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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings from a tracer evaluation of the Project Implementation and Conflict Management (PICM) Training Program for Bosnia-Herzegovina (B-H) which was jointly managed by the World Bank Institute (WBI) and the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR). WBI and the Austrian Federal Chancellery co-financed the program. Specifically, the report addresses the impacts of the program on its 186 participants who attended from 1996 through 1999. These programs were each held in Stadtschlaining, Austria. A total of eight workshops, each three weeks long, were delivered between October 1996 and June 1999.

Program Objectives

These PICM workshops were offered to assist B-H in overcoming severe damages in a post-conflict society emerging from a civil war which ended in 1995. It was hoped that the workshops would help the country in its reparations and would assist in implementing new projects and in resolving conflicts, thereby leading to more permanent and positive changes in B-H.

The principal objective of the PICM program was to provide Bosnians at every level, and from different cantons and communities, with the skills needed to manage and implement projects under difficult post-conflict conditions. The WBI component of the course provided training in the essential skills of project management and implementation, while the ASPR component provided training in essential skills of conflict management. It was hoped that both components would have an integrated impact on reestablishing the economic and societal infrastructure in B-H.

One specific goal of this specially designed training program was to build a cadre of Bosnians with skills in Project Implementation and Conflict Management. An additional objective of the training program was to ensure its sustainability by building an in-country capacity to independently carry out similar training activities.

Evaluation Objectives, Methods, and Analysis

This evaluation addresses primarily five main issues:

- How satisfied were participants with the courses overall and with various aspects of them?
- To what extent did participants increase their knowledge and skills as a result of participation in the course?
- Has learning from the course been used by former participants in their jobs?
- How did the workshops impact the participants’ work and their country? and
- How can such courses be improved in the future?

There were several sources of evaluation used for this evaluation study. The first was a tracer evaluation questionnaire sent to the past 186 participants of the PICM program. The response rate for the questionnaire was 32%. The second source of data was an
actual evaluation workshop of the program (sometimes referred to as the “ex-post evaluation”) that was conducted in Stadtschlaining, Austria in December 1999. This was the first instance for WBI in which former participants were invited back some months after their training program with the specific intent of obtaining information on how the program had impacted them, their work and their country. For this evaluation workshop assessment, 26 former participants from all prior offerings were invited. Fifteen participants attended. Additionally, evaluation data from previous workshops were reviewed to glean information on how successful the past workshops had been. Finally, informal conversations with the managers and participants of the course were undertaken both in Stadtschlaining, Austria and in Washington, DC.

Several methods were used to analyze these data. Open-ended participant responses citing learning gains and impacts were analyzed using a content-analysis approach, which enables key or recurrent themes to be identified. Learning gains resulting from the course were also analyzed in this manner. Participants also offered responses on the questionnaires and statements providing specific examples of impacts given during the evaluation workshop in December 1999.

Participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with a range of aspects of the course overall. These aspects included: perceived worth and relevance of the course; course content; and effectiveness of speakers, group interaction and resource materials provided.

**Strengths and Limitations of the Evaluation**

The fact that the questionnaire was created by the task managers of the program and by employees at the ASPR lends itself to being both a strength and weakness in this evaluation. It is a strongpoint because the validity of the questionnaire was increased since the task managers and the ASPR representatives are content experts in their fields and examined the questionnaire for its content validity. However, the questionnaire was not reviewed by any member of the WBI Evaluation Unit, who could have assisted in increasing the instrument’s face validity.

There were also several limitations in conducting this evaluation. Notably, we could not control for those participants who were out of the office or unreachable when the questionnaire was sent, nor could we control for those participants who did not respond even after reminders were sent. Both of these factors contributed to a response rate of 32%—an average rate.

Another limitation was both the variety and quality of evaluation data available from previous workshops. Some data from previous workshops were available through the ASPR, but their use of a four-point scale (“poor,” “fair,” “good”, “excellent”) would not translate well into the five point Likert scale which is typically utilized by WBIES; therefore those data were not used in this report. WBIES had assisted the managers of the program in evaluating the 1999 workshops, but the June 1999 course data were analyzed by the Environment and Natural Resources Division of WBI (WBIEN) and a full report of these could not be found. However, data from the February/March 1999 workshops were available, since they were analyzed by WBIES staff. Since the June 1999 course had more limited data than the February/March offering, comparisons between the two courses were even more difficult.
Evaluation Findings

The responses and data in this report are segmented into four thematic areas: respondent satisfaction; learning and skills gained; impacts on the respondents and their country; and suggestions for improvement. These responses indicate that the program had been a vital force in assisting with the post-conflict rebuilding of B-H.

Respondent Satisfaction
Respondent satisfaction with the course was high. A majority of the respondents (43, or 72%) indicated that all aspects of the course were useful, attesting that the course was important to them. Additionally, their responses that the program is needed and should be continued is further evidence of its importance and usefulness. The fact that many respondents consider follow-on programs vital to other countries in need of this type of training, and also the respondents’ offers to assist with further training in other countries are indicative of the importance and interest which they attach to this program.

Learning and Skills Gained From the Workshops
The more positive features of the PICM workshops were their ability to generally improve the project implementation and conflict management skills of participants. Indeed, respondents indicated that they commonly applied the skills which they learned in the workshops in proper project planning. This included: planning; organizing; implementing; controlling; and evaluating the project. Respondents believe that these vital skills can be used not only in their work, but also in their everyday lives. This indicates that the course has personally affected the participants and has impacted their lives—a conclusion that the course has gone beyond affecting their work environment.

Impacts on the Respondents and Their Country
The respondents’ replies to the questions posed to them in the evaluation workshop and in the questionnaires indicate that the PICM workshops have had profound effects on both the participants and their country. Respondents offered convincing evidence of level 3 (behavioral) and level 4 (institutional) impacts which arose from the knowledge and skills gained from participating in the course. Graduates implemented projects which impacted both their work and their country’s emergence from the countless damages inflicted during its civil war. Indeed, B-H, as a whole, seems to have benefited from the specific skills which participants brought back to their country and utilized to improve projects.

While impacts are unusually difficult to assess and even more difficult to directly attribute to any one program, respondents in this study offer specific examples which are both compelling and credible. These examples speak to the merits of the program and offer the clearest evidence that the program had demonstrable impacts.

Suggestions for Program Improvement
Respondents believe that the two topics of Project Implementation and Conflict Management can be effectively combined and taught, but also indicated that there needs to be better integration of the topics into the workshop. Their responses indicate a belief that the two topics are closely intertwined and not mutually exclusive. Moreover, the respondents stated that the two topics, taken together, should address and emphasize the phases of the entire life cycle of a project.
The respondents’ requests to incorporate the entire life cycle of a project into the course, along with their desire for additional topics (including Risk Management, Team Development, Procurement, Conflict Resolution—as opposed to Conflict Management, and Project Planning, Monitoring and Reporting), appear to reflect their growing understanding and sophistication in Project Implementation and Conflict Management. Suggestions also were made by the respondents that additional experts in the area of conflict management are needed for this program.

Additional training in computer applications and software for project management was another suggestion offered by the respondents to improve the program. This important type of training could certainly be better integrated into a one or two day event within the three week duration of the course.

While the case studies used in prior workshops were rated as good, respondents also suggested that more real life case studies, appropriate to their country-specific situations, are needed. If follow-on courses are offered by the PICM program to other countries, it should strive to utilize additional country-related case studies which are more realistic and appropriate to the participants’ specific situations. According to the respondents, these case studies would enhance the value of the program.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The responses and data in this report indicate that the PICM program has been positively regarded by its participants. It also appears to have been a vital force to assist in the post-conflict rebuilding of B-H, as expressed through the views of 98% of the respondents to the questionnaire who stated emphatically that there is still a demand for additional programs of this kind in B-H. Moreover, the responses of the PICM program graduates, along with the data analysis, attest that the PICM program has had positive impacts on both its graduates and the country of B-H. The respondents in this study offered convincing evidence of level 3 and level 4 impacts which arose from the knowledge and skills gained from participating in the program.

WBI, ASPR and the Austrian Federal Chancellery have established a unique partnership which continually supported and strengthened the PICM program and contributed to its success throughout its history. This partnership should be continued since it is mutually beneficial. The best evidence to support this theory is conveyed through the testimonies of the PICM graduates who took part in this study. Moreover, this collaboration would be very useful in implementing additional programs of this type for countries like Kosovo who are currently undergoing recovery and reparation in a post-conflict society. If WBI continues to offer this program with ASPR and with the Austrian government, the graduates of the program would make excellent teachers and vital resource contacts.
PART ONE
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF PICM PROGRAM

Overview
This report presents the findings of a tracer evaluation of the Project Implementation and Conflict Management (PICM) Program for Bosnia-Herzegovina (B-H). This program was jointly conducted and managed by the World Bank Institute (WBI) and the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR) from 1996 through 1999. WBI and the Austrian Federal Chancellery co-financed the program. One hundred and eighty-six participants representing various entities in B-H attended the course which was held at the ASPR in Stadtschlaining, Austria. The last training course in the series was held in June 1999.

