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31 May 2018

**SUMMARY**

On 25 May, the EU PRO has published a Public Calls for proposals for infrastructure projects. The Calls comprises, formulation of detailed regulation plans, technical documentation, local infrastructure and economic Infrastructure. Call for detailed regulation plans has indicative budget of 750.000 Euros and it is open till 11 June. The indicative budget for local infrastructure is 5.250.000 euros and call is open till 29 June. Other two calls are permanently open in the 12 months period with indicative budget of 3.700.000 Euros for economic infrastructure and 300.000 Euros for technical documentation. All Programme local self-governments (a total of 99) are eligible to apply.

The purpose for organizing eight regional informative sessions 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.

All LSGs were invited to appoint representatives to attend the sessions from areas of urban planning, local economic development, social affairs and PIMO coordinator. Besides LSGs, ten Regional development agencies that operates within Programme area were invited to participate. Overall, the participation was high with a total of 259 participants (160 female and 99 male) from 84 LSGs (85%) attended the sessions and nine RDAs[[1]](#footnote-1) (Regional Development Agency of Sandžak – SEDA did not attend). There was a 16 LSGs[[2]](#footnote-2) not participated. Concerning gender segregation there was 160 female participants (61.8%).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Info sessions | Šabac  (8 May) | Užice  (9 May) | Kragujevac (10 May) | Kraljevo (11 May) | Smederevo (15 May) | Zaječar  (16 May) | Leskovac (17 May) | Niš  (18 May) | TOTAL |
| No. of participants | 24 | 29 | 32 | 44 | 25 | 22 | 40 | 43 | **259** |
| No. of female participants | 12 | 14 | 20 | 20 | 13 | 7 | 19 | 25 | **160** |
| No. of LSGs | 9 | 10 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 15 | **84** |
| No. of RDAs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | **9** |
| No. of filled questionnaires | 19 | 30 | 26 | 35 | 20 | 29 | 40 | 36 | **227** |

The agenda included the following:

* Welcoming words and Programme Introduction
* Presentation of Public Call formulation of Detailed Regulation Plans
* Question and Answers
* Presentation of Public Calls for Development of Technical Documentation, Local Infrastructure and economic Infrastructure

Through the whole session, the representatives of LSGs get acquainted with nature and the concept of the Calls, in order to better understand the objectives and the concept of Programme support.

The most valuable benefit of the 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 by Sector 2 Programme staff. 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.

**OVERALL ASSESMENT**

Participants’ knowledge and understanding of the conditions of the Call was good before the sessions with approx. 51% 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. 93% of participants confirming better understanding of the Call.

Regarding the content of the sessions, majority of marks (Approx. 99%) 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.

**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 |
| Šabac | - | 7 | 9 | 3 |
| Užice | 3 | 6 | 15 | 6 |
| Kragujevac | 2 | 3 | 12 | 9 |
| Kraljevo | 3 | 6 | 18 | 8 |
| Smederevo | 1 | 7 | 5 | 7 |
| Zaječar | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4 |
| Leskovac | 1 | 6 | 17 | 16 |
| Niš | 2 | 4 | 13 | 17 |
| TOTAL | 14 (6%) | 45 (20%) | 98(43%) | 70 (8%) |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Answer | Negative | Neutral | Positive | Very positive |
| Šabac | - | 1 | 9 | 9 |
| Užice | - | - | 12 | 18 |
| Kragujevac | - | - | 6 | 20 |
| Kraljevo | - | - | 12 | 23 |
| Smederevo | - | - | 7 | 13 |
| Zaječar | - | - | 11 | 10 |
| Leskovac | - | 1 | 16 | 23 |
| Niš | - | - | 9 | 27 |
| TOTAL | 0(0%) | 2 (1%) | 82 (36%) | 143 (63%) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| In what way can the organization be improved? | * Cannot say at this moment, since all ambiguities are clarified * Q&A during whole process * To provoke better discussion * More time for Q&A * To be shorter and efficient |

