INTERNATIONALE AKADEMIE
für innovative Pädagogik, Psychologie und Ökonomie gGmbH (INA) an der Freien Universität Berlin

Freie Universität Berlin

Büro für psychosoziale Prozesse
Office for Psychosocial Issues

Priv. Doz. Dr. David Becker
Tel: +49 30 8385 2362
Fax: +49 30 83852130
e-mail: david.becker@fu-berlin.de

Final report

Review of the Organizational Structure / Organizational Development Perspectives of the Mental Health Project in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Mandated by:	SDC, Swiss Development Cooperation,
Contract number:	81017729
Project number:	7F-06515.01.01
Date:	July 18, 2013
Author:	**PD Dr. David Becker**

Content

1 List of Abbreviations

BIH   Bosnia and Herzegovina

FBIH   Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina

MHP   Mental Health Project

OPSI   Office for Psychosocial Issues

RS   Republika Srpska

SDC   Swiss development Cooperation

XY   Association XY

2 Executive Summary

The present review, mandated by SDC, was carried out in May and June 2013. The objective was to review the functionality of the current organizational structure of the mental health project in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In spite of an overall rather positive project outcome up to the present, a series of conflicts and difficulties had also become apparent in the project team, which could not be overcome or solved easily. Before starting the second project phase SDC decided thus evaluate the situation through an external expert.

Using a process oriented methodology the review was carried out in two steps by interviewing all stake holders once in Sarajevo and once in Banja Luka, and carrying out two prolonged meetings/evaluative workshops with the project team. In the second team discussion findings where checked with the team, specific conflicts discussed and potentials for future change presented. Finally the existing written material and the findings of individual and collective discussions were summed up and analyzed by the consultant. SWAT analysis was applied.

The review showed very clearly, that serious problems have existed for some time in the project team, which is less the result of personal problems and much more the result of a dysfunctional and rather contradictory project structure. For the future, if nothing changes, the risk of burn out in the project team as well as the risk of important deficiencies in efficiency and efficacy in the project outputs and outcomes is seen as high.

Structural changes alongside with supportive measures are finally proposed and focus on the following:

- Clearer project leadership structures and overcoming of unnecessary confusion and dissociation between administrative and content project coordination;
- Overcoming of project staff disequilibrium between RS and Federation by taking into account structural differences between both project components;
- Augmenting number of project officers;
- Strengthening of team cohesion and coherence by stronger focus on joint professional task and clarity of team membership;
- Setting up of a coaching structure to accompany the team and contain them emotianlly and relationally.

3   Background

3.1   The Project

The Mental Health Project (MHP) in Bosnia & Herzegovina (BiH) which is financed by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) was launched in June 2011. The first phase of this project ends in December 2013 and will be followed by an additional 4-year-phase. The MHP's overall goal is to improve the general mental health of the population of BiH and to enhance the capacities of policy makers and competent institutions for reaching European standards in Mental Health Care. The project is carried out all over BiH, that is in the Federation of BiH (FBiH), which has a decentralized health system administration with 10 cantonal administrations and in the Republika Srpska (RS) with a centralized health system administration. The project pursues four interrelated lines of intervention:

a. Development of Regulatory and Financial Framework
b. Education and Continuous Training of Mental Health Care Staff
c. Education and Continuous Training of Managers for Mental Health Care Institutions
d. Strengthening Users' Advocacy Capacities and Changing of Attitudes towards Persons with Mental Disorders

The Project Organizational Structure includes the Project Team with a Project Manager (100 %), 2 Entity Leaders of the RS (50 % time each), 1 Entity Leader of the FBiH (100 %), all of which are appointed by their respective Health Ministries, 4 project officers (2 per Entity, 100 % time each) and 2 logistic officers (1 per Entity, 100 % time each). It furthermore includes the Association XY (XY) which is in charge of the administration of the project. It does not act as project implementer but supports project implementation to the performance of financial and administrative tasks. The Entity Ministries of Health are the key project holders and have both appointed Assistant Ministers in their Ministries as contact persons and coordinators for project related issues within their Ministries. The Ministry of Civil Affairs of BiH ensures continuous coordination of reform-aimed activities supported by the project. Swiss partners and donors include SDC and the Swiss canton of Geneva, Jura, Bern and Fribourg. The Swiss cantons also provide experts and advisory support in the Project. Finally there is a steering committee (SC), which is composed of the representatives of the BiH Ministry of Civil Affairs, Entity Health Ministers, Brzko District and the donors (SDC and Swiss canton). The main SC task is to supervise project implementation and strategically steer the work of the project team.

In the past three years it has become obvious (according to SDC) "that not only the complexity of the project's organizational structure but also its ambiguity in terms of roles and responsibilities, poses significant problems to the effective implementation of the MHP". SDC has noted confusions regarding duties and tasks and frequent conflicts in the project team. Lines of Authority and Accountability between the numerous actors seem to be unclear, levels of hierarchy not well defined. The project team is envisioned by the project as <u>one</u> project team but tends to function more like two project teams. Only the project manager is not allocated to one of the two Entities. Finally the relationship between project team and project administration through XY is unclear.

Although the output of the project has been satisfactory the mentioned difficulties provoke doubts about the future efficiency and efficacy of the project. This has led to SDC's decision to ask for an external review of the situation.

