

## Progress report on the ReSPA Programme of Work 2009

**Period covered: 1 January - 27 April 2009**

This report covering the period from 1 January – 27 April 2009 reflects the progress made on the Programme of Work (POW) 2009 that was adopted by the Steering Committee during its meeting in Zagreb on 27 January 2009.

The report follows the structure of the POW.

### 1. Steering Committee and Board meetings

*According to article 16 of the draft IA, the Board shall meet quarterly. The Board shall meet within 2 months of the entry into force of the IA. It shall meet at least once a year at Ministerial level.*

*Under the assumptions stipulated above, two Steering Committee meetings are foreseen in January and April 2009.*

The 10th Session of the Steering Committee Meeting took place in Zagreb (Republic of Croatia) on 27 January 2009. The meeting was kindly hosted by the Central State Office for Administration. In total 14 participants (incl. an interpreter) attended this meeting. The draft List of Decisions and adopted documents related to the meeting have been distributed.

The 11th Session of the Steering Committee Meeting will take place in Brussels on 29 April 2009. So far the preparations for this meeting have been done in line with the rules of procedures.

### 2. ReSPA web site

*The web site will be maintained by EIPA till ReSPA will become a legal entity and these tasks can be transferred to Danilovgrad. The site will be transposed before the end of April from Paris to Maastricht, and as soon as the IA ratified, from Maastricht to ReSPA.*

The technical preparations are made to transfer the web site under the responsibility of EIPA by the end of April 2009. EIPA has identified two staff members (Ms Claudia Lisboa and Mr William Bull) who will be in charge of the continuous update of the web site.

On 7 February 2009 both staff members paid a visit to the OECD to meet Ms Françoise Drouillon and Mr Nicolas Dubois. The purpose of this visit was to explore and discuss the work that has been done for the web site and the newsletter by OECD in the past.

In view of the use of the web site and the news letter a discussion paper has been prepared by them and distributed to the SC members. This topic will be discussed at the 11<sup>th</sup> SC meeting in Brussels.

### 3. Training and development programme

*The proposed training activities are the result of the discussion on the draft proposal that was submitted to the Steering Committee for its meeting on 4 and 5 November 2008 in Sarajevo this proposal was based on the training needs analysis carried out in October 2008. This needs analysis has been implemented along the lines of the TNA methodology as this was approved earlier by the Steering Committee.*

*After approval of the proposed training programmes a detailed programme for each course will be prepared and sent to the SC members.*

*Throughout the year we will discuss and plan more relevant training activities.*

#### **I Carrying out a training need analysis**

With support of the Macedonian Civil Service Agency the first module of the training on **“Carrying out a Training Needs Analysis”** took place in Bitola (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) from 17-19 February 2009. It was carried out by EIPA (Mr Harry List) together with two external trainers (Mrs Anne Harrison and Mrs Amaya Echalecu). In total we received 21 registrations (3 registration forms per beneficiary country). However, due to three cancellations from the Republic of Serbia, unfortunately, only 18 participants attended this module.

The second module will take place in Bitola as well, from 26-28 May 2009. In between the participants will carry out an assignment.

The summary of the evaluation is attached to this document as **Appendix I**.

#### **II Strategic management; from defining strategic objectives to operational planning.**

With support of the Macedonian Civil Service Agency and in cooperation with the European Centre for Public Financial Management (EIPA-ECPFM), Warsaw (Poland) a strategic management programme on **“From Strategic Objectives to Operational Planning”** has been carried out from 21-23 April 2009 in Skopje. The course was attended by 19 participants. Since the Republic of Croatia was not able to nominate candidates for this seminar, a reserve candidate from the Republic of Montenegro was accepted.

At the time this report was drafted the evaluation report was not yet available.

#### **III A Train the trainers course on training methodology.**

This course is planned to be delivered in June 2009.

