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**SUMMARY**

On 3 October, the EU PRO has published a Public Call for Proposals for Introduction and Development of Geographic Information Systems. The Call has indicative budget of 1.200.000 Euros and it is open till 30 December. All Programme local self-governments (a total of 99) are eligible to apply under two LOTs. LOT 1 is for applications by single municipalities with maximum amount of 100.000 Euros that can be requested, while LOT 2 is for municipalities applying in partnership, with maximum amount of 150.000 Euros that can be requested.

The purpose for organizing eight regional informative sessions and basic training on GIS was to generate interest of LSGs to apply, to present the conditions of the call in more details and to provide an explanation regarding required forms to be filled in, but also to ensure better understanding of GIS, in terms of its applicability.

All LSGs were invited to appoint representatives to attend the sessions from areas of Information technologies, urban planning and local economic development. Besides LSGs, ten regional development agencies that operates within Programme area were invited to participate. Overall, the participation was relatively high with a total of 157 participants (57 female and 100 male) from 67 LSGs (68%) attended the sessions and six RDAs[[1]](#footnote-1). There was a 32 LSGs[[2]](#footnote-2) not participated. Concerning gender segregation there was 57 female participants (36.3%).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Info sessions | Valjevo  (20-21.11.) | Zlatibor  (22-23.11.) | Kraljevo (27-28.11.) | Kraljevo (29-30.11) | Niš (4-5.12.) | Niš  (6-7.11.) | Kladovo (11-12.12.) | Požarevac  (13-14.12.) | TOTAL |
| No. of participants | 16 | 21 | 23 | 24 | 21 | 19 | 17 | 16 | **157** |
| No. of female participants | 4 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 6 | **57** |
| No. of LSGs | 8 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 | **67** |
| No. of RDAs | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | **6** |
| No. of filled questionnaires (info session) | 12 | 14 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 7 | **123** |
| No. of filled questionnaires (training) | 11 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 14 | 9 | **105** |

The two day event agenda included the following:

Day 1

* Welcoming words and Programme Introduction
* Introduction to GIS
* Presentation of Public Call
* Clarification of application forms
* Examples of municipal GIS

Day 2

* Provision and use of data
* Organisational and management aspects of GIS
* New trends and techniques in GIS development
* Final wrap up and discussion

Through the informative session part, the representatives of LSGs get acquainted with nature and the concept of the Call, in order to better understand the objectives and the concept of Programme support, while during the training part, the participants were able to better understand purpose of GIS and its linkages with Call for Proposals.

The most valuable benefit of the info sessions seems to be clarification of key elements of the calls to LSG representatives. All questions related to the criteria, possible content of projects, eligibility and mechanisms for its implementation were discussed and answered. To ensure transparency, the Q&A section containing all identified questions was processed and published at the Programme’s website after the sessions were completed including those submitted through official mail for clarifications. Concerning training, the participants received training material and useful links related to GIS examples and data provision.

**OVERALL ASSESMENT OF INFORMATIVE SESSION**

Participants’ knowledge and understanding of the conditions of the Call was good before the sessions with 60% of participants stating that their understanding is good or excellent. This indicates that the terms of Call were properly explained in the documents but also that the subject is of great interest for the participants. Moreover, the understanding of the conditions improved after the session with approx. 91% of participants confirming better understanding of the Call.

Regarding the content of the sessions, all 100% of participants regarding the topics addressed and their relevance for work on development of project proposal were useful or very useful. All participants (100%) stated that they received concrete answers on the posed questions. The interactive approach established at the sessions by the presenters was resulted by response to specific questions on how certain aspects of the projects have to be implemented. Organisation of the workshop, clarity of information, clear and concise presentation, the accessibility and commitment of the Programme staff were identified as major qualities of info sessions.