Background
The economy of B-H was shattered after more than three years of war which also: brought productive activity almost to a standstill; deeply divided the country ethnically; and shattered the economy. Per capita GDP fell from its estimated pre-war level of $1,900 to $500, and total GDP dropped from $9 billion to $2 billion. The country's infrastructure suffered enormous destruction. All modes of transport and telecommunications and almost all the facilities for power generation and distribution were severely damaged.

The country is confronted with three major challenges.
- First, to continue the process of reconstruction and recovery which requires massive investments to rebuild the productive and infrastructure sectors, to complete the process of demobilization and reintegration of the combatants, and to resettle the displaced population.
- Second, to reestablish the institutions of government and service delivery.
- Third, to make the transition to a market economy.

The World Bank has worked with the government of B-H and the donor community to help develop an ambitious reconstruction program which was estimated to cost of $5.1 billion over three to four years. The Emergency Recovery Program would cover nine sectors and several sub-sectors including water and waste management, energy, transport, telecommunications, agriculture, industry, education, health and housing, and a Social Fund to support the strengthening of institutions, demining and demobilization. The major objectives of the program were to immediately rehabilitate the facilities essential for economic recovery and social well being, to make maximum use of private initiatives and to expand new facilities that have a high rate of economic return.
The detailed sectoral reports prepared in support of the Emergency Recovery Program all identified the following constraints to the pace of project implementation and hence, economic recovery:

- shortage of skills;
- weak project design and implementation capacity;
- lack of familiarity with international procurement procedures; and
- institutional weaknesses.

Additionally, the country is effectively landlocked and its economic development would be dependent on political and economic cooperation with Serbia and Croatia. Conflict prevention and management were therefore deemed essential requirements of the economic recovery effort.

**Course Objectives**

The principal objective of the training program in Project Implementation and Conflict Management has been to provide Bosnians at every level, and from different cantons and communities, with the skills needed to manage and implement projects under the difficult post conflict conditions. Another key objective of the program was to successfully integrate the two topics of project implementation and conflict management into one course.

The WBI component of the course has provided training in the essential skills of project management and implementation. A training course in a typical project cycle can take up to six weeks. However, in response to the emergency situation, WBI selected specific training modules for a shorter three-week course. The design of the course focused on providing the skills needed to establish common standards for project management and implementation, the procurement of goods and services and disbursements.

The Austrian Center for Peace Studies provided training on the techniques of conflict management. This component of the course was designed to provide the participants with the management and communication skills needed to carry out peace building activities like mediation, arbitration, facilitation, human rights protection, and strategies for conflict resolution and negotiation.

One goal of this specially designed training program was to build a cadre of Bosnians with skills in Project Implementation and Conflict Management. The course would provide training that would enable the participants to promote post-conflict reconstruction, improve the implementation of donor supported projects in the Emergency Recovery Program, and gain employment in the public or private sector.

An additional objective of the training program has been to ensure its sustainability by building in-country capacity to independently carry out similar training activities.

**Strategy**

The location of the training program in the small town of Stadtschlaining in southern Burgenland was chosen so that the participants could escape from the stresses of their country to a more peaceful place that encouraged learning. The program aimed to provide the participants with training that would help them to gain employment or do their
jobs better, and introduced them in this setting to the concepts and techniques of peace
keeping and peace building.

**Audience and Coverage**

About thirty participants were invited to attend each course, which was to be held three
times a year. Participants were recruited widely from the public and private sectors, the
central and local governments, different ethnic groups, refugees and displaced groups.
The total number of participants over the three year period was 186, consisting of 101
Federation members (Muslims and Croats, 54%) and 85 Serbs (46%). There were 81
women (44%) and 105 men (56%).

Overall, eight workshops were delivered between 1996-1999, as shown in the following
table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PICM Workshops by Dates, Gender and Ethnicity (1996-1999) N=186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td>19 (47%)</td>
<td>15 (53%)</td>
<td>32 (53%)</td>
<td>22 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (% of total)</td>
<td>9 (47%)</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
<td>20 (63%)</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (% of total)</td>
<td>10 (53%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>12 (37%)</td>
<td>12 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation (% of total)</td>
<td>19 (100%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>17 (53%)</td>
<td>9 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb (% of total)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
<td>13 (59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 attests to the achievement of a diverse mix of gender and ethnicity among
workshop participants.

**Partner Institution**

WBI worked closely with its partner institution in Austria (ASPR) located in
Stadtschlaining. ASPR was a co-sponsor of the program and provided the training
module in conflict management. The participants received boarding and lodging in the
nearby facilities. The schedule of the courses offered the Bosnian participants the
opportunity to interact with the participants from around the world who were either
attending workshops conducted by ASPR on Peace keeping and Peace Building or
attending the European University for Peace Studies (EPU). It was hoped that the rural
and peaceful surroundings would provide additional encouragement for learning and
discussions on conflict resolution matters.
Content and Delivery of Program

Each workshop lasted three weeks and was delivered daily in modules, except on weekends. Weekend excursions to sites of interests in Austria were also offered to the participants. Receptions, dinners and free time were given to encourage the building of partnerships and friendships.

The workshops included lectures, plenary and small group discussions, group presentations, and case study examinations of country experiences. Participants worked together on group projects during the workshops. Guest speakers who were experts in the areas of Conflict Management and Project Implementation were also invited. The topics in Conflict Management were mainly handled by the ASPR, while the Project Management topics were primarily managed by WBI; however, both teams frequently worked together to assist with the planning and delivery of all course topics.

The two modules, each of which included plenary sessions, group discussions, and group presentations, were composed of the following topics:

_module 1: Project Implementation and Management_
The skills and tasks required to manage the implementation of a project were the main topics of this module. This includes planning tools such as Work Breakdown Structure and the Critical Path Method, as well as team building and behavioral subjects such as leadership and motivation. Particular emphasis was placed on analyzing the organizational structure, authority and responsibility relationships. Participants were taught how to design and implement a project management system using the latest tools and computer software. The course also taught both World Bank and international procurement policies, procedures and practices. Particular emphasis was placed on planning for procurement and working within local guidelines.

_module 2: Strategies and Techniques for Conflict Transformation_
This module offered participants the skills to recognize conflict escalation and de-escalation factors. Additionally, it was believed that they would gain experiential knowledge of different concepts, simulation exercises aimed at improving communication skills and the promotion of inter-cultural understanding.
PART TWO

EVALUATION DESIGNS AND METHODS

Purpose and Sources of the Evaluation

There were several sources of evaluation data used for this evaluation study. The first was a tracer evaluation questionnaire sent to the past participants of the PICM program who had attended from its inception in October 1996 through its final workshop in June 1999. The tracer questionnaire was created by the managers of the program and the staff at ASPR (a copy of the questionnaire and its accompanying letters are included in Appendix A). It was comprised of thirteen questions, twelve of which were open-ended. The questionnaire was mailed in September 1999 to all former participants and asked them to:

- Reflect on how the workshops had impacted them, their work and their country;
- Explain their level of satisfaction with the course;
- Describe the most and least useful aspects of the course;
- Consider how the program could be improved and used for further follow-on training; and
- Consider how effective the combination of project management and conflict resolution was and how it could be improved.¹

The second source of data was an actual evaluation workshop of the program (sometimes referred to as the “ex-post evaluation”) that was conducted in Stadtschlaining in December 1999. This was the first time WBI had convened a course in which former participants were invited back with the specific intent of obtaining information on how the program had impacted them, their work and their country. In this ex-post course, twenty-six former participants from all prior offerings were invited, and fifteen participants actually attended. Additionally, evaluation data from previous workshops were reviewed to glean information on how successful the past workshops had been.

In November 1999, 26 individuals were chosen from the 186 past participants to take part in an evaluation workshop in which they could reveal the impacts of the workshops on themselves and their country. The basis for this selection was to have an equal number of participants from both the Republika Srpska (Serbs) and from the Federation (Muslims and Croats) who were from a range of sectors with diverse job responsibilities. Ultimately, 15 participants attended the evaluation workshop in Stadtschlaining. The primary objectives of this workshop were threefold:

1. To assess the effectiveness of the PICM training program as delivered;
2. To revise the program for future delivery; and
3. To define possible follow-on or second-generation training programs for other countries.

¹ The original workshops in 1996 began with parallel topics in project implementation and conflict management. The two topics were not fully integrated as one course at this time, but were eventually integrated into the course in the February 1998 workshop.
Third, comparable evaluation data from previous courses were sought, but found to be scant. However, evaluations were conducted on the three 1999 workshops with the assistance of the Evaluation Unit of the World Bank Institute. Since these evaluations contained the most reliable and valid data, they were used for this report.

Fourth, WBI's and ASPR's databases on participants and others who attended the courses were analyzed to determine the final number of workshop participants and to ascertain various demographic data such as gender, nationality and job sectors.