#### **IV Impact of EU policies to domestic policy fields**

*Harmonisation with the EU law in different areas makes it necessary to enhance domestic capacity in order to comply with EU policies. For the EU member states this is an ongoing process that frequently requires adaptation.*

*In the training programme 2009 three seminars are foreseen with the main focus to share knowledge and experiences with practitioners from EU member's states who have gone through the process of complying their departments with the demands that derived from the various EU policies. The seminar will have a high level of practical substance in order to provide the participants with tools to use in their own practice.*

The first seminar was organised from 17-19 February 2009. This seminar entitled **“Impact of EU policies to domestic policy fields – State Aid Policy”** was hosted at the premises of the Human Resources Management Authority in Podgorica (Republic of Montenegro) and was carried out by two EIPA faculty members (Mr Mihalios Kekelekis and Mr Peter Goldschmidt) and two external trainers (Dr Péter Staviczky and Mrs Katerina Sgouridou). The presentations of the third external trainer, Mr Melvin Könings, which were scheduled for the last seminar day had, unfortunately, to be cancelled. Due to bad weather conditions all flights to Podgorica were cancelled on 18 February, the arrival date of Mr

Könings. Therefore only the materials related to his lectures were distributed and briefly discussed. In total we received 21 registrations. However, eventually only 16 persons attended the seminar, due to cancellations, a last-minute registration and no appearances. Because of three cancellations from the Republic of Serbia and in order to reach the maximum number of participants as much as possible, it was decided to accept two more registrations from the Republic of Albania. The summary of the evaluation is attached to this document as **Appendix II**.

A second seminar entitled ***“Impact of EU policies to domestic policy fields - Intellectual Property Rights (Trade Marks and Designs)”*** was hosted at the premises of the Central State Office for Administration in Zagreb. The seminar took place from 15-17 April 2009 and was delivered by Mr William Bull from the European Centre for Judges and Lawyers (EIPA Antenna Luxembourg) with the support of two external experts, Mr Miodrag Marković (Republic of Serbia) and Mr Ian Starr (United Kingdom).

For this seminar 20 participants formally and 1 participant informally registered. Due to the specific training Bosnia and Herzegovina was, unfortunately, able to only nominate 1 candidate for this seminar. In order to reach the maximum number of participants two reserve candidates from the Republic of Albania were accepted. Eventually 19 participants attended the seminar, because one of the Kosovar participants did not receive his new passport in time to have the visa arranged and one of the Albanian participants had to cancel because of unforeseen personal circumstances.

The summary of the evaluation has not been finalised at this moment and will therefore be included in the next progress report.

The third seminar entitled ***“Impact of EU policies to domestic policy fields – Consumer Protection/Food Law”*** is scheduled to take place in Sarajevo from 13-15 May 2009.

## ***V Theory and practise of the Policy Cycle: from Drafting to Evaluating Policies***

*The process of policymaking has undergone the last decade quite a significant change. Governments became more and more aware that in a complicated nowadays society a successful development of policies relies on close cooperation with the market and civil society.*

*In the two five day courses that are planned for 2009 attention will be given to the concepts and experiences of the different stages of the policy process like; development, decision-making, planning, implementation and evaluation. The presentation of case studies will be part of the course.*

From 23-27 March 2009 the first training was hosted in Tirana (Republic of Albania). The seminar was carried out by three EIPA faculty members (Mr Tore Malterud, Mr Peter Goldschmidt and Mr Peter Ehn). In principle 20 participants had been nominated to participate, but due to last-minute cancellations / absence at the seminar, eventually 17 participants attended the seminar. Since the Republic of Serbia did not nominate any candidates, reserve candidates of the Republic of Albania were accepted.

The seminar was well appreciated. The summary of the evaluation is included as **Appendix III**.

## ***VI Communicating with the EC and negotiating EU membership***

*In view of the implementation of the SAA and a future EU membership the administrations of the ReSPA member entities will have frequent contacts with the EU institutions.*

*For this purpose it may be important to understand this process of communication with the EU institutions; like what is negotiable. Which procedures to be taken into account, how to stand for the own position etc. In two 3 day seminars that will be organised under this theme practices and experiences will be exchanged between representatives of the EU member states and the participants as well as amongst the participants who are in different stages of development when it comes to the implementation of the SAA.*

The first training is planned to be organised before the summer break.

