders recognize biggest challenges in a general lack of structural and institutional dedication to the policies and practices which would promote and norm refugees and asylum-seekers’ integration, prevention of VAW/G and protection of survivors, as well as generally deeply patriarchal and xenophobic culture, and finally – in a lack of systematic cooperation and coordination between the institutions. In such circumstances, CSOs are often the only mechanism of communication between the mandated institutions, final beneficiaries, and institutions, as well as international mechanisms and institutions.

Atina is recognized as particularly successful in all mentioned roles by the evaluation respondents from the CSOs and even some institutions.

However, these set of challenges could be rather acknowledged as characteristics of the context in which the project had been implemented and because of which this and similar projects are indeed implemented. Such a shift in understanding/presenting risk factors and challenges could be promoted in future, to provide for additional development of the regional civil sector capacities.
Main factors influencing project outcomes

EQ 4: What were the main factors influencing the outcomes of this project, either negatively or positively?

The evaluation found that the highly participatory approach to program delivery, high level of the staff and consultants’ expertise in participatory methodologies, as well as intrinsic yet operationalized ethics of care which characterize Atina’s work, could be considered as main factors influencing the outcomes and the ones that enabled successful mitigation of obstacles.

Adaptiveness

Atina’s response to the challenges was timely and relevant and the organization shortly adapted previous practices by introducing online psychological counseling, online workshops, and other types of support sessions (peer support, mediation, economic empowerment, etc.). Atina had been supporting women’s and girls’ mutual exchanges, while building on previously established relations and capacities (communication and conflict resolution workshops, peer support group set of activities).

Atina’s beneficiaries attest to the quality of the adaptations made in the period of the pandemic outbreak – type and frequency of the support provided, ensured optimal standards in service provision and the relevance of the services and general support provided. Some quite innovative initiatives were implemented (Promising practices annex to the Final narrative report, Letters from Isolation product), while the number of provided services increased (output indicators).

During the evaluation process, Atina’s staff also reflected on the organizations’ adaptiveness, but also on the enabling factors that make the adaptations possible and relevant, and recognized the donor’s approach as one of the most critical. Namely, the Emergency relief fund provided by the UNTF is seen as a catalyst for a successful adaptation of

“I have two friends whom I talk to, and they told me that the conditions in the camp have become even worse, that the army guards the camps so that people don’t go out, and that organizations cannot have activities inside the camps. However, I think that should be resolved in a different way, because these people cannot be imprisoned and feel as if they have been arrested in the camp. It should be organized differently - or allow them occasionally to go outside for a while. I don’t think this is good for them. I worry a lot about all the people in the camps.”

Beneficiary of the Direct assistance program, Letters from Isolation document
the project approaches. Other catalysts for the adaptiveness are identified in the evaluation as: continuous contextual analyses and the beneficiaries’ needs assessments, dedication to learning and a capacity for evidence-based planning.

**Collaboration and solidarity**

Moreover, interviewed actors from institutions and organizations stated that Atina remained the resource organization during the most critical period – providing online services to their beneficiaries and providing advice and other support needed to other organizations. Atina is recognized as a ‘point of gathering’ for all the issues/problems/challenges related to the VAW/G and trafficking in human beings and the organization’s messages are shared and received across the protection sub-sector as long as it’s perceived as benevolent and cooperative. The latter was proved by the evaluation assessment with all involved actors. Perceived levels of Atina’s cooperativeness and solidarity directly correlated with the increase in knowledge, skills and perceived applicability of the content offered/shared during the trainings, conferences, and other public event organized during the project implementation and moreover – from Atina’s establishment.

**Strategic embeddedness and the interrelations between strategic and program elements**

Interviewed representatives of institutions and organizations active in the refugees’ protection field fully recognize the complexity of Atina’s approach and value it as unprecedented within the sector(s). They observed that it would not be possible for Atina to achieve results within any of the program components, without depending on the results in others. As one of the most illustrative examples, interviewees mapped Atina’s economic empowerment program (EEP), interrelated with all other comprehensive support program components with the success upholding this integrity.

To highlight relations between direct assistance and economic empowerment program components, evaluation offers a synthesis based on the developed EEP and the inputs from the Atina’s staff, presented in the figure 8.

> “When I was referred to Atina’s program, I literally could not stand straight on my own, I was constantly dizzy and apathetic. I needed lot of time and support to be where I am right now. I was working with the psychologist, participated in numerous workshops, Atina helped me with my health issues, legal matters, etc. I participated in the job placement activities and when I finally find a job, I lost it due to COVID in a less than a month.

> And then I started the whole process again...”

*Beneficiary of the Direct assistance program*
Figure 8 thus shows the phases of the EEP and touches on the interrelations with other Atina’s program components and practices. At the same time, the very phases could be presented cyclically, since the assessments, planning, monitoring, revision, learning, and most importantly – psychosocial support and referral to other relevant services and institutions/organizations are being implemented continuously.

Apart from linkages between intra-programmatic components, Atina’s programs are conceptualized to build on the mutual intersections – insights and lessons learnt from the direct assistance program serve as a basis for the research and policy program (i.e. challenges in accessing services and exercising rights), links and relations established through the capacity building program serve to resolve practical problems in the service provision, direct assistance program beneficiaries actively participate in policy monitoring and reporting processes, etc.
Finally, evaluation concluded that the Action was embedded into Atina’s strategic orientation, and that all existing resources were utilized and coordinated to maximize the reach and effects. That fact is assessed as one of the success drivers.

**Intersectionality**

Atina’s intersectional approach to program development and delivery is assessed to be one of the factors of the project’s success.

“Intersectionality examines the intersections of the three most important global systems of domination: racism/colonialism, capitalism and patriarchy; and their by-products: classism, homo- and transphobia, cis- and heterosexism and all other forms of racism. Intersectionality looks at the ways in which various social categories such as gender, class, race, sexuality, disability, religion, and other identity axes are interwoven on multiple and simultaneous levels. The discrimination resulting from these mutually reinforcing identities leads to systemic injustice and social inequality. The concept of intersectionality is grounded in decades of activism that battled the challenges of racism and sexism throughout the 20th century.”

Center for Intersectional Justice: *Intersectional discrimination in Europe*

Based on the analysis of all information gathered through the desk review of relevant theoretical papers, Atina’s documentation and reports, as well as interviewees’ insights, evaluation found that the following approaches and practices could be considered as central and grounding in understanding Atina’s relation to intersectionality – individualized/highly tailored approach to the direct support provision, participatory approach and methodologies used throughout the organizational/project management cycle (internally and externally), cultural mediation approach and service as an added value in all processes that include women and girls, refugees and asylum seekers.
2. Relevance

Within the relevance dimension, it was assessed to what extent the achieved results continue to be relevant to the needs of targeted women and girls. The following aspects were considered: level of relevance of the project design and deliverables to the beneficiaries’ needs, coherence (and inherent relevance) of the project ToC, and the suitability of the adaptations to the changes in the context and the beneficiaries’ needs during the implementation.

Project relevance is evaluated based on the documented practices of beneficiaries' involvement in the project planning and implementation, evidence of alignment of project activities with beneficiaries’ needs (assessment results vis-a-vis activities implemented), reports from the assessment and consultation processes, interviewees with the project team (on the development of the intervention logic), COVID-19-related reports, and the interviews with the beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders.

Relevance of the project design and deliverables to the beneficiaries’ needs

*EQ 5*: Have the project design and choice of activities and deliverables properly reflected and addressed the needs of the beneficiaries?

The project had been based on the continuously assessed needs of the primary beneficiaries and planned and implemented with their full and informed participation, making the relevance dimension its grounding principle. Moreover, it was addressing policy and institutional constraints and related insufficient capacities of secondary target group to provide adequate and relevant answer to the women and girls survivors’ needs even in the long run (by promoting sustainable measures based on the best protection practices).

Project *Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia* was built upon Atina’s extensive experience in working with women and girls, VAW/G survivors, including survivors of trafficking in human beings, sexual exploitation, partner violence, etc. Namely, since 2004, Atina has been the leading anti-trafficking organization in Serbia providing shelter, psychosocial support, legal, medical services, and employment opportunities to women survivors, with the goal of facilitating survivors’ full recovery, overcoming trauma and full social inclusion.

As an organization highly responsive to the changes in the local context and the needs of the most vulnerable women and girls, Atina started conceptualizing its approach and programs dedicated to support of women and girls within the population of refugees and asylum seekers since the beginning of the latest ‘refugee crisis’ in 2015; and initiated actions aimed at changing xenophobic
and discriminatory practices and improving integration prospects for the women asylum seekers even before the recent migratory influx – from 2012. 

From the first mass influx of refugees in 2015, Atina has been adapting its approach to the beneficiaries’ needs and the contextual circumstances – from providing urgent and assistance through its mobile teams’ and cultural mediation approaches/programs, to the full integration of the needs of women and girls refugees and asylum seekers, VAW/G survivors into its strategic orientation and daily functioning and the provision of long-term support and assistance.

At the same time, as the only organization with available resources for the specialized support, Atina was recognized as an important referral point by the activist and professional community at the time in Serbia.

Contextual relevance of the project is conditioned by the organization’s learning/adaptive culture on one hand, and by its dedication to the survivor-centered approach, based on the continuous needs’ assessments and respective delivery and a full informed participation of the beneficiaries.

That being said, at the time when project was initiated, it was informed by the:
- Women and girls – beneficiaries’ expectations for the next phase of Atina’s support/assistance, as well as for their integration into Serbia society
- Testimonials documented by the mobile teams’ members about the types and extensiveness of VAW/G in the population of refugees and asylum seekers, as well as survivors’ experiences and perspectives
- Atina’s helpline and referral statistics and information
- Survey conducted at 6 asylum and reception centers, in Preševo, Belgrade, Bujanovac, Bogovađa, Banja Koviljača, Adaševci, as well as Maternal Home and Miksalište in Belgrade

“...“The reason why we are also now involved in the response to the refugee crisis, and especially in the response to the needs of women and girls who are on the road, is primarily the fact that women and children who have suffered some forms of violence were being referred to our programs. What made us to shift our resources, our knowledge, and skills we have acquired over the last 13 years dealing with the protection of women and girls, victims of human trafficking, is the fact that we recognized the real causes of their vulnerability to violence, but also – their strengths.”

Atina’s director, website

---

10 Opening Dialog Within Local Communities – Migrants and Citizens Towards Tolerance and Non-violence is the EU-funded project that Atina conceptualized in 2012 and implemented in 2013/2014. With this project, Atina developed its cultural mediation approach, developed capacities of the first 12 cultural mediators in Serbia and introduced the approach to the beneficiaries, professional and political communities in Serbia at that time.
According to all mentioned sources, and confirmed during the evaluation assessment by all interviewed actors, neither state institutions mandated with the protection of refugees and asylum seekers, nor engaged CSOs were providing gender-sensitive or specialized services for women and girls, they were not aware of the specific position of the women and girls within this group, and finally, were not capacitated to introduce and implement gender-sensitive practices (i.e., from the initial interviews with the men as the points for contact for all family members, including female, provision of ‘gender-blind’ hygienic products, inability to recognize VAW/G, etc.). Basically, women and girls have been in need for gender-responsive actions throughout the protection system and processes (figure 9).

*Figure 9: (Gender-responsive) refugees protection system structure*

Additionally, more than 70% of women and girls refugees have had been experiencing VAW/G, either in their countries of origin and along the migration route, in other transit countries and Serbia, or continuously. Perpetrators included partners or other members of immediate or extended family, smugglers and traffickers, police officers, employees working in the humanitarian response, and other refugees. Women and girls survivors expressed the need for various types of interventions and supporting schemes, depending on their plans and other circumstances (health status, attitudes towards violence, primary and secondary family structure, planned country of destination, current type of accommodation, etc.). Majority had been in need for specialized and gender-sensitive urgent support services and assistance throughout the referral processes, as well as for the longer-term specialized support and specifically: safe accommodation, psychological support, medical assistance and/or support in obtaining specialized medical care, support in resolving civic status, support in accessing other available
services, etc. With the time spent in the refugee/reception centers and/or longer-term assistance programs, additional support in integration was needed (i.e., enrollment into the educational system and labor market).

Majority of the interviewed beneficiaries from the asylum/reception centers consider the relevance of Atina’s program and the whole approach to be much higher compared to the programs offered by other organizations. They illustrate this claim with the practical examples of the most relevant support:

- Provision of basic items that are not distributed otherwise, such as clothes, socks, hygiene and beauty products, creams, hair color, depilatory razors, make-up, which they value very highly
- Workshops help them in relaxing and diverting their thoughts from the reality of a life in (isolated) camps (e.g., activities such as coloring, writing letters, jewelry making, general socializing with other women, etc.)
- Information about the rights they have in Serbia and the ways to exercise them
- Organizing psychological counseling (both offline and online)
- Empowering workshops in which they talked about topics such as human trafficking and how to protect themselves; as well as learn about women’s rights in general
- Economic empowerment workshops (creating CV, job interviews, etc.)
- Communication skills building and support in self-advocacy and representation of personal and family’s interest in front of the institutions

Moreover, beneficiaries particularly appreciate Atina’s staff’s caring and accepting attitude, their efforts to build a mutual, as well as participatory practice which they reaffirmed in the interviewees. In contrast to their previous experiences, interviewed beneficiaries state that they are asked and consulted about the topics of future activities, and that they can actively participate in planning the content of the workshops. Because of that, beneficiaries feel as if they also contribute to other women and their recovery and empowerment and thus, consider Atina’s approach unique.
Beneficiaries specifically emphasized the aspect of continuity in Atina’s work as important for the mentioned qualities (trust, care, participation) to come to fruition. Beneficiaries generally recognize Atina’s intentions integrated in the project proposal and their strategic orientation and value such intentions highly.

As one of the aspects that is currently missing (is not sufficiently developed), women from the asylum and reception centers mention the need for additional content and opportunities for their children while they are at the workshops – “Knowing that my children have been taken care of would greatly help me in my empowerment”.

All women and girls – beneficiaries of Atina’s direct assistance program, including the economic empowerment component of the pillar 1 activities, stated that the support they have been receiving was fully in line with their needs. They emphasized the following aspects of Atina’s work as the most illustrative for the needs-based approach:

- Beneficiaries can stay in the program for as long as they need it and feel that they can count on Atina’s support even upon their exit from the program
- Beneficiaries are provided with the safe environment and sufficient time to rest and familiarize with the new circumstances and the urgent/ad-hoc assistance and support, before the initial planning start
- Beneficiaries are supported to actively participate in the planning process and even in the public sphere (if and when they want to)
- The whole support network of the beneficiaries is involved in the program, as long as it helps the beneficiary; and the children are assisted and taken care of
- Beneficiaries are even motivated and skilled to help/support each other during their stay in direct assistance program

"Atina provides the space that women need for change and does not limit their time – it allows women to decide for themselves how long it takes for a change to happen."

Respondent from a CSO

Beneficiary of the direct assistance program

“I am continuously presented with the options, and I have the opportunity to choose what is appropriate for me. We talk about the procedures and the ways to resolve some of my issues, we even talk about the things I don’t like in Serbia and the Europe. I really think they understand me and my position here and I trust them because of all that.”

Beneficiary of the direct assistance program
Atina’s staff engaged in providing direct assistance reaffirmed the importance of the needs-based and beneficiary-centered assistance provision for the Atina’s work and informed the evaluation process about the instruments and standards that are being used so that working principles (will be elaborated more in the Organizational principles section of the report) can be effectively implemented.

Women who received subsidiary or asylum protection or have been staying in Serbia for a longer period (the latter is the case with most actual beneficiaries, due to the ineffectiveness of the asylum procedures in Serbia), see the economic empowerment program as a key support as it resolves their status in the long run and provides them with livelihoods.

EEP is assessed by the interviewed organizations and institutions as the program whose relevance is to be even higher in the future, with the increase in numbers of women (and refugees in general) in need for assistance in integration and the lack of systemic solutions for the integration into the local labor market. Respondents agree though that Atina will need additional resources and partnerships to be able to support a significantly higher number of beneficiaries and coordinate actions with even more targeted businesses (for the purpose of organization of vocational trainings, internships, job placement).

“I met Atina some 3 years ago. They helped me with my hospital bill. I was sick, I went to a state hospital, but it didn't help, they couldn't solve the problem, and then Atina took me to a private hospital. They paid the bill, talked to the doctors, and took care about the medicine and the check-ups. I lived for a year in Atina’s Safe House and basically started my life in Serbia. I recovered, found a job and my own apartment. I haven't lived there for almost 2 years now, but even now I know they are there for me if I need help. For example, if I don't work, I can turn to them for food or help until I start working again.”

Beneficiary of the direct assistance program

“When I was in Bogovada, Atina held some important workshops. For example, how to write a CV and how to prepare for the labor market when I come to Belgrade and start looking for a job. It helped me a lot because I wrote my CV based on that knowledge. Of course, when we came to Belgrade, neither my mother nor I had a job, and they helped with that – we joint the economic empowerment workshops and activities and got assistance with finding adequate opportunities. That’s the most important for us right now – to start earning and stay fully independent.”

Beneficiary of the economic empowerment program
Activities of the third project outcome aimed at empowering women for active participation and leadership, have primarily targeted women and girls – refugees and asylum-seekers who had previously showed the inclinations for activism (some even in their countries of origin), but also involved all other beneficiaries who wanted to engage in problem solving within their communities in the asylum/reception centers.

Interviewed beneficiaries consider the skills and knowledge acquired in the process (workshops, meetings with institutions and decision-makers, and involvement into formulating recommendations for the policy improvements) highly relevant to their future activist engagement and self-advocacy. During the evaluation assessment process, they particularly emphasized the importance of the opportunities to empower and support other women in the situations they had been in, and to build joint strategies for the advancement of refugee women, but also, the importance of the new social networks and knowledge about political processes in Serbia and Europe.

Coherence (and the inherent relevance) of the project theory of change

EQ 6: To what extent have the planned and actual activities and outputs of the project been consistent with the intended outcomes and impact?

While the general reasoning behind the ToC could be considered adequate on the level of outputs to outcomes logic, several sets of actions directed towards different target groups are missing to provide for a more (potentially) coherent ToC even on this intervention logic level. The same applies to the outcomes to goal logic and the expectations from the impact of the intervention of such coverage.

While the general reasoning behind the ToC could be considered adequate on the level of outputs to outcomes logic (figures 10a), based on theoretical frameworks, as well as the experience from the numerous projects that have been actively seeking to improve women’s agency, implemented
by the women’s groups, international organizations, and even governments, several sets of actions directed towards different target groups are missing to provide for a more (potentially) coherent ToC even on this intervention logic level. The same applies to the outcomes to goal logic (figure 10b) and the expectations from the impact of the intervention of such coverage, which will be additionally addressed in the later sections.
Outputs to Outcome 1. logic

If beneficiaries (2000) have information on their rights and increased knowledge on how to do self-advocacy by the end of the project
and
If they (30) gain skills to be economically empowered after each activity

Then, beneficiaries’ agency to respond to and prevent VAW/G will be increased (by the end of the project)

Outputs to Outcome 2. logic

If beneficiaries, VAW/G survivors (240) have better access to support services by the end of the project
and
If good practices on access to services for beneficiaries, survivors of VAW/G are shared among institutions/organizations and policy makers (by the end of the project)

Then, beneficiaries, VAW/G survivors receive appropriate and adequate service (by the end of the project)

Outputs to Outcome 3. logic

If beneficiaries (30) gain skills and have the space to advocate for their rights after each activity

Then, beneficiaries are empowered for active participation and leadership for decision-making on the issues of the importance for the position of women and girls in their communities (by the end of the project)
Specifically, such structurally complex changes cannot be achieved (at least) without addressing power imbalances and social inequalities based on gender (in this particular case – interculturally and cross-culturally, which makes it even more demanding) and without specific actions aimed at institutionalizing new and improved practice. With the project primarily targeting women and girls within the population of refugees and asylum seekers (with the identities on the spectra of interdepended disadvantages/oppressions based on gender, race, religion, nationality, class, etc.) and the representatives of relevant institutions (for the capacity building purposes), such intersections call for even broader intervention and thus, more complex ToC with integrated actions towards (contribution to) shifting cultural norms of the receiving community and the community of refugees, and the (contribution to) creation of more sustainable policy solutions (regulations, norms, and practices) in prevention of VAW/G and protection of women and girls refugees, VAW/G survivors.

That said, Atina has been reporting on, and evaluation reasserted that the actual intervention has been addressing the issues (or at least some of the issues) missing from the ToC to provide for higher level of contribution to the achieving expected impact. Atina managed to apply its comprehensive strategic approach by systematically addressing intersectional power imbalances within their approach to all actors, training delivery, public communication and appearances,
partnerships, and coalitions on the national and international level, etc., and the actions in the policy monitoring, reporting, and public advocacy domains.

As with the issue of setting up relevant (project) monitoring system and instruments (elaborated in the Annex H), with the relevant level of generality per result domain, clear definitions of indicators, formulated baseline and target values (per year and total) per indicator, determined relevant methods for data collection and finally, relevant means and sources of verification (including globally recognized structures and systems, such as SDGs); UNTF’s and organizations’ approach to planning and formulating intervention logic could be adapted to reflect the donor’s tendency for simpler interventions and/or to utilize more extensive planning/capacity building and specialized services in this domain.

Relevance of the adaptations, particularly in the context of COVID-19 pandemic

EQ 7: Has the project been able to adjust to the changes in the context and needs of the primary beneficiaries that occurred during the implementation?

EQ 8: How has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced the activities, outputs, and outcomes of the project?

Atina’s adaptations to the changes in the context, including the circumstances emerged from the COVID-19-pandemic and related measures are assessed as very relevant for both groups of beneficiaries and additionally allowed for Atina’s capacity development – creation of new/adapted content, procedures, and formats.

COVID-19 pandemic worsened position of the women and girls, beneficiaries and conditioned Atina’s additional adaptations to the newly emerged circumstances and beneficiaries’ needs – from accepting higher number of beneficiaries into direct assistance program, through organizing online psychosocial support programs, to organizing online capacity building events for the secondary beneficiary group. Yet, all the expected outputs were delivered, and results achieved (and some even exceeded).

Atina’s strategies are designed to align with best practices in the field, in compliance with relevant policies and procedures, and in accordance with all adopted international and local documents addressing the issue of VAW/G and women’s right to dignified life. At the same time recognized as an expert/specialized organization and the one gladly sharing its expertise and know-how, relevance of Atina’s approach, program, and the project in general, and particularly relevance of the adaptations which have been reflecting changes in the context and respective final beneficiaries’ and other target groups’ requests – was reaffirmed by all the interviewed actors, both from the CSOs and the state institutions.
Apart from the drivers that enabled crucial adaptations to the COVID-19 pandemic, described in the previous chapter, learning culture of the organization allowed for a timely recognition of potential challenges and risks and formulating adequate and relevant mitigation strategies.

Atina’s rapid assessment during the COVID-19 crisis and particularly, during the lockdown in Serbia, noted examples of drastic violations of human rights of the organization’s project primer beneficiary group – women and girls within the refugee population in Serbia. According to the assessment from 2020, women and girls, victims of trafficking and violence were losing jobs, they were deprived of the rights which were otherwise provided by the social protection system, including psychological and psychosocial support and even basic supplies within the state-run shelters, and at the same time, were expected to participate in the court proceedings, etc. Majority of women and girls who participated in the assessment reported the reactivation of the trauma they initially suffered from during the period of exploitation or other types of victimization. Refugee women and girls were deprived of any type of assistance provided by the civil society organizations, and the institutions specialized for providing residential care for women victims of violence/exploitation formally denied the rights to the services to the newly referred beneficiaries.

The first adaptation made to respond to such circumstances was to fill in the gaps that emerged because of inadequate functioning of the protection system in Serbia. As mentioned, Atina opened its safe accommodation spaces for all women and girls, VAW/G survivors in need for urgent and/or long-term assistance and accepted the beneficiaries previously residing in the state shelter (i.e., shelter for the victims of human trafficking). Also, Atina was in daily telephone contact with the beneficiaries from the closed asylum and reception centers to introduce an option for identification of any type of victimization and ensure that the process of referral could function, at least to some extent.

“From our perspective, Atina covers topics and provides services that other organizations do not provide, or stopped providing, and the activities they carry out are crucial for meeting the needs of women and girls continuously. They have enough knowledge and other resources to fill in the gaps in the protection system and they have been doing that from the beginning of the ‘refugee crises.’”