Finally, informal conversations with the managers and participants of the course were undertaken both in Stadtschlaining, Austria and in Washington, DC. These conversations also contributed to the data found in this report and helped to validate most of the quantitative and qualitative data which were analyzed.

The evaluation, therefore, addresses the following five main issues:

- How satisfied were participants with the courses overall and with various aspects of them, such as course content and resource material?
- To what extent did participants increase their knowledge and skills as a result of participation in the course?
- Has learning from the course been used by former participants in their jobs?
- How did the workshops impact the participants' work and their country?
- How can such courses be improved in the future?

In sum, the undertaking of this evaluation utilized five broad data sources:

1. Tracer questionnaires sent to the 186 past participants.
2. Qualitative data from the evaluation workshop in December 1999.
3. A close examination of WBI's and ASPR’s activity initiation, completion and evaluation reports for the workshops. This internal documentation provides an overview of the objectives, structure, target audiences, and impacts of the courses.
4. WBI's and ASPR’s databases on participants and others who attended the courses.
5. Informal conversations with a number of participants and managers during the evaluation workshop in Austria.

Data Analysis

Several methods were used to analyze these data. Participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with a range of aspects of the course overall. These aspects included: perceived worth and relevance of the course; course content; and effectiveness of speakers, group interaction and resource materials provided.

Overall, both the tracer questionnaire and the evaluation workshop asked similar questions so that the resulting data would be more reliable. The tracer questionnaire asked participants to provide additional comments on the course. Participants were asked to identify specific features of the course which they found most useful and least useful, together with reasons for their answers.

Participants were also asked similar questions during the evaluation workshop. The advice of participants on how to improve future courses, in addition to self-assessing what they learned, was also sought. Open-ended participant responses citing learning
gains and impacts were analyzed using a content-analysis approach, which enables key or recurrent themes to be identified. Learning gains resulting from the course were also analyzed in this manner as participants offered responses on the questionnaires and from statements and specific examples of impacts given during the evaluation workshop in December 1999.

Strengths and Limitations of the Evaluation

The fact that the questionnaire was created by the task managers of the program and by employees at the ASPR lends itself to being both a strength and weakness in this evaluation. It is a strongpoint because the validity of the questionnaire was increased since the task managers and the ASPR representatives are content experts in their field and examined the questionnaire for its content validity. However, the questionnaire was not reviewed by any member of the WBI Evaluation Unit, which could have led to an assurance of the instrument’s face validity.

There were also several limitations in conducting this evaluation. Notably, we could not control for those participants who were out of the office or unreachable when the questionnaire was sent, nor could we control for those participants who did not respond even after reminders were sent. Both of these factors contributed to an average response rate of 32%.

Another limitation was both the variety and quality of evaluation data available from previous workshops. Some data from previous workshops were available through the ASPR, but their use of a four-point scale ("poor," "fair", "good", "excellent") would not translate well into the Likert five-point scale which is typically utilized by WBIES; therefore those data were not used in this report. WBIES had assisted the managers of the program in evaluating the 1999 workshops, but the June 1999 course data were analyzed by the Environment and Natural Resources Division of WBI (WBIEN) and a full report of these could not be found. However, data from the February/March 1999 workshops were available, since they were analyzed and maintained by WBIES staff. As the June 1999 course had more limited data than the February/March one, detailed comparisons between the two courses were even more difficult.

The limitations of self-reported data and self-selection in answering the survey are constraints to weigh. There is no systematic verification of data through self-reporting. Self-assessment is often considered to be a less reliable measure of learning gains, whereas the use of cognitively-based questions is believed to be a more reliable measure. Self-selection is also a constraint because it may not offer as diverse a respondent pool as desired and this can lead to unsubstantiated inferences.
PART THREE

FINDINGS

This section of the report details course data from two primary sources: 1) The evaluation workshop (in two parts: the tracer questionnaire and the results of the evaluation workshop); and 2) evaluation ratings from two PICM workshops held in 1999.

Tracer Questionnaire

Demographics

One hundred eighty-six tracer questionnaires were sent to past participants. Two follow-ups were used to remind participants to respond to the questionnaire. Sixty respondents returned completed forms—a response rate of 32%. Of the 60, 32 (53%) were men and 28 (47%) were women. Thirty-two (53%) were from the Republika Srpska (Serb Republic), 27 (45%) were from the Federation and one (2%) was from Brcko, which, formerly under United Nations administration, has just recently become an autonomous part of B-H. Table 2 provides information on the sectors from which the participants came.

Table 2
Sectors Represented by the 60 Respondents of the Tracer Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>45% (n=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>45% (n=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>20% (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>12% (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>8% (n=5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the sectors represented by the 60 respondents appear to have good diversity and are representative of the participants which were sought by the program’s organizers.

Questionnaire Responses

This section presents the responses to the 13 questions on the questionnaire from the 60 respondents. Their responses, which were content analyzed, follow the same order in which they were asked on the questionnaire. Common themes were elicited from the content analysis of the participants’ responses. For each question, all 60 respondents made at least one comment, while some may have offered more than one response.²

² Some of the sectors represented by the respondents overlapped; therefore some respondents indicated that they represented more than one sector. This leads to the total being greater than 100%. The total percentages may also be greater than 100% due to rounding.
**Question 2:** What were the most valuable lessons from the Project Implementation modules of the workshop for you?

The primary goal of this question was to assess what the respondents believed were the most positive aspects of the workshops.

According to twenty-one of the sixty respondents (35%), project planning and the elements of a project implementation plan were valuable. This was one notable response:

- “I have been doing several big projects and many modest projects for the Republic Srpska government... Most of the lessons which I learned in the training program are very useful for my present work. I am very grateful for my new knowledge on project planning and implementation... Real access to defining, planning and implementation of projects are very important for the realization of projects.”

Nineteen of sixty 60 respondents (32%) stated that the overall project management approach and the role of the project manager were most valuable for them. The systems approach was one specific part of the Project Implementation module which the respondents mentioned. The most revealing quote included:

- “The most valuable lessons from the Project Implementation were lessons about the systems approach to the Project Management—how to achieve human resources work in accordance with other organizational and technical aspects/resources of the Project.”

Eight respondents (13%) stated that learning how to write proposals and contracts was most important to them.

Cost and budget analysis were mentioned by six respondents (10%) as the most valuable lessons learned in the workshops.

**Question 3:** How have you used those lessons in your work? Please give specific examples of how you used the lessons?

The responses to this question offered convincing evidence of level three impacts.3

---

3 Donald Kirkpatrick’s (1996) “Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels” (Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco) is referenced here. Level 1 evaluation measures participant reaction and satisfaction; Level 2 evaluation measures participant learning; Level 3 evaluation measures participant behavioral change and application of learning; and Level 4 measures institutional change, or impact (such as those which may occur in the participant’s country as a result of the training).
Twenty-four respondents (40%) stated that they had used the lessons to improve project management and implementation in the country. These included improvements in managing conflicts and in budgeting. The following were exemplary responses:

- “I used what I learned in the initial risk evaluation for Gractacac Waste Water TP project (USAID) and in the Banja Luca Water supply (EU phase).”
- “Following my participation in the training workshop, as a project manager I developed two database management systems for repayment of credits and state of accounts (SOE, SA, PA). The workshop provided guidance and information for me.”
- All lessons were applied on The World Bank emergency natural gas system reconstruction project according to my position in planning and coordinating the entire project and for formulating and implementing other subprojects.”
- “Using this approach has given me greater self-confidence in performing my daily duties as a project manager, especially in providing better relationships with clients and staff of the project, along with more successful implementation and control in executing the project.”
- “I have finished seven projects since attending the workshop. During preparation and implementation of these projects the lessons I learned in the workshop were of great use to me when I needed help. In one project, I faced strong obstruction from the Banjaluka rector office and several Republic Srpska political parties and I had to find resolution of these conflicts.”

One of the most usable lessons for twenty respondents (33%) was learning how to submit good project proposals according to the standards shown at the workshop, even with the limited use of time, money and people which they encountered in their work. A few notable quotes included:

- “My training was used in the procurement time reduction for Vogosca Water Supply.”
- “I implemented the knowledge for a water supply project for the city of Brcko in which I assessed the time required for its implementation, then the selection of personnel involved in the implementation phase.”

Five respondents (8%) mentioned that the workshop helped them in analyzing and controlling costs and financial resources during the planning and start of projects. One respondents said:

- “The combination of economic and financial analysis is the ground for making decisions of financing certain projects. Considering that I work in a bank on approving loans, I used the experience gained from the lessons.”

**Question 4:** What was the least useful aspect(s) of the project implementation modules of the workshop? And why?

This question was asked to ascertain the more negative aspects of the workshops. The majority of respondents (43, or 72%) stated that there were no aspects of the workshops which were least useful—that all aspects were, in their opinion, useful. The following quotes were testimonials to this belief:

- “I cannot separate anything non-useful. All of these lessons can be implemented in real life.”
- “I followed all the topics with high interest and passion and I do not find any of the topics as non-useful.”
“For my daily work all items prepared in project implementation were very useful and helped me to improve my knowledge about projects.”

