

*Miloš Marjanović, Ph.D., Full Professor  
Novi Sad Faculty of Law*

**THE EVALUATION DATA GIVEN BY  
PARTICIPANTS DURING  
THE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OF  
THE ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION  
IN SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO (JUGOLEX)  
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS/CONFERENCES**

**Introduction**

The project Development of the environmental legislation in Serbia and Montenegro (JUGOLEX) is extremely important and interesting from two points of view of participatory democracy. From the beginning, it was transparent and accessible to the public. At the same time, the public has had the possibility to evaluate some aspects of project presentations. In such a way, the rights of access to information and of public participation, as fundamental ones according to the Aarhus Convention and the newest directives of environmental protection in EU, have realized. That is very prominent and even paradigmatic innovation in the process of enactment in Serbia and Montenegro.

In this purpose, for receive feedback information, Project team leader has proposed the evaluation sheet that is attached. It was the same for all workshops/conferences. In addition, there are two workshops (Belgrade, 22.01.2003. and Novi Sad, 22.10.2003.) with evaluation of individual experts' presentations

and two workshops too (Belgrade, 22.o1. 2003. and 22.o5. 2003) with the evaluation of chairing of the workshop. The evaluation sheet concerns a presented information, content, tempo, quality of experts' presentations, organization and equipment, and discussion. The participants could evaluate mentioned characteristics with three marks – not enough/unsatisfactory, enough/satisfactory and good. From the evaluation point of view, these characteristics seem completely, but the marks could be a little bit more precise (very good, excellent). Besides evaluations not enough and enough, it was necessary to have evaluation overmuch. This sheet also contained two boxes where the participants could comment what was missing at the workshop and give their suggestions for further works.

We will analyze the review of held workshops/conferences (places, dates, topics), the number of evaluation sheets in relation to present and registration number of participants, average marks and the percentages of not enough/unsatisfactory, enough/satisfactory and good evaluations in a whole and in according to single workshops and their characteristics, including the qualitative analyze of that what was missing and suggestions.

Our hypothesis has been that the project team and the participants of public workshops and conferences have not much experience in this kind of evaluation and because of that there were some failures. Some regularities, correlations and empirical generalizations could be discovering. They are the result of interdependence of workshop characteristics and undertaken or missed activities. For instance, between the volumes of presented information, tempo of workshop activities and discussion there are close interdependence.

We hope that these analyses and conclusions may be of usefulness not only for project team and participants of workshops/conferences but also for International consortium, Ministry, the public in general and for similar projects and their public workshops in the future.

**MINISTRY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT  
PROTECTION**

**&**

**International consortium composed of  
FINNCONSULT Oy  
SCANDIACONSULT NATURA AB and  
Regional Environmental Center Country Office Yugoslavia**

**International Workshop  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT  
AND  
STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
Beograd, 13.12.2002**

**EVALUACIONI LIST / EVALUATION SHEET**

	Nedovoljno Not enough	Dovoljno Enough	Dobro Good
Prezentirane informacije <b>Presented information</b>			
Sadržaj Content			
Tempo Tempo			
Kvalitet ekspertskih prezentacija <b>Quality of experts' Presentations</b>			
Organizacija i oprema <b>Organization &amp; equipment</b>			
Diskusija <b>Discussion</b>			

**ŠTA JE NEDOSTAJALO / WHAT WAS MISSING**

--

**SUGESTIJE / SUGGESTIONS**

--

***Review of workshops/conferences: places, dates, topics***

Until now 13 workshops/conferences have held. Here are the list of them, with the places and dates of holding and the topics.

*List of workshops/conferences with the ordinals, places and dates of holding and topics*

1. Belgrade, 13.12.2002.	International workshop Environmental impact assessment and Strategic environmental assessment
2. Belgrade, 22.01.2003.	International workshop Integrated prevention and pollution control
3. Novi Sad, 30.01.2003.	First public Informative workshop with industrial companies of Vojvodina: Implementation of the integrated system of environmental protection
4. Niš, 25.02.2003.	Second public Informative workshop with industrial companies: Implementation of the integrated system of environmental protection
5. Kragujevac, 10.03.2003.	Third public Informative workshop with industrial companies: Implementation of the integrated system of environmental protection
6. Belgrade, 22.05.2003.	Public workshop on EIA, SEA and IPPC related regulations
7. Podgorica, 02.10.2003.	First public informative workshop Development of environmental legislation in Montenegro
8. Novi sad, 22.10.2003.	Second public informative workshop with industrial companies of the AP Vojvodina
9. Belgrade, 23.12.2003.	Public workshop on Emission limit values
10. Belgrade, 31.05.2004.	International conference Harmonization of environmental legislation of Serbia with EU requirements
11. Sremska Mitrovica, 07.07.2004	Public informative workshop with industrial companies of Srem: Development of integrated system of environmental protection
12. Novi Sad, 23.12.2004.	Public informative workshop: New environmental legislation in Serbia
13. Novi Sad, 25.04.2005.	Capacity building program, preparatory seminar