Respondent from the state institution
Furthermore, Atina had been functioning as a sort of a resource organization for all the services in need for advice and referral. One of the services that was offered (after the careful planning and creation of internal procedures and guidelines) to the current Atina’s beneficiaries in need, but also to the beneficiaries of other organizations and institutions involved in the protection of VAW/G survivors (within the population of refugees and asylum-seekers, but also wider population) – was an online psychological counseling.

Comparing to other organizations (and the system in general), Atina’s staff was available 24/7 for the beneficiaries in need for additional support and Atina adapted its operations and reorganized budget to be able to respond to the urgent needs and/or emerging needs of women and girls (for accommodation, health assistance, medical procedures, psychosocial assistance, etc., and even the fulfillment of basic needs, jeopardized because of the lost incomes).

Interviewed beneficiaries expressed high levels of satisfaction (especially in comparison with other organizations within the protection system) with Atina’s approach during COVID-19 lockdown, stating that they were regularly called to check whether they were well and healthy, whether they had been provided the necessary living conditions and if they needed any additional support. Beneficiaries who lost jobs due to the pandemic (two respondents were previously working in restaurants and one worked in a hotel) were supported to pay the rent and were provided with all necessary basic support (food, hygienic products, masks, antibacterial products, etc.).

In general, except during quarantine, when Atina (with the other CSOs) was forbidden to enter the asylum/reception centers, support continued, with some group of activities suspended (e.g., yoga classes, group meetings). All crucial support for the women in reception centers also continued online (workshops, counseling, economic empowerment sessions).

The set of activities aimed at building institutional and organizational capacities for adequate/gender-responsive/participatory service provision was also implemented online. Apart from the fact that this allowed for exceeding the targets regarding number of participants and even increased knowledge and skills, participants evaluated adaptations as highly adequate, both
in terms of the content and methodology used for trainings and other public events’ implementation.

Atina’s adaptations to the changes in the context, including the circumstances emerged from the COVID-19-pandemic and related measures are assessed as very relevant for both groups of beneficiaries and additionally allowed for Atina’s capacity development – creation of new/adapted content, procedures, and formats.
3. Efficiency

Within the efficiency dimension, it was assessed to what extent was the project implemented efficiently and cost-effectively. The following aspects were considered: efficiency in the achieving results and the use of resources (compared to alternatives), deviations from the initial plans, influence of COVID-19 pandemic on the efficiency, the organizational style/manner in using human and financial resources.

Project efficiency is evaluated based on the project progress reports (financial and narrative) analysis, management plans and activity reports, reports on adaptations analysis, as well as based on the interviews with the project staff.

Efficiency of the project implementation – project triangle

**EQ 9:** Were the results achieved on time and to budget? Were all activities organized efficiently and on time?

**EQ 10:** How was the difference between planned and actual expenditure justified (if any)?

**EQ 11:** Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

The project was implemented efficiently with the allocated resources spent adequately. Majority of the project activities were implemented on time, with the optimal use of resources, with the minor delays in implementation of few activities, due to COVID-19-related restrictions and measures introduced in Serbia. Even the timeliness of the adaptations to the consequences of the pandemic reasserted Atina’s high efficiency. Significant results were achieved with the exceeded targets and the staff’s dedication and engagement significantly beyond initial expectations.

The fact that Atina was already well established and widely recognized organization within the field of prevention of VAW/G and the protection of VAW/G survivors within the population of refugees and asylum seekers, largely contributed to the high level of efficiency in: a) reaching out to such a high number of final beneficiaries; b) reaching and/or exceeding initially set targets; and finally, c) achieving project results.

Efficiency of the project implementation is deeply connected to the efficiency of Atina’s work in general, since the project reflects organization’s general strategic orientation and, in a way, represents a detailed and enlarged view of Atina’s general approach to one of the key beneficiary groups – women and girls on the move (refugees and asylum-seekers within this project). This assumption is reflected in the fact that out of the initially approved total project budget ($1,084,482), Atina’s contribution was 53,94% ($584,982). Evaluation assessment in the triangle
area (scope, time, budget) covered solely UNTF’s contribution to the project-related budget and expenditures presented in the tables 4a and 4b, with the total grant amount planned at $499,500, and the expenditures executed at $471,688 (for both implementing agencies) and specifically at $457,656.58 (Atina as an implementing agency) (table 4b).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Project total (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total budget</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>Total budget</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.1.</td>
<td>33,000.00</td>
<td>29,992.47</td>
<td>36,007.53</td>
<td>31,636.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2.</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>525,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>34,000.00</td>
<td>29,992.47</td>
<td>38,007.53</td>
<td>32,161.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>5,633.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>5,633.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1 subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,000.00</td>
<td>29,992.47</td>
<td>46,007.53</td>
<td>37,794.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.</td>
<td>11,000.00</td>
<td>10,825.62</td>
<td>12,759.38</td>
<td>9,898.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2.</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3.</td>
<td>32,400.00</td>
<td>28,750.00</td>
<td>36,050.00</td>
<td>31,097.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.4.</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,400.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>57,600.00</td>
<td>51,575.62</td>
<td>65,209.38</td>
<td>52,996.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2.</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,600.00</td>
<td>51,575.62</td>
<td>71,209.38</td>
<td>52,966.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.1.</td>
<td>6,900.00</td>
<td>384.04</td>
<td>13,415.96</td>
<td>866,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2.</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>7,900.00</td>
<td>384.04</td>
<td>15,415.96</td>
<td>866,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project activities subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,900.00</td>
<td>384.04</td>
<td>15,415.96</td>
<td>866,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,482.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,482.00</td>
<td>3,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,300.00</td>
<td>31,550.00</td>
<td>36,800.00</td>
<td>34,908.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>911.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTF CD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>9,175.64</td>
<td>1,339.36</td>
<td>824.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>3,367.62</td>
<td>7,933.28</td>
<td>3,657.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal cross-cutting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65,782.00</td>
<td>44,093.26</td>
<td>58,403.74</td>
<td>43,401.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172,282.00</td>
<td>126,045.39</td>
<td>191,036.61</td>
<td>135,059.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible parties / Implementing agencies</td>
<td>Budget Category</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>Project total (USD)</td>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total budget</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>Total budget</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>Project Total Budget</td>
<td>Project Total Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Atina</td>
<td>Project Activities</td>
<td>106,500.00</td>
<td>81,952.13</td>
<td>132,632.87</td>
<td>160,093.41</td>
<td>163,289.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E/Audit/Management</td>
<td>38,300.00</td>
<td>34,917.62</td>
<td>45,582.38</td>
<td>69,404.79</td>
<td>47,273.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total NGO Atina</td>
<td>144,800.00</td>
<td>116,869.75</td>
<td>178,215.25</td>
<td>229,498.20</td>
<td>210,563.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>Project Activities</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E/Audit/Management</td>
<td>27,482.00</td>
<td>9,175.64</td>
<td>12,821.36</td>
<td>3,924.36</td>
<td>8,897.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total UN Women</td>
<td>27,482.00</td>
<td>9,175.64</td>
<td>12,821.36</td>
<td>3,924.36</td>
<td>8,897.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT TOTAL</td>
<td>172,282.00</td>
<td>126,045.39</td>
<td>191,036.61</td>
<td>238,395.20</td>
<td>210,563.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To present the first finding of the effectiveness, project evaluation used a program expense ratio (PER), as one of the most common key performance indicators used both internally and by donors and watchdog entities for measuring effectiveness for the nonprofits. PER represents the percentage of the budget spent on the core mission, namely, project activities, and for the evaluated project, based on the presented table 4b is measured at 72.68% (0.73), with the annual distribution presented in the table 5a.

**Table 5a: Annual PER calculated for Atina’s expenditures as presented in the GMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.12% (0.71)</td>
<td>70.38% (0.73)</td>
<td>77.54% (0.78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such distribution and particularly the increase in the third year of project implementation demonstrates the common practice for the multi-year project implementation. Namely, as the management system adapts and improves, the funds are being allocated more purposefully and efficiently. Moreover, since the personnel budget heading/category included monthly compensation/salaries for the direct assistance coordinator, (economic) empowerment coordinator, and the expense for the psychological counseling (in the Y2 and Y3), which could be considered expenses for the program implementation, it was concluded that the actual PER is even higher (presented in the table 5b). Namely, the only ‘traditionally’ administrative costs – salaries for the project management and administration (financial manager), office rent and communication costs made less than 14% of the expenditures in the Y3.

**Table 5b: Annual PER calculated for the Atina’s expenditures for the project activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.47% (0.83)</td>
<td>82.90% (0.83)</td>
<td>86.35% (0.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the latter distribution corresponds with the Y2 implementation dynamics and the COVID-19-related adaptations to the great extent.

Based on the findings from the interviewees with the program and project managers, compensations for the staff additionally engaged to support project implementation (both programmatically and administratively), as well as other project- and comprehensive program-related administrative expenses had been covered either by Atina’s own resources or by other active projects in the implementation period.

All mentioned attest to a significantly high level of efficiency on the cost dimension. With the organization with such distinctive capacities and unique (relative to the sub-sector) expertise and scope, it would be advisable to include additional sets of administrative costs into the budget.
and/or engage in negotiations with the donors to ensure better sustainability of its functions and results. This recommendation will be additionally elaborated in the next section of the report.

From the technical point, the project duration was extended from 31 August to 30 November 2021, with the approval of the UNTF and the funds spent in accordance with the approved no-cost extension and the reallocation of the costs within the program expense heading.

Majority of Action’s outputs were implemented in a timely and financially responsible manner. Atina’s prior engagement with the primary target group, as well as established relations with relevant institutions and CSOs, enabled smooth implementation from the very beginning. Continuous presence of Atina’s staff (mobile teams, cultural mediators and psychologists when needed) in the targeted asylum/reception centers allowed for adequate needs assessment(s) and action planning, setting up workshops’ methodology and selection of the topics on a project level, but also efficient adaptations on a week-to-week basis.

Also, already established structures and approach of the comprehensive direct assistance and the economic empowerment programs, as well as wide recognition of Atina’s competence in providing adequate support to the women and girls VAW/G survivors, allowed for smooth and regular service provision linked to the outcomes 1 and 2.

Basically, the fact that Atina was already well established and widely recognized organization within the field of prevention of VAW/G and the protection of VAW/G survivors within the population of refugees and asylum seekers, largely contributed to the high level of efficiency in: a) reaching out to such a high number of final beneficiaries (as mentioned in the Effectiveness section, almost 95% of all women and girls residing in/transiting through Serbia in the period 2018-2021 participated in different activities of the project); b) reaching and/or exceeding initially set targets; and finally, c) achieving project results.

Efficiency in the project implementation – systems and people

**EQ 12**: Have the human and financial resources been used in the best manner possible?

**EQ 13**: To what extent the resources were used economically? How could the use of resources be improved?
The project management structure for the project was set to allow for smooth integration of the project into the already established management system within Atina.

Atina is a women-led organization with the director and managers who are globally and nationally recognized voices on the issues of the rights of women and girls, VAW/G survivors. Atina’s director provides overall strategic guidance and advises on the political framework for Atina’s work, initiates innovations, provides directions for the fundraising and the organization’s sustainability. As a feminist professional and activist, Atina’s director was involved in project implementation from the project development phase.

Program and project managers were responsible for overall management, project decision-making, and the integration of the project structures into the general functions of the organization. Technical aspects of the implementation, including action planning, scheduling, coordination, and reporting, were the tasks of Atina’s program coordinators (with the programs currently set at: direct assistance, economic empowerment, capacity building, policy monitoring; and the function of the peer support and advocacy coordinator’s position being transferred into organizational function and mainstreamed). Project manager was tasked with the reporting to the donor and other constituency groups (beneficiaries, partners, etc.), while the beneficiaries’ participation was primarily organized and supervised by the peer support and advocacy coordinator (during the first two years) and by all engaged staff (by the project end).

With the staff experienced in providing direct assistance (psychologists, cultural mediators, and social workers), management, research, policy analysis and advocacy, ethical data collection, M&E, and administration, Atina managed to maximize its efficiency and productivity in achieving project results. All Atina’s professionals interviewed during the evaluation assessment attested to the high levels of dedication and efforts invested into the project management, and general achievement of the organization’s mission.
Atina has a solid procedural framework to lean on in its everyday organizational and program management. Procedures and practices are harmonized with the national administrative and financial obligations, as well as donor’s requests, and are additionally adapted to each project implementation. This makes Atina very reliable and efficient in managing all aspects of the project implementation and reporting, as emphasized by the UNTF Portfolio Manager during the evaluation interview. Key characteristics of Atina’s (overall) management and operations that are extrapolated during the assessment are: reliability, responsiveness, transparency, adaptiveness, inclusiveness, cost-effectiveness.

Although the external actors pointed to the high employee turnover as a potential challenge in longer-term stability of the organization, and the evaluation additionally observed changes in the project management structure, evaluation nevertheless concluded that due to the well-developed overall management system, robust internal procedures, communication channels with the organization, regular transfers of the know-how, project was managed highly successfully. This notion was additionally confirmed by the Portfolio Manager.

As specific to the UNTF approach, during the project implementation, Atina had the opportunity to additionally benefit from the capacity building programs organized and implemented by the UNTF, so to additionally adapt and ensure smooth operation during the project implementation, make connections with women’s organization world-wide, present its work and learn from the existing experience of other UNTF’s grantees and partners. These opportunities were very welcomed and assessed as good donor practice in communication with the grantees/partner organization. In addition, collaboration between Atina and UNTF, mostly represented by the Portfolio Manager, was assessed by both involved parties as particularly productive and empowering (Atina’s assessment). Finally, cooperation with the UNTF incentivized Atina to invest additional efforts in a deliberation and reporting on the COVID-19-related challenges that their beneficiaries were facing, safety measures, staff wellbeing, adaptations in the service provision, etc., as well as in formulating new organizational policy (Code of conduct on the rights and obligations of the Employer, employees, and engaged persons in relation to prevention and prohibition of sexual harassment) that entered into force during the project implementation and could serve as a pathway and the practical resource for the civil sector in Serbia.

Therefore, as a feminist donor, focused on dialogue and long-term partnerships that are being built and maintained through active listening and supporting real priorities rooted in women’s experience and knowledge, UNTF is recognized as an important project stakeholder. In a contrast with ‘typical’ donor organization, UNTF’s general approach and facilitation actually motivated and catalyzed cooperation(s) and accomplishments.

Atina’s systems, management, including financial management and administration are assessed as highly efficient, both based on the documentation revision and on the findings from the

---

11 The term ‘facilitation’ is hereby used as an approach different/opposite from ‘traditional’ management regarding decision making (participatory) and internal communication (empowering).
interviewees with the UNTF Portfolio Manager and the engaged administrative and program staff from Atina.

**Influence of the pandemic on the project efficiency**

**EQ 14:** Has COVID-19 pandemic caused reduced efficiency?

From the starting point, it might be concluded that the adaptations made to the respond to COVID-19 pandemic ‘crisis’ in Serbia did not reduce quality of the project performance, but rather added another layer to Atina’s already established and recognized credibility within the sub-sector of protection of women and girls on the move.

As mentioned, Atina promptly (and adequately) adapted to the circumstances that emerged from the COVID-19 pandemic. The organization continued providing most needed – urgent, but also long-term support services to the VAW/G survivors (outcome 2), and even introduced online psychological counseling for the women and girls in need for this type of service. This service was additionally supported by the UNTF through the Emergency relief fund. Additional resources helped in expanding the online counseling service, which was, as mentioned in the previous chapters, assessed as one of the crucial adaptations in the field of protection/provision of necessary services to primary beneficiaries, by all interviewed actors during the evaluation assessment, and the most importantly – by the beneficiaries themselves.

Very soon after the introduction of a lockdown in Serbia, Atina started organizing online workshops for women and girls in asylum/reception centers and adapted the economic empowerment program to serve a larger number of beneficiaries. Interviewed beneficiaries even referred to the online workshops on creating CV and job interviews as very effective in their later job placement.

Outputs and related activities that were slightly postponed due to the extended focus on adapting direct assistance program, were activities aimed at sharing good practices and building capacities of the professionals in the protection system to create and implement gender-responsive and participatory services for VAW/G survivors. Basically, Atina implemented 9 online trainings instead of initially planned 42 offline, with a higher number of participants than initially planned (247, instead of 240). Furthermore, although with the delay, instead of one final conference, Atina organized two for 309 participants in total, which allowed for: a) new set of opportunities for beneficiaries to plan, initiate and organize advocacy actions; b) the professionals to learn about new/advance standards in the protection area; c) interact with each other and learn from the case studies developed to present best practices in utilizing existing normative solutions and assisting women and girls VAW/G survivors; d) and engage in networking.
Atina’s capacity to organize and implement online programs was assessed as exceptional by all participants in the online events – efficient, well-structured, well-informed, and friendly facilitation, great use of online tools and time, and active participation of beneficiaries, as also observed by the evaluators, attest for such assessment.

In addition, Atina’s was providing support, and even assisted with resources to some extent, to other services run by the state institutions and other CSOs during the pandemic, and actively assisted their beneficiaries when asked to. One of the examples of the growing caseload was the one that emerged from the close-down of the state-run shelter for the victims of trafficking. Also, Atina was a go-to organization for advice and a resource for connections and professional referrals.

It might be concluded that the adaptations made to respond to COVID-19 pandemic ‘crisis’ in Serbia did not reduce quality of the project performance, but rather added another layer to Atina’s already established and recognized credibility within the sub-sector of protection of women and girls on the move.
4. **Sustainability**

Within the sustainability dimension, it was assessed to what extent will the project results be sustained after the project ends. The following aspects were considered: external and internal factors which influenced sustainability of the project results, likelihood of the stakeholders’ cooperation/scaling up/replication/institutionalization in the future, level of adaptiveness/built-in resilience to future risks.

Project sustainability is evaluated based on the documentation analysis, evidence of collaboration between Atina and different actors within the sub-sector, insights into the strategic planning process and draft strategic plan analysis, as well as based on the interviews with the beneficiaries and Atina’s staff.

*Sustainability of the project results*

**EQ 15:** What are the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project, including external and internal, such as Atina’s approach and practices (capacity building, participatory advocacy, Bagel shop, etc.)?

**EQ 16:** How is the stakeholders’ engagement likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated, or institutionalized after funding ceases?
First, to answer the questions about sustainability of the project results, it is important to make a distinction between two key positions tackled by the project – sustainability of the positive changes/improvements in the lives of the primary beneficiaries and the spillover effect of the changes produced with the secondary beneficiaries and the system they are integral part of (women refugees and asylum seekers protection system in Serbia). While the anchor dimension for the sustainable changes in gender (power) relations – i.e., cultural norms – as mentioned in the Relevance section of the report, was not a structural element of the project design/theory of change, as was not a creation of sustainable mechanisms and systems which could ground the improved standards and the changes on the individual level, the project exceeded its potentials in the sustainability dimension. Mentioned embeddedness of the project into Atina’s strategic orientation allowed for the sustainability of the results much beyond the scope of the project and as inseparable from Atina’s approach to project implementation, the evaluation also considered Atina’s general actions within its sustainability assessment aspect.

With all that in mind, several factors contributed to the good sustainability prospects of the project results:
1. Atina’s dedication and engagement in the policy analysis, monitoring and reporting and the successful contextualization of the international standards and practices

Based on documentation analysis and the interviewees with the respondents from the CSOs and institutions, Atina’s approach is based on the best international human rights and women’s human rights standards and practices and (although not funded through this project), Atina’s program dedicated to policy monitoring, analysis, and reporting, represents one of the anchors of program and approach sustainability. Apart from continued desk reviews and the research of the new international developments and contextualization of the findings, Atina reports on it nationally and integrates it into its other programs – adapts its approach to direct assistance, awareness raising and capacity building.

During the project implementation, with the constant dedication to the final beneficiaries’ participation, Atina had been actively assessing and researched and was reporting on the position of refugee and asylum-seeking women, position of the most vulnerable women, including survivors of VAW/G and human trafficking, and the position of children and girls in relation to the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention), The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW Convention), the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Detailed description of the processes and the content of the reports are available in the final narrative report that Atina submitted to the UNTF in December 2022.

2. Relevance of the Atina’s approach in the context of national normative and strategic framework

Precondition for sustainability of services introduced and offered by Atina could be found in The Law on Social Protection12, as the most relevant, but also, all other positive legislative solutions. Some of the basic principles of the normative framework include decentralization – devolution of certain responsibilities for social protection on local governments, development of community services that are oriented to the needs of beneficiaries, introduction of civil society organizations and private companies in the social protection system as the new providers, and so on. The objectives of the social protection system correspond greatly with the objectives of Atina’s direct assistance.

---

12 "Official Gazette of RS", No. 24/2011
support program and are defined as: the preclusion of abuse, neglect, or exploitation, and/or elimination of their consequences, and the creation of equal opportunities for independent living and encouraging of social inclusion.

3. Already and newly established partnerships and general dedication to networking and creating long-term relations across different sectors and policy focuses

In a global context, Atina has already been well-connected and actively engaged in deliberations and standardization of the practices dedicated to the prevention of VAW/G and protection of survivors. Nevertheless, during the project implementation, Atina established one new partnership and became a member of an international feminist NGO WIDE+. This European network of associations and women’s rights activists has a mission in advocating for policy changes at the European level and pointing out the deep inequalities and uneven distribution of power. Such partnerships enable Atina to learn about new standards and practices, involve the primary beneficiaries in global policy processes, and at the same time, to indirectly influence sustainable institutional and structural changes in Serbia (by reporting on the situation in Serbia and providing inputs for formulation of recommendations that would be imposed by the international structures). One such example was the participation of Atina in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE Forum) for Beijing+25 Regional Review of the realization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

On the national level, Atina has been a strategic member of the Women Against Violence Network, which is sort of an assurance that the actions and the project effects will be sustained, and its further replication coordinated closely with all women’s CSOs, especially service providers throughout Serbia. Also, during the project implementation, Atina became a member of the platform of CSOs for monitoring UN human rights mechanisms in Serbia, managed by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in Serbia. Collaboration with the human rights and women’s human rights on the tasks aimed at: successful provision of direct assistance services to VAW/G survivors, policy analysis and monitoring, building capacities of the institutions mandated with the protection, as well as public advocacy, already proved to be of significant importance to sustainability of the project (and program) results, widely beyond the scope of this evaluation, whereas in this case, evaluation additionally confirmed the highest levels of effectiveness of the established collaborations.
Atina’s 16-year successful cooperation with the relevant line ministries, including MoI, MoLEVSP, MoJ, as well as the most relevant institutions within the ministries – National Anti-trafficking Coordination Office, Public Prosecutor Office, Commissariat for Refugees and Migration, National Employment Agency, Asylum Office (MoI), Center for the Protection of Human Trafficking Victims, centers for social welfare throughout Serbia, and so on, as well as the solid recognition of Atina’s work by all these actors, already elaborated in the previous chapters of the report, also call for the conclusion about high level of sustainability of the project results, and the certain scale up in the future.

4. Atina’s dedication local integration of the best national and international solutions and practices

Atina’s general approach to program implementation – assessment, concept development, piloting, evaluation, learning and drawing conclusions for the policy initiatives and for the capacity building and local integration – could also be considered as a basis for sustainability of the results. All the activities implemented within the course of the project were based on this organizational general functioning logic, as determined during the evaluation.

“We worked with Atina on the development of the SOP for the protection of refugees against GBV and on the training for the field workers to recognize and report GBV. As an advantage of Atina, I would like to point out the fact that Atina was well known to state institutions even before the ‘refugee crisis’ (before 2015). Institutions have confidence in their interpretations of the situation on the ground, so I know that they appreciate and trust Atina’s advice in the process of VAW/G/trafficking/exploitation victims’ identification, victims’ treatment, and so on. We are aware that field workers even inform Atina about the potential victims and consult them about the best course of action, even before they notify the police."

Respondent from the UN agency in Serbia

“This is the organization that managed to create fully sustainable local networks in more than 10 local municipalities and never stepped up from supporting them and all their members. This is, for me, the best example of a sustainability of work in the civil society sector here.”

Respondent from the state institution
Atina’s dedication to continuity in service provision (primary target group) and the follow up (secondary target group)

The most sustainable aspects of the project, as initially provided in the ToC, are the benefits for the primary beneficiaries. Depending on the action output and project activities, the majority of the beneficiaries report that their lives changed and that they would “bring the changes” with them.