**INFORMATIVE SESSION EVALUATION QUESTIONAIRRE RESULTS**

1. How would you assess your knowledge and understanding of the conditions of the Public Call for Proposals for infrastructure?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Answer | Insufficient | Sufficient | Good | Excellent |
| Valjevo | - | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Zlatibor | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Kraljevo | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4 |
| Kraljevo | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 |
| Niš | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3 |
| Niš | 1 | 3 | 7 | 6 |
| Kladovo | 3 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| Požarevac | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 17 (14%) | 32 (26%) | 42(35%) | 32 (26%) |

1. What is your general impression on the organization of the informative session?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Answer | Negative | Neutral | Positive | Very positive |
| Valjevo | - | - | 3 | 9 |
| Zlatibor | - | - | 5 | 9 |
| Kraljevo | - | - | 4 | 15 |
| Kraljevo | - | - | 8 | 10 |
| Niš | - | - | 6 | 13 |
| Niš | - | - | 4 | 13 |
| Kladovo | - | - | 6 | 11 |
| Požarevac | - | - | 2 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 0(0%) | 0(0%) | 38 (31%) | 85(69%) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| In what way can the organization be improved? | * Heating (Valjevo) * The sessions should be organised earlier |

1. To what extent has this workshop helped in better understanding of conditions proposed with the Public Calls?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Answer | I haven’t learned anything new | I understand a little better | I understand better | I fully understand |
| Valjevo | - | - | 9 | 3 |
| Zlatibor | - | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| Kraljevo | - | - | 10 | 9 |
| Kraljevo | - | - | 11 | 7 |
| Niš | - | - | 12 | 7 |
| Niš | - | - | 6 | 10 |
| Kladovo | - | 1 | 9 | 7 |
| Požarevac | - | - | 4 | 3 |
| TOTAL | **0 (0%)** | **4 (3%)** | **65 (53%)** | **54 (44%)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What would help with better defining of conditions? | * To explain application form more slowly. * More detail criteria explanation and less examples * To go through one filled application example |

1. How would you evaluate the topics addressed during the informative session and their relevance for your work on development of project proposal?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Answer | Irrelevant | Partially useful | Useful | Very useful |
| Valjevo | - | - | 1 | 11 |
| Zlatibor | - | - | 6 | 8 |
| Kraljevo | - | - | 3 | 16 |
| Kraljevo | - | - | 10 | 8 |
| Niš | - | - | 5 | 14 |
| Niš | - | - | 4 | 13 |
| Kladovo | - | - | 8 | 9 |
| Požarevac | - | - | 1 | 6 |
| TOTAL | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 38 (31%) | 85 (69%) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Which segment should be more thoroughly explained? | * Application forms * Urban planning aspects |

1. Have you received concrete answers on the posed questions?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer | Yes | No |
| Valjevo | 12 | - |
| Zlatibor | 14 | - |
| Kraljevo | 19 | - |
| Kraljevo | 18 | - |
| Niš | 19 | - |
| Niš | 17 | - |
| Kladovo | 17 | - |
| Požarevac | 7 | - |
| TOTAL | 123 | - |

1. How would you evaluate your knowledge and understanding of the terms and conditions of public calls after conducted informative session?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Answer | Insufficient for preparation of project proposals | Better, but insufficient for preparation of project proposals | Sufficient. The preparation of project proposals is possible through minimal assistance | Excellent. All terms and conditions and procedures are clear and preparation of proposals is inevitable |
| Valjevo | - | 2 | 10 | - |
| Zlatibor | - | 1 | 12 | 1 |
| Kraljevo | - | 1 | 10 | 8 |
| Kraljevo | - | 3 | 10 | 5 |
| Niš | - | - | 14 | 5 |
| Niš | - | 1 | 14 | 2 |
| Kladovo | - | 3 | 13 | 1 |
| Požarevac | - | - | 7 | - |
| TOTAL | 0 (0%) | 11 (9%) | 90 (73%) | 22 (18%) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What questions remain unanswered? |  |

| What was good? | How can we address mistakes in the future? |
| --- | --- |
| Example from Subotica; Examples; explanation how to introduce GIS, | Heating (Valjevo); Venue connected with kitchen and noise (Kraljevo); |
| Excellent and clear presentation, concise elaboration with detail explanation of guidelines, presentation of application forms; The lecturer elaborated application through useful examples from previous experience, respect of timeframe, competency and efficiency; Kindness and active participation | More thorough explanation of application form and criteria as well as GIS sustainability |
| Possibility to ask questions for any matter, Advices, recommendations | To many examples and to present more foreign examples |
| Advantages and disadvantages, applicability, concrete instructions for project preparation | The training should last more days, reduce training duration to one day |
|  | To provide call criteria in Serbian, To distribute presentation before informative session, To provide pencils for info session participants |
|  | Timeframe for preparation of application |