For less than 2.5 years Project team organized 13 workshops/conferences or about 5 per year. We estimate that it is an active mode of public dissemination of information about project activities in the field of new environmental regulation. These workshops/conferences were organized five times in Belgrade, four times in Novi Sad and by once in Podgorica, Niš, Kragujevac and Sremska Mitrovica. As we can see, there were in the same time two tendencies – of decentralized territorial covering and of some concentration of them in Belgrade and in Novi Sad. The second one is more expressive. More than a half of work-shops/conferences (7 of them) was held in winter, 3 in springs, 2 in autumn, and 1 in summer. This annual rank according to the seasons seems logically. Finally, we point out that there were three international workshops/conferences, and five with a lot of industrial companies, concerning to information, implementation and harmonization of our new environmental regulation with EU requirement.

***How oft evaluation sheets were filled in and handed over by participants of workshops/conferences***

Table 1

Workshop/conference	1) number of present persons at the beginning	2) number of registration participants	3) number of evaluation sheets handed over	% related to 1)	% related to 2)
1. Belgrade, 13.12.2002.	more than 90	–	40	more than 44,4	–
2. Belgrade, 22.01.2003.	–	106	51	-	48,1
3. Novi Sad, 30.01.2003.	–	63	8	-	12,7
4. Niš, 25.02.2003.	50	28	17	34,0	60,7
5. Kragujevac, 10.03.2003.	60	38	22	36,7	57,9
6. Belgrade, 22.05.2003.	110	89	49	44,5	55,1
7. Podgorica, 02.10.2003.	–	–	28	–	–
8. Novi sad, 22.10.2003.	–	–	38	–	–
9. Belgrade, 23.12.2003.	–	124	80	–	64,5
10. Belgrade, 31.05.2004.	–	–	53	–	–
11. Sremska Mitrovica, 07.07.2004.	–	–	7	–	–
12. Novi Sad, 23.12.2004.	150	–	74	49,3	–
13. Novi Sad, 25.04.2005.	–	95	60	–	63,2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1) 460</b>	<b>2) 543</b>	<b>1) 202 2) 287</b>	<b>43,9</b>	<b>52,9</b>

As the table 1 showed, less than a half of **persons present at the beginning** of the workshop (43,9%) filled in and handed over the evaluation sheets – about 1/3 in Niš (34,0%) and Kragujevac (36,7) and more than 40% in Belgrade (three times – 44,5%, 44,5% and 49,9%). But the percent of evaluation sheets filled in and handed over by **registration participants** (52,9%) are more favorable than in precedent case (43,9%). Except of extremely low percent Novi Sad (30.01.2003, only 12,7% - why?) and in some measure in Belgrade (22.01.2003, less than a half – 48,1%) in all other cases the percents approach to 2/3 of handed over sheets by registration participants: Belgrade (22.05.2003) 55,1%, Kragujevac 57,9%, Niš 60,7% and Novi Sad (25.04.2005) even 63,2% and Belgrade (23.12.2003) 64,5%.

The first datum shows that some officials, journalists and other participants "have not time" and they leave a workshop during the first or second coffee break (when the workshop evaluation sheets were spread amongst participants) and even before them and some another ones before the end of workshop. In addition to that, some people have not a habit to evaluate information obtaining from experts and organizers. We cannot suppose any other serious reasons. As an organization, there were also **some omissions** –in eight cases we have not the datum about the number of present persons at the beginning of the workshop and in six cases of the registration participants, in four cases neither one nor another (see table 1), so the percent of evaluation sheets filled in and handed over cannot be calculate. As well as the organizer had to be more "aggressive" and persistent in "propaganda" of evaluation and to accustom the participants to it.

### **General evaluation measured by average mark**

General evaluation of all aspects or characteristics in all workshop/conference activities was obtained so that the evaluations "not enough/unsatisfactory" were multiplied by 1, "enough/satisfactory" by 2, and "good" by 3, and then this sum (7519) was divided by all number of evaluations (3000). **Obtained average mark of 2, 51 is quite on the boundary of very favorable evaluation – it is right between evaluations enough/satisfactory and good** (table 2).

In the other way said, all aspects or characteristics of workshop/conference activities (presented information, content, tempo, quality of experts' presentation, organization and equipment, and discussion) are evaluate by the participants witch filled in and handed over the evaluation sheets in such a way that

**more than a half of these participants (or more exactly, near 3/5 or 57,1%) estimate that mentioned activities have been good, a bit more than 1/3 (36,4%) that they have been enough/satisfactory, and only 6,5% (or hardly each 15<sup>th</sup> participant) that they have been not enough/unsatisfactory.**

There are **not any temporal regularity** or correlation between workshop/conferences from average point of view, except that it is extremely winding and that two lowest average marks are noted at two last workshops/conferences.