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 |
| Šabac | - | 1 | 12 | 6 |
| Užice | - | 1 | 20 | 9 |
| Kragujevac | - | 1 | 7 | 18 |
| Kraljevo | - | 2 | 22 | 11 |
| Smederevo | - | 1 | 8 | 11 |
| Zaječar | - | - | 14 | 7 |
| Leskovac | 1 | - | 24 | 15 |
| Niš |  | 1 | 16 | 19 |
| TOTAL | 1 (0%) | 7(3%) | 123 (54%) | 96 (42%) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What would help with better defining of conditions? | * Translation of documents into Serbian language * To go through application form at info session * Written manuals and submitted presentations * To focus more on call criteria * To publish calls earlier and with longer duration * More seminars on similar topics * Concrete examples * To organise info session earlier * To wrote guidelines more clearly * Q&A on the website |

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 |
| Šabac | - | - | 13 | 6 |
| Užice | - | 1 | 16 | 13 |
| Kragujevac | - | - | 7 | 19 |
| Kraljevo | - | 1 | 15 | 19 |
| Smederevo | - | - | 7 | 13 |
| Zaječar | - | 1 | 7 | 13 |
| Leskovac | - | 1 | 13 | 26 |
| Niš | - | - | 12 | 24 |
| TOTAL | 0 (0%) | 4 (2%) | 90(40%) | 133 (59%) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Which segment should be more thoroughly explained? | * Case study example * Practice examples |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer | Yes | No |
| Šabac | 19 | - |
| Užice | 30 | - |
| Kragujevac | 26 | - |
| Kraljevo | 35 | - |
| Smederevo | 20 | - |
| Zaječar | 21 | - |
| Leskovac | 40 | - |
| Niš | 36 | - |
| TOTAL | 227 | - |

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 |
| Šabac | - | - | 16 | 3 |
| Užice | - | 4 | 19 | 7 |
| Kragujevac | - | 2 | 14 | 10 |
| Kraljevo | - | 4 | 24 | 7 |
| Smederevo | - | 2 | 14 | 4 |
| Zaječar | - | 2 | 16 | 3 |
| Leskovac | - | 1 | 22 | 17 |
| Niš | - | 1 | 23 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 0 (0%) | 16 (7%) | 148 (65%) | 63 (28%) |

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

| What was good? | How can we address mistakes in the future? |
| --- | --- |
| Topics were clearly presented, and answers were easy to understand; The presenters were available for any clarifications submission of information; extremely good topic elaboration at info session; It was helpful to understand call criteria; very professional. | To find premises with air conditioner |
| All presentations were good (clear and concise); everything that was related to calls criteria was explained precisely; clarity of presentation. | More similar public calls are needed |
| Explanation for detailed regulation plans | More frequent organisation of such events |
| Good organisation, respecting timeframe, presenting | More frequent contacts with participants out of info session |
| All questions were clearly and precisely answered; simplified procedures; the most important parts of the call were selected and explained in a very understandable way. | Examples/more examples from previous calls |
| Clarification of doubts and good practice examples, good practice examples; cross-cutting with SWISS PRO | Perhaps to organise info sessions two months in advance of application process |
| Excellent call for proposals for industrial-business zones, regardless of available funds | By visiting and monitoring LSGs |
| Lecturers competency; good approach and clear and thorough lecturers; preparedness and knowledge of UNOPS representatives; interaction and relevance of the lecturers; excellent knowledge of themes; directness in communication and openness of programme representatives; informal relations and communication |  |
| Clearly defined criteria and its clarification; additional clarifications, which are not stated in guidelines; no unnecessary information. |  |
| Detailed explanation of types of support and useful information obtained through interactive part; Information on supporting documentation and evaluation; Announcement of quality support during process |  |
| Good discussion; active participants and lectures engagement; positive atmosphere |  |
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