## **VII HR concepts and practices**

The first module of this training is planned to be organised before the summer break.

## **VIII SAA/Acquis implementation training**

*Since this topic is covered under the TAIEX programme only one module will be carried out.*

In the framework of SAA/Acquis Implementation EIPA organised in cooperation with InWent (*Internationale Weiterbildung und Entwicklung gGmbH*) and IEP (*Institut für Europäische Politik*) the Regional Workshop on **“Benefiting from new impulses free movement of goods”** which took place in Belgrade (Republic of Serbia) from 9-11 February 2009. The workshop was carried out by Mrs Christine de Barros Said, Mr Jan Reckmann, Mr Peter Vrtacnik, Mr Wolfram Spelten and Mrs Violina Panayotova.

In total 21 participants (3 participants per beneficiary country) attended this seminar. The summary of the evaluation is attached as Appendix IV.

## **IX Management Concepts and Skills for Senior Civil Servants**

The preparations for this training are in progress and the first session of the training is planned to be organised in Podgorica (Republic of Montenegro) from 26-28 May 2009. The training will be carried out by two external experts from the Belgian company Performance Coaching (Mr Johan de Bruycker and Mrs Astrid Karg).

The second module of this training programme is scheduled to take place in Podgorica from 30 September-2 October 2009.

## **X Ethics and integrity and the fight against corruption**

*The confidence of the civil society that they will be treated impartially and that there will not be an abuse of power from the side of the administration is an issue of constant concern for modern administrations and its initiatives' taken in that respect are prerequisites for EU member states. It is obvious that this cannot simply be done by a moral appeal on the members of the administration rather also to take organisational measures in order to reduce abuse of power.*

This training will be organised in cooperation with the French National School of Administration (ENA) and is planned to take place in Podgorica (Republic of Montenegro) from 22-26 June 2009. The ReSPA Secretariat has recently started the preparations for this seminar and will send out the mailing in due course.

## **XI Europe in Action: Training on EU Leadership Competences**

In cooperation with the Dutch Institute of Public Administration (ROI) the blended learning training programme will be organised at the premises of the Central State Office for Administration in Zagreb. The first session takes place from 27-29 April 2009, the second session will take place from 29 June-1 July 2009. In between the two sessions there will be distance learning.

At the moment of the preparation of this progress report, 21 participants had registered for this training programme. In order to reach the maximum number of participants, reserve candidates from the Republic of Croatia were accepted.

## **XII Drafting of Legislation**

*The manner in which legislation is drafted is an indication of its quality. A law that follows a logical structure and is written in clear, user-friendly language is easier to understand and apply. Poorly drafted legislation leads to mistakes in implementation, possible litigation and a need for amendments to cure the initial oversights, ultimately resulting in higher costs. Furthermore, it creates uncertainty for citizens and negatively impacts the credibility of the legislator. While the substantive content of a law matters, a proper format is almost as important. In a four days practical oriented programme participants will be offered guidelines and concepts for proper drafting of legislation and will also practice these tools and instruments.*

This training is planned for after the summer break.

## **XIII Summer Schools in Bruges and Luxembourg**

For both courses the first preparations have started and will be announced in May 2009.

### **4. Communities of Practice**

The preparations for this activity will start in May 2009 and the implementation is planned for after the summer break.

### **5. Fourth ReSPA Annual conference**

*In line with the design of the three previous annual conferences the 2009 conference will be organised during the period October-November 2009. Steering Committee members are invited to suggest themes as well as the location for the fourth ReSPA annual conference.*

A paper with suggestions has been prepared and will be discussed during the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the SC Meeting.

### **6. Third Annual meeting of the Schools of Public administration in the Western Balkans**

*The ReSPA convention between OECD and the EC specifies that a third meeting of the Heads of Schools of Public administration of the region should take place in the course of 2009.*

*Based on the experiences on the ReSPA activities so far it is suggested to have a discussion on how ReSPA can contribute to a further professionalism of the National Schools and how added value through ReSPA contributions can be maintained.*

*Steering Committee members are also invited to coordinate with their respective Heads of Schools and institutes of Public Administration and suggest possible themes as well as location for the thirds annual meeting of the Heads of School of Public administration in the Western Balkans*

**Calendar:** May or June, to be decided in consultation with the co-organiser and host country.

### **7. Meeting of the Heads of Schools of the EU Member States**

This meeting will be organised in Brussels on 28 April 2009 in combination with the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the SC Meeting.