The span (interval) of variations between the lowest mark (2, 27 in Novi Sad, 25.04.2005) and the highest one (2,83, again Novi Sad, 30.01.2003) is not so large (0,56). **All values of average marks are significant over the evaluation enough/satisfactory (2).**

It is very interesting that the highest (rank 1) and the lowest three average marks (ranks 11-13) is registration in Novi Sad workshops/conferences. Less extremely the participants evaluated in Belgrade (ranks 2-9) and in other places – Podgorica, Niš, Kragujevac, Sremska Mitrovica (from 3 to 10). **The average marks for workshops/conferences in these other places are 2,63, for Belgrade 2,60, and for Novi Sad 2,31.** While between other places and Belgrade almost there are not differences, between them and Novi Sad it is important. In the first case the mark is even very good, in the second one it is nearer to enough/satisfactory than to good.

Although differences between average marks are not so large, they could be divided into five groups.

- 1) The highest marks (2,80 and more), that are in fact excellent mark, have only Novi Sad (2,83) and Belgrade (2,80) – ranks 1-2. But the highest mark (2,83) is given by the least percent of registration participants which handed over their evaluation sheets (only 12,7%, tab 1) at one workshop (total evaluation only 23, tab 2).

Table 2

***Absolute and relative frequency, average mark and rank of total evaluation in all workshops/conferences***

workshop, conference	not enough, unsatisfactory		enough, satisfactory		good		total	average mark	rank
	no	%	no	%	no	%			
1. Belgrade, 13.12.2002.	16	6,8	82	35,0	136	58,2	234	2,51	7
2. Belgrade, 22.01.2003.	21	6,3	119	35,5	195	58,2	335	2,52	6
3. Novi Sad, 30.01.2003.	1	4,3	2	8,6	20	87,1	23	2,83	1
4. Niš, 25.02.2003.	3	7,3	18	43,9	20	48,8	41	2,41	10
5. Kragujevac, 10.03.2003.	2	3,6	24	43,6	29	52,8	55	2,49	8
6. Belgrade, 22.05.2003.	20	6,1	97	29,4	213	64,5	330	2,58	5
7. Podgorica, 02.10.2003.	5	3,0	37	22,6	122	74,4	164	2,71	3
8. Novi sad, 22.10.2003.	27	12,6	76	35,5	111	51,9	214	2,39	11
9. Belgrade, 23.12.2003.	4	0,8	85	18,0	384	81,2	473	2,80	2
10. Belgrade, 31.05.2004.	18	5,7	132	41,9	165	52,4	315	2,47	9
11. Sremska Mitrovica, 07.07.2004.	1	2,4	12	28,6	29	69,0	42	2,67	4
12. Novi Sad, 23.12.2004.	44	10,5	214	50,8	163	38,7	421	2,28	13
13. Novi Sad, 25.04.2005.	32	9,1	195	55,2	126	35,7	353	2,27	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>46,5</b>	<b>1093</b>	<b>36,4</b>	<b>1713</b>	<b>57,1</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>2,51</b>	<b>–</b>

- 2) The marks between 2,60-2,79 are very good (ranks 3-4). There were in Podgorica (2,71) and in Sremska Mitrovica (2,67).
- 3) The marks still nearer to the evaluation good than to the evaluation enough/satisfactory (2,50-2,59) were noted three times in Belgrade (ranks 5-7).
- 4) The group nearer to the evaluation enough/satisfactory than to the evaluation good (2,39-2,49) consists from four workshops – Kragujevac (2,49), Belgrade(2,47), Niš (2,41), and Novi Sad (2,39) – ranks 8-11.



- 5) Finally, the group still nearer or the nearest to the evaluation enough/satisfactory (2,27-2,28) make twice Novi Sad, in two last workshops/conferences (ranks 12-13).

Let's see figures in **percents of evaluations** good, enough/satisfactory and not enough/unsatisfactory because it makes precise and specifies average mark analyze. We can espy three groups of marks in the **evaluation good**.

- 1) In the first group there are excellent and very good marks – between 64,5% and 87,1% (ranks 1-5): Novi Sad 87,1%, Belgrade 81,2%, Podgorica 74,4%, Sremska Mitrovica 69,0%, and again Belgrade 64,5%.
- 2) In the second group there are workshops/conferences in the places where more than 50% and less than 59,5 evaluate project presentation activities as good (ranks 6-9 and 11): twice Belgrade by 58,2%, Kragujevac 52,8%, Belgrade 52,4%, and Novi Sad 51,9%.
- 3) Finally, the third group consists of three places where there are less than 50% participants with the evaluation good (ranks 10, 13,12): Niš 48,8%, Novi Sad 38,7% and again Novi Sad 35,7%.

As a **evaluation enough/satisfactory** only in two cases the percent is more than 50% – both of them in Novi Sad (55,2% and 50,8%, ranks 12-13, i.e. two latest ranks and as well as two latest workshop/conferences. More than 40% there are Niš(43,9%), Kragujevac (43,6%), and Sremska Mitrovica (41,9%) – ranks 10,8 and 9, more than 30% – Novi Sad, 35,9%, Belgrade 35,5% and again Belgrade 35,0% (ranks 11,6-7), more than 20% - Belgrade 29,4%, Sremska Mitrovica 28,6%, and Podgorica, 26,6% (ranks 5,4,3) and, finally, Belgrade 18,0% and Novi Sad, only 8,6% (ranks 2,1).