Sustainability of the project results in this area could also be observed in the strengths and capacities of women (beneficiaries) who are empowered to support other women in need for additional support, to participate and even lead (to some extent) advocacy actions, and/or to conceptualize and implement preventive and awareness raising actions. Long-term dedication and the resources invested in the women’s empowerment thus have multiple effects – apart from the benefits for women’s physical and psychological wellbeing, they are useful for deeper understanding of the effects of different interventions and measures, and finally – for the improvements of existing protection practices and programs (proposed and initiated by the beneficiaries).

As for the sustainability of the effect produced by the capacity building actions, institutions and organizations reported that Atina managed to “really introduce them to each other”, because they had enough space and support to overcome past misunderstandings and even conflicts.

“I owe Atina everything I am in my life. They saved me from a terrible life full of violence and insecurity, helped me stabilize, supported me through all the processes and procedures – either themselves or together with other organizations. I have a job and my own apartment now and I can tell you that I would never tolerate any violence or something similar.”

*Ex-beneficiary of the comprehensive assistance program*
After the trainings, conferences, and other gatherings, they continued cooperation in provision of direct support to women and girls, children, or refugees in general in need for multisectoral assistance and approach. In addition, representatives from various institutions stated that Atina helped them to overcome prejudices towards the civil sector in general, which could hopefully influence improvements in general cooperation between the sectors in the future.

Almost all respondents stated that the preconditions for the effects achieved in this area were a long-term partnership with Atina, Atina’s continued dedication to the central topic – protection of women and girls, VAW/G survivors, as well as regular follow up. Being perceived as credible and sustainable, Atina managed to influence practical and even policy debate in the area of refugees and asylum-seekers’ protection, which will be further discussed in the next report section.

6. Other sustainability initiatives

Currently, Atina is dedicated to licensing the professionals and services for the women and girls, survivors of VAW/G, trafficking, and exploitation which could be funded by the state in the future. For now, one service was licensed, and the beneficiaries have been referred to it, but the state funding has not yet been provided.

Atina’s program that was assessed as the most (potentially) sustainable is the EEP, with its link to Atina’s social enterprise, initially established (in 2014) to provide for a better sustainability prospect of the direct assistance schemes.

Program built around beneficiaries’ strengths and capacities produced values for beneficiaries and the sustainable benefits for them individually by helping them to overcome VAW/G consequences, empowering them to own and voice their agency, and by continuously supporting them to express their concerns and advocate for the improvements of their own treatment, but also – improvements on the structural level. Also, the project positioned the very topic on the protection agenda in Serbia and activated and motivated a wide range of actors to invest their resources into programs and actions aimed at providing support to women and girls refugees and asylum seekers, in a structured and adequate manner.
However, sustainability of the direct assistance program needs to be further secured and advanced in the next project/program phases. Namely, due to the general unfavorable conditions for refugees’ and asylum seeker’s integration in Serbia and the lack of state’s investment into protection programs and services, additional actions aimed at structural improvements in integration prospects will be needed in the future and Atina is equipped with the necessary knowledge, capacities, partnerships, and experience to lead these actions.

**Built-in resilience**

**EQ 17:** How has the project, and especially adaptations to the pandemic, built-in resilience to future risks?

The project with its adaptations allowed for a systematization of key steps as a reaction in any similar/crisis: rapid assessment, action planning, introduction of a set of new/adapted measures, creation of relevant procedures and/or adaptation of the existing ones, agility in implementation.

First, it is important to note that Atina has been active in the provision of direct assistance to the most vulnerable groups of women, children and girls from its establishment. Victims of human trafficking (mostly sexually exploited), rape, incest, partner violence, etc., usually from already multiple discriminated groups, have been Atina’s primary beneficiaries from 2004. Atina has been providing urgent and the long-term assistance services 24/7 and has been available for both its beneficiaries for support provision and other actors in need of advice or referral services and the deterioration of the position of women and girls refugees and asylum seekers, due to the lockdown and restrictions introduced on the national level, and particularly within the asylum and reception centers, was thus not a circumstance that caught Atina unprepared. Namely, already well-developed procedures, highly motivated, knowledgeable, and resourceful staff, and wide recognition, were preconditions for an adequate response and functional adaptations to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Even so, it is possible to systematize a series of steps and actions which Atina implemented as a reaction to the pandemic, which will likely additionally improve the organization’s resilience in the future (figure 11).
Atina’s built-in mechanism for reacting in crisis situations

- Beneficiaries position and needs;
- Systems’ capacities to fulfill the needs of beneficiaries;
- Contextual analysis.

- Participatory planning of a flexible system of actions grouped per program and need category.

- Internal procedures for adaptive functioning and/or additional context-related procedures.

- In collaboration with all relevant actors.

- Creation of procedures.

- Focusing on change management and constant values for beneficiaries.

- Agility in implementation.

- Rapid assessment.

- Action planning.

- Introduction of measures.
5. Impact

Within the impact dimension, it was assessed to what extent project contributed to ending violence against women, gender equality and/or women’s empowerment, both intendedly and/or unintendedly. The following aspects were considered: number of people affected by the project, real difference/changes that the project made to the lives of the primary beneficiaries and their perception of the change, access to necessary services for the primary beneficiaries, beneficiaries’ agency, and the influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on the (potential) impact of the project.

Project impact is evaluated based on the result framework matrix analysis, project reports, internal MEL data and reports, materials produced during the project implementation (best practices examples), interviewees with beneficiaries, Atina’s team, and other stakeholders involved in the field, and the observation of the conference.

Changes in women’s and girls’ lives

**EQ 18:** What real difference/changes has the activity made to the lives of the primary stakeholders, how they perceive that change, and how many of them have been affected?

Although it is not possible to assess the impact of an intervention right upon its finalization, there is evidence that the project influenced changes/impact on the individual and relational level with almost all population of female refugees in Serbia. However, the impact on the individual level (and even to some extent on the relational) – increased knowledge and agency – was largely evident with the beneficiaries who stayed in Serbia for more than 6 months. At the same time, 11 beneficiaries had been formally employed, and with the approach Atina utilizes, it’s highly likely that all beneficiaries would become economically independent in recent future (40 from this project). All beneficiaries who had been provided with the comprehensive direct assistance exited violence, changed the environment, and used provided opportunities to overcome trauma, become healthier and more independent in the future. The impact on their lives is immeasurable, since the very fact that they got the needed support to escape violence, could be considered sufficient to rationalize the efforts.

First of all, it should be noted that it is difficult to assess the impact of any intervention right upon its finalization. However, existing evidence about the effects on women beneficiaries, and the impact of Atina’s past performance could serve as a pathway for the analysis of the mid-term and
long-term effects achieved by the project *Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia*, which will most probably lead to the desirable impact in the future.

As the most used analytical framework, the ecological model of VAW/G (adapted model to reflect the position of VAW/G survivors in humanitarian settings is presented as the figure 12), offers the overview of the complexity of the causes, as well as underlying factors that influence VAW/G’s persistence and its presence, and at the same time implies a structural path for the fight against it.

*Figure 12: Adapted ecological model of factors associated with VAW*\(^\text{13}\)

To understand the (potential) impact of the project, several important issues (preconditions for the impact achievement) should be considered:

1. Atina’s strategic orientation encompasses actions that aim to tackle all groups of factors influencing VAW/G, and moreover, considers them intersectionality and in the wider context of a Serbian socio-economic context, and a global migratory context. Thus, although the project’s ToC had (relatively) limited focus, Atina’s actions during the time of project implementation, managed to cover a wider area and influence all four areas – individual, relational, community and societal factors, or at least – some aspects of all areas.

---

2. Atina is widely recognized as a prominent, credible, and relevant organization for the provision of services to the VAW/G survivors, as well as for referral, consultations, etc. In addition, Atina has been developing long-term partnerships based on mutual interests and trust and utilizes the partnerships in all the actions involving primary beneficiaries.

3. Atina’s actions are based on the continuously assessed needs and a dedication to the follow ups, based on the needs assessments, and thus, the actions’ relevance improves its prospects for the future impact.

4. Atina has a significant resource base – from extensive expertise, dedicated staff, through adequate infrastructure and financial resources.

5. Atina managed to reach 2002 primary beneficiaries, which was 96.4% of all women and girls registered as refugees and asylum seekers in Serbia in the period 1 September 2018 to 30 November 2021. Such wide coverage increased the probability of an impact of all actions implemented (since already assessed as effective and relevant).

Targeted women and girls were from Afghanistan, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Somalia, SAR, Nigeria, Eritrea, Cameroon, Russia, BiH, Turkey, India, refugees and asylum seekers, family/partner violence survivors, survivors of human trafficking, rape, incest, sexual exploitation, labor exploitation, etc. Apart from the difference in nationality, ethnicity and religious views, beneficiaries were of diverse political orientation, ability, types of disabilities, different sexual orientation, and gender expression. With the workshops organized in the asylum centers in Krnjača (Belgrade), Bogovadja (Lajkovac) and Banja Koviljača (Loznica), as well as in the reception centers in Preševo, Bujanovac, Bosilegrad and Vranje (Southern Serbia), and Šid (Vojvodina, Northern Serbia), the project influenced changes/impact on the individual and relational level with almost all population of female refugees in Serbia. However, as suggested in the Effectiveness chapter of the report, evaluation analysis showed that the impact on the individual level (and even to some extent on the relational) could had been achieved with the beneficiaries who stayed in Serbia (and in the program) for more than 6 months (at least 30% of all reached beneficiaries) (figure 13).
Beneficiaries of the workshops reported fundamental changes in their knowledge and attitudes about women's rights, trafficking prevention, reaction to violence, and children upbringing, as the most memorable and relevant topics. As they were provided with the constant support in practicing newly gained knowledge and attitudes, beneficiaries were actively involved in the peer support groups' meetings, they were proactive in approaching Atina and other service providers with their requests. Some of them (depending on the legal status), entered the integration program in Serbia, entered the educational system and labor market, and finally – became active (women's,

---

14 Stages of Change Model posits that individuals move through six stages of (behavioral) change: precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance. For each stage of change, different intervention strategies are most effective at moving the person to the next stage of change and subsequently through the model to maintenance, the ideal stage of behavior.
refugees’ human rights advocates (which could be considered as proxy indicators for the effectiveness to impact on the individual level).

The impact of the EEP, which had been provided in a comprehensive manner and involved women and girls accommodated out of the asylum and reception centers (with its job placement component), managed to produce significant change in the lives of beneficiaries involved – all interviewed participants considered this program as precondition for the fulfillment of all other rights and for their future independence. During the evaluation assessment, 11 beneficiaries had been formally employed, and with the approach Atina utilizes, it’s highly likely that all beneficiaries would become economically independent in the recent future (40 from this project).

Of the utmost importance is the fact that 260 women and girls, survivors of trafficking, exploitation, family violence, partner violence, incest, and rape, changed the environment and used provided opportunities to overcome trauma, become healthier and more independent in the future.

The impact on their lives is immeasurable, since the very fact that they got the needed support to escape violence, could be considered sufficient to rationalize the efforts.

Interviewed beneficiaries who have experience of accommodation in Atina’s safe house refer to this support as the most relevant/crucial support they have received, since it actually enabled their exit from violence and further empowerment. In addition, what they state as important and what distinguishes Atina’s approach is that “Atina asks...”

“Some women from the center ask me for my help when they need something – a contact or advice – because they know that I am well connected (smile). And I give my best to help them. I myself invited more than 20 women to the Atina’s workshops, so they can hear everything for themselves and become more prepared for the life in Europe.”

Beneficiary from the reception center in Krnjača

"I had a problem with my husband who was violent. Atina helped me talk to the police when I wanted to report the violence. And they were with me all along, throughout the whole process. And they told me that I could use the safe house and that I could call if anything happened."

Beneficiary of a comprehensive assistance program

"It used to be very difficult for me. And one night I sent a message around 2am and I got the answer. That’s how I knew that I really wasn’t alone and that they were there for me."

Beneficiary of a comprehensive assistance program
“I think everything that happened to me was not so terrible, and that I should forget it all, but I am haunted by the images. I realized that I need new images of me, strong and powerful! Therefore, I am gladly helping women refugees in Serbia, while waiting for a better solution for myself. What I want to say to all those who work with women like me, who survived violence, is that they need to know we are strong and brave, and we wouldn’t have survived if we weren’t. All we need is your support to find our strength after so much time and after our long journey.”

Beneficiary of direct assistance program, Atina’s publication Violence against women and girls among

you what you need the most and delivers exactly that”. They describe the first days after arriving at Atina’s safe accommodation as a time when "the sun shone on them" or they finally "saw the light and the way out" and when they could finally sleep and relax without “fear of tomorrow”. They generally describe these first days as a time when tension and fear were reduced and when they were finally able to rest and reflect on the circumstances in which they were, think about their needs and desires and understand the options that were available. Only from that position, after a few days of regular meals, rather fair conditions for personal hygiene, regular beds and clothes provided to them, were they able to start thinking about further steps and their goals in the long run.

Women and girls – beneficiaries recognize the impact of Atina’s work through the changes they experienced in their own levels of confidence, knowledge, and skills, as well as their position within the society and attribute those changes to Atina’s specific approaches and activities implemented during the project, and most of all – the ability to recognize their existing capacities and to build on them. The most significant changes/impact vis-à-vis specific aspects of Atina’s program are presented in table 7.

Table 7: Most significant changes attributed to the specific Atina’s approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact perceived</th>
<th>Atina’s approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are stronger, more confident, and more oriented towards their future</td>
<td>Regular contact and continuous needs assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-judgmental communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are ready to take responsibilities for their decisions</td>
<td>Provision of opportunities to decide and try (even make mistakes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their physical and mental health is improved</td>
<td>Provision of decent living conditions - accommodation, food, hygiene products while needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of medical and psychological assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have acquired skills and knowledge that will benefit them in the long run and provide security, stability, and independence</td>
<td>Specific knowledge and skills through the EEP, including language, IT, communication skills, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are linked with other actors who can support them</td>
<td>Full participation in all processes, including external ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are connected to other women and dedicated to the mutual support</td>
<td>Organization of various activities to provide the opportunity to connect and gain and support other women who are in similar circumstances through peer support groups and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They developed new interests and strove for them, from education, through business opportunities to various types of relaxation and self-care</td>
<td>Provision of the support for recognizing own capacities, resources, and strengths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EQ 19:** How has the access to necessary services for refugee and asylum-seeking women been improved by the project? How was their agency improved?

Asylum-seeking women, empowered by the project, started voicing their concerns publicly and in front of the responsible institutions, while the full impact of this practice is yet to be seen in the future.

“I had some advocacy experience in the country I came from. However, in the Advocacy Group I met lot of women from different countries and environments and learned that we all have the same needs. We all want to be considered not only as asylum seekers, but as human beings. We all want to be heard, appreciated, and valued.”

*Beneficiary, member of the Advocacy group*

Furthermore, members of the advocacy group have had been actively involved in both internal and external program development, awareness raising, reporting and policy making processes (table 8) and are recognized as key reference points in this field by the most relevant actors interviewed during the evaluation assessment (e.g., UNHCR, Danish Refugee Council, Belgrade Center for Human Rights, etc.), which attests to the high level of effectiveness, but also to the clear (road to) impact of this project outcome.
Table 8: (Policy) processes and deliverables/Advocacy group involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Involved organizations/Targeted institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy inputs</td>
<td>Recommendations for the improvement of services for integration and protection from VAW/G</td>
<td>MoI, MoLEVS, Protector of Citizens’ Office, Belgrade City Center for Social Work, local anti-trafficking teams in Vranje and Novi Sad, TRAG foundation, LABRIS, Freedom has no price, US State Department, UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness raising/Capacity building</td>
<td>Street actions bring attention to the violence and exploitation risks; Participation on the trainings and conferences</td>
<td>Youth offices from Vranje, Kikinda, Novi Pazar, Obrenovac and Jagodina WIDE+ (Women in Development Europe, EU TACSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-organizing</td>
<td>Formed organization Women on the Way, created and printed material, organized public events</td>
<td>Trag Foundation, Reconstruction Women’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and shadow reporting</td>
<td>Organizational reports and joint CSO reports – position of refugee and asylum-seeking women, VAW/G survivors</td>
<td>GREVIO expert group of the Council of Europe, GRETA expert group of the Council of Europe, UN CEDAW Committee, Special Working Group for monitoring the implementation of the Strategy for combating human trafficking and supporting the victims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“It was the first time in my professional carrier to meet the refugee who referred to the exact articles of the relevant laws requesting her rights. These women (Advocacy group’s members) are introduced to us by Atina, and we will try to include them in our processes from now on.”  

Respondent, decision-maker

Moreover, institutions’ representatives attested that the (future) impact of the capacity building
activities could be largely attributed to the active involvement of a primary beneficiary group in trainings’ implementation.

**Improved performance of the institutions involved**

**EQ 20:** How did the project impact and improve the operation of the institutions involved in the project?

Capacity building component of the project made a permanent change in the prioritization of the involved institutions’ functions and activities, motivating them to stay dedicated to the identification of VAW/G victims and their referral to adequate services, which would potentially be seen as a general improved functioning of the state in the field of VAW/G prevention and victims’ protection. Yet, to integrate such changes into general institutions’ operations and the policies that guide it, constant efforts need to be invested to sustain current, and produce additional systemic improvements.

Outside the project scope, yet highly relevant for the impact analysis (societal aspects of the change) is Atina’s involvement in advocating recognition of gender-based violence as an act of persecution in the Law on Asylum and Temporary Protection, adopted in 2018. Atina’s (and other women’s organizations dealing with the women’s rights in general and the protection of women against VAW/G) advocacy position concerned harmonization of the law with the provisions of the Council of Europe Convention against Violence against Women in relation to the recognition of gender-based violence as the basis for the granting of refugee protection and the introduction of gender sensitive decision-making procedures on asylum applications. Adopted adaptations implied a shift in protection paradigm and opened a space for further improvements and operationalizations of the legislative intentions.

“I can give you an example of one social worker who was refusing to admit that any issue with the inequality existed at all. She argued that it was ‘natural’ for women to be quiet and depended. I met her several times at Atina’s events and trainings. Now, after two years of cooperation with Atina, she is the loudest in advocating for the rights of women refugees. If that’s not an impact, I literally don’t know what is.”

*Respondent from a state institution*

The very topic – protection of women and girls in the population of refugees and asylum seekers from VAW/G – is assessed to be introduced and put on the agenda of the institutions’ actions by Atina and the project interventions.

Institutions (and organizations) targeted by the capacity
building component of the project reported that the content of the trainings made a permanent change in the prioritization of their functions and activities and that they would stay dedicated to the identification of VAW/G victims and their referral to adequate services. Three topics that were assessed by the institutions’ representatives as the most memorable (and probable to make an impact in the future) are:

- Gender aspect of the ‘refugee crisis’
- Indicators for identification of trafficking victims
- Available services and referral paths

From the international organizations’ perspective, the impact of Atina’s work can be described as twofold – Atina helps the civil society sector in gaining recognition from the institutions, while it also helps institutions in being presented as more reliable and relevant to the final beneficiaries, which together influence improved functioning of the state in the field of VAW/G prevention and victims’ protection and in that way, improved equality prospects, hence influencing community and societal layers of the general change.

In order to integrate such changes into general institutions’ operations and the policies that guide it, nevertheless, additional efforts to sustain current, and produce additional systemic improvements, are needed in the future – both in terms of support in introduction and/or state financing of the necessary comprehensive and individualized support services for VAW/G survivors (among the refugees and asylum-seekers), establishing and effective implementation of integration services, as well as an adoption of equitable and non-violent political discourse.

**Influence of pandemic on the (potential) impact**

**EQ 21:** Has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced (potential) project impact?

Evaluation concluded that the effects and the pace of recovery, number of affected beneficiaries, as well as dynamic of their empowerment and the volume of the space for exhibiting agency, would be even higher in different and more stable circumstances, while not jeopardized by the pandemic, due to Atina’s effective adaptations and high efficiency.
As pointed out throughout the report, as well as in numerous global and national reports and analyses dedicated to this issue\(^\text{15}\), COVID-19 pandemic significantly influenced:

- General position of the most vulnerable women and girls.
- The quality of life of women and girls, refugees, and asylum seekers in Serbia, especially women and girls resided in the asylum and reception centers.

Namely, during the state of emergency which lasted from mid-March 2020 until mid-May 2020, freedom of movement was fully denied, together with the access to the services provided by the CSOs and even local institutions. Atina’s beneficiaries in that period reported re-traumatization, various psychological and mental difficulties, exposure to physical and psychological violence, and the need for additional medical support.

- Level of already obtained independence and economic position of women who had been engaged in the support program for a longer period, and even ex-beneficiaries. Due to the massive loss of jobs in the service/hospitality industry, in which majority of the beneficiaries have been employed, beneficiaries were forced to re-enter the support program.
- The quality of services provided by the state (and CSOs to some extent). State services (i.e., CSWs) were not accepting new clients, neither adapted their services to the new circumstances, nor had adapted budgets for the service provision, while many CSOs shut down their services due to the lack of funding.

That being said, evaluation did not obtain relevant evidence of the decrease in effectiveness and relevance of Atina’s services and general approach, which rather gained an additional layer of the support from the external actors that will provide the organization with the improved negotiation and advocacy position in the future. Also, it is safe to assume that the effects and the pace of

recovery, number of affected beneficiaries, as well as dynamic of their empowerment and the volume of the space for exhibiting agency, would be even higher in different and more stable circumstances.
6. Knowledge generation

Within the knowledge generation dimension, it was assessed to what extent project generated knowledge, promising or emerging practices in the field of EVAW/G that should be documented and shared with other practitioners. The following aspects were considered: new knowledge and innovations that the project has generated, potentials for replications or scaling-up in future projects or different contexts, lessons learned from the pandemic and their potential utilization in future practices.

Knowledge generation dimension is evaluated based on the assessed deliverables, products and materials created, evidence of promising practices and adaptations to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the interviewees with the team and secondary beneficiaries.

Knowledge generation, innovation, and potentials for scaling-up and/or replication

**EQ 22:** Was any knowledge generated which could be further used in work with other vulnerable groups or with other institutions in the protection and support system? What is the new, innovative knowledge that the project has generated, that builds on evidence from other projects, and/or has potential for replication or scale up in future projects, or different contexts?

Atina’s approach to learning and process management could be considered as the initial resource for potential replications, as it already proved to be effective in building the basis of Atina as a learning organization. However, some of the functions of Atina’s learning approach (i.e., monitoring and documentation) also call for further development.

Also, the project introduced and practiced relevant innovative solutions in the field of provision of direct assistance services to the VAW/G survivors. All introduced practices would benefit from a scaling-up, first through detailed and structured documentation and presentation of the concepts and the effects of their implementation in different program phases, precise guidelines for implementation, as well as description of the procedures for their implementation.

A precondition for effective knowledge generation and continuous adaptation to the changes and challenges, as already attributed to Atina through the evaluation assessment, is first, organizational dedication to learning, integrated into the mission, and operationalized within the structure and systems.
Atina’s dedication to learning and successful adaptations to the contextual changes was reaffirmed during the evaluation process by all actors involved and the currently ongoing strategic planning process additionally confirmed this dedication. Thus, Atina’s approach to learning and process management, presented in the figure 14 and table 9, as based on the interviews with the organization’s management team, could be considered as the initial resource for potential replications, as it already proved to be effective in building the basis of Atina as a learning organization.

*Figure 14: Atina’s learning approach to process management*

“A learning organization is an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights.”

*Harvard Business Review*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Management Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Learning/Action Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiate and build</td>
<td><strong>External:</strong> Informing, raising awareness, teaching, mentoring, motivating – Initiating learning about the key issues and motivating future actions, and/or change in attitudes and behavior change to direct future actions</td>
<td>How do we include our beneficiaries in this phase? What do we know about our target groups? What do we want to achieve? What our target group wants to see achieved? Can it be achieved with this action? What do we offer (which information, knowledge, skills, support...)? What are the immediate effects (output indicators)? What's the depth of our influence (discussion upon finalization of the events)? What actions are needed as a follow up to maintain target groups’ willingness to join our cause and expand it further (adapt). (Mapping those interested in staying in touch). (Being transparent about the next steps offered to the target groups – what, when, how, how to contact us if they need support...) (Document it for the next phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Internal:</strong> Organization’s continuous organizational/capacity development, including learning, participatory analysis and research and understanding contextually relevant information</td>
<td>How do we include our beneficiaries in this phase? What do we do better now? Why is this important? An example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate</td>
<td>Establishing partnerships, creating common ground for joint actions, fostering dialogue</td>
<td>How do we include our beneficiaries in this phase? Why are these particular partnerships relevant for the societal change we aim to initiate? What do we know about potential partners? What are the aims of our collaboration? What are the conditions (dynamics, common grounds, potential challenges)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand</td>
<td>Support/follow up and monitor diffusion of the initiative</td>
<td>How do we include our beneficiaries in this phase?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Atina’s group supervision practice is currently a central learning mechanism within the organization. Apart from its primary function – to provide systematic and professional support to the staff engaged in the provision of direct assistance – group supervision spontaneously developed to facilitate organizational learning, from the identification of gaps and successes in implementation, through the drafting procedures and discussing communication strategies towards different stakeholder groups, to the joint deliberation and formulation of proposals for program adaptations and further development.