## 8. Networking

*As for the further development and visibility as ReSPA a professional school of administration in the region the participation in networks is considered as an important issue*

ReSPA will actively be represented at the NISPAcee Annual Conference in Budva (Republic of Montenegro) by three SC Members and the ReSPA Secretariat. The conference will take place on 14-16 May 2009.

During the seminar on State Aid Policy which took place at the premises of the Human Resources Management Authority (HRMA) in Podgorica (Republic of Montenegro), a press conference on the implementation of the ReSPA Programme for 2009 was given. This press conference was attended by the Deputy Prime Minister, the Head of Delegation of the EC, the Director of the HRMA, the Mayor of Danilovgrad and the ReSPA Project Director. The press conference has also been broadcasted on local television.

## 9. Institution Building

Further to the discussions and decisions taken during the 10th Session of the Steering Committee, a revised ToR and procedure recruitment (incl. a calendar) of the ReSPA Director was prepared and published.

The preparation of the short list and the interviews with 4 candidates have taken place resulting in the recommendation of a candidate for the position of ReSPA Director.

The transfer of the ReSPA regulation into applicable guidelines will be presented to the next SC meeting/meeting Governing Board.

It needs to be said that the support given and the cooperation with the hosting ReSPA members was very good and contributed to a high extend to the successful implementation of the activities.

### Overview of training days delivered until the end of April and expectations of training days delivered by the end of May

Training (numbering according to the report)	No. registrations	No. participants	Training days	Expected no. participants	Expected training days	Total training days
I, module 1	21	18	<b>54</b>			
I, module 2				18	<b>54</b>	
II	21	19	<b>57</b>			
IV, seminar 1	21	16	<b>48</b>			
IV, seminar 2	21	19	<b>57</b>			
IV, seminar 3				21	<b>63</b>	
V	20	17	<b>85</b>			
VIII	21	21	<b>63</b>			
IX				21	<b>63</b>	
XI, module 1	21	21	<b>63</b>			
XI, distance learning				18	<b>105</b>	
<b>Total:</b>						<b>712</b>

**Appendix I**

## Seminar on “Carrying out a Training Needs Analysis”

*organised by  
European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA), Maastricht (NL)*

**Bitola (FYROM), 17-19 February 2009**

### SUMMARY EVALUATION

**PART A: CONTENTS**

Please give your opinion on the presentations you have heard, according to the following scale:

Scale →	Excellent 5	Good 4	Average 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
---------	----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------	-----------

From Anne HARRISON

7	8			
---	---	--	--	--

From Amaya ECHALECU

7	7	1		
---	---	---	--	--

Panel discussions

4	4	1		
---	---	---	--	--

**PART B: METHODOLOGY**

Scale →	Excellent 5	Good 4	Average 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
---------	----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------	-----------

Adequacy of the training methods used

6	3	5	1	
---	---	---	---	--

**PART C: GENERAL EVALUATION**

Scale →                      **Excellent**    **Good**    **Average**    **Fair**    **Poor**  
    5            4            3            2            1

Questions to Speakers and Plenary Discussions

4	8	3		
---	---	---	--	--

The contribution of the EIPA facilitator

7	8	1		
---	---	---	--	--

Overall evaluation of the seminar

6	8	2		
---	---	---	--	--

**PART D: ORGANISATION**

Scale →                      **Excellent**    **Good**    **Average**    **Fair**    **Poor**  
    5            4            3            2            1

- How do you estimate the organisation of the seminar?

9	6	1		
---	---	---	--	--

- Was the time allowed for discussions and questions enough?