Four respondents (7%) noted that financials, such as accounting and contracts, were least useful to them.

“Accounting, because there needs to be more time to provide the participants with the specific skills in this field.”

The classical model of communication process was one least useful aspect mentioned by three participants (5%).

“The least useful lessons were about communications. That was interesting but not of adequate weight for the level of the training program that we listened to in the workshop. This is because I find every adult person knows and uses the techniques of communications we were listening to in the seminar.”

**Question 5**: What topics in project management that were not covered in the workshop could have been useful in your daily work?

This question hoped to uncover additional topics that could have been more useful to the workshop participants. Eighteen respondents (30%) stated that more topics in financial resources and financial management, such as cost control, budgets, and investments, would have been useful:

“[Training on] “Budgeting, types of contracts, is needed.”

“Financial resources (and how to get them), funding, credits in infrastructure.”

Fourteen respondents (23%) indicated that all the necessary topics they wanted were covered in the workshop. This implies a general satisfaction level with the topics already given in the workshop.

“I think that all necessary topics in project management were covered and all of them are very useful in my daily work.”

Project management software and computer applications were an additional topic which eight respondents (13%) mentioned.

“How to use some appropriate software (e.g., Microsoft Project, Microsoft Outlook).”

The government’s role in project management was another suggestion by six respondents (10%). One respondent stated that:

“I'd like to know more about the role of government in creating projects and how government can improve investments, donations, and credits in infrastructure.”
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Question 6: What have been the most valuable lessons from the conflict management modules of the workshop for your daily work?

General skills in conflict resolution and practice were the most valuable lessons mentioned by thirty-eight respondents (63%). Some of these skills included negotiation, mediation, facilitation, and arbitration. The following were some of the most revealing quotes:

- “I managed to make successful negotiations with the partners [of a project] who have different interests.”
- “The most valuable lessons have been those held by Mr. Dudley Weeks about conflict resolution and by Dr. Zarko Puhovski about normalization of mutual relations between peoples from former Yugoslavia.”

Six respondents (10%) indicated that the planning processes were most valuable:

An additional six respondents said that all the lessons were most interesting. One respondent stated:

- “All lessons, including the approach of how to think about it and how to use skills and negotiation [were useful].”

Question 7: How have you used those lessons in your work? Please give specific examples.

This question offered the respondents another opportunity to explain the impacts of the workshops on them and in their countries (level 3 and level 4 impacts, respectively). The majority of the respondents (33, or 55%) indicated that they generally use different aspects that they learned in the workshops in their everyday work. Some notable quotes were:

- “I found the lessons rather useful in my everyday contacts and communication with co-workers and clients.”
- “Most of the lessons were used in daily work and life. An example for using some of the skills from lesson was my participation in the Natural Gas Restructuring Study where I had a coordination role in the sector between members from the Federation of B-H and the Rep. Of Srpska.”
- “I am working in the community development of UMCOR. We have a few projects on conflict resolution and nonviolent communication. I organized and was trainer on the training and workshops in that field.”

Fourteen respondents (23%) stated that their working environments had improved greatly due to the lessons they learned in the workshops. These were some of their quotes:

- “The relations with the staff I manage have significantly improved. Problems with staff are more openly discussed.”
- “The health center reconstruction and equipment project I am just working on managed to convince the HC staff management to accept the equipment provision according to the bidding conditions. That is quite different from the way they used to provide it before.”
“There are some situations in the field when we have had some conflict between investors, employers and contractors. Using some lessons, we successfully solved problems in the field.”

Eight respondents (13%) said that better or improved communications with other ministries were a lasting result of the workshop. Some of their quotes included:

- “I faced strong obstruction from a ministry during one project and I had to find resolution of these conflict situations. I used the lessons I learned in the course to guide me.”
- “What I have learned about conflict management I have in particular used in the realization of projects, which were implemented in borderline area of conflicting (entity) sides.”

**Question 8:** What was (were) the least useful aspect(s) of the conflict management modules of the workshop? And why?

Twenty-two respondents (37%) had no response to this question. Twenty respondents (33%) indicated that everything was useful or excellent and needed no change. This again seems to be indicative of the overall quality of the workshops and suggests that they need little improvement. The following responses were given by the respondents to support this notion:

- “All lectures from conflict management were interesting for my daily work and this lecture was a very good experience for my future work.”
- “I couldn’t find such a lesson because all of them were a new way of thinking and acting on a very high professional level for me.”

International conflict resolution was a topic mentioned by seven respondents (12%) as needing improvement. One response was:

- “Practicing conflict resolution facilitation, because the role-play scenario was too similar to a war in Bosnia-Herzegovina.”

Five respondents (8%) said that the planning/preparation phase of conflict partnership facilitation was least useful to them.

- “The project planning process could be worked out in more detail.”

Four respondents (7%) indicated that the political aspects of conflict management were least useful.

- “We are not politicians. The politically colored aspects of the Conflict Management were the least useful aspects for my work.”
Question 9: What topics in conflict management that were not covered in the workshop could have been useful in your daily work?

Thirty respondents (50%) once again attested that there were no topics which were not useful for them.

- “I am not able to say exactly what topics could be useful, but I think that all topics can be useful in daily life, and not only in daily work.”

Exercises with real-life cases, including political ones, were a needed topic mentioned by nine respondents (15%).

- “A real case study from our state of Bosnia-Herzegovina.”

Seven respondents (12%) indicated that communications and negotiations could be useful in the workshop. These were some of their quotes:

- “Much more about negotiations and work in teams [is needed].”
- “Mediation as a way to control yourself and improve relationships with others.”
- “More training and information in regards to internal communication (among project managers and local authorities) since the majority of people employed at local institutions still keep the previous system working habits, as well as the management system.”

Question 10: In your view, how effective was the combination of project management and conflict resolution?

Since the original workshops in 1996 began with parallel topics in project implementation and conflict management (the two topics were not fully integrated as one course at this time, but were first integrated into the course in the February 1998 workshop), the managers of the course wanted to ascertain how successfully the two topics were integrated into one course.

A majority of the respondents (45, or 75%) indicated that the combination of the two topics was excellent or very effective. These were some of their comments:

- “In the work that I am doing, the rehabilitation of housing on the territory of B-H, the combination of project management and conflict resolution was more than effective.”
- “It was very effective and applied through our final exams. It should be continued especially in B-H as it is still economically divided into two entities.”
- “The two processes are inseparable.”

Nine respondents said the combination was either good or generally useful or effective. Some offered suggestions for improving the program:

- “Theoretically, it was very good. I can say it’s an excellent idea, but in the course itself there was too little real cross-issue training and exercises. In fact, we had a separate project management course and conflict management course in the same room, during the same three week.”
- “The combination of the topics was ok, but the trainers and the group members were very different and showed different levels of interest and knowledge of topics.”
Three respondents (5%) offered no answers to the question.

Two respondents (3%) said that the combination was not effective. One stated:

- “From my point of view, it was not so effective because these topics are quite different.”

**Question 11:** In your view, how might the combination of the two modules be strengthened?

Fifteen respondents (25%) stated that more key case studies related to the topics would help to strengthen the program.

- “More concrete examples from project management and conflict resolution.”
- “More practical examples during the seminar.”

An additional 15 respondents indicated that, as a natural follow-up to the suggestions of the previous 15 respondents, more practical examples would be useful.

- “It would be good to have a combination of both topics without insisting on political items, but [instead] on real problems which can arise in the project.”

Twelve respondents (20%) had no answer to the question or indicated that the workshop should remain the same. One respondent said:

- “Keep it the same way.”

Eight respondents (13%) said that future joint projects could strengthen the combination of project implementation and conflict management.

- “Through the creation of mutual projects for the two entities, which can be concrete and realized as well.”
- “Introduce topics on interdependence between democracy, market economy, and development projects.”

**Question 12:** Do you think there is a need for additional programs of that type which have been offered the least three years in Schlaining for participants from B-H?

The responses to this question were nearly unanimous in their agreement. Fifty-nine respondents (98%) affirmed that there is a need for additional programs for participants in B-H. Only one respondent stated no to this question. The typical affirmative responses included:

- “Yes, because a large number of people in B-H manage projects but do not know how to write a project proposal.”
- “Yes, it is very needed!”

The following respondents said yes, but also offered additional suggestions to improve the program:

- “It is a very good idea and I am positive about it. It only needs more development and experiences, as does every new thing.”
“Yes, we need more advanced programs since all the activities so far were focused on infrastructure reconstruction whereas the true big economic projects still lie ahead.”

“Yes, but in a shorter form.”

**Question 13**: Do you think that follow-on advanced courses in advanced project and conflict management for former participants are needed? If so, which topics should be dealt with?

There was an overwhelmingly affirmative response to this question. Fifty-eight of the 60 respondents (97%) stated that there was a need for future courses.

The most common view elicited from the respondents was that topics concerned with controlling the project, including project management, preparation, and realization, were necessary for future courses. This was mentioned by 18 respondents (30%):

- “I think that advance courses are needed especially in the area of project management and especially on the topic of ‘preparation and realization of the projects for small businesses,’ the period which is currently applicable to B-H.”
- “Yes, project management, process management, organizational reengineering and communication can be used entirely and could be applied on team work.”