It is very visible that exists negative correlation between enough/satisfactory and good evaluations. If the evaluation good is higher, the evaluation enough/satisfactory is lower, and *vice versa*.

The basic characteristic of evaluation **not enough/unsatisfactory** is low percents. Only four workshops/conferences have a percent more than 7% - three times Novi Sad: 12,6%, 10,5%, 9,1%, and Niš 7,3% (ranks 11, 13, 12, 10). Three lowest percents – 0,8%, 2,4%, and 3,0% have the places with high ran of average mark (ranks 2,4,3) – Belgrade, Sremska Mitrovica, Podgorica. Here there is also negative correlation in relation to average mark, with some irregularities in the middle of the rank (between 3,6% and 6,8%).

In conclusion of this part of the work we can say that the average mark is determinate by positive correlation of the evaluation good (almost 3/5) and in less measure by negative correlations with the evaluation enough/satisfactory (more than 1/3) and not enough/unsatisfactory (1/15).

### ***Basic characteristics of workshops/conferences***

Let's see the basic characteristics of workshops/conferences (table 3). It shows that between the number of evaluations and average marks exists almost ideal positive correlation. As the average mark is higher, the number of evaluations is higher, too. So we have two indicators of degree of evaluations, which are in close relation. Evidently, more often are evaluated the characteristics with higher mark and more rare with lower one.

Table 3

#### ***Basic characteristics of workshops/conferences: absolute and relative frequency of evaluations, number of marks, average mark and rank***

characteristics	not enough, unsatisfactory		enough, satisfactory		good		total, number of marks		Average mark	rank
	no	%	no	%	no	%	no	%		
<b>1.Content</b>	11	2,1	184	35,5	323	62,4	518	98,3	2,60	1
<b>2. Presented information</b>	13	2,5	200	38,7	304	58,8	517	98,1	2,56	2-3
<b>3. quality of experts' presentation</b>	24	5,1	162	34,2	287	60,7	473	89,8	2,56	2-3
<b>4. organization and equipment</b>	27	5,8	142	32,4	290	61,8	469	89,0	2,55	4
<b>5.tempo</b>	39	8,4	197	42,2	231	49,4	467	88,6	2,41	5
<b>6. discussion</b>	78	17,3	178	39,6	194	43,1	450	85,4	2,23	6

Number of handed over evaluation sheets      527

Differences between “content” and “discussion” as characteristics or aspects of workshops/conferences don't seem so much – 68 evaluations or 12,9% and 0,37 into average mark. But there are some significant differences and we will discuss them.

**The highest number of evaluations** (more than 98%) and in the same time **the highest average marks** (2,60 and 2,56) have the characteristics **content and presented information**. That is very good, because other characteristics are some kind of “logistics” to them. Then follow quality of experts’ presentations, organization and equipment and tempo (about 89% or about 10% less than precedent case) and with average marks of 2,56, 2,55 and 2,41. Nevertheless, the average marks of **quality of experts’ presentations and of organization and equipment** are almost entirely approach to characteristics **content and presented information** making **the very good marks** (2,60-255), nearer to the evaluation good than to the enough/satisfactory one. In the same time, **tempo**, with the average mark of 2,41 is nearer to the evaluation enough/satisfactory than to the good one and with the **discussion** (2,23) make **the lowest evaluate characteristics**.

There are very regular negative correlation between the evaluation not enough/unsatisfactory and the height of average mark. This regularity is of importance only to the end of two other evaluations (for evaluation tempo and discussion). But in the middle and in the top of them there is an inversion. The lowest evaluation enough/satisfactory have characteristics organization and equipment (32,9%) and quality of experts’ presentation (34,2%). In the same time, the highest percent of evaluation good has the content as a characteristic, but the organization and equipment has percent of evaluation good (61,8%) higher than the quality of experts’ presentation (60,7%) and the presented information (58,8%). In all case, that is a fine compliment for organizational and experts’ structures of the project team.

It will be very interesting to point at **maximum and minimum percents of evaluation good** and every here and there at other two evaluations. That gives opportunities to the project team to further analyze undertaken and missed activities before and during workshops/conferences. As the rank of average mark of some characteristic is lower, as the number of missed activities are larger, including more remarks in boxes “what was missing” and “suggestions”. In a qualitative analyze we will point out at some of these insufficiencies and suggestions. As an analyze of percents better discover the structure of evaluations and their extremes than an analyze of average mark, which synthesize but as well as cover them, we will use the second one only in some cases and in a specific way.

- 1. Content.** More than 80% of evaluation good were noted in Novi Sad, 30.01.2003 (87,1%), Sremska Mitrovica (85,7%) and Belgrade, 23.12.2003 (85,0%). Less than 50% were twice at Novi Sad –25.04.2005.