Too much time **[1x]**    Enough **[13x]**    Not quite enough **[ ]**    Not enough **[ ]**    No answer **[ ]**



**PART E: RELEVANCE**

Scale →

Excellent 5	Good 4	Average 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------	-----------

How relevant was the seminar to your work?

8	5	3		
---	---	---	--	--

**Were there additional questions, important for your work and not covered by the seminar, that you would like to have seen included?**

- Publicity and public strategy.
- No, all the questions related to TNA were answered and explained in the proper way.
- No, everything that was necessary and important was covered by the seminar.
- More information about methodology and analyzing data.

**What part of the module did you valued most?**

- Whole.
- The different country projects that will be implemented and the possibility to share the projects' results on the next module of the training.
- The structured way of conducting a TNA i.e. stages through which everything can be not so difficult.
- More in pairs/groups.
- Publicity, but it is still something that has to be worked on. I think that it is the basic in any successful work or institution.
- The part when we learned about the TNA tools.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> day with project elements. It was really good structured and useful.
- TNA tools and variety in using it.
- A module of setting up a needs analysis project; Gathering information.
- The methodology.
- Every part was valuable for me because I did not have previous knowledge about TNA.
- Develop TNA methodology.
- The 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> module.

**What part did you appreciate least?**

- Using the reading method – reading requires much more concentrate and attention than listening.
- Introductory part – no sufficient information on the purpose of the training is given to participants.
- The lack of powerpoint presentations that can be easy to be followed (especially in the case study).
- There was no such part. Every part of the seminar was useful and necessary in order to understand the idea of the TNA.
- Maybe some introduction information about conducting TNA (basic).
- Focus groups and how to conduct work with them.
- The part of stakeholders.
- I cannot outline any part as least, because I really needed information about the whole package.
- Case study.

**Are there additional comments or recommendations you wish to make?**

- Make better introduction on the objectives of the seminar before it.
- For organizers: Please forward information on seminars/trainings earlier. Better instructions form whom training to avoid inexperienced people in seminars where some experience is necessary.
- I think it was excellent just the way it was.
- The last comment is thank you for organising this seminar.
- Maybe a little more concrete examples.
- I look forward to meeting you again in June.
- I have impression that seminar is rescheduled in these three days and the goal is changed.
- Thank you!
- I think it was good.

## Appendix II

### **Seminar** **Impact of EU policies to domestic policy fields - *State Aid Policy***

*organised by*  
*European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA), Maastricht (NL)*

**Podgorica (Montenegro), 17-19 February 2009**

---

## **SUMMARY EVALUATION**

---

### **PART A: CONTENTS**

Please give your opinion on the presentations you have heard, according to the following scale:

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

#### **1. The Concept of State Aid & Compatibility**

*Mihalis Kekelekis*

10	4			
----	---	--	--	--

#### **2. State Aid Procedures**

*Mihalis Kekelekis*

11	4			
----	---	--	--	--

#### **3. Recovery Principles & Practice**

*Mihalis Kekelekis*

10	5			
----	---	--	--	--

Scale →                      **Excellent**      **Good**            **Average**            **Fair**            **Poor**  
    5                      4                      3                      2                      1

**4. Panel Discussions**

3	9	2		
---	---	---	--	--

**5. De minimis aid**

*Ms Katerina Sgouridou*

7	6	2		
---	---	---	--	--

**6. The General Block Exemption Regulation 800/2008: Explanation of the main provisions and procedures**

*Katerina Sgouridou*

7	5	3		
---	---	---	--	--

**7. The SME definition: Commission Recent Developments**

*Mihalis Kekelekis*

11	3			
----	---	--	--	--

**8. Regional Aid Guidelines and the Concept of Investment**

*Mihalis Kekelekis*

8	6			
---	---	--	--	--

**9. Research & Development & Innovation: Explanation of the main provisions of the Framework and the Balancing Test**

*Dr Péter Staviczky*

6	7			
---	---	--	--	--

**10. State Aid for Environmental Protection – CANCELLED DUE TO WEATHER CONDITIONS**

*Melvin Könings*

2	3			
---	---	--	--	--

Scale →                      **Excellent**    **Good**    **Average**    **Fair**    **Poor**  
    5            4            3            2            1