Respondents stated a need for financial analysis/management and budget monitoring. Some of the 14 respondents (23%) who mentioned this topic said that the following were needed:

- “Management approach in organizing and financing scientific and research work.”
- “They are absolutely needed. To have the presentation of the project that are financed by the specific funds (not a credit) like the municipal, state...budget. Such projects do not have strict propositions like those financed by credit, donors, and the World Bank...All people in charge with such should be invited to attend such a course and training [as this].”

Eight respondents (13%) indicated that more concrete and realistic examples were a good topic to include in the course. This would include inviting back former participants of the program to help with the training for other countries:

- “Yes. A combination of project management and conflict management based on the problems and experiences of one country (like B-H) contacts between professionals concerning some natural projects, with specific interests could certainly have been better results in practice.”
- “Follow-on advanced courses could be useful for former participants. In part, they could share their experiences and solve problems in other’s jobs.”
- “I think that follow-on advanced courses are needed. I would strongly suggest that the World Bank should make a selection of former participants in order to fully train them as project managers, but this may take more than two weeks.”

More topics in conflict and crisis management were another topic mentioned by six respondents (10%).
Six more respondents said that software and computer applications used in project management would be good topics for future courses:

- “Computer and software applications, such as Microsoft Project, are important for us.”

Although five respondents (8%) answered “yes” to this question, they had no specific suggestions for additional topics.

Results from the Evaluation Workshop

Overview of the Workshop and its Results

The evaluation workshop took place in Schlaining from December 1-4, 1999. It was planned by the task managers of the program and by the managers at ASPR. An evaluator from the World Bank Institute (the author of this report) was also in attendance to lead and facilitate the workshop and to provide guidance to both the participants and the course managers.

An even mix of ethnic identities, gender, sector and class year was sought in the participants. Twenty-six past participants, representing each ethnic entity and the public and private sectors, were invited to attend. Fifteen participants arrived in Schlaining for the workshop.

Convening the evaluation workshop with previous participants was a means of gathering feedback on how the course had impacted the participants and to ask them how it could be improved. This was the first WBI workshop which expressly took place in order to gauge overall impacts on a program’s participants and to determine the program’s ultimate worth and success. It was envisioned that the workshop would produce the following products:

1. An evaluation of the program;
2. An improved program design that could be implemented in the future in B-H or elsewhere; and
3. Suggestions/recommendation for more advanced follow-on programs.

The format of the agenda centered around specific questions, similar to those on the tracer questionnaire, which aimed at providing information on the three above topics. These questions were created by the course’s managers, but were not reviewed by the Evaluation Unit of WBI.

Triangulation was used to assure the reliability and validity of the data from the workshop. The evaluator took notes on the group’s responses and presentations during the evaluation workshop and later verified and compared them with the reports given to him by the course managers and the translator. The report’s results were examined and verified by the evaluator for their validity and reliability. Additionally, the translator, fluent in the Bosnian language and present at the workshop, was helpful in maintaining the reliability of the data which needed to be examined. The evaluator and course managers worked with her in these translations. Informal discussions with the course participants
were also conducted by the evaluator in order to verify the findings elicited in the workshop.

Each day, the workshops began with an overview of the day’s tasks. Afterwards, the participants were assigned to three groups of five participants each to consider the discussion questions of that day. Once the groups came to agreement on their answers to these questions, the session would then turn to a plenary in which each group presented their findings individually. Appendix B displays the evaluation workshop agenda.

**Demographics**

The fifteen participants of the evaluation workshop were, as hoped, fairly diverse in their gender, sector and ethnicity. They consisted of fifteen middle management government and NGO representatives: six from the Bosnian Federation and nine from the Republika Srpska (Serb Republic). There were ten women and five men in attendance. The participants were also from diverse sectors with the largest groups from education and training (5) and health (2). Overall, a good range of participants was present.

**Day One of the Workshop**

The objective of day one was to evaluate the PICM program since its implementation in 1996. The views of the fifteen participants were sought to accomplish this objective. At the beginning of the first day of the workshop, the participants introduced themselves and were informed of the course agenda, what was expected from them, and how the course would be run. Following are summaries of the group’s responses to the day’s questions:

1) **Specific examples of useful application in their work of information and skills gained as a result of the course. What could they actually use in their jobs?**

By asking this question, it was hoped that the workshop participants would provide specific details and examples of the impacts which the course had on them. Their responses included particular instances of completed buildings and projects, in addition to the restructuring of their organizations, changes within the country’s government and changes in governmental policies. These responses indicate clear evidence of level 3 and level 4 impacts. Moreover, these impacts were mentioned as direct results of having participated in and having acquired knowledge and skills from previous PICM workshops.

Perhaps the most common use of the skills learned in prior workshops was in proper project planning, which was stated by all three working groups in the evaluation workshop. In particular, the groups noted their use of the classic management process of planning, organizing, implementing, controlling, and evaluating in the development of project proposals.

The use of project proposal development exercises utilizing the principles of project management during the course was a major factor, mentioned frequently in responses to this question. The groups stated that the organizational knowledge gained was useful in their work. Additionally, procurement and contracting knowledge were successfully
applied in their jobs. Specific examples of these projects offered by the participants included:

- Rehabilitation of the City Hall in Sarajevo.
- Rehabilitation of the Stadium Kosevo in Sarajevo.
- Rehabilitation of the Secondary Technical School in Sarajevo.
- Reorganization of the NGO “Synerjia” to a more functional design to assist in applying matrix organization principles for future project implementation.
- Integration of three health sector projects into one PMU through application of by applying new organizational principles.
- Full preparation of housing project proposals in both the Federation and in Srpska, including the use of budgeting and implementation skills learned during the course.
- Procurement of vaccines through learned bidding procedures.
- Application of the principles of conflict management in the management of project priorities.
- Application of “Partnership Life Skills” in project implementation teamwork.

It can be inferred, from the responses and specific projects above, that the program has had impacts at levels 3 and 4. While level 3 impacts are more readily discernible here, level 4 impacts appear to have arisen (and more will likely arise soon) in B-H and at the participants’ institutions.

2) What did they want to do or try that did not work, and why?

A common theme for the groups was that project management skills did not exist for all parties in the implementation process, thus there was significant difficulty in realizing efficiencies which, in some cases, resulted in cancellation of projects.

It was also stated that schedule and cost control skills learned during the course could not be applied due to lack of computers and programs, and the lack of qualified instructors in B-H. It is believed that this situation was the impetus for comments, during the last day of the Workshop, for developing a TOT (training of trainers) program.

Participants suggested that computer applications and software such as Microsoft Project and Outlook would be useful in their work.

Other suggestions included:

- A good legal framework during procurement of contracts
- Flexibility in the timing of activities
- Other project planning skills (critical path, distribution of resources, cost assessments)
3) Least useful topics contained in the present course design and why.

The participants’ responses to this question indicated that they were generally satisfied with the present course design; however, several particular course topics were mentioned as being least useful. They included:

- Lessons on the “Dayton Agreement”
- Political cases in Conflict Management
- Communications and perception training

The last topic listed above was mentioned in disapproving comments which arose from the participants’ experiences during the first day of the course, in which the presentations were given. The participants considered these role-playing exercises to be akin to “kindergarten” games and not worthy of adult attention.

4) Additional topics that would have been useful.

The comments made show the need for more intensive training in the skills required for present-day implementation requirements. They also reflect the progress made in B-H in improving project implementation skills. The participants stated that the following additional topics would be useful:

- Pre-feasibility study skills, particularly in the privatization process.
- How to manage and guide “creative” conflict processes.
- PM software training (i.e., Microsoft Project).
- Further training in reporting systems.
- More detailed procurement training.
- Project presentation skills.
- More advanced financial monitoring and cost control topics.

5) Have participants successfully demonstrated to superiors and subordinates the knowledge and skills learned? Examples. Effects of successful demonstration.

The responses to this question were positive both in the group sessions and in informal conversations during the three days of the workshop. Some examples were:

- The advantages of teamwork with all parties to the project were presented.
- On request, the distribution of training materials from the course to interested parties was made.
- One NGO (EDA) organized short training programs for their personnel and other interested parties.

One participant mentioned that she actually convinced her superior to attend this course, which he ultimately did.

6) Other assistance (besides training) that might have been provided.
Most of the participants were pleased with the assistance they received during their courses. Some, however, offered the following suggestions:

- More discussion about financial disciplines, such as the Stock Market, Managing Investment Funds and Working Capital;
- A request to use e-mail to keep former participants informed of new developments and ideas;
- Suggested use of better Visual Aid equipment such as LCD projectors;
- Make trainers of former participants; and
- Present more topics on the “legal side” of PM.