(40,0%) and 23.12.2004. (49,3%), with average mark less than 2,50 (2,37 and 2,45). In two last cases the evaluation enough/satisfactory were participated even by 56,7% and 47,9%. Only in two cases the average mark of this characteristic (Belgrade, 22.05.2003 = 2,54 and Podgorica = 2,68) were lower than average mark of all six characteristics of respective workshops (2,58 and 2,71). Let's note that at Belgrade workshop (22.05.2003.) was 10,6% participants with the evaluation not enough/unsatisfactory. That is five time higher percent that the average one is – only 2,1%.

2. **Presented information.** In the same workshops, but more extremely, there are the maximum – Novi Sad, with 100% of evaluation good and the average mark of 3,00 (the unique case into all workshops) and Belgrade with 87,5% on one side and twice Novi Sad by minimum on the other – only 25,4% and 46,6% of evaluation good and even 66,7% and 50,7% of evaluation enough/satisfactory. Only three times the average mark of presented information is lower than that one of all six characteristics in respective cases – twice 0,10 and once 0,13 (Novi Sad, 25.04.2005, Sremska Mitrovica and again Belgrade, 22.05.2003. On the other side, at Novi Sad workshop of 22.10.2003. The average mark was higher for 0, 24.
3. **Quality of experts' presentations.** The maximum (more than 90%) of „good” evaluation was in Belgrade, 31.05.2003. – impressive 93,7% and in Podgorica – 92,9%. The minimum was less than 1/3 – both again in Novi Sad: 23.12.2004 – 32,8% and 24.04.2005 – only ¼ or 25,4%, with respective 57,5% and 59,3% of evaluation enough/satisfactory, and 9,6% and 15,3% of not enough/unsatisfactory one. This last mark (15,3%) was registration in Belgrade, 22.05.2003. too. Three times „quality of experts' presentations” mark were less than respective average mark of six characteristics: minus 0,55, 0,06 and 0,17 (Novi Sad, Belgrade, Novi Sad – ordinal numbers 6,12 and 13<sup>th</sup> in table 2.

There are **some temporal regularities** or at least coincidences – all these extreme values were registration in **the second part of dates** when the workshops/conferences were held (from number 6-13, table 2). Maybe to it contributes the fact that from 3<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> workshop there are not data concerning this characteristic (and organization and equipment and tempo, too). Only to illustrate that: the next higher average mark (for 0,18) was in Belgrade, 22.01.2003, i.e. ordinal number 3, in table 2.

**3-4. Charring of the workshop** is a characteristic, which is, evaluated only twice in Belgrade 22.01.2003 and 22.05.2003. On both of them the average marks were very good: 2,80 and 2,71, with 0,28 and 0,13 better mark than that were the average marks for six other characteristics in respective workshops, and with 82,0% and 72,9% of evaluation good. Moreover, this characteristic, which is somewhere between „organization and equipment” and „quality of experts’ presentations”, is the best evaluated one, with average mark of 2,76. Of course, only two workshops are not enough representative for this evaluation but it is an indicative datum.

**4. Organization and equipment.** This characteristic is toward the average mark (2,55) almost in the same level as the quality of experts’ presentation (2,56), but with much less extreme evaluations. Certainly, some degree of uniformity or standardization of organization and equipment in all workshops/conferences is very desirable. More than 80% of evaluation good was in Belgrade (23.12.2003) 83,7% and in Podgorica 82,1% and less than 50% in Novi Sad (23.12.2004) 31,5% and again in Novi Sad (but now 22.10.2003) 41,7%. This time the last conference in Novi Sad (25.04.2005) has even 61% of evaluation good and 39% of enough/satisfactory one.

Evidently, the lowest average mark (2,27) and evaluation good (35,75) of the **last Novi Sad conference** (ordinal number 13 in table 2, 25.04.2005) is not the result of organization and equipment (2,55 and 61%) and content (2,37 and 40,0%) already of quality of experts’ presentations (2,10 and 25,4%), presented information (2,17 and 25,4%), tempo (2,17 and 35,1%) and particularly discussion (only 2,10 and 27,1%).

In opposite, in relation to the other characteristics, in Novi Sad workshop (no 8, 22.10.2003) was 19,4% of evaluation not enough/unsatisfactory, with the average mark 2,22 (less than the average mark of all characteristic into this workshop for 0,17).

**5. Tempo.** More than 50% of evaluation good was in five cases: Podgorica 75,0%, Belgrade (no 9) 69,2%, Belgrade (no. 6) 60,4%, Sremska Mitrovica 57,1%, and Novi Sad (no 8) 54,3%. Less than 50% of evaluation good was into: Novi Sad (no 12) 37,4%, Novi Sad (no) 35,1%, Belgrade (no 2) 38,0%, Belgrade (no 100) 39,6%, and Belgrade (no 1) 48,7%.

Novi Sad, Niš and Kragujevac are not evaluations for this characteristic.

More than 50% of evaluation enough/satisfactory was only in two workshops/conferences – Belgrade (no 2) 60,0% and Novi Sad (no 13) 54,4%.