**11. Case study – CANCELLED DUE TO WEATHER CONDITIONS**

2	4		1	
---	---	--	---	--

**12. Managing Horizontal Coordination: What and Why Co-ordinate?**

*Peter Goldschmidt*

9	2	1		
---	---	---	--	--

**13. State Aid Monitoring Office: Hungary**

*Péter Staviczky*

6	7			
---	---	--	--	--

**14. Dealing with State aid in The Netherlands – CANCELLED DUE TO WEATHER CONDITIONS**

*Melvin Könings*

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

**PART B: METHODOLOGY**

Scale →                      **Excellent**    **Good**    **Average**    **Fair**    **Poor**  
    5            4            3            2            1

Adequacy of the training methods used

4	9	2		
---	---	---	--	--

**PART C: GENERAL EVALUATION**

Scale →                      **Excellent**    **Good**        **Average**    **Fair**        **Poor**  
    5                4                3                2                1

Questions to Speakers and Plenary Discussions

3	10	1		
---	----	---	--	--

The contribution of the [EIPA/EC/ReSPA/etc] facilitator

8	4	2		
---	---	---	--	--

Overall evaluation of the seminar

5	8	1		
---	---	---	--	--

**PART D: ORGANISATION**

Scale →                      **Excellent**    **Good**        **Average**    **Fair**        **Poor**  
    5                4                3                2                1

- How do you estimate the organisation of the seminar?

8	6			
---	---	--	--	--

- Was the time allowed for discussions and questions enough?

Too much time [1x]    Enough [9x]    Not quite enough [ ]    Not enough [ ]    No answer [ ]

**PART E: RELEVANCE**

Scale →                      **Excellent**      **Good**              **Average**              **Fair**              **Poor**  
    **5**                      **4**                      **3**                      **2**                      **1**

How relevant was the seminar to your work?

3	7	1		
---	---	---	--	--

**Were there additional questions, important for your work and not covered by the seminar, that you would like to have seen included?**

- There should have been covered State Aid issues regarding potential Member States candidates, ex. State Aid reporting. There should also be organised another State Aid seminar that would extend discussions on State Aid issues.
- I would like to have more exchanging experiences between the states in the rayon, to know how state aid works in these countries.
- Everything is included in this seminar.

**What part of the module did you valued most?**

- Case studies (2x).
- State Aid procedures; Minimis Aid.
- The part that I really appreciate most was the case analysis, the SME definition and managing horizontal coordination.
- SME definition.
- It was very important the first module, introduction & State Aid procedures. It is not my field of work and it was very important to get an intro of these concepts.
- Managing horizontal coordination: what and why coordinate. It was more easy for me to understand this module.
- State Aid procedures.
- Minimis Aid.
- Recovery Principles and Practice.

**What part did you appreciate least?**

- Research & development & innovation.
- GBER.
- Every part was important.
- I found very interesting all the seminar, even some part which were difficult for me to understand.
- Case study (2x).

**Are there additional comments or recommendations you wish to make?**

- I congratulate the ReSPA for this seminar. I am very pleased to be here, in the first seminar (opening) of ReSPA.
- Very good choice of case study. I would recommend a seminar that deals with a specific issue of state aid, which is very problematic, and also keeping in mind that all the participants are from country not part of EU.
- Next time it would be nice to have heating.
- I would like to take part to other ReSPA training courses.
- Everything was prepared very well. I wish we can meet again in other seminars.
- Premises where the seminar has been held were inappropriate to be concentrated during lectures due to the extreme coldness. Lunch too....