Although already being applied to the great extent and fully based on the extensive experience in participatory program conceptualization and project management, presented approach, including the function of the supervision within it, needs to be further elaborated (conceptualized/adapted based on the offered evaluators’ presented extrapolation), operationalized and completely integrated into the existing systems and operations. Besides, some of the functions of Atina’s learning approach (i.e., monitoring and documentation) also call for further development in terms of staff’s technical expertise and the clarification of the position of the function within the (learning) organizational system.

Furthermore, as pointed out throughout the report, Atina has been actively engaged in analysis, thinking, documenting, and sharing knowledge about the challenges, mitigation strategies, and specific good practice examples, so to support other local in international CSOs and institutions in formulating adequate strategies for adequate protection of VAW/G survivors, particularly in challenging circumstances (such as COVID-19 pandemic and related measures). This process of deliberation, documentation and sharing could be also considered as relevant for further replication. With the resources specifically allocated for such purposes, CSOs worldwide should be additionally supported to engage in such practice. Since the UNTF is a donor dedicated to and practically supporting exchange between the grantees and their participation in global processes, this conclusion should be shared (and advocated) with the wider donor community in the future.
Apart from evidence about the importance of the scaling-up and replication of the practices in developing solid knowledge generating foundation, evaluation gathered numerous evidence about Atina’s innovations and good practices which could be beneficial for the CSOs and institutions which provide direct assistance services to the VAW/G survivors:

1. Individualized and participatory approach to service delivery (case management system)

*Figure 15: Atina’s case management system*

Based on Atina’s documentation, but also interviewees’ statements and impressions, Atina’s case management system is organized as a highly participatory practice, focused on the beneficiaries’ resiliencies and strengths and as such allows for the whole empowerment process to result in re-owning and voicing women’s and girls’ agency. The approach was additionally adapted during the project implementation to reflect the intersectional ‘nature’ of the discrimination/oppression. Intersectional approach also manifests in the function of the additional service of cultural mediation established to ground for better understanding of beneficiaries’ needs and perspectives. More references are presented in the section Effectiveness (EQ 2).

2. Approach to economic independence/empowerment

Interrelatedness between different components of the direct assistance program showed to be one of the key drivers of success of Atina’s general approach additionally adapted during the project implementation. EEP, with its anchor in the Atina’s social enterprise – Bagel Bejgl was, not only evaluated as the most (contextually) innovative practice, but also recognized as a model which could be, at least to some extent, replicated in implemented within different projects
aimed at providing sustainable support to women, VAW/G survivors. Approach is presented in detail in the section Effectiveness (EQ 4).

3. Advocacy Group model

As elaborated in the report, Atina’s central programmatic focus is a direct assistance program, approached in a highly participatory, individualized, and holistic manner. Although initially proposed and planned, the model of work aimed at empowering beneficiaries for leadership (pillar 3), has been additionally framed and reshaped by the very implementation and based on beneficiaries’ reactions and feedback (figure 16).

*Figure 16: Advocacy Group’s focus*

Members of the advocacy group have had been actively involved in both internal and external program development, awareness raising, reporting and policy making processes and are recognized as key reference points in this field by the most relevant actors interviewed during the evaluation assessment, which attests to the high level of effectiveness.

All three models could benefit from a scaling-up, first of all through detailed and structured documentation and presentation of the concepts, effects of their implementation in different program phases, precise guidelines for implementation, as well as description of the procedures for their implementation (both internal, such as adaptations of the Rulebook on internal organization and systematization of work positions, to reflect on the additional functions and obligations regarding new/adapted sets of activities, and external – cooperation protocols, etc.)
Apart from the above mentioned, Atina developed a number of useful documents and material to present the generated knowledge and lessons learned throughout the project implementation. Material can be used for deeper understanding of the best ways to adapt to challenging circumstances, adequate ways to organize and implement multisectoral support to victims of different forms of violence, best integration practices, etc. Following is the material available for sharing and building upon:


Finally, Atina developed a document presenting five illustrative case studies with detailed analysis of the factors of vulnerability and resiliency strengths and related strategies used for effective support and empowerment.

*Lessons learned from the pandemic*

**EQ 23:** What are the lessons learned from the pandemic, and can they be utilized for knowledge-generation and future practices?

Lessons learned from the pandemic are numerous and could help Atina and organizations with a diverse mission direction in the future. Atina already developed relevant material that focuses on the lessons learned and the additional efforts in a wide distribution and promotion of the material should be made in a recent future.
1. In order to raise awareness of general population about the position of those who are particularly vulnerable and affected during the times of crisis (as the primary beneficiary group has been from the pandemic outburst), to organize effective delivery of services, and to create synergies around the need for support, it is necessary to communicate messages about the position of the most vulnerable populations and the need for urgent support widely, and to organize and mobilize civil society as a countermeasure against human rights violations and a reduction of space for civil society initiatives.
“COVID-19 crisis has also proven that institutional responses designed to protect and support refugee women and girls are not enough and that without civil society organizations, the mobilization of citizens, the private sector and volunteers, it is not possible to provide an adequate response and meet the needs of the victims of violence. According to the statistics of state institutions in the field of protection of victims of human trafficking, they managed to respond to only 30% of the needs of victims during the COVID-19 pandemic. Fulfillment of the other 70%, or most needs, was carried by service providers from civil society organizations such as NGO Atina, which does not receive any aid from the state. The most striking, however, is the fact that the first impulse of the system is to always defend itself and refuse to change, and to take greater responsibility for its citizens. As this was firmly confirmed since the outbreak of the coronavirus pandemic, it has motivated NGO Atina’s team to work and fight even harder than before. Examples of good practices during the pandemic include mobilization of community members, volunteers, and citizens that collected goods and also provided ideas on how to overcome existing barriers. The private sector was also active in helping Atina provide quality services to its beneficiaries.”

Atina’s final report

2. To provide adequate support – comprehensive and scalable assistance schemes, it is necessary to advocate for maintaining long-term support programs that can provide follow-up in the later phases of recovery and stabilization to all the women and girls who have survived violence. This basically means that the CSOs need to be proactive in reaching out to the donor community and the state and promoting allocation of additional resources for the service providers (mostly CSOs, as the most agile and responsive in the critical times).

That said, Atina is recognized as an organization with a strong voice, good credibility, and relations with a donor community and the one which should be more engaged in advocating for the sector as a whole, and specifically for the smaller, grass roots and informal women’s initiatives in the future. As such, Atina can serve as a nexus between the sub-sector and the donor community and grow to be even more vocal about the needs of the sub-sector and more importantly, small feminist initiatives and feminist activists throughout Serbia and the region.

3. The lesson learned shared mostly by the CSOs is that donor’s responsiveness and flexibility is of crucial importance for CSOs’ sustenance and consequently, ability to implement actions aimed at supporting their respective beneficiary groups. While majority of CSOs had
significant difficulties resulted from lack of understanding and flexibility of their donors, UNTF’s approach, assessed through the donor-grantee correspondence and interviewees with the Portfolio Manager and Atina’s staff could serve as a good practice example which should be instructive for the donor community, at least in the EVAW/G field. UNTF’S approach was characterized as agile, responsive, understanding of diverse contextual circumstances and needs and unequal power distribution within the donor-grantee relation.

4. **COVID-19-related crisis** once again confirmed the necessity for stronger adaptiveness of the civil society organizations (and the protection system as a whole, for that matter). Organizations that managed to create (at least to some extent) adaptable organizational culture and practices prior to the crisis, managed to sustain at least minimum of their functions, and those that have been particularly dedicated to the sustainability and adaptations, such as Atina, have been able to continue providing their services, and even increase their beneficiary base.

5. “Many lessons have been learned from this COVID-19 situation, above all, that human rights and especially women's rights must be conquered over and over again.” Due to inadequate actions of the state (from formal introduction of the emergency state and total lock-down with the Serbian army entering asylum and reception centers for refugees and asylum-seekers, through the lack of investments into protection program, to the, at least, tolerating xenophobic and violent narratives and public manifestations) and its institutions, women refugees, VAW/G survivors were (once again) deprived of basic human rights. That’s why it is of utmost importance to closely monitor services’ implementation, policies’ implementation, and levels of women’s human rights’ exercise and react by the adequate actions on the case-by-case basis, creating and implementing relevant services, but also reporting about human rights violations.

6. Due to the previously mentioned deterioration of the general status and position of primary beneficiary group, it is necessary to create a wide front and advocate for the implementation of the adopted legislative framework, previously harmonized with the international standards, through piloting and reporting on the best practices/mechanisms that could be formalized through relevant bylaws and protocols.

> “From the beginning of the ‘crisis’, we started deliberating about allocation and use of resources for women and girls in need of urgent support. After the closure of the state-run shelter for trafficking victims, we had to use our Emergency fund developed for those purposes and started contacting our ‘traditional’ donors and supporters to ensure that all women are taken care of.”

*Respondent from Atina*
7. In times of crisis, more than ever it appears crucial to provide integrated and comprehensive services, so as to prevent re-traumatization and new cycles of violence and to maintain achieved progress on the individual level (with each beneficiary) and the community level (within the protection structure and system).

8. Based on the evidence of Atina’s staff high levels of engagement throughout the pandemic, and based on the past experience of an increased staff turnover, commented on by various actors, professionals engaged in service provision and direct support to the most vulnerable groups of women need additional support and care. Organizations, thus, need to integrate this function into their operations and (in time) organizational culture, and the donors should invest additional resources for this purpose. Additionally invested funds could be used for diverse purposes, based on the staff needs assessment – from additional supervision and psychological support, through paid recreation and additional vacations, to professional development.
7. Gender equality and human rights

Within the gender equality and human rights dimension, it was assessed to what extent human rights based and gender responsive approaches have been/were mainstreamed/incorporated into the project. The following aspects were considered: integration of relevant standards and principles into Atina’s general work and the project activities implementation, adaptations to other relevant gender and human rights issues emerging during the project.

Gender equality and human rights dimension is evaluated based on the review of the assessed Atina’s internal documents (protocols, strategic and action plans, policies, etc.), activity reports, interviews with beneficiaries; products and materials created.

Integration of gender equality and human rights concern

EQ 24: To what extent was a human rights-based approach and gender equality incorporated in the design and implementation of the programme?

Atina’s actions, including the activities within this project could be considered as, not just fully in line with the international human rights and gender equality standards, but also the contribution in their future development and adaptations.

The project was essentially aimed at promoting gender equality and human rights standards and it was aligned with the Atina’s general approach and thus based on the standards proscribed by key international instruments, from the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, through the CEDAW, and Istanbul Convention, as specifically focused on the right of women and their protection against VAW. The essence of the key instruments is built into the organizational mission and is the very basis for every action and the project Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia itself. Obligations proscribed by the key instruments regarding women’s human rights – to protect women and girls from discrimination and from VAW/G – inspired very establishment of Atina.

The project was specifically focused on the provisions of the Istanbul Convention regarding women’s and girls’ access to services facilitating their recovery from violence (article 20), and specifically, to appropriate, easily accessible shelters to provide safe accommodation for and to reach out pro-actively to victims (article 23). Also, relevant global standards and policies regarding protection of ‘women and girls on the move’, such as the UNHCR Policy on the Prevention of, Risk Mitigation, and Response to Gender-based Violence, were integrated into the project design and overall approach in implementation.
Moreover, Atina’s reputation and actions in the field of policy analysis and monitoring, although out of scope of the evaluated project, contributed a lot to the project processes – from the integration of the recommendations (CEDAW Committee, GREVIO and GRETA expert groups) into the content of the capacity building program, through the adaptations of the organization’s own approach, to the formulation of relevant advocacy requests to the national actors (first of all, institutions and the government) and the mechanisms created by the instruments/conventions/declarations.

Additional issues that have been tackled by and integrated in the project approach are:

- Provision of specialist women’s support services with a gendered approach and expand the provision of shelters while ensuring de facto access of all women, in particular women with disabilities, Roma women and women migrants/asylum seekers (GREVIO recommendation from January 2020)
- Quality standards for shelters for VAW/G survivors based on a gendered understanding of VAW, the empowerment of victims and a victim-centered and integrated approach to service provision
- Unimpeded access to effective protection from violence (including free legal aid provision by experienced State, academia and NGO professionals, a sufficient number of shelters and an anonymous SOS helpline, etc.) (CEDAW recommendations for Serbia, 2019)
- Raising public awareness of available services (CEDAW)

In that way, Atina’s actions, including the activities within this project could be considered as, not just fully in line with the international human rights and gender equality standards, but also the contribution in their future development and adaptations.

**EQ 25:** How responsive has the project implementation been to gender and human rights issues emerging during the course of the project?

The project successfully addressed emerging gender equality and human rights issue, by entrenching the intersectional lenses, utilizing necessary resources to respond to the needs of multiple-discriminated and marginalized groups and creating horizontal connections across the civil society sector.

Also, the project provided a framework for the integration of international standards into Atina practice and, through Atina’s collaborations, practices of other local actors in Serbia.

As already mentioned, Atina’s full programmatic integration provided for an actual (from an international standards perspective) and timely adaptations of the project framework and
actions, and for relevant inputs for the adaptations of the national system, including adaptations of practices of all actors involved in coordination based on the SOP. By focusing on comprehensive protection and all aspects of wellbeing, the project managed to address or help Atina in the strive to mediate in addressing all the emerging human rights issue throughout the implementation. Also, to prevent the general and specific gender and human rights violations that could emerge during the project implementation, Atina worked on building up the knowledge and capacities of the programmatic staff and field workers on the specificities of working with multiple vulnerable and minority groups, by supporting their involvement in different education processes initiated by various CSOs in Serbia and globally.

As one of the examples of the addressing specific human rights issue(s) and based on the feminist principles and SOGISC inclusive practices, Atina developed special service response and special attention was given to the beneficiaries who are part of the multiple-discriminated groups. Beneficiaries belonging to SOGISC spectrum, who participated in project activities, gained additional support in learning about the specificities of the health and social systems in Serbia and overall position of the LGBTI+ persons. By becoming a part of Atina’s self and public advocacy group, they were additionally empowered to step out and voice their concerns and needs, to begin cooperation and become actively engaged in LGBTI+ movement in Serbia. Special cooperation was developed between “Da Se Zna!”, “Labris – Lesbian Human Rights organization”, “SOS consultation for lesbians” and “XY Spectrum”. Cooperation with the well-established LGBTI+ organizations secured that the project beneficiaries were able to: a) cast a special light on the challenges that LGBTI+ women and girls in refugee and asylum-seeking population were facing and 2) become a part of the process aimed at creating (policy) mechanisms for addressing

“I met Tijana (Da Se Zna!) and she explained me how I could get involved and volunteer in the organization of the Pride Parade in Belgrade. You know that Belgrade will host Euro Pride in 2022! If I’m still in Belgrade, I will definitely work with them.”

Beneficiary of the comprehensive assistance program

Picture 3: Greeting card, beneficiaries’ independent project
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the issues of LGBTI+ population in global migrations.

This experience provided Atina with a know-how for continuous program development based on the intersectionality and the needs of multiple-discriminated groups and secured the advancement of inclusion of human rights into their work. As a resource organization with the significant capacities and extensive expertise, Atina should invest in structural integration and conceptualization of this approach, as well as in development of the next round of capacity building programs, based on the lessons learned in this process.
8. Organizational principles

Within the organizational principles dimension, it was assessed how have organizational (Atina’s) principles been affecting processes within and the results of the project. The following aspects were considered: meaningfulness of Atina’s principles to the relevant stakeholder groups, level of adherence of the project to the Atina’s principles, and the results of that adherence.

Organizational principles dimension is evaluated based on the analysis of Atina’s strategic orientation, interviewees with all stakeholder groups, and the observation of the final conference.

As a principle-based initiative implemented by Atina – recognized feminist organizations in Serbia and globally – project Making a Difference for Women and Girls Refugees in Serbia is also assessed from a feminist and (adapted) principle-focused evaluation perspective. Therefore, after the initial analysis and presentation of the results against the dimensions initially proposed in the ToR, focus was put on the additional review of the literature on feminist social work and feminist pedagogy, Atina’s documentation analysis through the feminist lens and the discovering new layers of meanings in the interviews and discussions around the evaluation. This section of the report will thus concentrate on emphasizing Atina’s principles of work, and positioning of the key findings and conclusions around these principles to provide the evaluation with the additional inference.

EQ 26: How meaningful have Atina’s principles been to the relevant stakeholder groups?
EQ 27: To what extent has the project been adherent to the Atina’s principles?
EQ 28: What are the results (and to some extent the impact) of the adherence to the principles?

“At a feminist social worker helps to unlock the client’s capacity for decision-making, self-validation and the acquisition of new knowledge and skills.”

Lena Dominelli

Atina’s approach and application of organizational principles have been highly meaningful to beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholder groups. Participatory approach to program delivery, applied ethics of care, as well as Atina’s uncompromising dedication to women’s rights, were widely recognized as crucial and critical factors for the achievement of the project results. Thus, Atina’s feminist perspective to VAW/G and the practices which successfully operationalized this perspective were the only guarantee that the root causes of the violence were considered and addressed, and consequently, that the action contributed to reshaping existing patriarchal paradigm and the structural dimensions of inequality.
Following principles emerged from the feminist social work theory can be recognized as guiding Atina’s work in general, and project implementation in particular:

1. Full and informed participation of women and girls (beneficiaries) throughout internal and external processes (with full awareness of existing power relations within each communication/service delivery/others situation)
2. Feminist ethic of care
3. Challenging traditional social norms and structures that perpetuate violence and power imbalance

First, principles are evident in the Atina’s mission and general description of its work:

“Atina’s aim is to support the transition process in Serbia towards development of society which will fully respect the rights of women and children. Atina stands for establishment of equal status of all members of society in public and private spheres, through a) identification of, and struggle against, gender-based marginalization, discrimination and violence, and b) provision of direct assistance and support in reintegration of victims of trafficking and sexual and labor exploitation.”

As a feminist organization, Atina intends to enhance the fight against human trafficking and violence against women, improve the position and protection of survivors, strengthen gender equality, and contribute to wider social cohesion. In addition, through its advocacy measures, Atina is dedicated to elimination of violence, exploitation and exclusion of women and girls, as well as the empowerment of key actors to create a society fit for all, and united at all levels.

Atina’s work is guided by the needs of women and girls’ survivors but also of those in risk, and it represents a response to non-existence of adequate, long-term support programs which respect women’s human rights, and which are based on the invaluable experience of women’s movement activists.

Evaluation respondents recognize Atina’s approach and the values Atina bases its work on as:
Primary beneficiaries particularly appreciate Atina’s responsiveness (to their needs), reliability, caring attitude, and trustworthiness. Majority of interviewed beneficiaries noted that their experience with Atina significantly differed from the experiences with other organizations. Observation of the conference and other interactions between Atina’s staff and the beneficiaries in addition recognized friendliness and casual communication style as important characteristics of Atina’s approach that contributed to beneficiaries’ proactiveness in voicing their requests and attitudes. Other stakeholders describe this relation as crucial for the program success – achievement of the results in general empowerment of women and girls.

“They are always here for me whatever is happening, and I appreciate this a lot – I can trust them. They helped me with my very complicated medical issues, they help me with my child... Even when they say that something is not possible, I’m sure that that’s true – that’s because it really isn’t. They are totally different than others – especially from the state institutions. Institutions first say ‘impossible’ and then ask you what you actually want.”

Beneficiary of the comprehensive direct assistance program
Feminist principles were operationalized and fully integrated into project design and implementation. Namely, evaluation found that Atina’s approach and application of organizational principles—highly participatory approach to program delivery, high level of the staff and consultants’ expertise in participatory methodologies, as well as intrinsic yet operationalized ethics of care which characterize Atina’s work, were critical factors for the achievement of the project results. Moreover, feminist perspective to VAW/G and the practices which successfully operationalize this perspective are the only guarantee that the root causes of the violence are taken into account and addressed, and consequently, that the action aims to reshape existing patriarchal paradigm and the structural dimensions of inequality.

Atina is widely recognized as an organization that introduced the issue of the position of women and girls refugees and asylum-seekers into the national protection framework, started developing capacities of the institutions mandated with refugees’ protection for the participatory and gender-sensitive approach to protection, and the most challenging—the organization that exposed violations of the rights of women refugees committed by the humanitarian workers, police officers, etc. At the same time, Atina is also perceived as highly cooperative and dedicated to partnerships within and across the sectors, which makes their attitudes and actions, including the actions initiated within this project, more influential and effective.

Finally, to implement a project that successfully supports numerous women and girls from diverse and at the beginning distant cultural and political contexts, organization needs to rely on activists and professionals who can imprint their own and share joint values. Atina’s staff brought their diverse perspectives and formed a culture that influenced all achieved changes. So, these and numerous other personal histories of the key project actors have been driving a distinctive and

“I saw how they communicate with the women form their program—they are friendly, talk to each other in a very relaxed manner. I remember one joint case conference—how they gave a ‘space’ to the beneficiary to really think about her needs and wishes, without any pressure or implicit expectations. That’s the beginning of the road to healing for those women.”

Respondent from the international organization

“... and then I realized that I won’t be the shadow of me any longer. I now have people who care about my experience!”

Beneficiary, member of the Advocacy group
contextually unique intersectional 3-year long feminist and comprehensive women’s empowerment process characterized by its nurturing, healing, and empowering nature.

“I would like us to have and create an alternative to the life in violence for every woman, but it’s not always possible and I have a hard time to accept that.”

“We learned how to be here for them and not to project our expectations and aspirations.”

“My perception has been constantly changing and my feminism growing. I am a different person now – fully aware of the need for a constant fight for women human rights, since we have a lot of work ahead of us and in parallel, we must fight already won battles. We can easily see that on the examples of a position of women in Iran and Afghanistan. By keeping other women safe, we keep ourselves safe. I think that our beneficiaries recognize that and that’s why they are coming back.”

Respondents from Atina
### VII. Conclusions and lessons learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Project <em>Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls</em>, funded by the UNTF and implemented by Atina from 2018 to 2021 in Serbia, was very successful in achieving its goal and outcomes, with most of the results exceeding planned targets. Project provided a framework, piloted and established successful practices for the empowerment of women and girls refugees, contributed to their increased awareness of women’s human rights, gender-based violence and the protection mechanisms, and improved quality and general access to services for the protection against VAW/G. As fully embedded into Atina’s strategic orientation and general programmatic logic, project also resulted with sustainable partnerships and short-term and long-term effects, as well as wide recognition of Atina as credible and reliable actor in the field (sub-sector) of women and girls refugees’ protection in Serbia, which itself is an important sustainability anchor. With the contextually innovative practices of women’s empowerment – such as economic empowerment program with its key pillar – Atina’s social enterprise Bagel Bejgl, as well as its dedication to the full and informed participation of the primary beneficiaries, individualized approach to services delivery and focus on beneficiaries strengths and capacities, project helped in creating momentum for women refugees’ advocacy actions, by supporting their efforts and emancipating reception (on the decision-making and institutional sides). With the relevant and effective adaptations to the COVID-19 pandemic and emerged challenges, this project once again highlighted the importance of donors’ responsiveness and adaptability and in that sense, enabled UNTF’s approach and Atina’s and UNTF’s cooperation to become important aspect of the project’s success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Effectiveness       | C1: The project was highly effective with most of the results (outputs and outcomes) exceeding planned targets. During the project implementation, Atina managed to create, plan, and implement new and/or adapted and improved approaches and strategies by employing its full organizational capacity, instead of initially planned project-capacity and delivered results which had been in its zone of proximal development in the initial proposal planning period and thus, achieved project results even beyond the proposed theory |

C1: The project was highly effective with most of the results (outputs and outcomes) exceeding planned targets. During the project implementation, Atina managed to create, plan, and implement new and/or adapted and improved approaches and strategies by employing its full organizational capacity, instead of initially planned project-capacity and delivered results which had been in its zone of proximal development in the initial proposal planning period and thus, achieved project results even beyond the proposed theory.
of change. However, the MEL system and instruments, including proposed and adapted indicators, did not offer an adequate framework for measuring envisioned changes and need further elaborations and support.