In the second part of workshops/conferences were the highest percents of evaluation not enough/unsatisfactory – three times in Novi Sad (no) 20,0%, (no 12) 18,1%, (no 13) and 10,5% and once in Belgrade (no 10) 15,1%.

Only in two cases the average mark of the characteristic tempo was higher of the average of all other characteristics – Podgorica (no 7) 0,03 and Belgrade (no 6) 0,02.

These data show that the tempo was „overstrained” and „furious” already to all workshops/conferences.

**5. Discussion.** The lowest average mark and the least evaluation good the participants of workshop/conferences given to this characteristic. Only in Belgrade, 22.05.2003. (2,75) this mark was higher than the average mark for all characteristics (for 0,17). In all 12 other cases this mark was less than respective average. The lowest two average marks (under 2,00) were in Belgrade (no 2) 1,86 and in Novi Sad (no 8) 1,87. Something over 2,00 were in Belgrade (no 10) 2,02 and in Niš (no 4) 2,03.

More than 50% of “good” evaluation was in five cases: Belgrade (no 6) 77,1%, Novi Sad (no 3) 71,4%, Belgrade (no 9) 66,7%, Sremska Mitrovica (no 11) 60,0%, and Podgorica (no 7) 50,0%.

The list of the lowest “good” evaluation is as follow: Belgrade (no 2) 22,2%, Novi Sad (no 8) 25,8%, Kragujevac (no 5) 26,7%, Novi Sad (no 13) 27,1% and again Novi Sad (no 12) 29,4%, Belgrade (no 1) 33%, Niš (no 4) 36,3%, and Belgrade (no 10) 38,7%.

The highest evaluation enough/satisfactory was in Kragujevac 60,0% and twice in Novi Sad – (no 13) 55,9% and (no 12) 51,0%.

Even more than 30% of evaluation not enough/unsatisfactory was in these cases: Novi Sad (no 8) 38,7%, and twice in Belgrade, at the beginning of workshops – (no 2) 36,1% and (no 10) 30%.

The last low evaluation not enough/unsatisfactory was in Sremska Mitro-  
vica (no 11) 0 and in Belgrade (no 6) 2,1%. All other was between 13,6%  
(no 5) and 19,6% (no 12).

### *What was missing and suggestions*

We don't dispose of datum on empty evaluation sheets in the boxes what was missing and suggestions. Nevertheless, on the indirect way, according to the number of remarks and suggestions, we can tell that at least 61,3% of sheets doesn't contain them. This percent is somewhat higher than the percent of participants (57,1) which given the evaluation good to the public project workshops/conferences. Perhaps the participants were in a hurry at the end of workshops/conferences but it is evidently that we have to get used a necessity and a usefulness of evaluation and giving concrete remarks, suggestions and proposals.

In response to the question „What was missing?” or giving suggestions certain participants said: „Nothing”; „Not any”; „All was OK”; „The events are interesting and deserve attendance”; „What I have seen as by now is at a satisfactory level”; „Particularly useful Workshop” (no 6); „I am fully satisfied with presentations and discussions. Organization was at a high level. Thank you”; „What was presented is a pioneering task – it was time to make things tidy and impose the obligation for environment protection. Discussion was different and that is the reason that they are making wholeness”; „The project is open, tolerant and educative one”; „First time we do have the draft law and draft regulations prepared in parallel”; „Continue this way!”; „Continue with work which will for sure have results”.

Giving general comments, related to the realization of the phase I of the project, at Belgrade workshop (no 6, 22.05.2003.), one participant wrote: „Notwithstanding the number of important remarks on the solutions contained in the draft Regulations, I consider the procedure and this kind of public participation as a right one in our country. That is for highest degree of evaluation and good final results may be expected. It is for sure that the team working on this during the Phase I had to work hardly. Easier is to us, the public, to take part at the workshops and give remarks. But we are here with that aim. In any case, I am fully supporting further work of this tem. We need this as the desert needs the water. Without this we cannot enter the world and the world cannot come to us...”.

But there were opposite opinions that put in question whole job. Here are two such opinions, from Novi Sad workshop (no 12, 23.12.2004.), which, perhaps, illustrated the critical spirit of the latest two workshops/conferences (no 12-13) in this city. A sheet with evaluation „not satisfactory” comprising all the criteria (characteristics) contains the following text:” Totally wrong approach! We are trying to „get closer” to EU by „sorting” the legal provisions... We do not miss legal provisions, but enforcement of them. With that fact, we hardly could have search a way towards EU... All in all – administration again or better to say; in continuation. Right job for administration!”. Another one wrote:” The presentations comprised only reading of the laws. The laws are being enacted, but in many cases their enforcements is not possible. For example, business dos not respect laws; there are no investments. Municipalities do not have regulated very basic issues connected to the problems at the agenda (for example – depositing of hazardous waste, processing of industrial waste)“ The third remark: „To much empty words in bad English” (Belgrade, no 10, 31.05.2004).

Here are the review of remarks, suggestions and proposals classified, if possible, according to the main evaluated workshop criteria or characteristics. Many comments content several related characteristics and we also discuss them, pointing out their interdependence.

