



EVALUATION OF THE REGIONAL MEETING ON TRANSFER OF KNOW HOW IN THE PROCESS OF EU ACCESSION NEGOTIATIONS

**21-22 JUNE 2011, PODGORICA
MONTENEGRO**

In the framework of the “Social Security Coordination and Social Security Reforms” (SSCSSR) Programme, a European Commission and Council of Europe Joint Programme to further develop social security institutions in the Balkan Region and Turkey, the Secretariat of the Programme organised, following the extended Action Plan, a Regional Meeting on **“Transfer of know how in the process of EU accession negotiations”** in Podgorica, Montenegro.

At the end of the meeting, and in order to allow the Secretariat to evaluate the overall content of the training event, the quality and relevance of the speakers’ interventions, the availability and assistance of the Secretariat and the overall organisation of the event, an evaluation form was distributed to all participants.

This report has been prepared on the basis of the 18 evaluation forms received at the Secretariat from a total of 29 participants.

The Beneficiary Parties were represented as follows:

- 3 representatives from Albania,
- 2 representatives from Bosnia & Herzegovina,
- 2 representatives from Croatia,
- 11 representatives from Montenegro,
- 3 representatives from Serbia,
- 3 representatives from Macedonia
- 2 representatives from Turkey and
- 3 representatives from Kosovo¹.

¹ All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

Six experts and the Programme Manager were responsible for conducting the training event.

It has to be noted that the forms were anonymous and, consequently, the results obtained could be accepted as not being influenced by external factors.

The results are based on a percentage, on the basis of the evaluation forms received.

1. Content

Did the content of the course fit your needs and expectations? (based on 18 evaluation forms)

On a very large scale	51.60%
On a large scale	48.40%
Partially	-
On a small scale	-

2. Experts (speakers)

Please evaluate the interventions provided by Mr Bernard Spiegel with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

<u>Quality (based on 18 eval.)</u>		<u>Relevance (based on 18 eval.)</u>	
Very good	88.87%	Very relevant	83.21%
Good	11.12%	Relevant	11.24 %
Average	-	Simply interesting	5.55%
Poor	-	Irrelevant	-

Please evaluate the interventions provided by Mr Celal Polat with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

<u>Quality (based on 18 eval.)</u>		<u>Relevance (based on 15 eval.)</u>	
Very good	50.00%	Very relevant	38.13%
Good	44.40%	Relevant	40.11%
Average	5.55%	Simply interesting	21,76%
Poor	-	Irrelevant	-

Please evaluate the intervention provided by Mr Klaus Kapuy with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

<u>Quality (based on 16 eval.)</u>		<u>Relevance (based on 15 eval.)</u>	
Very good	38.80%	Very relevant	43.60%
Good	56.00%	Relevant	45.30%
Average	5.20%	Simply interesting	11.10%

Poor - Irrelevant -

Please evaluate the intervention provided by Ms Katja De Sadeleer with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

<u>Quality (based on 16 eval.)</u>		<u>Relevance(based on 16 eval.)</u>	
Very good	39.20%	Very relevant	47.45%
Good	44.40%	Relevant	32.80%
Average	16.40%-	Simply interesting	19.65%
Poor	-	Irrelevant	-

Please evaluate the intervention provided by Ms Snjezana Balokovic with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

<u>Quality (based on 18 eval.)</u>		<u>Relevance (based on 15 eval.)</u>	
Very good	61.10%	Very relevant	48.40%
Good	33.35%	Relevant	46.20%
Average	5.55%	Simply interesting	5.40%
Poor	-	Irrelevant	-

Please evaluate the intervention provided by Dr Albrecht Otting with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

<u>Quality (based on 18 eval.)</u>		<u>Relevance (based on 18 eval.)</u>	
Very good	77.80%	Very relevant	61.10%
Good	16.70%	Relevant	27.50%
Average	5.50%	Simply interesting	11.40%
Poor	-	Irrelevant	-

3. Organisation

How would you rate the overall organisation of the course? (based on 18 evaluation forms)

Very good	66.60%
Good	33.40%
Average	-
Poor	-

How would you rate the meeting facilities provided? (based on 18 evaluation forms)

Very good	45.40%
Good	48.80%
Average	5.80%
Poor	-

How would you rate the hotel accommodation and food provided? (based on 16 evaluation forms)

Very good	60.50%
Good	34.80%
Average	4,70%
Poor	-

How would you evaluate the availability and assistance provided by the Secretariat? (based on 18 evaluation forms)

Very good	72.30%
Good	27.70%
Average	-
Poor	-

4.- Other comments/suggestions:

Most participants confirmed that the meeting was a very good opportunity to hear and to exchange views and ideas about other countries' experiences in EU accession negotiations, as well as to take note on lessons learnt by some EU member states during the process of their accession to EU and useful advises on how to avoid certain problems encountered.

CONCLUSIONS

The figures included in this report can be considered as representative of the overall organisation and evaluation of the event, irrespective of the fact that, of a total of 29 participants, 18 evaluation forms were received at the Secretariat. However, it should be noted that some evaluation forms were partially completed and, therefore, may not reflect the real assessment of the event by participants.

As far as the content is concerned (Chapter One), it can be stated that the training event satisfied, to a very large scale (51.60%) and a large scale (48.40%) the expectations of the participants.

As far as the interventions of the speakers are concerned (Chapter Two), the majority of participants agreed that the quality and relevance of the interventions of the speakers was either good/relevant or good/very relevant.

Concerning the overall organisation of the event (Chapter Three), the majority of participants have rated the overall organisation, the facilities, accommodation and catering together with the assistance of the Secretariat as good/very good.

No further follow-up activity is envisaged at this stage.