**Day Two of the Workshop**

Day two’s objective focused on recommendations for improvement of the program. These were the key questions and responses discussed by the participants for that day:

1) **Are the topics of Project Implementation and Conflict Management successfully integrated? If not, how might the integration be better effected?**

Responses from the groups indicated that the integration was only partially successful. The point was made that Project Implementation and Conflict Management were presented “side by side” and therefore not integrated. It was pointed out that Project Implementation seemed to be derived from project experience while Conflict Management had a political base, thus integration did not occur. The suggestion was made that both Project Implementation and Conflict Management should have a common denominator of business applications in order to be shown integration.

According to the participants, there must be a clearer definition of priorities, organization and implementation. In this sense, a clearer explanation and better integration of a all phases of a project—from beginning to end—is a must.

2) **What topics should be eliminated? What should be retained?**

The consensus of the groups was that Conflict Management should address and emphasize all the phases of the PM life cycle and thus lessen the emphasis on political examples. Once again the groups suggested the elimination of communication and “kindergarten” exercises given at the beginning of the course.

3) **Which topics should be condensed or lengthened? What topics should be added?**

One group suggested condensing the topics of contracts and contracting. Some suggested lengthening or adding some topics, such as Risk Management, Team Development, Procurement, Conflict Resolution (as opposed to Conflict Management), and Project Planning, Monitoring and Reporting. These suggestions appear to reflect a growing understanding and sophistication in Project Implementation and Conflict Management among the participants.
4) What is an appropriate mix of training methods? Case studies, lecture, role playing, independent reading, implementation planning?

There was general agreement that lectures and case studies (in that order) were desirable, but that role playing in Conflict Management be eliminated. Case studies in Project Implementation should reflect real world cases in B-H.

Additionally, the participants stated that both a list of useful publications and software used in Project Implementation and Conflict Management are needed.

Day Three of the Workshop

Discussion of follow-on programs and their applicability to other countries were the key topics for day three. The participants were asked to consider:

1) Advanced topics for the program

The groups recommended that Project Implementation be expanded to include the topics of the entire project life cycle. These would include: pre-feasibility studies; economic and financial analysis; procurement, implementation, supervision; and monitoring and evaluation. The topic of preparation and design of project proposals was also recommended in addition to methods of obtaining financing. Additional topics recommended were impact analysis, team building, risk management, negotiation and presentation skills.

2) Training of trainers

The consensus of the groups was that TOT is important and needed. The participants strongly suggested that Project Implementation trainers should be chosen from the graduates of the present course, but that Conflict Management trainers should be specialists in their field. They also recognized that it was important to have teaching skills as well as professional skills. Training methods should be fairly mixed between theory and practice (i.e., case studies, lectures, exercises, and the development of presentation techniques are very important). During this time, many of the fifteen participants expressed interest in becoming teachers for future courses. These participants emphasized that they had acquired the necessary skills and experience which would be useful in teaching future courses.

3) Applicability of the program to other Balkan countries

The workshop participants stated that PM skills are applicable to every country, but Conflict Management skills have to be adapted to the country in question. This is a result of the differing cultural and sociological background and environment found in each country. Again, some of the participants strongly suggested that B-H could be a major player in such a training program. Kosovo was one country mentioned in group discussions which could benefit from this training.
4) Other topics

Suggested topics to be considered for the follow-on program included:

- Financial Management
- Software applications “across the board”
- Capital Markets and Stock Markets
- Management of Investment Funds
- Human Rights
- Rule of Law
- Preparation of Master Plans
- Economic transition for former socialist countries

Findings and Data from WBI Evaluations of Two PICM Workshops

Overview

In order to fully assess the impacts of the PICM program and to verify their reliability and validity, the evaluator again utilized triangulation. Evaluation results from previous PICM workshops which were partially organized, reported and analyzed by members of the WBI Evaluation Unit (WBIES) were examined. These findings served multiple purposes such as: to add perspectives from additional participants of the PICM program; to check the reliability and validity of the data by examining responses from the evaluation workshop with previous evaluation findings to determine if there were any consistencies or inconsistencies; and to lend credibility to the overall evaluation perspective of this report. Additionally, evaluation reports conducted and written by ASPR were also examined for the same reasons—to determine their reliability and validity. Unfortunately, the ASPR used rating scales for their questionnaires which could not be matched with those from WBI’s. Nevertheless, the ASPR reports were still useful for examining and attesting to the overall success of the PICM program.

WBIES began working with the task managers of the PICM program during 1999. The questionnaire for the March 1999 course was co-created and analyzed by members of the Evaluation Unit. The June 1999 questionnaire, however, although partially created by WBIES, was analyzed by WBIEN and not by WBIES; therefore only a small part of the evaluative data were compiled. Moreover, the original completed questionnaires could not be located which meant that additional data (such as percent rating a question with a score of 4 or 5) still could not be analyzed.

Comparable Data Analysis and Results

In comparing the June 1999 and March 1999 evaluation results conducted by WBIES and the task managers, only six comparable questions were asked. One difficulty in comparing these data is the fact that the March workshop utilized a six-point rating scale, while the June workshop used a five-point rating scale. To achieve comparability,
the ratings for the March workshops were converted to five-point equivalent scores by applying a conversion factor of 0.78.\(^4\)

One means of measuring whether a course is a "success" or "effective" is the extent of participant satisfaction with it — a course is unlikely to be successful in achieving its objectives if participants are dissatisfied with it. Two related questions were asked of participants: *how relevant was the course to your current work or functions?*; and *how would you rate the overall usefulness of the course?*

Table 3 enables comparisons among the two courses. The March and June courses achieved different mean scores for *their relevance to the participants’ current work* (3.7 and 4.0, respectively). These are moderate ratings which suggest that the relevance of the course was not its best feature.

Another similar question asking if the course *was useful overall for the respondents* had higher ratings for the March and June workshops (4.0 and 4.1, respectively). These mean scores indicate a more consistent rating that the course was worthwhile for the respondents.

Two questions measuring the course’s effectiveness were also asked. The mean score for the *effectiveness of the methods used to convey the issues* varied between March and June, but not greatly (3.8 and 4.0, respectively). The *effectiveness of the workshop in maintaining respondents’ interest* also had varied ratings (mean score for the March course was 3.9 and in June it was 4.2). These means represent average to above average ratings for the course’s effectiveness.

The mean rating between March and June for *the focus of the seminar on high priority issues* were lower (3.7 and 3.9, respectively). However, *the quality of the reading and other supporting materials* received higher ratings (3.9 and 4.1). Again, these ratings are considered to be average, but closer to a maximum rating rather than to a minimum rating.

Overall, there is little variability in the ratings between the March and June 1999 courses which indicates that the respondents were nearly in complete agreement. Moreover, these ratings can, as a whole, be considered as average, but not negative. The close consistency in these course ratings are indicative of uniform agreement among the respondents, but since it is only a comparison of two courses, some variability is expected.

Table 3
Respondent Ratings of Course Relevance, Usefulness and Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>March 1999 Workshop (a)</th>
<th>June 1999 Workshop (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>% who rated 4 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall usefulness of the course</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the course to your current work</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of the methods used in the course</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of the course in maintaining your interest throughout</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of the course on high priority issues</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the reading and supporting materials</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) The end-of-course questionnaires for the March 1999 course used a six-point ratings scale (6=maximum, 1=minimum). An advantage of the five-point scale used for the June 1999 course is that it enables respondents to provide a mid-point rating. As previously mentioned, to achieve comparability the ratings for the former questionnaires were converted to five-point equivalent scores by applying a conversion factor of 0.78. This approach is based on a WBI report, *Evaluating EDI Participant Reactions via Different Response Scales: A Technical Review*, 1999.

The data in Table 3 suggest that two features of the 1999 workshop received high quality ratings (a rating of 4 or 5 from 85% of the respondents\(^6\)): The effectiveness of the course in maintaining participants’ interest and the quality of the reading and supporting materials. The mean scores, while generally higher for the June workshop, still suggest an overall average rating for the two workshops. Both course usefulness and relevance, key features for assessing the course’s overall worth, are at or above average (mean ranges of 4.0-4.1 and 3.7-4.0, respectively for the March and June workshops). In brief, no features of the workshops generally stand out more than any other, nor do any features appear to be rated low. This is indicative of a course that is not outstanding, but certainly can be considered to be within a range of average to good.

\(^5\) Unfortunately, percentages of 4 or 5 ratings from the June 1999 course evaluation were not calculated and could not be located.

\(^6\) A course is considered to be of high quality if at least 85% of respondents give an overall rating of 4 or 5. This is a target for World Bank courses and conferences. Ratings of 4 or 5 by 80-84% of respondents indicate a “good” course, while ratings of 4 or 5 by 75-79% of respondents indicate an “average” course.
There are no sound reasons behind the overall average ratings given to these two workshops. While two workshops cannot as a whole represent the entire PICM program, these ratings can still be interpreted as features of the program which may need improvement. But again, the ratings also suggest that the program is in good shape and that the respondents consider it to be important.