**The least comments were dedicated to the presented information and content of workshops/conferences.** It is understandably because they were two the best evaluated characteristics. There were some suggestions concerning not to presented information and contents but to **information about the project and missing contents.**

„Information on the Project is a high level” (Belgrade, no 2, 2201.2003). But – „There not in information when the Law on the System of Environment Protection will be enacted” and „most of the information about air are missing”. „Co-operation of participants – attending the Workshop with the project group is important, because it is possible to collect all the information needed to the Project through by the “shortest way”. The participant is the Project „collaborate” in collecting of data”. In additional notes there are data about present media, some companies that proposed further communication wit the project. There was the request of list of participations and experts (with contact addresses, telephone and e-mail) because of communication and to inform a bigger number of companies about project activities. One proposal from Kragujevac: „It should be formed a joint team of journalists from different parts of the



country, which would follow the Project implementation *in continuo*, i.e. which would in time inform the public through the public media on all relevant aspects of the Project implementation, and which would be connected with the Project Office and provide it with feedback from the field". There were pleadings for more information for general public (web site, TV, newspapers). For example, regular informing of general public of the biggest polluters; even before the enactment of new legislation".

On the **presented content** there was not a lot of remarks. „Content of great importance" (Sremska Mitrovica); One participant graded the content for water as excellent and for air as very good (Belgrade, no 9); „Content is oversized" Novi Sad, no 13); „pointing out the content of expert' presentations" (Belgrade, no 1) and „The content of the EIA should be clearly defined" (two participants, Belgrade, no 1). On the content what was missing there was a lot of remarks, suggestions and proposals, but about that we will say something later.

At least 28 out of 527 participants, who handed over evaluation sheets (5,3%) gave comments about the **tempo**. It was „too fast", even „very fast, so it is impossible to write down". There was missing "one more day" and "it was possible to divide the Conference in two separate parts. That would be the way for avoidance of overload with information" (Belgrade, no 10). „Total lasting of the Workshop was all right, but the time schedule for discussion should be enhanced at the account of presentations". There was not "a control of time". „The Program time of schedule was not respected". To four participants was missing a coffee break ("for renewal of attention" and "also as possibility to make contacts") and to another one "longer pause for lunch". Even for 11 participants there was not enough time for discussion. It was necessarily to have "enough time for all presenters or limited time for their presentations". A suggestion was: "Stick to the time planned for presentations". Evidently, for some participants "time" or "tempo" was the problem because of "many information for a short time" and "to many presentations in a short time, and it was not time enough for discussion".

There were about 90 comments on a **quality of experts' presentations** what was almost each sixth or about 17% out of 527 handed over evaluation sheets. Some of them were positive - "Acceptable"; "There is need for more this kind of presentations". Three participants graded the quality of experts' presentations as „excellent". Another ones were negative – „Experts are experts in their branches, but there are poor presenters". All other comments were concer-

ning to some characteristics of presentations, as followed. Even 13 remarks were on the **length of presentations**: „long presentations”; „all presentations was to long”; „shorter presentations”; „presentations should be shorter”; „better timing for experts”; „limiting the time for presentations”; „more condensed and shorter presentations”; „certain presentations were slow, prolonged...”

As a **speed and dynamics**, there were opposite evaluations:” slower presentations”; „more dynamics in the way of presentations” (3 times); „presentations should be fast exposed to make certain positive dynamics”; “high speed of presentation caused impossibility to follow experts”; “to many presentations in a short time”; „to fast presentations (dynamics) reduced on expositions of the chapters of the laws”; „certain presentations were monotonous, reduced on formless reading of prepared presentations and as such they did not occupy attentions of participants – such presentations make the impression that there is not enough personal motivations of presenters, what was not good”.

Here are some another remarks on the **way of presentations**: „there was to much of repeating “ (3 times), and „to much of texts and reading, having in view that all was given in the binders”; „punting out the content of experts’ presentations”; „the most important issues should be pointed out and presented in a picturesque way”; „all presentations have to much of text. They should be more clearly and with less amount of text (only key notions, if possible). Presenter should say other. In other case the participants are not able to follow presentation with due attention”; „the presentations did not suggested discussion”; „not to leave everything (for discussion), but certain questions clarify during presentation”.

A certain number of participants estimated there were **not enough accordance and coordination** between some elements of presentations or presenters: „Experts do not have to read material. If the material is given to the participants and if it is good enough, they should only make their short review”; “Presentation of experts (power point) or slides should be integral part of the experts’ contribution, due to the fact that they differed from the papers in binders”; Less reading, more explanations”; „Shorter presentations, with more table and graphs”; „The tables with certain presentation could be more easy for review”; „Some presentations were not in accordance with the presented material where are the EU Directives (without any comment)”; „To coordinate the preparation and presentation of different experts”; „Non-accordance of experts in the interpretation of legal provisions and their not enough knowledge of the whole of presented laws”.