**OVERALL ASSESMENT OF BASIC GIS COURSE**

Concerning training content and training material, the overall average grade was 4.52. The participants grades indicates the quality of training methods as most valuable, as well the other elements such as training content and training materials. The majority of marks regarding the topics addressed their relevance for later use with ranking score from 4.35. The competence of the trainers and their attitude towards participants were identified as a major quality of the training with highest ranking scores of 4.88 – 4.98. The participants stated that obtained knowledge and skills during this training was improved and its applicability will be of great use. This part was evaluated with average ranking score of 4.21. The total number of participants that filled evaluation form was 104.

**EVALUATION QUESTIONAIRRE RESULTS**

1. **Grade for training content and training material**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Average grade |
| Training objectives are achieved | 1 | - | 1 | 23 | 79 | 4.71 |
| Training content corresponded to my needs and expectations | 1 | - | 4 | 38 | 61 | 4.51 |
| Training materials were appropriate for use at training | 2 | 2 | 7 | 31 | 62 | 4.43 |
| Training materials are useful for later use | 2 | 1 | 5 | 37 | 57 | 4.35 |
| Training methods and techniques were appropriate | - | - | 5 | 29 | 69 | 4.58 |
| TOTAL AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  | 4.52 |

1. **Grade for the quality of training realisation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Average grade |
| Trainers show competent for the training topics | - | - | 1 | 5 | 98 | 4.93 |
| The trainers attitude towards participants was fair and focused on the needs of participants | - | - | 1 | 10 | 93 | 4.88 |
| Trainers supported interaction, trainees participation and questions | - | - | - | 11 | 93 | 4.98 |
| Training room and logistical support were appropriate | 1 | - | 8 | 21 | 74 | 4.60 |
| Duration of sessions were well distributed | - | - | 1 | 21 | 82 | 4.78 |
| Total duration of the training was appropriate | 3 | - | 3 | 21 | 77 | 4.60 |
| TOTAL AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  | 4.80 |

1. **Usefulness and applicability of acquired skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Average grade |
| My knowledge and skills after the training, have improved and enriched | - |  | 15 | 47 | 42 | 4.26 |
| Knowledge and skills that I gained during this training are applicable and will improve my future work | - | - | 15 | 53 | 35 | 4.15 |
| TOTAL AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  | 4.21 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What have the participants found most useful in training? | * Examples * New technologies and data aquiring methods * GIS applicability in LSGs * Identfication of problems in GIS development * GIS techniques * Trainers expertise * GIS management and administration * Dinamycs and constructive dialogue * Exchange of experience * Informations on open source software |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What have the participants found least useful in training? | * Short duration of the training * GIS examples * New trends in GIS development |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Additional comments and suggestions of participants for improvement of training | * Short presentation in local self-governments * More presence of LSG experts * To make a visit of some GIS good practice example * More participants involbvement andinteraction during the trainings * Longer duration of training * Additional consultations if needed * To provide pencils in training material * To get presentations and printed handouts during the training * Presentation of some GIS tools (for drawing maps …) |

1. Regional Development Agency "South", Regional Development Agency – Zlatibor, Regional Development Agency of Raška and Moravica Districts - Kraljevo, Regional Development Agency of Šumadija and Pomoravlje – Kragujevac, Regional Development Agency "Braničevo-Podunavlje", and "Regional Development Agency of Rasina District [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Ljig, Osećina, Ub, Valjevo, Bogatić, Koceljeva, Arilje, Bajina Bašta, Kosjerić, Jagodina, Aranđelovac, Knić, Lapovo, Lučani, Aleksandrovac, Brus, Varvarin, Crna Trava, Lebane, Vlasotince, Bosilegrad, Gadžin Han, Merošina, Ražanj, Svrljig, Dimitrovgrad, Prokuplje, Knjaževac, Petrovac na Mlavi, Veliko Gradište, Žabari, Smederevska Palanka.; [↑](#footnote-ref-2)