Summary

The results from the tracer questionnaire and the evaluation workshop, along with the evaluation results from prior PICM workshops, suggest areas of the program which worked best and those where improvements are suggested. Overall, the responses and data from the respondents are segmented into four thematic areas: respondent satisfaction; learning and skills gained; impacts on the respondents and their country; and suggestions for improvements.

Respondent Satisfaction

Respondent satisfaction with the course was high. A majority of the respondents (43, or 72%) indicated that all aspects of the course were useful, attesting that the course was important to them. Additionally, their responses that the program is needed and should be continued is further evidence of its importance and usefulness. Indeed, the respondents considered the course to be worthwhile and useful in their daily work and also in their daily lives. The fact that many respondents consider follow-on programs vital to other countries in need of this type of training and also the respondents’ offers to assist with further training in other countries are indicative of the importance and interest which they attach to this program.

The usefulness of the program was also a key positive result according to the respondents. In particular, they noted that the course had maintained their interest throughout its entirety and that the quality of the reading and supporting materials was another useful feature.

Learning and Skills Gained From the Workshops

The more positive features of the PICM workshops were their ability to generally improve the project implementation and conflict management skills of participants. It was the use of these improved skills which assisted the respondents in their work and even in their everyday lives. Respondents stated that the most common use of the skills which they learned in the workshops was in proper project planning. This included: planning, organizing, implementing, controlling and evaluating the project.

Impacts on the Respondents and Their Country

Perhaps the most overwhelmingly positive responses which speak to the merits of the program were the actual examples of impacts provided by the respondents. When asked to provide specific examples of how they used what they had learned in the program, respondents offered convincing evidence of projects on which they worked and helped to improve as a direct result of their workshop training. These responses offer the clearest evidence that the program had long-lasting and far-reaching impacts—which are normally very difficult to assess and even harder to prove.

Other instances of positive impacts and results arising from this course included examples given by the respondents of how they utilized the knowledge and skills learned in the workshops. One respondent stated that her NGO organized a short training
program for their personnel and other parties based on the training she received from the PICM program. Another respondent even convinced her manager to attend the course once she returned to her office, which he eventually did. These are examples of changes within organizations (level 3 impacts) which are often difficult to document and measure, but which seem to be a positive and direct effect stemming from the PICM training. Additionally, the respondents' examples of positive changes in their country (such as the implementation of new projects) are evidence that the conditions in B-H have improved and progressed from the first year of the program to its final year. These, too, are indicative of positive outcomes and impacts resulting from the PICM program.

**Suggestions for Course Improvement**

Some features of the course which needed improvement were also elicited from the respondents. One example was the need for more real-life case studies, such as those which reflect the real world in B-H. According to the respondents, these case studies would enhance the value of the program.

Further training in computer applications and software was a topic frequently mentioned by the respondents. Software such as Microsoft Project and Microsoft Outlook were two such programs which would be useful to the respondents. Computer programs would also help to improve the analysis of financial resources and financial management and also help to improve the organization and implementation of projects. Respondents, for instance, stated that schedule and cost control skills could not be applied due to their lack of computer training. Further training in supporting systems and computers is clearly needed.

While the respondents stated that the combination of the topics of project management and conflict resolution are effective, they also believed that the integration of the two topics into the course were only partially successful. Some issues in conflict management, such as international conflict resolution and political cases, were not well-received by the respondents.

The entire life cycle of the project was another topic which needs to be integrated into the course. The respondents said that both Project Implementation and Conflict Management should emphasize and address this entire life cycle which would include: pre-feasibility studies; planning; economic and financial analysis; and monitoring and evaluation.

Communication and perception training were additional topics which the respondents believed were least useful. In particular, the communication exercise at the beginning of the course were considered to be like “kindergarten” and not worthy of adult attention.

A good legal framework was another topic which the respondents stated would be useful. This would be particularly helpful in the procurement and analysis of contracts.

Respondents also noted that additional training in project presentation skills would be immeasurably helpful, especially during the early stages of the project proposal and afterwards in the monitoring and reporting stages as well.

Team building skills and negotiation were other aspects which the respondents believed would also be useful to them.
PART FOUR

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The responses and data in this report indicate that the PICM program has been regarded as a positive program by its participants. It also appears to have been a vital force to assist in the post-conflict rebuilding of B-H, as expressed through the views of 98% of the respondents to the questionnaire who stated emphatically that there is still a demand for additional programs of this kind in B-H. The respondents also maintain that there is a need for this type of program in countries (such as Kosovo) which are undergoing massive rebuilding and reconstruction in a post-conflict environment.

If WBI continues to offer this program with ASPR and with the Austrian government, the graduates of the program would make excellent teachers and vital resource contacts. The experiences of the participants in the program could be an incomparable source of information which should not be overlooked. Moreover, many of the graduates of the program have already expressed interest in becoming instructors or at least resource persons for future follow-on programs. Clearly, these participants would need some additional training in pedagogy (a training of trainers course would be valuable), but their knowledge and desire to help with the program, would be an invaluable resource.

Most positively, the program seems to have had profound effects on both its participants and their country. The respondents in this study offered convincing evidence of level 3 and level 4 impacts which arose from the knowledge and skills gained from participating in the course. A number of projects were implemented by previous graduates which impacted both their work and their country’s emergence from the countless damages inflicted during its civil war. Indeed, B-H, as a whole, has benefited from the specific skills which participants brought back to their country and utilized to improve projects.

While impacts are unusually difficult to assess and even more challenging to directly attribute to any one program, the specific examples offered by the respondents in this study are both compelling and credible. For this reason, the impacts of this course on its participants are viable and should likely continue into the future. The managers of the program would likely reinforce its credibility and impacts through careful monitoring and evaluation. This would include keeping abreast of changes in B-H and remaining in close contact with the graduates of the program. In fact, the participants in the evaluation workshop also recommended that e-mail be used to keep former participants informed of new developments and ideas—these would certainly be excellent opportunities to monitor the program’s effectiveness and to interact with the graduates.

The workshops were regarded as useful and worthwhile by the respondents. Additionally, the workshops maintained the interest of participants throughout their length. These ratings attest that the respondents consider the PICM program to be of high standards and applicable to their everyday work. In fact, one of the highest ratings for the course was in its ability to improve the participants’ overall skills in project implementation and conflict management, which they believe can be used not only in their work, but also in their everyday lives. This indicates that the course has personally
affected the participants and had impacts on their lives—a conclusion that the course has gone beyond affecting their work environment.

Many of the conclusions reached through the evaluation of this program lead to the recommendations stated in the next section.

**Recommendations for Improving the Program**

There are four means of improving the PICM program which should make it more effective and successful, according to the program graduates.

First, while the respondents believe that the two topics of project implementation and conflict management can be effectively combined and taught, they also indicated that there needs to be better integration of these topics into the workshop. The program should better address conflict within the area of project management. Effective management of projects includes successful management of conflicts. Moreover, the two topics of Project Implementation and Conflict Management should address and emphasize the phases of the entire life cycle of a project. Related topics such as pre-feasibility studies, economic and financial analysis, and monitoring and evaluation were not discussed at all or not in enough depth at the previous workshops. The managers of the program should consider adding to these topics in future courses. Suggestions also were made by the respondents that additional experts in the area of conflict management are needed for this program.

Second, the respondents also suggested that additional training in computer applications and software for project management were needed. This important type of training could certainly be integrated as a one or two day event within the three week duration of the course. This seems to be a reasonable request.

Third, while the case studies used in prior workshops were rated as useful and good, respondents also suggested that more real life case studies, appropriate to their country-specific situations, are needed. If follow-on courses are offered by the PICM program to other countries, it should strive to utilize more country-related case studies which are more realistic and appropriate to the participants’ specific situations.

Finally, the role playing in conflict management, which normally took place during the beginning of the workshop, should be eliminated or improved. These communication exercises were considered to be like “kindergarten” and not worthy of adult attention.

In general, however, these recommendations for improving the program and for future programs should not be construed or interpreted to be entirely negative, since the data in this report attest that the PICM program was generally successful and has had positive impacts on both its graduates and the country of B-H.

Lastly, WBI, ASPR and the Federal Chancellery in Austria have established a unique partnership which continually supported and strengthened the PICM program and contributed to its success throughout its history. This partnership should be continued since it is mutually beneficial. The best evidence to support this theory is conveyed through the testimonies of the PICM graduates who took part in this study. Moreover, this collaboration would be very useful in implementing additional programs of this type.
for countries like Kosovo which are currently undergoing recovery and reparation in a post-conflict society.
Appendix A: Letters and Tracer Questionnaire Send to Program Graduates

The World Bank
INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT
1818 H Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433
U.S.A.
(202) 477-1234
Cable Address: INTBAFRAD

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION
U.S.A.
Cable Address: INDEVAS

November 17, 1999

Ex-Post Evaluation of
Project Implementation and Conflict Management Training Program
for Bosnia-Herzegovina

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR) and the Environment and Natural Resources division of the World Bank Institute (WBIEN) are pleased to invite you to participate in the ex-post evaluation of the Project Implementation and Conflict Management training program for Bosnia-Herzegovina. The three-day evaluation workshop will take place in Stadtschlaining, Austria, December 2 – 4, 1999.