## **Appendix III**

### **Seminar Theory and Practice of the Policy Cycle: From Drafting to Evaluation Policies**

Tirana (Albania), 23-27 March 2009

## **SUMMARY EVALUATION**

### **PART A: CONTENTS**

Please give your opinion on the presentations you have heard, according to the following scale:

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Scale →</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

#### **New Public Management in Europe, trends and new demands**

Tore Chr. MALTERUD

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
12	6			

#### **New Structures in the Public Sector**

Peter EHN and Tore Chr. MALTERUD

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
6	11	1		

#### **Policy Cycle**

Tore Chr. MALTERUD

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
13	4	1		

#### **The effect of the SAA and EU Accessions requirements: Approximation of national laws to meet EU association and membership requirements**

Peter GOLDSCHMIDT

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
16	1	1		

#### **What is coordination? Why coordinate?**

Peter GOLDSCHMIDT

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
14	4			

**Simulation**

Tore Chr. MALTERUD and Peter GOLDSCHMIDT

5	4	3	2	1
14	3	1		

**An example of policy co-ordination from Sweden**

Peter EHN

5	4	3	2	1
5	9	4		

**Implementing the *acquis communautaire***

Peter GOLDSCHMIDT

5	4	3	2	1
18				

**Group work: Analysing EU legal acts**

Peter GOLDSCHMIDT

5	4	3	2	1
15	2	1		

**An example on how policy implementation is organized in one of the new Member States**

Leno SAARNIIT

5	4	3	2	1
8	8	2		

**Formalities which should not be forgotten**

Peter GOLDSCHMIDT

5	4	3	2	1
13	5			

**Administrative requirements and process management**

Tore Chr. MALTERUD

5	4	3	2	1
9	9			

**Organisation, institutions and functioning in modern Public Administration**

Tore Chr. MALTERUD

5	4	3	2	1
10	7	1		

**From Candidate to Member: An example of organisational changes for a new Member State**  
 Leno SAARNIIT

5	4	3	2	1
7	7	4		

**Work-shop: Who is involved and who takes the lead?**  
 Tore Chr. MALTERUD

5	4	3	2	1
12	6			

**Simulation**  
 Tore Chr. MALTERUD

5	4	3	2	1
13	5			

**Impact Assessment**  
 Tore Chr. MALTERUD

5	4	3	2	1
11	4	2	1	

**Monitoring and Evaluation**  
 Leno SAARNIIT

5	4	3	2	1
10	2	5	1	

**Panel Discussions**

5	4	3	2	1
8	6	2		

**PART B: METHODOLOGY**

Scale →                      **Excellent**    **Good**        **Average**        **Fair**        **Poor**  
                                      5                4                3                2                1

Adequacy of the training methods used

5	4	3	2	1
11	6	1		

**PART C: GENERAL EVALUATION**

Scale →                      **Excellent**      **Good**      **Average**      **Fair**      **Poor**  
    **5**            **4**            **3**            **2**            **1**

Questions to Speakers and Plenary Discussions

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
9	9			

The contribution of the EIPA facilitator

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
10	7	1		

Overall evaluation of the seminar

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
11	6	1		

**PART D: ORGANISATION**

- How do you estimate the organisation of the seminar?

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
6	6	5		

- Was the time allowed for discussions and questions enough?

Too much time ☐ Enough ☒ Not quite enough ☐ Not enough ☐ No answer ☐

**PART E: RELEVANCE**

How relevant was the seminar to your work?

<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
6	9	3		

**Were there additional questions, important for your work and not covered by the seminar that you would like to have seen included?**

- No 3
- yes
- No comment

**What part of the module did you valued most?**

- The practical exercises where the EC legislation has been analysed.
- Also the simulations were excellent
- the part on acquis communautaire
- Coordination and Impact assessment
- Part B
- First one
- N/A
- Workshop & Simulation Part
- I valued the combination of theory with exercise and especially the model on logical framework.
- I valued most the methodology of explanation and the interchange of theory with practice.
- Policy cycle, coordination, analysing EU Acts, impact assessment. Monitoring and evaluations.
- Policy cycle, policy implementation, impact assessment
- Simulations