C2: The project significantly benefited both primary and secondary beneficiary groups. Depending on the program and activities in which primary beneficiaries had been participating in, they gained relevant knowledge about the topics covered on the workshops and peer support groups meetings, skills to act and react in the situations of crisis and/or violence in general, as well as capacities for engagement in the peer support processes, self-advocacy and finally – public advocacy. Beneficiaries felt safer and better protected against VAW/G and valued significantly all provided services.

Professionals in the field gained practical knowledge and skills and made necessary connections within the sector.

Evaluation recognized the need for additional set of activities enabling women beneficiaries to effectively transfer the knowledge and know-how to their families and partners, but also activities targeting and involving men into the gender equality struggle.

C3: Obstacles to achieving results were numerous yet overcame during the project implementation. The most significant obstacle was the circumstance that for the most women and girls - refugees Serbia is not envisioned country of final destination. Furthermore, the structure of beneficiaries had been changing constantly, with the new women and girls entering the program and some of them leaving it (both willingly, as the need for support ceased to exist, or due to other circumstances, such as voluntary or involuntary leaving the territory of Serbia). Also, the environment within the asylum/reception centers can be considered disabling for women’s empowerment and independence. Finally, such disfavorable conditions additionally worsened after the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

C4: The evaluation found that the highly participatory approach to program delivery, high level of the staff and consultants’ expertise in participatory methodologies, as well as intrinsic yet operationalized ethics of care which characterize Atina’s work, could be considered as main factors influencing the outcomes and the ones that enabled successful mitigation of obstacles.

Relevance

C5: The project design and choice of activities continuously reflected beneficiaries’ needs. The project had been based on the continuously assessed needs of the primary beneficiaries and planned and implemented with their full and informed participation, making the relevance dimension its
grounding principle. Moreover, it was addressing policy and institutional constraints and related insufficient capacities of secondary target group to provide adequate and relevant answer to the women and girls survivors’ needs even in the long run (by promoting sustainable measures based on the best protection practices).

C6: While the general reasoning behind the ToC could be considered adequate on the level of outputs to outcomes logic, several sets of actions directed towards different target groups are missing to provide for a more (potentially) coherent ToC even on this intervention logic level. The same applies to the outcomes to goal logic and the expectations from the impact of the intervention of such coverage.

C7: Atina’s adaptations to the changes in the context, including the circumstances emerged from the COVID-19-pandemic and related measures are assessed as very relevant for both groups of beneficiaries and additionally allowed for Atina’s capacity development – creation of new/adapted content, procedures, and formats.

C8: COVID-19 pandemic worsened position of the women and girls, beneficiaries and conditioned Atina’s additional adaptations to the newly emerged circumstances and beneficiaries’ needs – from accepting higher number of beneficiaries into direct assistance program, through organizing online psychosocial support programs, to organizing online capacity building events for the secondary beneficiary group. Yet, all the expected outputs were delivered, and results achieved (and some even exceeded).

| Efficiency |

| C9: The project was implemented efficiently with the allocated resources spent adequately. Majority of the project activities were implemented on time, with the optimal use of resources, with the minor delays in implementation of few activities, due to COVID-19-related restrictions and measures introduced in Serbia. Even the timeliness of the adaptations to the consequences of the pandemic reasserted Atina’s high efficiency. Significant results were achieved with the exceeded targets and the staff’s dedication and engagement significantly beyond initial expectations. |

The fact that Atina was already well established and widely recognized organization within the field of prevention of VAW/G and the protection of VAW/G survivors within the population of refugees and asylum seekers, largely contributed to the high level of efficiency in: a) reaching out to such a high number of final beneficiaries; b) reaching and/or exceeding initially set targets; and finally, c) achieving project results.
C10: Atina’s systems, management, including financial management and administration are assessed as highly efficient, both based on the documentation revision and on the findings from the interviewees with the UNTF Portfolio Manager and the engaged administrative and program staff from Atina.

C11: The utilization of resources was maximized and the circumstance that Atina had other resources available at the time of project implementation, together with the significant expertise in financial administration, contributed to the economical use of resources, but also to smooth adaptations and high cost-effectiveness.

C12: It might be concluded that the adaptations made to the respond to COVID-19 pandemic ‘crisis’ in Serbia did not reduce quality of the project performance, but rather added another layer to Atina’s already established and recognized credibility within the sub-sector of protection of women and girls on the move.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C13: Program built around beneficiaries’ strengths and capacities produced values for beneficiaries and the sustainable benefits for them individually by helping them to overcome VAW/G consequences, empowering them to own and voice their agency, and by continuously supporting them to express their concerns and advocate for the improvements of their own treatment, but also – improvements on the structural level. Also, the project positioned the very topic on the protection agenda in Serbia and activated and motivated wide range of actors to invest their resources into programs and actions aimed at providing support to women and girls refugees and asylum seekers, in a structured and adequate manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C14: Atina’s approach to economic empowerment, implemented as an integral component of the comprehensive direct assistance program is recognized as the key innovation in the approach to combating VAW/G, and assessed as the most sustainable action for the future work.

Motivated by Atina’s actions, different stakeholders continued cooperation in provision of direct support to beneficiaries in need for multisectoral assistance. Partially overcame prejudices between the CSOs and institutions could hopefully influence improvements in general cooperation between the sectors in the future.

C15: The project with its adaptations allowed for a systematization of key steps as a reaction in any similar/crisis: rapid assessment, action planning, introduction of a set of new/adapted measures, creation of relevant procedures and/or adaptation of the existing ones, agility in implementation.
**Impact**

C16: Although it is not possible to assess the impact of an intervention right upon its finalization, there is evidence that the project influenced changes/impact on the individual and relational level with almost all population of female refugees in Serbia. However, the impact on the individual level (and even to some extent on the relational) – increased knowledge and agency – was largely evident with the beneficiaries who stayed in Serbia for more than 6 months. At the same time, 11 beneficiaries had been formally employed, and with the approach Atina utilizes, it’s highly likely that all beneficiaries would become economically independent in recent future (40 from this project). All beneficiaries who had been provided with the comprehensive direct assistance exited violence, changed the environment, and used provided opportunities to overcome trauma, become healthier and more independent in the future. The impact on their lives is immeasurable, since the very fact that they got the needed support to escape violence, could be considered sufficient to rationalize the efforts.

C17: Asylum-seeking women, empowered by the project, started voicing their concerns publicly and in front of the responsible institutions, while the full impact of this practice is yet to be seen in the future.

C18: Capacity building component of the project made a permanent change in the prioritization of the involved institutions’ functions and activities, motivating them to stay dedicated to the identification of VAW/G victims and their referral to adequate services, which would potentially be seen as a general improved functioning of the state in the field of VAW/G prevention and victims’ protection. Yet, in order to integrate such changes into general institutions' operations and the policies that guide it, constant efforts need to be invested to sustain current, and produce additional systemic improvements.

C19: Evaluation concluded that the effects and the pace of recovery, number of affected beneficiaries, as well as dynamic of their empowerment and the volume of the space for exhibiting agency, would be even higher in different and more stable circumstances, while not jeopardized by the pandemic, due to Atina’s effective adaptations and high efficiency.

**Knowledge generation**

C20: Atina’s approach to learning and process management could be considered as the initial resource for potential replications, as it already proved to be effective in building the basis of Atina as a learning organization. However, some of the functions of Atina’s learning approach (i.e., monitoring and documentation) also call for further development.
Also, the project introduced and practiced relevant innovative solutions in the field of provision of direct assistance services to the VAW/G survivors. All introduced practices would benefit from a scaling-up, first through detailed and structured documentation and presentation of the concepts and the effects of their implementation in different program phases, precise guidelines for implementation, as well as description of the procedures for their implementation.

C21: Lessons learned from the pandemic are numerous and could help Atina and organizations with a diverse mission direction in the future. Atina already developed relevant material that focuses on the lessons learned and the additional efforts in a wide distribution and promotion of the material should be made in a recent future.

### Gender equality and human rights

C22: Atina’s actions, including the activities within this project could be considered as, not just fully in line with the international human rights and gender equality standards, but also the contribution in their future development and adaptations.

C23: The project successfully addressed emerging gender equality and human rights issue, by entrenching the intersectional lenses, utilizing necessary resources to respond to the needs of multiple-discriminated and marginalized groups and creating horizontal connections across the civil society sector.

Also, the project provided a framework for the integration of international standards into Atina practice and, through Atina’s collaborations, practices of other local actors in Serbia.

### Organizational principles

C24: Atina’s approach and application of organizational principles have been highly meaningful to beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholder groups. Participatory approach to program delivery, applied ethics of care, as well as Atina’s uncompromising dedication to women’s rights, were widely recognized as crucial and critical factors for the achievement of the project results. Thus, Atina’s feminist perspective to VAW/G and the practices which successfully operationalized this perspective were the only guarantee that the root causes of the violence were considered and addressed, and consequently, that the action contributed to reshaping existing patriarchal paradigm and the structural dimensions of inequality.
## VIII. Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Relevant stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Multiyear projects that aim at the long-term effect through various comprehensive intersecting activities should engage additional MEL expertise, both through developing implementing organizations’ capacities and through engagement of external MEL experts from the very beginning. External MEL experts should support internal structure for monitoring and evaluation to create a sustainable monitoring mechanism for the organization. In addition to this, engagement of the external MEL support from the very beginning would ensure that the evaluation structures and systems are properly set from the very beginning and aligned with the donor’s and implementer’s practices. Accurate, evidence-based reporting that would inform management and decision-making to guide and improve project/program performance throughout the project implementation is necessary in order to ensure effective and meaningful project implementation. Even though the main target group of the project is women and girls from the refugee and asylum-seeking population who have survived VAW/G, the participation of men is necessary to adequately reach the goal of the project. Gender-related social constructs reinforce and support the structures of male power and stereotyped masculinities, which lead to VAW, and multiple discrimination towards women and girls. To address these social norms that create preconditions for VAW/G, the engagement of men is essential. Project interventions that aim to deconstruct masculinities, encourage the practice of men in care roles, develop knowledge on women’s rights illustrate the positive impacts on human rights and equality, both for men and women, and support men and boys to address VAW/G in a more nuanced and positive manner. To do so, it is advisable that Atina either create and implement specific programs targeting men from the refugee and asylum-</td>
<td>UN Trust Fund Atina Atina Other actors in the sub-sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

seeking population, or even better – identify and support CSOs that would deliver such initiatives with Atina’s support.

Advocacy actions should continue towards the institutions mandated with the implementation of the employment-related legislation using the previously developed participatory approach. A set of organized actions aiming to influence public policies, societal attitudes, and socio-political processes where beneficiaries speak for themselves are necessary for the sensitization of the institutions. The main goal of advocacy actions should be broader with an intersectional approach and oriented towards women’s labor rights and a variety of issues women face based on their identity categories (such as refugee, asylum-seeking, LGBTI+, Roma, class, ethnicity, etc.). Also, a multisectoral approach is necessary to create effective advocacy actions, and the inclusion of various national and international protection actors can be done through specific coalitions where beneficiaries of the project would have an equal and leading role.

| Relevance | Taking into consideration that the number of women refugees and asylum-seekers staying in Serbia for a longer period of time is increasing, additional efforts should be invested into re-thinking and creating integration policies, piloting comprehensive integration practices and advocating for sustainable changes of the national legislative and strategic framework to allow for successful and sustainable integration. Being an organization aware of the intersectional character of discrimination and all aspects and full dynamic of the position of the multiple-marginalized groups, Atina is in a good position to initiate this discourse and focus on integration of women and girls with an intersectional approach – looking at different aspects of their needs based on class, legal status, race, ethnicity, etc. In that manner, women refugees and asylum-seekers could be seen as equal members of the local community, and not as special category which often is the very reason behind discrimination. | Atina |

| Efficiency | In order to develop comprehensive services throughout the country, empowerment of the local women’s organizations, including non-formal groups, is necessary. Atina could be the nexus between local women’s organizations and donors. This would lead to more efficient project implementation since the members of Atina organizations would not have to travel to |

| Atina National system for refugees’ protection |
provide services to women and girls outside of Belgrade. Also, members of the community or to be specific women’s organizations would develop enough capacity to provide services to both the local population and refugee, and asylum-seeking. This would cost less, create employment opportunities in local communities, support the development of women-focused programs throughout the country, and decrease travel and thus even contribute to the environmental impact.

Finally, beyond the efficiency dimension, this approach would allow for wider investment into supporting women’s leadership and building stronger and self-reliable women’s movement.

### Sustainability

Donors should develop specific approaches which would allow for improving sustainability prospects of the grantees beyond asking about grantees’ already developed sustainability strategies and plans. Namely, it would be beneficial for the CSOs worldwide to provide them with possibility to invest certain (at least 5% for the beginning) percentage of total budget for the improvement of the sustainability prospects.

Specifically important element of sustainability of organizations engaged in provision of services to survivors of VAW/G is usually very high turnover rate, due to the burnout and related reasons. It would be highly beneficial for the CSOs to be able to budget specific HR/staff retention-related expenses which would be then financed by the donors willing to invest into the strengthening women’s movement. As linked to the knowledge generation and organizational principles dimensions, such budgets could include costs for: professional development, individual and group supervision, other strategies of care for staff.

As an organization recognized as a leader in the Serbian women’s movement and a sub-sector (refugees’ protection), Atina should invest in creating relevant partnerships within the sector (on the global level) and with the relevant donors, and initiate negotiations with the donor community to improve sustainability prospects of the civil society sector and particularly, women’s organizations on the national and global level.
| Impact | Since it is difficult to assess the impact of any project right upon its finalization, to get adequate insight, an impact evaluation should be done at least 3 to 5 years after the project implementation. To plan for effective impact assessment, preparatory actions should start from the evaluation. That would allow for collection of relevant baseline data – e.g., beneficiaries perceptions on gender norms and hierarchies, behavioral patterns, and level of their economic in/dependence, perceived levels of empowerment, etc.  

Structurally complex changes, such as in this project cannot be achieved (at least) without addressing power imbalances and social inequalities based on gender (in this particular case – interculturally and cross-culturally, which makes it even more demanding) on all levels (with the general public, professionals, VAW/G survivors), and without specific actions aimed at institutionalizing new and improved practices, such as service of cultural mediation, programs of inclusion in the labor market for refugees and asylum-seekers, etc.  

In order to bridge the gap, two solutions are recommended:  
- To allow the development of projects that intend to have an impact on system and framework change, with a more complex structure and a longer period of implementation (at least 5 years), or  
- To simplify the project structure, so that the expected impact is in the zone of direct service provision, while the projects could still tackle root causes of problems and changes of behaviors.  

Even though the project has influenced changes that reflect in improved institutions’ response to VAW/G, to sustain these changes to become a permanent way of institutional response to VAW/G on operational and policy level, ongoing monitoring of institutional response and advocacy actions need to be continued. Also, additional improvements are needed – both introduction of state-run services and/or state financing of the necessary comprehensive and individualized support services for VAW/G survivors (among the refugees and asylum-seekers).  

Licensing of services that Atina provides (Shelter, Reintegration Center), represents a crucial point for the development of programs, as well the possibility for sustainable funding by the government. However, programs |

| Atina | Licensing of services that Atina provides (Shelter, Reintegration Center), represents a crucial point for the development of programs, as well the possibility for sustainable funding by the government. However, programs |
should be continuously improved with the support of external experts, as well based on the feedback from beneficiaries that should be (as currently is) collected on a regular basis. In that way, Atina will be able to fully achieve its strategic orientation – to pilot innovative programs and strategies, build capacities of various national actors to implement and institutionalize such programs and strategies, provide expert support, and ensure beneficiaries’ participation throughout the implementation and monitor the implementation and recommend improvements, and start a new cycle of programs and strategies development.

**Gender equality and human rights**

As an organization perceived as a leader in the field of protection from VAW/G in the region, Atina could further develop its functions to support small, local women’s organizations and initiatives, both formal and informal and in that sense serve as a sort of empowering point and a nexus between initiatives and donors. Also, Atina should continue supporting and even set additional structures for the function of supporting feminists’ voices within the organization and within the Serbian society.

**Knowledge generation**

Through this project, different materials and products have been developed that tackle the issue of VAW/G. All project products could be shared and considered as relevant for further replication. With the resources specifically allocated for such purposes, CSOs worldwide should be additionally supported to engage in such practice – developing and sharing. Since the UNTF is a donor dedicated to and practically supporting exchange between the grantees and their participation in global processes, this approach could be shared (and advocated for) with the wider donor community in the future.

Also, lessons learned from the project implementation during covid19 pandemic could be useful to share among grantees.

All introduced practices would benefit from a scaling-up, first through detailed and structured description of the concepts, standardization of the best implementation practices, analysis of the effects of their implementation in different program phases, creation of guidelines and procedures for their implementation. Finally, documentation and wider presentation of the standardized practices could be organized,

| Gender equality and human rights | As an organization perceived as a leader in the field of protection from VAW/G in the region, Atina could further develop its functions to support small, local women’s organizations and initiatives, both formal and informal and in that sense serve as a sort of empowering point and a nexus between initiatives and donors. Also, Atina should continue supporting and even set additional structures for the function of supporting feminists’ voices within the organization and within the Serbian society. | Atina |
| Knowledge generation | Through this project, different materials and products have been developed that tackle the issue of VAW/G. All project products could be shared and considered as relevant for further replication. With the resources specifically allocated for such purposes, CSOs worldwide should be additionally supported to engage in such practice – developing and sharing. Since the UNTF is a donor dedicated to and practically supporting exchange between the grantees and their participation in global processes, this approach could be shared (and advocated for) with the wider donor community in the future. Also, lessons learned from the project implementation during covid19 pandemic could be useful to share among grantees. | UNTF |
| Knowledge generation | All introduced practices would benefit from a scaling-up, first through detailed and structured description of the concepts, standardization of the best implementation practices, analysis of the effects of their implementation in different program phases, creation of guidelines and procedures for their implementation. Finally, documentation and wider presentation of the standardized practices could be organized, | Atina Donors |
and the products shared with the professional and activist community.

Donor’s support for this specific purpose would be beneficial for Atina’s further growth, but also for the improvements of the national protection system (with the additional capacity building based on the fully conceptualized practices and rounded knowledge), and potentially – for other CSOs and protection systems (by wider distribution and additional contextualization of the generated knowledge).

Although already being applied to the great extent and fully based on the extensive experience in participatory program conceptualization and project management, Atina’s learning approach, presented in the evaluation report, including the function of the group supervision within it, needs to be further elaborated (conceptualized/adapted based on the offered evaluators’ presented extrapolation), operationalized and completely integrated into the existing systems and operations. Besides, some of the functions of Atina’s learning approach (i.e., monitoring and documentation) also call for further development in terms of staff’s technical expertise and the clarification of the position of the function within the (learning) organizational system.
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## Annex A – Evaluation matrix

### Evaluation criteria and questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs (project results) achieved and how?</td>
<td>To what extent do the achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls?</td>
<td>To what extent was the project efficiently and cost-effectively implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What were the main factors influencing the outcomes of this project, either negatively or positively?</td>
<td>• To what extent have the project design and choice of activities and deliverables properly reflected and addressed the needs of the beneficiaries?</td>
<td>• Were the results achieved on time and to budget? Were all activities organized efficiently and on time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has the project directly benefited primary and secondary beneficiaries?</td>
<td>• To what extent have the planned and actual activities and outputs of the project been consistent with the intended outcomes and impact?</td>
<td>• Has COVID-19 pandemic caused reduced efficiency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the project achieved results in accordance with the expected theory of change?</td>
<td>• Has the project been able to adjust to the changes in the context and needs of the primary beneficiaries that occurred during the implementation?</td>
<td>• To what extent the resources were used economically? How could the use of resources be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What were the challenges/obstacles to achieving the expected results?</td>
<td>• How has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced the activities, outputs, and outcomes of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the efficiency of the management strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• % of resources used for the primer beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the organization’s efficiency in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity reports, additional requests to UNTF, including COVID-related requests, focus group with the secondary beneficiaries, interviews with the project manager and staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Goal indicators 1, 2 and 3</td>
<td>• Documented beneficiaries’ involvement in the project planning and implementation</td>
<td>• Evidence of the efficiency of the management strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outcome 1 indicators 1 and 2; Outcome 2 indicators 1 and 2; Outcome 3 indicators 1 and 2</td>
<td>• Type, quality and sensitivity of the consultative processes, mechanisms, and tools</td>
<td>• % of resources used for the primer beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All output indicators</td>
<td>• Evidence of alignment of project activities with beneficiaries’ needs (assessment results vis-a-vis activities implemented)</td>
<td>• Evidence of the organization’s efficiency in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ToC analysis (results)</td>
<td>• Evidence of coherence of the project ToC</td>
<td>Activity reports, additional requests to UNTF, including COVID-related requests, focus group with the secondary beneficiaries, interviews with the project manager and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beneficiaries’ and other stakeholders’ perception of the benefits</td>
<td>• Evidence of project adaptations to the beneficiaries needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of agreement on the challenges/obstacles within the organization and among different stakeholders.</td>
<td>• (Social) media presence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data sources and data collection methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports, monitoring data, beneficiaries’ evaluations; interviewees with the beneficiaries, interviews with the project team</td>
<td>Relevant international and national normative and strategic framework; Status reports and CSOs; research and publications; Assessment instruments and protocols, reports from the assessment and consultation processes; interviewees with the project team (on the development of the intervention logic); COVID-19-related reports; content analysis of the produced (social) media content; focus group interview with the beneficiaries</td>
<td>Activity reports, additional requests to UNTF, including COVID-related requests, focus group with the secondary beneficiaries, interviews with the project manager and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Sustainability** |  - Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?  
- How was the difference between planned and actual expenditure justified (if any)?  
- Have the human and financial resources been used in the best manner possible?  
- Adequacy of the (project management plan)  
- Relevant documents show, and informants recognize continued effects of the project  
- Evidence of agreements on the stakeholders’ continued collaboration  
- Evidence of the improved sustainability prospects by the employment of a specific approach and practices (capacity building, participatory advocacy, Bagel shop, etc.)  
- Available international and national reports; interviews with the policy makers and high-level officials; internal documents, including strategic plan, protocols, action plans for relevant working areas corresponding to 3 action pillars; interviews with all stakeholder groups; follow up online survey to the activities evaluation surveys |
| **(Road to) Impact** |  - To what extent has the project contributed to ending violence against women, gender equality and/or women’s empowerment (both intended and unintended impact)?  
  - What real difference/changes has the activity made to the lives of the primary stakeholders and how they perceive that change?  
  - How many people have been affected?  
  - How has the access to necessary services for refugee and asylum-seeking women been improved by the project? How was their agency improved?  
  - Has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced (potential) project impact?  
  - How did the project impact and improve the operation of the institutions involved in the project?  
  - Goal indicators 1, 2 and 3  
  - Primer beneficiary group’s representatives’ testimonials  
  - Degree to which all stakeholders perceive structural changes  
  - National statistics on the service provision (quantity and quality) vs. primer beneficiaries’ perception  
  - Evidence of the impact achieved using the same/similar approach from its establishment  
  - Atina’s team’s representatives’ testimonials  
  - Changes of the procedures of the institutions and/or practices of the institutions’ representatives  
  - Scores on the observation guide scoreboard (all indicators)  
  - Project reports, internal MEL data and reports, materials produced during the project and material presenting impact of the previous actions of Atina; interviewees with beneficiaries; interview with Atina’s team, interviews with other stakeholders involved in the field; observation of the conference |