The purpose of this evaluation is three-fold: to assess the effectiveness of the PICM training program as delivered; to revise that program for future delivery; and, to define possible follow-on or second-generation training programs. Your views on these matters are extremely important to us, and we hope that you will be able to accept this invitation.

ASPR and WBIEN will arrange travel to and from the evaluation workshop, as well as for lodging and meals while in Stadtschlaining. As for travel, a bus will leave from outside the World Bank Resident Mission in Sarajevo (Hamdije Kresevljakovicva 19) at 7 a.m., Wednesday, December 1. The bus will stop around 12 noon at the Hotel Palace in Banja Luka, and then continue on to Stadtschlaining, arriving late that evening. (Participants may of course make their own travel arrangements at their own expense.) All participants are individually responsible for obtaining all necessary papers, passports and visas. Lodging and meals will be at the hotel in Schlaining, where you stayed before. The return bus will leave Stadtschlaining at 7 a.m., December 5, and will make one stop in Banja Luka (about 5 p.m.) before continuing on to Sarajevo (arriving about 10 p.m.).

Please inform Gudrun Kramer, at ASPR (fax 43 – 3355 – 2662; e-mail address: ipt@aspr.ac.at), by November 26 whether you will be able to attend or not.

Hoping you will be able to assist us improve these important training programs, I remain

Sincerely,

Gordon Appleby
Social Scientist
Environment and Natural Resources
World Bank Institute
Dear Sir or Madam:

The Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR) and the Environment and Natural Resources division of the World Bank Institute (WBIEN) intend to undertake a retrospective evaluation of the Project Implementation and Conflict Management training program that was held at ASPR the last three years.

We would like to enlist your assistance in two ways. First, please let us know whether you would be available to participate in the evaluation, which will be held at Stadtschlaining, December 2-4, 1999. Second, we ask that you take a few moments to reflect on the experience and answer the general questions that are attached. Both the notification form and the questionnaire response should be faxed to Arno Truger at ASPR.

Finally, whether or not we have the occasion to meet again in Stadtschlaining, we take this opportunity to thank you for your participation in both the workshop and this evaluation activity. With best wishes for your continued success,

Sincerely,

Gordon Appleby  
Social Scientist  
Environment and Natural Resources  
World Bank Institute

Arno Truger  
Deputy of the Executive President  
Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution

September 30, 1999
Ex-Post Evaluation of the Project Implementation and Conflict Management Training Program for Bosnia-Herzegovina

(Please print clearly in capital letters, using a black pen.)

Name: ___________________________
Agency: ___________________________
Street Address: ___________________________
Telephone: ___________________________
Fax: ___________________________
E.mail ___________________________

Availability: ASPR and WBIEN regret that we will be able to invite only a very limited number of workshop participants to the evaluation review. We would, however, like to ascertain whether or not you would be available December 1–5. (Note: Only those selected will receive an invitation by fax or e-mail)

would
I would be able to participate in the evaluation Dec. 1-5.
would not

Please fax this form and the attached questionnaire to:

Arno Truger
Deputy of the Executive President
Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution
Rochusplatz 1, Burg
7461 Stadtschlaining,
Austria

Fax: 43 – 33 – 55 - 2662
Evaluation of the PICM Training Program for Bosnia-Herzegovina

Ex-Post Evaluation of the
Project Implementation and Conflict Management Training Program
for Bosnia-Herzegovina

(Please print clearly in capital letters, using a black pen.
Return this form also to Arno Truger at ASPR; fax: 43-33-55-2662;
email: TRUGER@ASPR.AC.AT)

1. Your sector
   Education and Training
   Energy
   Housing
   Infrastructure
   Health
   Agriculture
   Other

Project Implementation

2. What have been the most valuable lessons from the project implementation modules of the workshop for your daily work:

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

3. How have you used those lessons in your work? Please give specific examples of how you used the lessons.

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

4. What was the least useful aspect(s) of the project implementation modules of the workshop? And, why?

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

5. What topics in project management that were not covered in the workshop could have been useful in your daily work?

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________
Conflict Management

6. What have been the most valuable lessons from the conflict management modules of the workshop for your daily work?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

7. How have you used those lessons in your work? Please give specific examples.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

8. What was the least useful aspect(s) of the conflict management modules of the workshop? And, why?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

9. What topics in conflict management that were not covered in the workshop could have been useful in your daily work?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Combined Project Implementation and Conflict Management Program

10. In your view, how effective was the combination of project management and conflict resolution?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

11. In your view, how might the combination or coordination of the two modules be strengthened?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Further Training

12. Do you think that there is a need for additional programs of that type which have been offered the last three years in Schlaining for participants from B-H?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

13. Do you think that follow-on advanced courses in advanced project and conflict management for former participants are needed, and if so, which topics should be dealt with?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix B: Workshop Program Agenda

WORKSHOP

Ex-Post Evaluation of the
Project Implementation and Conflict Management Training Program For Bosnia-Herzegovina
December 2 – 4 1999

Background

For the past three years the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR) and the World Bank Institute (WBI) have jointly conducted a course in Project Implementation and Conflict Management for participants from Bosnia and Herzegovina (B-H). Approximately 200 participants representing the various entities in B-H have successfully completed the course that was held at ASPR in Stadtschlaining in Austria. The last course in the series was held in June 1999.

The completion of the program affords an opportunity to evaluate the course not only in terms of individual participant development but also in terms of overall contribution to the development of their country. Although the evaluations received at the end of each course segment were positive there still remains a question of whether the original objectives of the program have been met: (1) enable trained participants to promote post-conflict reconstruction; (2) improve the implementation of donor supported projects in the Emergency Recovery Program; (3) effective employment in the public or private sector.

Introduction and Statement of Objectives

In order to determine the overall effectiveness in accomplishing the goals of the program, a plan is proposed whereby former participants can input their post-program experiences and resultant contributions to their country. The plan envisions a three-day workshop type conference with panel discussions and small workshops that will include as objectives findings of fact on the effectiveness of the prior program in addition to reports on current issues of project development in B-H. Participants to the seminar have been chosen from the entire field of graduates of the program, and include, inter alia, participants from the public and private sectors including NGO’s with an even mix of ethnic identities. It is also reasonable to expect that the seminar will yield recommendations for future seminars, including, for example, an advanced course in project management in B-H, and/or a similar course for training of trainers, addressing preconditions necessary for effective project management and conflict management training.
Workshop Procedure

The workshop will consist of small discussion groups of four to six members each. Each group will “brainstorm” the session topic by presenting and discussing ideas brought up by the members and then consolidating and prioritizing them for presentation in plenary session. Presentations shall be oral, with written backup material presented to ASPR and World Bank representatives at the end of each session.

Workshop Agenda

Day 1, Thursday
December 2, 1999

9:00 – 10:30 Welcome
Introduction of Program and Participants

10:30 – 11:00 Break

11:00 – 12:30 Continuation

12:30 - 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:45 Plenary and Group Discussions of PICM Program
Discussion questions (other suggestions welcomed):
1. Specific examples of useful application in their work of information and skills gained as a result of the course. What could they actually use in their jobs?
2. What did they want to do or try to do that did not work, and why?
3. Least useful topics contained in present course design and why. (Didn’t even think of using or even bother to try)
4. Additional topics that would have been useful.
5. Have participants successfully demonstrated to superiors and subordinate the knowledge and skills learned? Examples. Effects of successful demonstration.
6. Other assistance (besides training) that might have been provided.

15:45-16:00 Break

16:00-17:30 Presentation of Working Group Findings in Plenary and Discussion

Day 2, Friday
December 3, 1999
9:00 – 10:45 Working Group Discussions of Suggestions for the Revision of the Existing Training Program. Discussion Questions:
   1. Are the topics of Project Implementation and Conflict Management successfully integrated? If not, how might the integration be better effected?
   2. What topics should be eliminated? What should be retained?
   3. Which should be condensed or lengthened? What topics should be added?
   4. Mix of training methods (by module, i.e., PI or CM)
      Case Studies – appropriate? Useful?
      Lecture
      Role Plays
      Independent reading
      Implementation planning

10:45 – 11:00 Break

11:00 – 12:30 Presentation of Working Group Findings in Plenary and Discussion

Afternoon Free

**Day 3, Saturday December 4, 1999**

9:00 – 10:30 Plenary and Working Group Discussions: Suggestions for Follow-on Programs
   1. Advanced topics (PI, CM)
   2. Training of Trainers
   3. Applicability to other Balkan countries
   4. Other topics

10:30 – 11:00 Break

11:00 – 12:30 Presentation of Working Group Findings in Plenary, and Discussion

12:30 – 15:00 Lunch

15:00 – 16:30 Working Groups Design Follow-up Training Programs

16:30 – 17:30 Report Back and Discussion

17:30 – 18:00 Wrap up of conference

19:00 Closing Dinner
**Workshop Products**

1. An evaluation of the three-year program as held.

2. An improved design of the program that could be held in the future in B-H or elsewhere.