Nevertheless, the main remark not only to lecturers and their presentations but also *in general* was concerning to the **adjustment to the audience, implementation, concretization, practical examples, direct answers**. Such comments were about 40 or almost a half of total ones concerning to the quality of experts' presentations. „The lecturers should be brought closer to the audience” and „efficient enough in giving answers”, with more „practical examples”, „implementation”, concretization”, „concrete answers to clear questions”, „direct answer on the concrete question”, „examples for each law”, „personal” and “domestic experiences”.

„It is important to note that experts agreed and allow the organizers to give chance for evaluation of their presentations to the participants” – wrote in the note the team leader about Belgrade workshop, no 2, 22.03. 2003. At this workshop **the evaluations of individual experts' presentations** was as followed: non-satisfactory 2,4%, good 60,9% and excellent 36,7%. The average mark was 2,34, the span of marks between 2,17 and 2,58. The worst marks were given to the experts with „lack of visual presentation” (2,17; 2,19; 2,21). Not more better were they with „to long and dull” one (2,26 and 2,39) and the experts presented the paper of missing expert (2,21 and 2,27). “Concise”, „clear” and „useful” presentations were evaluate by 2,58; 2,50; 2,42. Foreign presentations (2,40) were something better evaluated than domestic ones (2,31).

The second evaluation of individual presentations was in Novi Sad, no 8, 22.10.2003. In this case, the evaluation was academic, from 5 to 10. The average mark was very good – 8,15, i.e. 8,50, if we exclude the mark 5 (twice) given to two absent political functionaries (one of republic, another of provincial level). Once was noted the average mark 10. Unfortunately, these evaluations not to be useful and of value without descriptions of their characteristics. In all cases, this kind of evaluation may be an additional motivation for expert.

To the **discussion** were dedicated about 35 comments or 6,6% of handed over evaluation sheets (each 15<sup>th</sup>). Evaluation was between „not satisfactory” and „very qualitative”. There was a remark „not enough” and a suggestion „more discussion”. It was not time enough for discussion (9 comments), „for in-depth explanations of more important parts of experts' contributions”. It was „demotivated”, should be „better structured”, with „lack of questions and comments of the participants”, compactness of the group declined during discussion („it is rude”). Some discussions were „huge and no adequately concrete”, they „should provide more concrete data”. There were suggestions for shorter discussions, limiting the time to 5 or even 3 minutes. „It is good to pre-

vent endless discussions that lead nowhere – it should be stricter”, for preventing „pensioners and non-professionals from discussion (often they give the lectures) on the subjects having no connection with the agenda”. „Discussion should be initiated by moderator”. „Informing of participants... would improve discussion”. „The proposal is that participants should put their questions in written form after the longest coffee break. In that way the experts would be able to prepare the answers. The participants would more time for preparation of better questions. Organizers should make the review of the questions in order to avoid duplication of questions”. „Discussion about practice, implemented technological solutions that would be in compliance with directives and standards, from other countries or ours (if they exist)” was missing. „If there is no discussion enough, the chairperson should facilitate the discussion in order to provide different opinions”. From this reason, it has to be „more dialogue”.

Even about 100 remarks or 19% of handed over evaluation sheets (almost each 5<sup>th</sup>) concerned to **organization and equipment**. The most of them –about 35 was related to workshop **material**: not enough or lack of material (8 comments), no distributed in time or in advance (10), no prepared for easy presentation, not completed, lack of material translated into Serbian (7), presentations should be on CD, power point, web site, e-mail, including addresses, etc. The interpreters should know a little better the terminology (5 comments). There were remarks on „human conditions of works” (fresh air or air conditioner, mineral water, coffee, shape of the room, wardrobe, sound, audio facilities, logistics). Invitations should delivered in time, low level of participants in comparison with invitations, certain invited speakers was not participating (in one case more than 50%). Especially it was mentioned lack of representatives of business sector and some companies, Ministry for National Resources and environmental Protection (15 comments) and other Ministries (for urbanism and planning, building, capital investments, tourism = 9). One participant proposed „more unique methodology of work” and another one wrote that „charring person does not have to answer all questions and should try to respect other speakers”.

In addition, several participants gave some **suggestions and proposals about organization**: to hold more often workshops, to include more experts, professionals or collaborators from local level and companies, institutes of health and standardization, mayors, producers, polluters, to get plastic ID, for improving communication between participants, „to take into account the opinion of the public” and „all constructive remarks should be built into the draft texts”.

Some **other issues and topics** were proposed too: to organize a workshop about EIA, to public all secondary legislation, to give review of the environmental conditions in Serbia, to implement inter-sector, multidisciplinary and human ecological approach, to define which persons could be experts for EIA, to include economy and education aspects and topics about soil, water, air, hazardous waste, the waste processing and reuse, galvanization and thermo processing, energy of Sun, monitoring, inspections. „It should be considered that this kind of public workshops last 2-3 days”.

In conclusion, we can say that a lot of these proposals and suggestions have been realized during the next worksshops/conferences. We are absolutely agreed with the proposal of one participant: „Evaluation sheet should be offered at the all public events like this”.