**Knowledge generation**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent has the project generated knowledge, promising or emerging practices in the field of EVAW/G that should be documented and shared with other practitioners?</th>
<th>• Evidence of a problem solving and adaptive capacity of Atina’s team (e.g. use of recommendations from the previous evaluations, internal learning sessions, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Was any knowledge generated which could be further used in work with other vulnerable groups or with other institutions in the protection and support system? What is the new, innovative knowledge that the project has generated, that builds on evidence from other projects, and/or has potential for replication or scale up in future projects, or different contexts?</td>
<td>• Number and quality of the working methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the lessons learned from the pandemic, and how have they been utilized for knowledge-generation and future practices?</td>
<td>• Evidence of a promising practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of adaptations to the unforeseen circumstances (COVID-19)</td>
<td>• Evidence of adaptations to the unforeseen circumstances (COVID-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality and human rights</td>
<td>International best practice examples review, Project documentation (roles and responsibilities, minutes from the meetings), project reports, methodologies for work in the protection field (all pillars), COVID-19-related rapid assessments and reports, interviews with the team and secondary stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent human rights based and gender responsive approaches have been/were mainstreamed/incorporated into the project?</td>
<td>• Degree to which the relevant standards and principles are integrated into Atina’s general work and the project activities implementation (feminist principles and standards, UN standards, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent was a human rights-based approach and gender equality incorporated in the design and implementation of the programme?</td>
<td>• Evidence of adaptations to the unforeseen circumstances (COVID-19) (the same as the indicator in the previous section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How responsive has the project implementation been to gender and human rights issues emerging during the course of the project?</td>
<td>• Evidence of adaptations to other relevant gender and human rights issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Degree to which the effects (intended and unintended) of the intervention can be attributed to the organizational principles and its application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Principles</td>
<td>• Scores on the observation guide scoreboard (all indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have organizational (Atina’s) principles been affecting processes within and the effects of the project?</td>
<td>Intervieweees with all stakeholder groups; observation of the final conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How meaningful have Atina’s principles been to the relevant stakeholder groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex B – Result matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Indicators*</th>
<th>Targets*</th>
<th>Achieved total</th>
<th>% target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia are safer and better protected against VAW/G, especially VAW/G survivors</td>
<td>Number of supported refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls throughout the project activities</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of women and girls that feel safer and better protected</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>118%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perspective of women and girls on their safety and protection (% of beneficiaries that can name at least 3 relevant (re)actions to violence, including reporting/relevant institutions)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Achieved total</th>
<th>% target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC 1. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia have increased agency to respond and prevent VAWG by the end of the project</td>
<td>OCI 1.1. Percentage of refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls WHO FEEL empowered to make informed decisions</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCI 1.2. Number of refugee and asylum-seeking women who report to have gained skills through economic empowerment vocational trainings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC 2. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G receive appropriate and adequate service by the end of the project.</td>
<td>OCI 2.1. Number of refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls provided with support services who report satisfaction in quality of service received from project</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCI 2.2. Percentage of women and girls who find provided shelter adequate and safe</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC 3. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia empowered for active participation and leadership for decision-making on the issues of the importance for the position of women and girls in their communities by the end of the project.</td>
<td>OCI 3.1. Number of advocacy actions initiated by refugee women and girls who have been part of the project.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCI 3.2. Percentage of women and girls who feel empowered for advocacy after participating in project activities.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP 1.1.</td>
<td>2000 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia have information on their rights and increased knowledge on how to do self-advocacy by the end of the project</td>
<td>OPI 1.1.1. Number of refugee and asylum-seeking women informed on the available services</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 1.1.2. Level of knowledge of women and girls regarding available services for protection of VAW/G (% increase)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 1.1.3. Percentage of women and girls who have better understanding of their rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP 1.2.</td>
<td>30 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia to gain skills to be economically empowered after each activity</td>
<td>OPI 1.2.1. Number of women skilled through economic empowerment practices</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 1.2.2. Level of skills and knowledge gained (% increase)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP 2.1.</td>
<td>240 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G have better access to support services by the end of the project</td>
<td>OPI 2.1.1. Number of individual plans of services</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 2.1.2. Number of professionals trained for provision of participatory services</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 2.1.3. Level of knowledge of professionals regarding participatory services increased</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP 2.2.</td>
<td>Good practices on access to services for refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G are shared among institutions/organizations and policy makers by the end of the project.</td>
<td>OPI 2.2.1. Number of publication copies disseminated to relevant professional</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 2.2.2. Number of representatives of institutions, organizations and policy makers attending the conference</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 2.2.3. Number of representatives of institutions at promotional round table</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP 3.1.</td>
<td>30 refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia gain skills and have the space to advocate for their rights after each activity</td>
<td>OPI 3.1.1. Number of refugee women and girls attending the meetings and workshops for taking the active role</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 3.1.2. Number of meetings with refugee women and girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI 3.1.3. Percentage of women and girls project participants who feel that they have access to space that can allow them to advocate for their rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Target values that were not set in the proposal development/adaptation period are formulated with the project team during the evaluation process. In addition, indicators that were not precisely defined and described in the initial result framework matrix were additionally discussed with the Atina’s program team and presented to better reflect Atina’s MEL system.*
Annex C – Data collection instruments

Interview guide – Atina’s team

(Program manager, Project manager, Direct assistance coordinator, Mobile team coordinator, Psychologist, Cultural mediator, Advocacy group coordinator, Capacity building coordinator, Policy coordinator, Economic empowerment program coordinator)

Note: Out of the pool of questions presented below, each team member will be asked up to 15, selected to reflect their specific role in the project and/or Atina’s program

1. What are your most important personal traits?
   Probes: Tell me something about yourself; What are your main identities?
2. What are the key principles of Atina’s work?
3. Tell me more about your role in Atina and your activities within this project. Please describe your program in detail.
4. Please name the key characteristics of the women and girls you met at the beginning of the project (their arrival to Serbia) – 3 adjectives
5. How successful has Atina’s approach been to the protection of women and girls – refugees in the past three years? Please, share an example.
   Probes: What are the successes you are mostly proud of? Which opportunities has been missed? Why? What are/were the key factors influencing your successes and/or missed opportunities?
6. How about Atina’s approach to developing capacities of institutions and organizations – what was the most successful and which opportunities you have missed? Why? What are/were the key factors influencing your successes and/or missed opportunities
7. Which concrete effects/benefits/gains for the women and girls’ refugees this project has been producing?
8. How about the institutions - what is their specific gain from the project?
9. Elaborate on adequacy/relevance of the project Theory of Change and present an example or similar argument? (PROGRAM MANAGER, PROJECT MANAGER)
10. How can it be adapted in future (if needed)? (PROGRAM MANAGER, PROJECT MANAGER)
11. What primer beneficiaries’ needs the project managed to address? How do you know that – what data have you used? Where do you find it most successful, and where do you think it failed?
12. How did you manage to adapt to the changes in the context and needs of the primary beneficiaries that occurred during the implementation? Please give an example.
13. Please elaborate on the COVID-19 adaptations and the ways pandemic influenced this project and Atina’s work in general.

14. What have you done better than other similar organizations/institutions? Why and how did you managed to do so?
15. Can you briefly explain the management changes in Atina through the project cycle?
16. How did they reflect on the implementation of the program? Where there any effects, positive or negative?
17. What specific achievements can be attributed to the management style and UNTF’s/Atina’s approach to partnerships?
18. To what extent the resources were used economically? What can be done to further improve your efficiency?
19. Could you please explain/elaborate on the structure, management system, monitoring system and the project management system in Atina?
20. What would you want to see as a sustainable change in the beneficiaries’ lives? Do you see it now, as a result of a project? Please give an example. (If not): Why not?
21. What are the relationships with the existing institutions and are they capable to continue the project flow of benefits (how deep is the project incorporated in the institutional structures)?
22. Could you elaborate on any structural/institutional change produced/emerged from the project?
23. How has Atina structurally adapt/built in resilience to future risks? What does it have to do with the COVID - please elaborate?
24. How did you help your beneficiaries in this process?
25. What have you done specifically aiming at improving sustainability prospects of the project effects?
   - Has this project contributed to establishing strategic long-term partnership that could make the effects more sustainable?
   - Will established services/products be at disposal to final beneficiaries after the project ends?
26. How did the project influence sustainability of Atina’s work?
27. Describe the changes in the lives of the primer beneficiaries.
28. Which policy changes emerged from your project
29. How about changes in the institutional practices
30. How did it change you personally?
31. What is the new, innovative knowledge that the project has generated?
32. What are the lessons learned from the pandemic?
33. Please elaborate on the gender responsive and human rights-based approaches that have been used by the project?
34. Please name the key characteristics of the women and girls from the beneficiary population you meet now (after your work is coming to an end) – 3 adjectives
35. If there was any occasion when you needed to deviate from the basic principles of work, please elaborate and give an example.
36. What are your recommendations for UNTF’s future work?
37. What do you think should be done globally to improve the position of women vis-a-vis violence? In general?
38. If there’s anything you would like to share and I did not ask you, please do so.
Interview guide – UNTF Portfolio Manager

1. What are your most important personal traits? Probes: Tell me something about yourself; What are your main identities?
2. Which Atina’s principles would you extrapolate/recognize from your communication with the Atina (including reviewing reports and other products)? How about (PRINCIPLES EXTRAPOLATED FROM THE PROJECT STAFF INTERVIEWS)?
3. What do you like about this project and the ways it was managed by Atina?
4. What could have been better/different? (Responsiveness, general communication, reporting, something else).
5. How did the management changes in Atina reflect on the implementation of the program throughout the project cycle?
6. What specific achievements can be attributed to the UNTF’s approach, Atina’s management style and UNTF’s/Atina’s approach to partnerships?
7. Is the project comparable to any other you can recall? Please elaborate.
8. What are your recommendations for Atins’s future work?
9. What do you think should be done globally to improve the position of women vis-a-vis violence? In general?
10. If there’s anything you would like to share and I did not ask you, please do so
**Focus group guide – girls, participants in the pillar 1 activities**

**Description of the procedure**

Focus groups will be conducted with the girls to gain insight into how refugee girls assess their awareness of their rights and what existing programs, services and roles of professionals from Atina and other organizations / institutions involved in the protection system they recognize as relevant for their information, support and protection.

Questions and work will be focused on obtaining answers to the following topics:

- The level of awareness of their rights and of the programs and services available to them
- What are the existing mechanisms of cooperation between different actors involved in protection?
- What are the internal rules of conduct, practices and procedures of different service providers and what are the existing obstacles to quality protection of girls in exile?
- What are the views of girls in exile in terms of support, programs and services that they need and are available?

The conversation will be conducted in a relaxed atmosphere and with the help of various audio-visual aids that will give the girls the opportunity to express themselves and to overcome language barriers to the greatest extent. Also, the use of drawings, photographs and music is a good way to create a relationship of trust and connection through joint creative work, and the evaluation process itself for girls will be empowering and educational. The expectation is that in this way, authentic experiences and attitudes of girls will be obtained.

The planned duration of the focus groups/workshops is 3.5 hours, including 2 breaks (15 minutes for each break).

**Ethical issues, child protection and data confidentiality issues**

Additional attention during the work is given to the adjustment of the provided information and methods of work to the girls involved in the process, and giving consent primarily by the girl, and subsequently her parent / guardian.

The principles of anonymity and confidentiality imply the collection of data without the possibility to connect the answers obtained with the specific girls. They will be asked only to give the data necessary to check the sample statistics, and not their full names and other personal data.

The list of evaluation participants from the group of girls will be submitted collectively without the possibility of being linked to the specific answers provided. Information about that will be given orally to all girls, it is also included in the introductory text of the consent form. The
paragraph on the principle of impartiality from the evaluation process is also a part of the consent document.

When talking to the girls, special attention is given to the fact that they do not feel isolated and/or uncomfortable staying alone in a room with an unknown person / evaluator. The door of the room will be open, but with the proviso that the content of the conversation itself cannot reach outside the room where the evaluation is taking place.

The door of the room will be open, taking into account that the content of the conversation itself should not be heard outside of the room where the evaluation is taking place.

At the beginning of the conversation, the girls will receive an information that they can end the conversation at any time without necessarily giving explanations about the reason for the cessation, and that there is a person close to whom they can turn to for support.

**Step by step description of the process:**

1. **INTRODUCTION:**

   - Information about the evaluator
   - Description of the evaluator’s role
   - Description of the objectives of the workshop/focus group interview
   - Description of the evaluation process and the ways in which the obtained information will/would be used
   - Information about the content and technical aspects of the workshop/focus group interview
   - Purpose and the content of the consent forms (including consent for audio recording) is explained and the participants are given enough time to read and sign the consent form, and to talk to their parents / guardians who will also sign the consent forms
   - Interpreter’s role is being explained and her neutrality reaffirmed
   - Detail introduction to the process and principles: mutual respect, confidentiality, welcomed criticism as a space for growth and learning, trust vs. loyalty, participation for the improvement

2. **ABOUT PARTICIPANTS/RESPONDENTS**
Step 1: Draw yourself in the middle of the sheet. Where would your heart be? Tell us 5 things that would make you/makes you happy. You can draw them as symbols next to your heart or choose a sticker that illustrates or reminds you of that.

Step 2: Next to each of them, draw one of the symbols: 😊😊😊, depending on how much you think Atina helps you to realize them.

Step 3: Are there any topics you wanted to know more about, but didn’t have the opportunity? What are these topics? Draw them below your image on the paper.

Step 4: Can you remember how did you feel when you just came to Serbia? Choose one of the cards which reminds you of yourself from that period. And how about how you feel these days, if it’s any different.

15-minute break

3. ABOUT ATINA’S SUPPORT

Step 1: Can you draw a few things that you think are allowed to boys and not to girls? Draw them on one side of the paper. On the other side, draw what is allowed to girls and not to boys. Circle each of those things you talked about with someone from Atina. What was important to you in those conversations? Did you learn anything new? What? How do you feel about this topic now?

Step 25: Can you show how much Atina helped you with the following (giving out the cards symbolizing education, recreation and sports, leisure, self-confidence, communication, relationship with other people in the center – and explaining the meaning). How much did you talk about these topics with someone from Atina? Do you feel they helped you on these topics in any way? Next to each topic, draw a symbol on how much you think they helped you on that topic: 😊😊😊. What is the most important information/knowledge you gained from Atina?

Step 3: I would now like to walk around and take at least 3 photos of the things – objects that have been/were/are strange to you when you came to Serbia (this can be even something that I brought with me). You have 10 for that, after that, we’ll talk about the photos. Who would you ask you explain the new things to you?

Step 4: Which song reminds you of Atina/name of a person? Do you want us to play it? While the song is playing, would you explain to me why that song reminds you of Atina/name of a person? What makes Atina special to you? If you are to talk to a friend/sister/brother about Atina, what would you tell her/him? What do you think the Atina team learned from you? Where and how can they use that knowledge?
Step 5: Tell us 3 things you think other organizations should learn from Atina? What should they (Atina) learn and do better in future?

15-minute break

4. ABOUT COVID-19

Step 1: Now we will talk about one topic that has shaken the whole world during the past 2 years. What do you think the topic is? What are your first associations to the COVID-19? Do you know how to protect yourself? Who did you get the information from? What information about COVID-19 did you get from Atina? How has the pandemic affected your situation and your status here?

5. CLOSING

- Emphasis on the fact that their participation in the process is crucial
- Thanking them for their openness and honesty, for taking care of themselves and creating the positive atmosphere
- Thanking them for their trust
- Information about the next steps and possibility to contact the interviewer with the additional information or even withdrawal of the consent
- Information about the consultations in the phase of drafting the evaluation report

Step 1: Do you remember one of our first tasks – to choose a card which represented you when you came to Serbia and now. Can you think about what would you like to feel in the future and choose one more card for the end? Group discussion.

Step 2: Use one of these symbols (emotion scale) to share with us how have you been feeling during this workshop

Materials:
- Papers, pens and crayons
- Stickers, cards with images
- Camera phones
- Phone with available music, speaker
- Consent forms for girls (include parent / guardian consent and audio recording consent)
- Sample record document - monitors the number and age of girls included in the focus group

Purpose: Finalizing the workshop/interview in a positive atmosphere and sharing the message about the appreciation of their time and inputs.
• Symbols (emotion scale)
Focus group guide – women, participants of the pillar 1 activities

1. Name three rights you have as a woman that you consider the most relevant for your happiness.
   Probes: What would make you happy right now? What would make you happy in the future? What do you want for your family?
2. How much safer and more empowered do you feel now compared to the period before Atina’s workshops (1-5 for each)? Can you please elaborate on this change – give us some examples.
3. How important do you think it was for other women and their empowerment (1-5)?
4. What are the 3 most important things Atina has done to empower you? What was/is missed?
5. How has Atina been ensuring that your voice had been heard throughout their support?
6. What do you particularly like and dislike about Atina’s approach?
   Probes: What would you recommend for continuation? What do you think they should do differently?
7. What sets Atina apart from other organizations you have been in contact with since you came to Serbia? And since you left home?
8. If you had to describe in 3 words how you feel about the activities of Atina, what would those words be?
9. How has the Covid-19 pandemic affected your position and your situation? How has Atina’s approach changed from the pandemic outbreak?
   Probes: Did you get any information from Atina about the Covid-19 pandemic and about the possibilities to protect yourself, treat if necessary or get vaccinated?
10. Which services provided in the Center or in the community have you used since you came to Serbia (health, leisure, education, protection, etc.)? How much are you satisfied with the treatment and the quality of the services? How have Atina helped with any of the service you mentioned?
11. To what extent have the activities you were involved in and the information you received (from Atina) respect your culture? Can you give an example?
12. What have you noticed about the position of women here that is different from your society?
   Probes: Tell me at least 3 things?
13. What do you like and what do you dislike?
14. Have you talked about it with anyone from Atina?
15. If there’s anything you would like to share and I did not ask you, please do so
Focus group interview guide – women, participants of the economic empowerment activities

1. Name three rights you have as a woman that you consider the most relevant for your happiness.
   Probes: What would make you happy right now? What would make you happy in the future? What do you want for your family?
2. How much more prepared for the Serbian/European labor market do you feel now compared to the period before Atina’s activities (1-5)? Can you please elaborate on this change – give us some examples.
3. How important do you find the women's right to work and to be economically independent? Please elaborate. If your attitude towards this right has changed in the past, please elaborate.
4. Which specific knowledge and skills have you gained in this area from Atina?
5. How has Atina been ensuring that your voice had been heard throughout their support?
6. What do you particularly like and dislike about Atina’s approach?
   Probes: What would you recommend for continuation? What do you think they should do differently?
7. If you had to describe in 3 words how you feel about the activities of Atina, what would those words be?
8. How has the Covid-19 pandemic affected your position and your situation? How has Atina’s approach changed from the pandemic outbreak?
   Probes: Did you get any information from Atina about the Covid-19 pandemic and about the possibilities to protect yourself, treat if necessary or get vaccinated?
9. To what extent have the activities you were involved in and the information you received (from Atina) respect your culture? Can you give an example?
10. What have you noticed about the position of women here that is different from your society?
    Probes: Tell me at least 3 things?
11. What do you like and what do you dislike?
12. Have you talked about it with anyone from Atina?
13. What have you noticed about the position of women here that is different from your society?
    Probes: Tell me at least 3 things?
14. If there’s anything you would like to share and I did not ask you, please do so
In-depth interview guide – women, participants in the pillar 2 activities

1. Name three rights you have as a woman that you consider the most relevant for your happiness.
2. Probes: What would make you happy right now? What would make you happy in the future? What do you want for your family?
3. What kind of support has been provided to you by Atina? How would you rate the quality of Atina’s support (1-5)?
4. How much safer and more empowered do you feel now compared to the period before Atina’s workshops (1-5 for each)? Can you please elaborate on this change – give us some examples.
5. What do you value the most and what should be different in the future?
6. What are the 3 most important things Atina has done to empower you?
7. How has Atina been ensuring that your voice had been heard throughout their support?
8. From your experience with Atina, what would you say are the 3 key principles of Atina’s work? How close and important are these principles to you personally (1-3)?
9. What sets Atina apart from other organizations you have been in contact with since you came to Serbia? And since you left home?
10. How has the Covid-19 pandemic affected your position and your situation? How has Atina’s approach changed from the pandemic outbreak?
   Probes: Did you get any information from Atina about the Covid-19 pandemic and about the possibilities to protect yourself, treat if necessary or get vaccinated?
11. To what extent have the activities you were involved in and the information you received (from Atina) respect your culture? Can you give an example?
12. What have you noticed about the position of women here that is different from your society?
   Probes: Tell me at least 3 things?
13. What do you like and what do you dislike?
14. Have you talked about it with anyone from Atina?
15. What have you noticed about the position of women here that is different from your society?
   Probes: Tell me at least 3 things?
   If there’s anything you would like to share and I did not ask you, please do so
**In-depth interview guide – women, participants of the pillar 3 activities**

1. Name three rights you have as a woman that you consider the most relevant for your happiness.
   Probes: What would make you happy right now? What would make you happy in the future? What do you want for your family?
2. How much safer and more empowered do you feel now compared to the period before your cooperation with Atina (1-5 for each)? Can you please elaborate on this change – give us some examples.
3. Could you please elaborate on your involvement in the peer support/advocacy group?
   Probes: How did the activities of the peer support/advocacy group help you to achieve your goals?
4. To what extent do you feel more able to advocate for your rights (1-5)? Please elaborate.
5. How about refugee women’s rights (1-5)? Please elaborate.
6. What made it difficult to work on self-advocacy? Please elaborate.
7. From your experience with Atina, what would you say are the 3 key principles of Atina’s work?
   How close and important are these principles to you personally (1-3)?
8. What do you particularly like and dislike about Atina’s approach?
   Probes: What would you recommend for continuation? What do you think they should do differently?
9. What sets Atina apart from other organizations you have been in contact with since you came to Serbia? And since you left home?
10. How has the Covid-19 pandemic affected your position and your situation? How has Atina’s approach changed from the pandemic outbreak?
    Probes: Did you get any information from Atina about the Covid-19 pandemic and about the possibilities to protect yourself, treat if necessary or get vaccinated?
11. How have your experience and knowledge helped other women, beneficiaries of Atina’s program?
12. How has Atina been ensuring that your voice had been heard throughout their support?
13. To what extent have the activities you were involved in and the information you received (from Atina) respect your culture? Can you give an example?
14. Have you noticed any difference in society regarding the position of women here in relation to your life before? What kind? Give us 3 differences. Have you talked about it with anyone from Atina? How do you see those differences?
15. If there’s anything you would like to share and I did not ask you, please do so.
Focus group interview guide – institutions

(CSOs, social welfare workers, health workers, uniformed personnel)

1. What are your most important personal traits?
   Probes: Tell me something about yourself; What are your main identities?
2. Which Atina’s principles would you extrapolate/recognize from your collaboration with the organization?
   Probes: How about (PRINCIPLES EXTRAPOLATED FROM THE PROJECT STAFF INTERVIEWS). Please elaborate?
3. Tell me more about your work in general and specifically, your work in protection of women and girls’ refugees and the violence prevention?
   Probes: What is your institution’s/organization’s role? What is your personal role/job in this area?
4. What are the key characteristics of the system for protection of women and girls - refugees against violence in Serbia?
5. How does it compare to the regional policies and practices?
6. What has been Atina’s role in the direct assistance/service delivery to women and girls?
7. What are the key benefits of Atina’s work for women and girls - refugees now?
8. What do you think could be the key benefits of Atina’s work for women and girls - refugees in the future?
9. What are the key takeaways from the adaptations of the protection system to COVID-19?
10. How would you rate Atina’s capacity building activities/training you participated in (1-5)?
11. Which specific knowledge and skills did you manage to apply so far?
12. What are the best aspects of the capacity building activities/training?
13. Which aspects should be improved in the future?
14. What are your recommendations for Atins’s future work?
15. What do you think should be done globally to improve the position of women vis-a-vis violence? In general?
16. If there’s anything you would like to share and I did not ask you, please do so
In depth interview guide – policy makers and advocates

1. What are your most important personal traits?
   Probes: Tell me something about yourself; What are your main identities?
2. Tell me more about your work in general.
3. How about your work in protection of women and girls’ refugees from violence and the violence prevention?
4. What is your institution’s role? What is your personal role/job in this area?
5. What are the key characteristics of the system for protection of women and girls - refugees against violence in Serbia?
6. How does it compare to the regional policies and practices?
7. What has been Atina’s role in the creation of a current system?
8. How have the final beneficiaries been included in the policy making process?
9. Could you please reflect on the advocacy meetings with Atina’s beneficiaries?
10. Describe the process. Which issues have been raised? How did it influence policy process?
11. Which Atina's principles would you extrapolate/recognize from your collaboration with the organization?
   Probes: How about (PRINCIPLES EXTRAPOLATED FROM THE PROJECT STAFF INTERVIEWS). Please elaborate?
12. What are the key benefits of Atina’s work for the protection system in general?
13. What are the key takeaways from the adaptations of the system to COVID-19?
14. What are your recommendations for Atina's future work?
15. What do you think should be done globally to improve the position of women vis-a-vis violence? In general?
16. If there’s anything you would like to share and I did not ask you, please do so
**Observation guide – final conference**

*(Activity which will be organized in the next period)*

| Conference to network stakeholders and promote good practices organized | OUTCOMES 2. Refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia survivors of VAW/G receive appropriate and adequate service by the end of the project. | OUTPUTS 2.2. Good practices on access to services for refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in Serbia survivors of VAW/G are shared among institutions/organization s and policy makers by the end of the project. | Activity 2.2.3: Organization of public promotion of the Research and the final conference with 60 institutions/organization s and policy makers and refugee and asylum-seeking women and girl in Serbia participating |

**Place:**
**Date and time:**
**Researcher:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Actively involved in support of the event/tasks</th>
<th>Actively involved in the program</th>
<th>Present at the end of the event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Project Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Program Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditions in which the event is realized (space, work materials, technical and safety conditions)**

**Conditions**

**Description:**
### Event flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Before the conference</th>
<th>During the conference</th>
<th>Parallel processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of the interaction between beneficiaries of the project with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the interaction between beneficiaries and the staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the interaction between beneficiaries and other project stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the interaction between staff and other project stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Atmosphere:**
1=not at all, 2= a little, 3= neutral, 4=yes, 5= completely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>1. To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs (project results) achieved and how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Beneficiaries communicate openly to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Beneficiaries are autonomous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Beneficiaries makes choices confidently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Beneficiaries demonstrate knowledge of the topic and information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Beneficiaries developed an expressive language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANCE</td>
<td>2. To what extent do the achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Mentioning of the Covid 19 pandemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Examples of adaptation due to the Covid 19 pandemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Description of the current context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Reflection of the beneficiaries on the current situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>3. To what extent was the project efficiently and cost-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Mentioning of the topic of resource use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mentioning of the topic of missing resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

Resolving challenges:

Comment:
| SUSTAINABILITY | 4. To what extent will the achieved results, especially any positive changes in the lives of women and girls (project goal level), be sustained after this project ends? | 1. Representatives of institutions and organizations show appreciation of the presented content  
2. Representatives of institutions and organizations reflect on the positive aspects and examples  
3. Decision makers reflect on positive aspects and examples  
4. Decision makers look critically at challenges and obstacles  
5. The topic of future cooperation between different stakeholders is opened  
Other: |
| IMPACT | 5. To what extent has the project contributed to ending violence against women, gender equality and/or women’s empowerment | 1. Beneficiaries talk directly about the topic of violence against women  
2. Beneficiaries show a critical view on the topic of violence against women  
3. Beneficiaries are empowered for public appearance  
4. Representatives of institutions and organizations show understanding of the presented examples |
| KNOWLEDGE GENERATION | 6. To what extent has the project generated knowledge, promising or emerging practices in the field of EVAW/G that should be documented and shared with other practitioners? | Reactions to the presented content:  
1. Beneficiaries recognize and refer to personal experience  
2. Asking questions after the presentation  
3. Confirmation of the relevance for the questions by the beneficiaries  
Other: |
| GENDER EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS | Cross-cutting criteria: To what extent human rights based and gender responsive approaches have been incorporated throughout the project? | To what extent are the values and principles of work reflected in the atmosphere:  
1. Beneficiaries participation  
2. Beneficiaries proactivity and spontaneity  
3. Staff proactivity  
4. Proactivity of other Project Stakeholders  
5. Active listening and asking questions  
6. Support for inclusion  
7. Difference in appearance  
8. Beneficiaries initiating communication with men  
9. Beneficiaries initiating communication with women  
Other: |
Other observations:

Questions which came up during the observation:

Dilemmas that needed to be further clarified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photos</th>
<th>Association/theme:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex D – Ethical and safety protocols

General form of consent

We invite you to participate in the evaluation process of the project Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia, supported by the United Nations Fund for Combating Violence against Women (UNTF), and implemented by the Association of Citizens ATINA from 1st September 2018 to 30th November 2021 in Serbia.