**What part did you appreciate least?**

- The effect of the SAA and EU Accession requirements
- Last part
- N/A
- None

**Are there additional comments or recommendations you wish to make?**

- Perhaps the part of the acquis communautaire should be expanded further. I think the time frame for this part was not appropriate
- Also, the cohesion and the coherence between the different parts of the seminar could be improved. Sometimes, the link and the transition from one part /presentation to another was not clear enough.
- Also, I would suggest better time arrangements by the presenters.
- We had quite a lecturer with remarks making true experts in the field. As regards the time scheduled to deliver for the training, I think that it has been sufficient for the presentations and simulations but not enough in a way, one could have to absorb information provided.
- There should be more time between arrival and the start of the seminar, and more time between the end of the seminar and departure.
- Not to strength seminar. More flexibilities
- Maybe daily programs too long. End of days will be earlier (e.g. 4 pm). Directly from airplane we to to class and directly from last class we will go to plane. We have complains to hotel....
- Thank you !
- I very much appreciate it, that I had the chance to participate in this training.
- Thank you, hope to participate again in your activities.
- There is a lot of information.
- The agenda was overbooked. Training days starts in 09.00 which is ok, but it should have finished by 16.00 top. The participants from other countries than a country of training should be given a chance to explore a city of training which is a natural need of any person. Otherwise, the training organisation was ok.

## **Appendix IV**

### **SAA/Acquis Communautaire**

### **Regional Workshop Benefiting from new impulses for the Free Movement of Goods**

Belgrade, 10-12 February 2009

## **SUMMARY EVALUATION**

### **PART A: CONTENTS**

Please give your opinion on the presentations you have heard, according to the following scale:

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Scale →</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

Basic principles of the internal market of the EU and institutional responsibilities / The four freedoms in a nut shell

From Wolfram SPELTEN:

16	3	1		
----	---	---	--	--

EU instruments to foster the free circulation of goods: New and Global Approach

From Wolfram SPELTEN:

16	4			
----	---	--	--	--

Establishing the required legal, institutional and administrative frameworks to comply with the internal market of the EU

From Peter VRTAČNIK:

10	8	2		
----	---	---	--	--

Aligning to the acquis in the field of free movement of goods – experiences from a new EU Member State

From Peter VRTAČNIK:

12	7	1		
----	---	---	--	--

The new “Goods Package” of 2008: new impulses for the internal market and consumer protection

From Peter VRTAČNIK:

11	6	3		
----	---	---	--	--

Harmonisation of horizontal technical legislation with emphasis on the New Approach – state of play and Croatian experiences

From Ladislava ČELAR:

11	7	2		
----	---	---	--	--

From pre-market control to post-market surveillance – experiences from Bulgaria

From Violina PANAYOTOVA:

17	3			
----	---	--	--	--

## **PART B: METHODOLOGY**

Scale →

<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

Adequacy of the training methods used:

11	9			
----	---	--	--	--

## **PART C: GENERAL EVALUATION**

Scale →

<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

Questions to Speakers and Plenary Discussions:

10	9			
----	---	--	--	--

The contribution of the IEP facilitator:

14	5			
----	---	--	--	--

Overall evaluation of the seminar:

13	6	1		
----	---	---	--	--

## **PART D: ORGANISATION**

Scale →

<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

- How do you estimate the organisation of the seminar?

13	5			
----	---	--	--	--

- Was the time allowed for discussions and questions enough?

Too much time [4x] Enough [13x] Not quite enough [ ] Not enough [ ] No answer [3x]

**PART E: RELEVANCE**

How relevant was the seminar to your work?

11	9			
----	---	--	--	--

**Were there additional questions, important for your work and not covered by the seminar, that you would like to have seen included?**

- goods package (4x)
- market surveillance (2x)
- non-tariff barriers (2x)
- warning of SIG-group
- everything was covered and well explained
- perfect organisation

**What part of the module did you value most?**

- all was useful and interesting (2x)
- internal market of the EU
- market surveillance (in Bulgaria)
- the discussions
- presentations of Mr. Spelten and Panayotova
- service directive
- new revision of new approach
- exchange of experiences between the participants

**What part did you appreciate least?**

**Are there additional comments or recommendations you wish to make?**

- hopes to participate on free movements of goods in the future (3x)
- thanks for everything
- completely satisfied
- sometimes problems of understanding because of English presentations
- another workshop on quality infrastructure system and market regulation 765/06
- additional seminar regarding the approximation of legislation
- further seminars (in general)