The evaluation of the project, which is currently focused on providing support to women and girls from the population of refugees and asylum seekers, will help us to better understand the challenges within this field of work, but also examples of good practice and promote them in Serbia and globally.

The evaluation process will be led by the project evaluators, Aleksandra Galonja and Marijana Jović. Participants in the evaluation process will be asked to comment on the quality of support provided by the Atina Association, as well as the importance of this support for the development of a system for the protection of women from violence.

Evaluation involves participation in focus group and in-depth interviews during November and December 2021, live or online, if the circumstances of the pandemic require it. We will agree on the exact date and time of the interview if you agree to participate in the evaluation process.

The information obtained during the evaluation process will be used exclusively for the purpose of project evaluation and creating recommendations for improving support for women and girls refugees and asylum seekers, as well as for identifying examples of good practices and defining ways for integrating good practice examples into work with other vulnerable groups.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you are free to decline to participate. If you say no, this will not affect you or your organization / institution negatively in any way whatsoever. You are also free to withdraw from the evaluation at any point, even if you do agree to take part. The information that has been collected from you up to that point will then be deleted. It also means that you will not be paid, nor will you have any kind of benefits due to participating in this process.

Your participation in the evaluation process is anonymous, the names of the participants in the process will be available only through group records and it will not be possible to link the names to the answers and information provided. The session will be recorded. You will have the right to review / edit the recording after the session. These recordings may also be transcribed. The transcriber will sign a confidentiality agreement. In any reports, journal articles, or presentations prepared based on the data collected during this evaluation, you will remain anonymous.
Your participation is extremely important to us because it gives a specific perspective of project realization and project activities.
If you are willing to participate in this evaluation, please sign the attached Declaration of Consent. For all additional questions about the evaluation process and your role, you can contact the evaluator Aleksandra Galonja at +381 63 272163 or by email at saska.galonja@gmail.com

DECLARATION OF CONSENT BY PARTICIPANT

I declare that:
• I have read the attached information leaflet and it is written in a language with which I am fluent and comfortable.
• I have had a chance to ask questions and all my questions have been adequately answered.
• I understand that taking part in this evaluation is voluntary and I have not been pressurized to take part.
• I may choose to leave the evaluation at any time and will not be penalized or prejudiced in any way.
• All issues related to privacy and the confidentiality and use of the information I provide have been explained to my satisfaction.

I have received information about the project, and I give my consent to participate.

____________________________
(Participant signature, date and place)

I agree to participate in the interview - (circle)
YES  NO

I agree that the anonymous transcript of the interview be preserved until the final evaluation report is prepared in March 2022. - (circle)
YES  NO

* The consent form is made in 2 copies, of which the signatory keeps one, and the evaluator keeps the other copy
Consent to participate in the evaluation process – women

We invite you to participate in the evaluation process of the project *Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia*, supported by the United Nations Fund for Combating Violence against Women (UNTF), and implemented by the Association of Citizens ATINA from 1st September 2018 to 30th November 2021 in Serbia.

The evaluation of the project, which is currently focused on providing support to women and girls from the population of refugees and asylum seekers, will help us to better understand the challenges within this field of work, but also examples of good practice and promote them in Serbia and globally.

The evaluation process will be led by the project evaluators, Aleksandra Galonja and Marijana Jović. Participants in the evaluation process will be asked to comment on the quality of support provided by the Atina Association, as well as the importance of this support for the development of a system for the protection of women from violence.

Evaluation involves participation in focus group and in-depth interviews during November and December 2021, live or online, if the circumstances of the pandemic require it. We will agree on the exact date and time of the interview if you agree to participate in the evaluation process. The information obtained during the evaluation process will be used exclusively for the purpose of project evaluation and creating recommendations for improving support for women and girls refugees and asylum seekers, as well as for identifying examples of good practices and defining ways for integrating good practice examples into work with other vulnerable groups.

What does participation in evaluation mean?
Without access to the experiences, opinions, and views of the women to whom the project was directed at, the evaluation process would have no value. The researchers want to talk to women of different ages and with different experiences and life situations in order to see their perspective of the implemented project. To make sure all of the information received from you is noted, we would like to record the conversations.

How will your data be used?
Researchers have an obligation to respect and protect confidentiality when it comes to participants in interviews. Your participation in the evaluation process is anonymous, the names of the participants in the process will be available only through group records and it will not be possible to link the names to the answers and information provided. The session will be recorded. You will have the right to review / edit the recording after the session. These recordings may also be transcribed. The transcriber will sign a confidentiality agreement. In any reports, journal articles, or presentations prepared based on the data collected during this evaluation, you will remain anonymous. This means collecting data without the possibility to connect the answers obtained with specific persons. Participants are required to provide the data necessary to check
the sample statistics, but not the name and surname and other personal data. All recordings of the conversation will be deleted by the end of March 2022.

Voluntary participation
Participation in the conversations is voluntary. If you say no, this will not affect you or your organization / institution negatively in any way whatsoever. You are also free to withdraw from the evaluation at any point, even if you do agree to take part. The information that has been collected from you up to that point will then be deleted. It also means that you will not be paid, nor will you have any kind of benefits due to participating in this process.

Your participation in the evaluation as a project beneficiary is crucial because it gives a specific perspective of project implementation and project activities, and we believe that your assessment is extremely important for the final findings of the evaluation. During the phase of drawing conclusions from the evaluation and making recommendations, you will have the opportunity to participate in their creation and we support you to take an active part in that process. We highlight this process with the moto “Nothing about us without us”, by which we want to motivate you to actively participate in the process. We firmly believe that you are most aware of the challenges that women with similar experience face and the support they need along the way.

If you are willing to participate in this evaluation, please sign the attached Declaration of Consent.

For all additional questions about the evaluation process and your role, you can contact the evaluator Aleksandra Galonja at +381 63 272163 or by email at saska.galonja@gmail.com

In case of the need for additional emotional support during the participation in the evaluation process, the support persons of the Atina Association will be at your disposal.

DECLARATION OF CONSENT BY PARTICIPANT

I declare that:
- I have read the attached information leaflet and it is written in a language with which I am fluent and comfortable.
- I have had a chance to ask questions and all my questions have been adequately answered.
- I understand that taking part in this evaluation is voluntary and I have not been pressured to take part.
- I may choose to leave the evaluation at any time and will not be penalized or prejudiced in any way.
- All issues related to privacy and the confidentiality and use of the information I provide have been explained to my satisfaction.
I have received information about the project, and I give my consent to participate.

_______________________

(Participant signature, date and place)

I agree to participate in the interview - (circle)
YES  NO

I agree that the anonymous transcript of the interview be preserved until the final evaluation report is prepared in March 2022. - (circle)
YES  NO

* The consent form is made in 2 copies, of which the signatory keeps one, and the evaluator keeps the other copy
Consent to participate in the evaluation process - girls

We invite you to participate in the evaluation process of the project *Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia*, supported by the United Nations Fund for Combating Violence against Women (UNTF), and implemented by the Association of Citizens ATINA from 1st September 2018 to 30th November 2021 in Serbia.

The evaluation process will be led by Aleksandra Galonja and Marijana Jović. For the process of evaluation, it is important to think together about the quality of support provided by the Atina association and the importance of this support for girls and women refugees and asylum seekers. The data collected will be used to improve the existing services and to identify those services that give good results.

**What does participation in this evaluation mean?**
Without access to the experiences, opinions, and views of the girls towards whom the project was directed at, the evaluation process would have no value. Researchers want to talk to you about your experiences and the support you got. To make sure all of the information received from you is noted, we would like to record the conversations. The recording will be deleted after the finalization of the report, in March 2022 at the latest. Until then, it will not be available to anyone but us.

**How will your data be used?**
Researchers have an obligation to respect and protect confidentiality when it comes to participants in interviews. Your participation in the evaluation process is anonymous, your names and your answers will be used to write the report and we will not discuss with others what you have said here.

**Voluntary participation**
Participation in the conversations is voluntary. Even if you agree to the conversation now, if at any moment the conversation feels uncomfortable to you, you can end it without having to explain why you did it.

Your participation in the evaluation is very important because we believe that you are the best person to assess what you liked and benefited from, what you missed and how you would like and want the support you receive to look like in the future.
If you want to participate, it is important that you sign the consent. After that, your parents / guardians need to give their consent as well.

If you have any questions, you can ask them at any time during our conversation or you can reach me later over the phone: Marijana Jović +381 63 71 99 759
In case you need support, Atina team support persons will be available. The door of the room where we work will be open and you can go out at any time and ask for help and support from a parent or a person you trust.

DECLARATION BY PARTICIPANT

I declare that:
• I have read the attached information leaflet and it is written in a language with which I am fluent and comfortable.
• I have had a chance to ask questions and all my questions have been adequately answered.
• I understand that taking part in this evaluation is voluntary and I have not been pressurized to take part.
• I may choose to leave the evaluation at any time and will not be penalized or prejudiced in any way.
• All issues related to privacy and the confidentiality and use of the information I provide have been explained to my satisfaction.

I have received information about the project, and I give my consent to participate.

____________________________
(Participant signature, date and place)

I agree to participate in the interview - (circle)
YES   NO

I agree that the anonymous transcript of the interview be preserved until the final evaluation report is prepared in March 2022. - (circle)
YES   NO

I have received information about the project, and I agree that my child is participating in the evaluation process

____________________________
(Parent / guardian signature, date and place)

I give my consent for her to participate in the interview - (circle)
YES   NO
I agree that the anonymous transcript of the interview be preserved until the final evaluation report is prepared in March 2022. - (circle)

YES  NO

* The consent form is made in 2 copies, of which the signatory keeps one, and the evaluator keeps the other copy
Consent to participate in the evaluation process - employees and associates of Atina

We invite you to participate in the evaluation process of the project *Making a Difference for Refugee Women and Girls in Serbia*, supported by the United Nations Fund for Combating Violence against Women (UNTF), and implemented by the Association of Citizens ATINA from 1st September 2018 to 30th November 2021 in Serbia.

The evaluation of the project, which is focused on providing support to women and girls from the population of refugees and asylum seekers, will help us to better understand the challenges, but also examples of good practice and promote them in Serbia and globally.

The evaluation process will be led by the project evaluators, Aleksandra Galonja and Marijana Jović. Participants in the evaluation process will be asked to comment on the quality of support provided by the Association of Atina, as well as the importance of this support for the development of a system for the protection of women from violence.

Evaluation involves participation in focus group and in-depth interviews during November and December 2021, live or online - if the circumstances of the pandemic require it. We will agree on the exact date and time of the interview if you agree to participate in the evaluation process. The information obtained during the evaluation process will be used exclusively for the purpose of project evaluation and creating recommendations for improving support for women and girls refugees and asylum seekers, as well as for identifying examples of good practices and defining ways for integrating good practice examples into work with other vulnerable groups.

**Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you are free to decline to participate.** If you say no, this will not affect you or your organization / institution negatively in any way whatsoever. You are also free to withdraw from the evaluation at any point, even if you do agree to take part. The information that has been collected from you up to that point will then be deleted. It also means that you will not be paid, nor will you have any kind of benefits due to participating in this process.

Your participation in the evaluation process is *anonymous*, the names of the participants in the process will be available only through group records and it will not be possible to link the names to the answers and information provided. The session will be recorded. You will have the right to review / edit the recording after the session. These recordings may also be transcribed. The transcriber will sign a confidentiality agreement. In any reports, journal articles, or presentations prepared based on the data collected during this evaluation, you will remain anonymous.

Your participation is extremely important to us since you participated in the planning and implementation of the project and project activities. In this way, you will have the opportunity to further contribute to the exchange of experience and knowledge within the team, the opportunity to get acquainted with the work of the organization and to put your work in a broader context and to contribute to the collection and distribution of the organizational knowledge.
If you are willing to participate in this evaluation, please sign the attached Declaration of Consent. For all additional questions about the evaluation process and your role, you can contact the evaluator Aleksandra Galonja at +381 63 272163 or by email at saska.galonja@gmail.com

DECLARATION BY PARTICIPANT

I declare that:

• I have read the attached information leaflet and it is written in a language with which I am fluent and comfortable.
• I have had a chance to ask questions and all my questions have been adequately answered.
• I understand that taking part in this evaluation is voluntary and I have not been pressurised to take part.
• I may choose to leave the evaluation at any time and will not be penalised or prejudiced in any way.
• All issues related to privacy and the confidentiality and use of the information I provide have been explained to my satisfaction.

I have received information about the project, and I give my consent to participate.

____________________________
(Participant signature, date and place)

I agree to participate in the interview - (circle)
YES   NO

I agree that the anonymous transcript of the interview be preserved until the final evaluation report is prepared in March 2022. - (circle)
YES   NO

* The consent form is made in 2 copies, of which the signatory keeps one, and the evaluator keeps the other copy
Consent form for the translator

In order to avoid relativization of the principles of impartiality and neutrality and taking into account that in the evaluation process it is necessary to provide translation into language used by the primary beneficiaries of the project (female refugees/asylum seekers, women/girls victims of trafficking, women/girls victims of sexual exploitation - adolescent, young as well as adult women) we find it important to define instructions for translators involved in the evaluation process.

The ethical standards of the methodological approach based on feminist principles of work imply that female translators are primarily hired for the needs of direct work with women victims of violence and sexual exploitation. The number of female translators in Serbia is very limited and most of you were involved to varying degrees in the realization of activities within this project. Still, we think it is important to set certain principles in our joint future work.

In the beginning, it is crucial that the women and girls involved in the evaluation process feel safe and free to talk openly about the challenges in communication and relationship with the Atina organization and other parties involved in the project, and we invite you to support them in this.

It is important to state from your personal position that the statements they make will not in any way affect their role in the activities, and that you accept everything they state as a constructive criticism and opportunity for learning and growth.

Also, you undertake the principle of anonymity and confidentiality of data, ie you will not disclose personal names and data of girls and women who participated in the evaluation process or in any way connect them with the findings.

In order to make the evaluation process less demanding and challenging, we will use the services of the translator outside of direct communication with girls and women whenever possible by submitting translation materials (consent forms, questionnaires and work guides) in advance. Direct communication will be limited to giving the introductory information during the focus groups and interviews. We will be asking for additional support in translation during the work when the need arises.

We will inform you in person about your specific position and role during direct communication with girls and women, which will happen during the introductory part of the meeting you will attend. On that occasion, you will also sign the consent document. We will give clear information to the beneficiaries (women and girls) about how important it is for them to know that you support and encourage their critical review of the project and project activities in which they took part. We will let them know that you understand why it is important that we hear what they particularly liked, what they think should be different, what is missing, and what they enjoy and benefit from the services they receive from Atina.
You commit not to pass on the received information, and you will treat the received information in good faith.

Thank you in advance for respecting the principles on which the evaluation is based on.

If you have any questions or dilemmas regarding your role in evaluating and communicating with girls and women, we invite you to contact us outside of the time allotted for interviews with girls and women.

By signing this document, you state that:

- you understand the challenges that your role in the evaluation process brings, and you agree to approach it responsibly
- You will perform your role in the process by supporting the girls and women involved in the evaluation to feel safe and free
- You commit to the principle of anonymity and confidentiality of data on girls and women involved in the evaluation process
- It is clear to you to whom, in what way and in what context you are addressing for support in relation to your role as a translator

________________________
(Translator's signature, date and place)
### Annex E – Beneficiary data sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary beneficiaries</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Achieved annually</th>
<th>Achieved total</th>
<th>% target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>Y3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female refugees/asylum seekers</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Adult women (25-59)</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young women (20-24)</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescent girls 10-19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/girls victims of trafficking</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Adult women (25-59)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young women (20-24)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescent girls 10-19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/girls victims of sexual exploitation</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Adult women (25-59)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young women (20-24)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescent girls 10-19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary beneficiaries</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved annually</th>
<th>Achieved total</th>
<th>% target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>Y3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations (including NGOs)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/welfare workers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformed personnel (police, asylum authorities)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex F – List of documents reviewed

Project documents and Atina’s reports and publications

- Atina’s concept note
- Full proposal
- COVID-19 adaptations
- Result framework and the revised result framework
- 3 progress reports
- 2 annual reports
- UNTF Beneficiary and Common Results Reporting forms for 2019 and 2020
- Atina’s correspondence with the Portfolio Manager
- Beneficiary workshops methodology, reports
- Trainings for the institutions – material, reports
- Direct assistance to VAW survivors – concept and framework, reports
- Economic empowerment program documentation: program framework and reports
- Peer support program documentation: program framework and reports
- Brief review of the beneficiaries’ advocacy actions
- Atina’s policy program documentation: program framework and reports

Other relevant documents and publications


• UNEG. (2008). *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation*

• UNEG (2011). *Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluations*

• UNICEF’s. Various resources. *Child and youth participation guide*

• WHO (2016). *Ethical and safety recommendations for intervention research on violence against women*

• WHO (2007). *Ethical and safely recommendations for researching, documenting and monitoring sexual violence in emergencies*

• WHO/PATH (2005). *Researching violence against women: a practical guide for researchers and activists*
Annex G – Terms of reference

Background and Context

Description of the project that is being evaluated
Atina - Citizens' Association for Combating Trafficking of Human Beings and All Forms of Gender-based Violence is implementing a project “Making a difference for refugee women and girls in Serbia” with the support of the United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (UN Trust Fund). Its focus is improved access for refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls to essential, safe, and adequate multi-sectoral services to end VAW/G. The project lasts for 3 years, from September 1, 2018 until November 30, 2021, and is currently in the final quarter of its implementation.

This project responds to the lack of safe and adequate services for women and girls victims of gender-based violence and trafficking among the refugee and asylum-seeking population. It is based on evidence from Atina's past and current programs aimed at addressing violence against women and human trafficking, as well as on global practice and testimony of peer organizations and relevant institutions that age and gender-neutral mechanisms are destined to fail in the process of integration of refugee women and girls. Main objective of the project is for refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia to be safer and better protected against VAW/G, especially VAW/G survivors.

Specific forms and manifestations of violence this project addresses are: violence in the family (intimate partner violence, sexual violence, harmful practices, forced marriages), violence in the community (trafficking in women and girls); and violence perpetrated by the State or at the State level (sexual and gender-based violence in refugee camps). Since holistic and multi-sectoral approaches are more likely to have impact, Atina facilitates coordinated interventions operating at multiple levels, across sectors and over multiple timeframes. This project reflects NGO Atina's principle in assisting victims of VAW/G, human trafficking and exploitation – all victims should have access to all available services in Serbia, regardless of their ethnic or legal status.

The project targets primary beneficiaries (female refugees/asylum seekers, women/girls victims of trafficking, women/girls victims of sexual exploitation – adolescent, young as well as adult women), and secondary beneficiaries (members of civil society organizations and NGOs, health professionals, social/welfare workers, and uniformed personnel).

Once the coronavirus pandemic began, in March 2020, Atina had to reorganize its work and adapt to new restrictions and measures in place (state of emergency, curfew). The team was not able to work entirely from home due to obligation within direct support programme (women residing in safe houses and similar). However, all the safety precautions in line with recommendations of the World Health Organization were taken to protect the health and safety of beneficiaries, staff, and all actors involved. This has led to creating the online psychological counseling service, as well
as intensified phone contact of Atina’s case managers with women and girls refugees/asylum seekers, who were inside the asylum/reception centers and unable to move freely. Atina has been adapting to the situation ever since, and continues with all the project activities in a manner that best suits the beneficiaries, and circumstances in the country.

**Strategy and theory of change (or results chain) of the project with the brief description of project goal, outcomes, outputs and key project activities**

Designed strategy is deployed through three main directions, and the activities are designed in order to support refugee and asylum seeking women and girls:

a. Access to information
NGO Atina is assisting the refugee and migrant women and girls in accessing the necessary information. This is being done through mobile teams which are present and operating in the field – mostly in reception and asylum centers. These teams have already gained sufficient experience throughout the refugee crisis to address specific or urgent needs of refugees and migrants in a timely and appropriately manner. Mobile teams consist of social workers, psychologists and cultural mediator; these professionals as well as mobile teams themselves, appeared to be of crucial importance for many refugees during the crisis, as they provided necessary information, recognized risks of violence or exploitation, assisted in accessing the safe accommodation, healthcare, psychological support, etc. Throughout the project, mobile teams have been tasked with providing information to women and girls about relevant services and programs available, about other community services and programs, but also about risks related to VAW/G. Mobile teams are also responsible for establishing and maintaining communication channels between relevant stakeholders on the local level and beneficiaries from women and girls` support programs. Furthermore, mobile teams will maintain communication and share relevant information with representatives of the respective institutions at all governance levels.

b. Access to services
Being in close contact with refugee and migrant women and girls, Atina’s mobile teams will also be able to identify potential victims and facilitate their access to a holistic package of services aimed at their protection, both urgent and the long-term one. For the victims who are in need of longer support, Atina will facilitate their transition from emergency shelters to independent living spaces, in close coordination with relevant institutions. These spaces are equipped to meet the specific needs of VAW/G victims and other vulnerable groups. Further on, once being accommodated in these spaces, victims will have access to programs and services through Atina’s support center, which include, but are not limited to: individual and group counselling and therapy work, other forms of psychosocial support, legal assistance in situations of violence, language interpretation and cultural mediation. As Atina also provides economic empowerment and maintains professional training and practice in Bagel Bejgl shop – which is a social enterprise established and run by Atina, these services will be available for the target group. On the other
hand, professionals in charge of the provision of the support services will also be trained in order to facilitate and improve the access to these services to VAW/G survivors.

c. Empowerment for active participation and leadership
No matter whether they are involved in long-term programs and accommodated in Atina’s shelters or residing in the state-run facilities, refugee and migrant women and girls will be empowered to take an active role in their communities and in the hosting (local) community. Women and girls will be supported through a series of workshops aimed at enabling them to express their needs, formulate and communicate them towards the members of local communities, local authorities and other relevant stakeholders. The follow-up will be maintained via a series of meetings with representatives of local institutions and with participation of refugee and migrant women during which they can advocate for their needs and in general for their perspective. As this will bring local competent actors and refugee and migrant women closer, it will create the opportunity for these women to participate in the creation of the procedures and policies relevant for their lives. In order to bring effective and sustainable results, Atina will also work with relevant local institutions and build their capacities to appropriately understand the gender perspective of refugee response, the needs of women and girls as well as the potential risks they might be exposed to. Even though refugee women and girls are at the core of the proposed strategies, the strategies will be realized in close cooperation with actors authorized to provide support to the refugee and migrant population and running the accommodating facilities. Finally, in order to promote activities in this area and present achieved results and successful stories, NGO Atina will also conduct the analysis on the need of refugee and migrant VAW/G survivors with their participation in the research, thus preparing a respective publication at the end of the project implementation. This application will be promoted and disseminated at a conference organized in this regard.

Result chain
Goal: Refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia are safer and better protected against VAW/G, especially VAW/G survivors

Outcome 1: Refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia have increased agency to respond and prevent VAWG
Output 1.1: 2000 refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia have information on their rights and increased knowledge on how to do self-advocacy
Activity 1.1.1: Two Atina's mobile teams organize 36 workshops for 2000 refugee and asylum seeking women girls in Serbia on women rights and available services for protection of VAW/G
Activity 1.1.2: Atina organizes 6 peer support groups of refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia and facilitates 36 peer group meetings
Output 1.2: 30 refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia to gain skills to be economically empowered
Activity 1.2.1: Vocational training for 30 refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia at social enterprise Bagel Bejgl to increase their employability
Outcome 2: Refugee and asylum seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G receive appropriate and adequate service
Output 2.1: 240 refugee and asylum seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G have better access to support services
Activity 2.1.1: 90 refugee and asylum seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G supported through safe accommodation
Activity 2.1.2: 240 refugee and asylum seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G supported through cultural mediation
Activity 2.1.3: 240 refugee and asylum seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G supported through case management including referrals to community services
Activity 2.1.4: 42 trainings organized for 240 professional from 48 institutions/organizations and 12 policy makers are trained to implement participatory services
Output 2.2: Good practices on access to services for refugee and asylum seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G are shared among institutions/organizations and policy makers
Activity 2.2.1: Research with 5 case studies on access to services for refugee and asylum seeking women and girl in Serbia survivors of VAW/G conducted by Atina
Activity 2.2.2: Printed Research disseminated among 100 institutions/organizations and policy makers
Activity 2.2.3: Organization of public promotion of the Research and the final conference with 60 institutions/organizations and policy makers and refugee and asylum seeking women and girl in Serbia participating

Outcome 3: Refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia empowered for active participation and leadership
Output 3.1: 30 refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia gain skills and have the space to advocate for their rights
Activity 3.1.1: 12 workshops held for 30 refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia to increase their communication and advocacy capacity
Activity 3.1.2: 21 meetings with institutions organized with participation of 30 refugee and asylum seeking women and girls in Serbia to develop and implement 6 joint actions to promote refugee integration

The geographic context, such as the region, country and landscape, and the geographical coverage of the project

After the Balkan route was closed in March 2016, several thousands of refugees and migrants remained residing in Serbia, in reception and asylum centers, young women and children being the majority of this population. Since then, they have continued coming to the country on a regular basis. Since the closure of Hungary’s external border, most migrants in the Balkans have been trying to enter the EU via Croatia. Also, a new Balkan route leads through Bosnia and Herzegovina, either from Serbia or from Albania and then Montenegro. Even if the numbers decreased, migrants and refugees did not stop coming due to various reasons. Also, in Serbia,
there is still a lack of a systemic and effective response to the protection and support of refugee
and migrant children and youth, including the lack of safe spaces, long-term support programs,
identification, and prosecution of perpetrators of violence, etc. The responses of the system to
eliminate the consequences and potential risks of violence remain insufficient.
The project implementation takes place on the territory of the Republic of Serbia. Specific
activities are being implemented in the period in the places where a large number of refugees
and migrants are accommodated. These are the asylum centers in Knjača (Belgrade), Bogovađa,
Preševo, Bujanovac, Bosilegrad, Banja Koviljača, Adaševci, and Šid, as well as in Maternity Home
in Belgrade and Atina’s safe accommodation.

**Total resources allocated for the intervention, including human resources and budgets (budget
need to be disaggregated by the amount funded by the UN Trust Fund and by other
sources/donors).**

The total resources allocated for the intervention are 1,084,482 USD.
Of that amount, the part funded by the UN Trust Fund is 499,500 USD, while additional 584,982
USD are funded from other sources.

**Key partners involved in the project, including the implementing partners and other key
stakeholders.**

In this project, Atina was partnering with state institutions relevant in the field of migration, such
as Commissariat for Refugees and Migration, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Labor,
Employment, Social and Veteran Affairs (specifically Center for the Protection of Trafficking
Victims), but also Department for Family and Child Care. In addition, based on direct cases, Atina
was coordinating and cooperating with relevant local Centers for Social Work, and involved in
partnering with NGOs on national and local level that have experience in working on the
protection of human rights, migration, women’s rights, child rights. Atina was also deeply involved
in cooperation with UN agencies, such as UNHCR, UNFPA, UNICEF, IOM. This specific project
covered cooperation with international actors working in Serbia such as International Rescue
Committee (IRC), Catholic Relief Service (CRS), as well as specific professionals working in various
ministries, such as the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of the Interior (Departments working with
smuggling and human trafficking cases, and asylum cases). In addition, key partners of the project
are also refugee and asylum-seeking women themselves, as well as the UN Trust Fund portfolio
manager.

**Purpose of the evaluation**

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess the processes and achievements made to draw
lessons that will inform the development of future actions. The evaluation is intended to be
forward looking which will effectively capture lessons learnt and provide information on the
nature, extent and where possible, the effect of the project. The emphasis on lessons learned
speaks to the issue of understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future planning.

Evaluation objectives and scope

Scope of Evaluation:
- Timeframe: this evaluation needs to cover the entire project duration (September 1, 2018 – November 30, 2021).
- Geographical Coverage: for the purpose of the evaluation, it is necessary to cover at least half of the asylum and reception centers (located in Krnjača (Belgrade), Bogovađa, Preševo, Bujanovac, Bosilegrad, Banja Koviljača, Adaševci, and Šid), as well as Maternity Home in Belgrade and Atina’s safe accommodation. Target groups to be covered: this evaluation needs to cover primary beneficiaries (female refugees/asylum seekers, women/girls victims of trafficking, women/girls victims of sexual exploitation – adolescent, young as well as adult women), and secondary beneficiaries (members of civil society organizations and NGOs, health professionals, social/welfare workers, uniformed personnel), as well as broader range of stakeholders engaged in this area of work, and the UN Trust Fund portfolio manager. A subset of at least 15% of primary and secondary beneficiaries is to be included in the evaluation. However, the final number, as well as the sampling, of beneficiaries will be agreed upon between the chosen evaluator and the Evaluation Team.

Objectives of Evaluation:

Mandatory evaluation objectives:
- To evaluate the entire project against the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact criteria, as well as the cross-cutting gender equality and human rights criteria (defined below);
- To identify key lessons and promising or emerging good practices in the field of ending violence against women and girls, for learning purposes (this is defined under the knowledge generation criteria below).

Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Mandatory Evaluation Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>1. To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs (project results) achieved and how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What were the main factors influencing the outcomes of this project, either negatively or positively?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What are the lessons to be learned for a replication or continuation of the project approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the project is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group and the context.</td>
<td>Measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which refers to whether the project was delivered cost effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do the achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls?</td>
<td>To what extent was the project efficiently and cost-effectively implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Have the project design and choice of activities and deliverables properly reflected and addressed the needs of the beneficiaries?</td>
<td>1. Were the results achieved on time and to budget? Were all activities organized efficiently and on time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent have the planned and actual activities and outputs of the project been consistent with the intended outcomes and impact?</td>
<td>2. Has COVID-19 pandemic caused reduced efficiency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has the project been able to adjust to the changes in the context and needs of the primary beneficiaries that occurred during the implementation?</td>
<td>3. To what extent the resources were used economically? How could the use of resources be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced the activities, outputs and outcomes of the project?</td>
<td>4. Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is Atina’s comparative advantage in this area of work?</td>
<td>5. How was the difference between planned and actual expenditure justified (if any)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Have the human and financial resources been used in the best manner possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of a project are likely to continue after the project/funding ends.</td>
<td>4. To what extent will the achieved results, especially any positive changes in the lives of women and girls (project goal level), be sustained after this project ends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. How is the stakeholders’ engagement likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated or institutionalized after funding ceases?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How has the project built in resilience to future risks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How has the pandemic affected the resilience to future crises?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Assesses the changes that can be attributed to a particular project relating specifically to higher-level impact (both intended and unintended).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent has the project contributed to ending violence against women, gender equality and/or women’s empowerment (both intended and unintended impact)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● What has happened as a result of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● What real difference/changes has the activity made to the lives of the target group?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● How many people have been affected?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● How do the women and girls involved, and competent stakeholders, see the impact themselves and how do they describe the changes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● How has the access to necessary services for refugee and asylum seeking women been improved by the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced project results?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● How did the project impact and improve the operation of the competent institutions involved in the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● How have the refugee and asylum seeking women assessed the impact of the activities they were involved in (workshops, advocacy, economic empowerment trainings)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge generation</th>
<th>Assesses whether there are any promising practices that can be shared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent has the project generated knowledge, promising or emerging practices in the field of EVAW/G that should be documented and shared with other practitioners?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● What is the new, innovative knowledge that the project has generated, that builds on evidence from other projects, or has potential for replication or scale up in future projects, or different contexts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
● What are the lessons learned from the pandemic, and how have they been utilized for knowledge-generation and future practices?

● Was any knowledge generated which could be further used in work with other vulnerable groups or with other institutions in the protection and support system?

Gender Equality and Human Rights

Cross-cutting criteria: the evaluation should consider the extent to which human rights based and gender responsive approaches have been incorporated throughout the project and to what extent.

● Evaluation approach and data collection methods must be gender responsive (ensure that women and girls interviewed feel safe to share information and are fully informed of the purpose).

● Evaluation data is to be disaggregated by sex, beneficiary group - as listed within the result chain - and other criteria of importance to the project and the evaluation quality.

● How have feminist principals and intersectionality been incorporated in the relevant policies?

Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation methodology should be participatory, inclusive (consultations with all stakeholders, such as gender, age, disability and other vulnerability considerations), sensitive to social norms and practices, and ethical in data collection practices (safety, informed consent, etc.). This is especially important for the methodology of the evaluation, for example, it is encouraged to suggest different methods which include adolescents as active agents for data collection and analysis as well. Findings and analysis should be disaggregated by age and gender.

Evaluator/s is encouraged to use participatory and qualitative methods for data collection and data analysis, along with quantitative methods for measuring the changes, in line with the overall theory of change of the project – as identified above. Additionally, since one of the objectives of the final evaluation is to understand the contribution of the project towards change at various levels in the project’s theory of change, the evaluator is encouraged to suggest different methodologies, which can provide answers in a valid and reliable manner. Evaluator/s will be provided with all relevant materials, including but not limited to: project documents and reports; progress reports, self-assessment reports, documents and/or reports produced through the project, material used for activities; training materials; resource-use information; list of beneficiaries and workshop/meeting participants, counterparts and resource persons; existing feedback (assessments, letters, surveys, etc.).

The evaluator must use a mixed-method approach to triangulate all available data sources to reach conclusions and findings. Such evaluation methodology may include but is not limited to the following:

− Review of relevant project documents and relevant materials;
− Interviews with relevant staff;
− Personal or telephone/online interviews with direct beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders, depending on the situation concerning the pandemic, and potential restrictions;
− Surveys of workshop participants and project partners, as may be required;
− Analysis of the data collected.

Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluator/s must put in place specific safeguards and protocols to protect the safety (both physical and psychological) of respondents and those collecting the data as well as to prevent harm. This must ensure the rights of the individual are protected and participation in the evaluation does not result in further violation of their rights. The evaluator/s must have a plan in place to:

• Protect the rights of respondents, including privacy and confidentiality;
• Elaborate on how informed consent will be obtained and to ensure that the names of individuals consulted during data collection will not be made public;
• For any potential contact with children16, the evaluator/s must consider additional risks and need for parental consent;
• For including adolescents in data collection process, evaluator/s must provide relevant ethics and safety protocols, in addition to the resources listed below. These include, but are not limited to, basic ethical principles in work with adolescents in VAW/G studies, culture and gender considerations, as well as considerations for particularly vulnerable individuals;
• The evaluator/s must be trained in collecting sensitive information and specifically data relating to violence against women and select any members of the evaluation team on these issues;
• Data collection tools must be designed in a way that is culturally appropriate and does not create distress for respondents;
• Data collection visits should be organized at the appropriate time and place to minimize risk to respondents, or held online;
• The interviewer or data collector must be able to provide information on how individuals in situations of risk can seek support (referrals to counseling support, for example).

Resources:

• WHO, “Ethical and safety recommendations for intervention research on violence against women “, (2016)
• WHO, “Ethical and safely recommendations for researching, documenting and monitoring sexual violence in emergencies” (2007)

---

16 A child means every human being below the age of eighteen years unless under the law applicable to the child, majority is attained earlier.
▪ UNICEF’s “Child and youth participation guide” (various resources)

Key deliverables of evaluators and timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Deadlines of Submission to UN Trust Fund M&amp;E Team</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation Inception Report</td>
<td>This report is to be submitted by the evaluator within 2-4 weeks of starting the assessment. The inception report needs to meet the minimum requirements and structure specified in this guideline for UN Trust Fund’s review and approval.</td>
<td>By 15 October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Draft Evaluation Report is to be submitted between 1 month and 2 weeks before the final evaluation is due. The Draft Report needs to meet the minimum requirements and structure specified in this guideline for UN Trust Fund’s review and approval.</td>
<td>By 25 December 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Final Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Final Evaluation is to be submitted no later than 2 months after the project end date. The Final Report needs to meet the minimum requirements and structure specified in this guideline for UN Trust Fund’s review and approval.</td>
<td>By 31 January 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Team composition and required competencies

Evaluators must be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing, managing or advising any aspect of the project that is the subject of the evaluation and any other UN Trust Fund-funded projects.

Evaluation Team Composition and Roles and Responsibilities

NGO Atina encourages both companies and individual evaluators to apply for this consultancy service. The main requirement is the experience in the region, and usage of innovative and mixed methods approaches, including the considerations for remote modality due to COVID-19. The evaluator/s will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish and for managing the evaluation team under the supervision of evaluation task manager from NGO Atina, for the data collection and analysis, as well as report drafting and finalization in English.

Required Competencies
• Evaluation experience at least 10 years in conducting external evaluations, with mixed-methods evaluation skills and having flexibility in using non-traditional and innovative evaluation methods;
• Expertise in gender and human-rights based approaches to evaluation and issues of violence against women and girls;
• Experience with program design and theory of change, gender-responsive evaluation, participatory approaches and stakeholder engagement;
• Specific evaluation experience in the area of ending violence against women and girls in the Republic of Serbia/in the region;
• Experience in collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data as well as data visualization;
• In-depth knowledge of gender equality and women’s empowerment;
• A strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e. credible evaluation and its report that can be used;
• A strong team leadership and management track record, as well as interpersonal and communication skills to help ensure that the evaluation is understood and used;
• Good communication skills and ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely and clearly ideas and concepts;
• Regional/country experience and knowledge: in-depth knowledge of Serbia is required;
• Language proficiency: fluency in English is mandatory; good command of Serbian is desirable.

Management Arrangement of the evaluation

The team that will be involved in the evaluation process consists of key personnel that were involved in this project, Project Manager, Case Managers, members of the mobile teams, Psychologist, as well as Direct Assistance Coordinator and Empowerment Coordinator, and the UN Trust Fund portfolio manager. Evaluation task manager will be Coordinator of Direct Support. Stakeholder reference group will be made up of the actors involved in the project (secondary beneficiaries).

Timeline of the entire evaluation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Evaluation</th>
<th>Key Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Number of working days required</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception stage</td>
<td>Briefings of evaluators to orient the evaluators</td>
<td>Evaluation Task Manager</td>
<td>10 working days</td>
<td>First week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desk review of key documents</td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td>First week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalizing the evaluation design and methods</td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td>Second week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft <strong>Inception Report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td></td>
<td>By 15 October 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review <strong>Inception Report</strong> and provide feedback</td>
<td>Evaluation Task Manager, Stakeholder Group and UNTF</td>
<td>5 working days</td>
<td>By 22 October 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating comments and revising the <strong>Inception Report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td>4 working days</td>
<td>By 28 October 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting final version of <strong>Inception Report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review final <strong>Inception Report</strong> and approve</td>
<td>Evaluation Task Manager, Stakeholder Group and UNTF</td>
<td>5 working days</td>
<td>By 4 November 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk research</td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td>10 working days</td>
<td>By 25 December 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country technical mission for data collection (visits to the field if possible, interviews, questionnaires, etc.)</td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td>Over 6-8 weeks</td>
<td>By early December 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and interpretation of findings</td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>By 25 December 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a <strong>first draft report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the draft report with key stakeholders for quality assurance</td>
<td>Evaluation Task Manager, Stakeholder Group and UNTF</td>
<td>10 working days</td>
<td>By 3 January 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate comments from all the groups and submit the consolidated comments to evaluation team</td>
<td>Evaluation Task Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating comments and preparing <strong>second draft evaluation report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>By 17 January 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final review and approval of report</td>
<td>Evaluation Task Manager, Stakeholder Group and UNTF</td>
<td>5 working days</td>
<td>By 24 January 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final edits and submission of the <strong>final report</strong></td>
<td>Evaluator/s</td>
<td>4 working days</td>
<td>By 31 January 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex H – Recommendations for MEL system improvements

Observations and recommendations regarding project monitoring, for both UNTF and the implementing organizations, based on the evaluator’s extensive experience in creation and implementation of robust monitoring systems, are as follows:

- Within the result chain framework set as it was, the monitoring matrix should introduce outcome and impact indicators in order to set a system for measuring longer-term changes, together with the ones used – immediate (process/output indicators) and intermediate (result/output, e.g., increase in knowledge of training participants)
- Number of indirect (proxy) indicators could be identified (especially since the system was used to describe/measure qualitative state of affairs) in the measuring system to support evidence of progress against different criteria
- With the outcome and impact indicators, nationally and internationally relevant sources of verification could be identified and used in the process of project progress monitoring (this action could be also additionally supported by UNTF so to provide internationally comparable and globally relevant evidence of progress and practices)
- In addition, using existing global indicators framework (SDG indicators relevant for the project) could be considered for global use
- Precise timeline for measuring process-effects could be set to support the process and all involved actors (monitoring system could then serve as a comprehensive roadmap for project implementation)
- Baseline studies should be used to inform the monitoring process and system, so that all baseline values in the monitoring matrix reflect the real state in the given measured areas/fields (for outcome and impact indicators). In the same way, project/monitoring system could benefit from the end line study which would include references to the means of verification relevant for the monitoring system
- Data disaggregation should be used for identification of potential areas for improvements (e.g. upon identification of lack of women and/or men participating in specific activity, specific targeting actions could be planned/implemented) and thus, system adaptations; Other contextually/project relevant criteria for data disaggregation could be identified (e.g. disability, decision making level (for institutions), type of violence, etc.) and utilized for further adaptations. In addition, it would be beneficial to go beyond the male-female binary and include options for other groups, such as transgender and intersex populations
- System could benefit from more precise definition of indicators (e.g. clarity on numerators and denominators), as well as evidence on data quality assessment relative to the key standards (validity, reliability, timeliness, prevision, integrity.
Annex I - Benefits for beneficiaries from the evaluation process

Women and girls who participated in the project evaluation process were included through focus group and in-depth interviews. Both methods of work were based on feminist values and principles of work, which alludes to an approach in which both participants and evaluators come out of the process with developed mutual trust and empowered on several levels. The benefits for the evaluators are, in addition to the obtained specific and valuable information, insights into the personal experiences, understandings and values of the women respondents. In order for the work to result in equal benefits and for both parties to have the opportunity to come out of the work process richer than when they entered into communication, the evaluators had the responsibility to provide women/respondents with a prospect for the additional empowerment.

Depending on the method, women’ and girls’ personal circumstances in relation to the project, as well as the number of project (Atina’s program) activities in which they were involved and the length of involvement, women’s’ and girls’ (respondents’) benefits were planned and, based on their feedback during the evaluation process, around the following aspects of empowerment:

**Informative component**
Women and girls were additionally provided with the information on:
- Available services and service providers in general
- Activities implemented by Atina and other CSOs, and the options for other types of non-formal and informal support
- Available service providers in the domain of resolving civil status and other legal issues
- Potentially challenging situations, obstacles, and opportunities for overcoming them when it comes to exercising various women's human rights

This component was particularly pronounced among women who participated in focus group interviews and who had been relatively short period of time in Serbia and were involved in a small number of project activities.

**The social component**
Function of the evaluation interviews was also to provide women and girls, Atina’s beneficiaries with:
- Additional opportunity to meet other women and girls who were not available for communication earlier due to social barriers (language, different cultures) and living conditions (few places for socializing and socializing in asylum/reception centers, especially in winter and during the COVID-19 pandemic)
- Collective activity that, is in challenging conditions in which women live, often isolated and lonely, a valuable opportunity for socialization and deeper connection based on trust
- Social event or opportunity for quality time during which the focus was on their personal needs, experiences, desires, and plans
- Strengthening the informal support network in the environment in which they currently live
This aspect was particularly relevant for women who participated in focus group interviews within the asylum/reception centers for a longer period.

**Educational component**

Evaluators’ intentions during the evaluation were to additionally support respondents for:

- Better understanding of the social context by differentiating one’s own and others’ experiences and its relative relation to their own (and mutually different) societies and the society they currently live in
- Getting to know women with a different cultural and social background and the challenges they have, and thus learning about diversity with the critical review of social circumstances
- Getting acquainted with other women's and girls’ experience and learning from those experiences, as an opportunity to see practical techniques for the reflection on one's own experience based on reflection to others', with the critical review in a safe environment
- Ability to express their questions, dilemmas, worries, personal stories in a safe environment, recognize certain potentially unsafe behaviors or risky situations and create new opinions and attitudes
- Framing the stories about their experience through a perspective of benefit to other women
- Improving communication skills in a new social context
- Additional framing of the public advocacy concept, by emphasizing power dynamics of the process, need for building the critical mass and differences between targeting diverse target groups

This aspect was particularly relevant for the respondents/beneficiaries active in the peer support groups and the advocacy group.

**Emotional-psychological component**

Evaluation additionally provided women and girls respondents with the:

- Emotional support to recognize their needs and validation of their inclination to actively work to meet them
- Motivation for taking a proactive role (even) in the uncertain circumstances
- Support in the identification of behaviors and actions that energize them and make them happy (happier)
- Support to name the problems they had been facing and full understanding of the ways in which they had mitigated them
- Validation of experienced feelings
- Encouraging to see their own situation with a distance
- Reflection on experience, understanding and validation of personal progress – especially with the women and girls who had been involved in the program for a long time and received comprehensive support
- Validation of efforts made by women to survive intersectional discrimination and oppression and specifically – misogyny, racism, classicism, nationalism and take responsibility for their lives.
This aspect of additional support was important to all women and girls, regardless of the way they participated in the evaluation and the extent of their involvement in the project.