3.2 The Task of the Review

In the terms of reference the consultant is asked to systematically analyze and critically assess the MHP's organizational structure for needed changes in the project setup. Specifically he is asked to determine whether the existing structure is appropriate for the next project phase. If the answer is "yes" then he is supposed to propose measures which avoid conflicts in the future. If the answer is "no" then he is supposed to propose alternative project organizational structures, potential changes and job descriptions, recommend other actions and mechanisms to reinforce effective team work and to raise the awareness and understanding or the required changes in the team members and in project stake holders. Some of the key issues to be addressed by the review are

- Project setup
- Agreement on objectives
- Decision making process
- Internal team dynamics
- Organizational learning.

4   Methodology

Given the task it was paramount to speak with all stake holders and register their opinions. It was furthermore necessary to have collective discussions with the project team so the existence of potential conflicts between them could be directly observed. Finally it was important to choose a review strategy that would not in and of itself constitute an element of aggravated conflict. Also it had to be taken into account that the project team actually works in two different places (Sarajevo and Banja Luka) and thus needed to be observed within their "natural habitat".

Beyond studying the written project progress reports, project setup and job descriptions the consultant decided on a two-phase approach. At first he visited Sarajevo and there carried out two types of activities:

1. A prolonged discussion with the whole project team

2. Individual conversations with

- The Assistant Minister of Health of the Federation, Dr Goran Cerkez

- The project manager, Darko Paranos

- The director of Association XY, Emina Osmanagic; and the project accountant, Sabaheta Rizvanovic

- The Entity leader of the Federation, Dzenita Hrelja-Hasecic

- The project officer 1 of the Federation, Selma Kukic

- The project officer 2 of the Federation, Selma Medmedic-Dzonlic

About two weeks later the consultant travelled to Banja Luka and there, once again, proceeded with two types of activities.

1. A second collective discussion with the whole project team in which the consultant presented the group also with some of his impressions and allowed them to comment on them

2. Individual conversations with the following persons:

- The Assistant Minister of Health and Social Welfare of RS, Dr Milan Latinovic

- Entity leader 1 of RS, Dr Biljana Lakic

- Entity leader 2 of RS, Tatjana Popovic

- Project officer 1 of RS, Zvjezdana Stjepanovic

- Project officer 2 of RS, Tanja Bajic

The multiple conversations were recorded (see the documentary appendix of all audio files on CD). The chosen two-phase approach allowed for a development of a discussion in the project team and also for the possibility of seeing the project team interact in two different occasions and two different locations. The individual conversations allowed stake holders to explain their opinions in a more direct way. From all of these conversations and analyzing the written material it was possible to draw rather clear and straight forward conclusions. In terms of the diagnosis of the problem by the consultant it was possible to check the conformity or unconformity of this diagnosis by the project team during the second visit.

The structure of this report is to first present the findings in the different conversations. Thus the two conversations with the project team, the conversations with the project manager, with the manager and accountant of XY, with the project staff in the federation and with the project staff of the RS, and with the deputy health ministers in the RS and in the Federation are summed up. The in the analytical chapter first of all the general question is discussed if the findings permit to assume there is an important problem or not. Then a SWOT analysis is carried out. Finally on the basis of all this Recommendations are given on how to solve the existing problems.

5 Findings

5.1 Conversations with the Project Team

In the conversation with the project team in Sarajevo the consultant shortly explained the objectives of the review and then asked participants to give examples of positive and of problem situations in the project. This was facilitated through a guided fantasy. The whole team initially was very careful and reluctant to talk about conflicts. Actually some team members expressed profound surprise about the fact that the review was being carried out. It was stated that probably this was just a prejudice on the side of SDC who maybe was not informed correctly about the project. After all the project output had been positive so what was there to worry about? Others mentioned that in the beginning there had been problems but that many of these problems had been overcome. Everybody emphasized how good and without problem the local cooperation was within the sub-teams, i.e. the RS team and the Federation team. In spite of these initial observations, after an hour or so, rather strong discussions erupted with very direct and explicit mutual criticisms, actually obliging the consultant to intervene very directly to partially control the situation. The discussion focused on two issues:

1. The first one was a criticism by the Entity leaders from RS expressing doubts about the project manager and putting the question whether he speaks for the project or only for the donor.
2. The second issue referred to a conflict around a planned publication where the question was if this would be two separate publications by the RS and the Federation or only one. Apparently the original plan was to do one and finally it was done separately.

Although all participants agreed that finally the whole issue had been solved exactly as the Entity leaders from RS had proposed it did not change the fact that they felt that the project manager had not handled the situation well. In terms of group dynamics the consultant was impressed with how aggressively this criticism was expressed and how much basic human respect was ignored by some of the participants while others silently observed. The project manager reacted to all of this very calmly but it was visible how carefully he was trying to not react with unproductive anger and how reluctant he was to directly confront the situation. When the consultant finally expressed that at least there could be no doubt that they were having a conflict with each other all agreed. But the capacity to objectively discuss this issue was obviously limited. In spite of all the shouting that had been going on during the official discussion it was also impressive to see how during the lunch break everybody talked quite nicely with each other.

In summary in this first conversation with the team it became very obvious that the team has serious internal conflicts. The most visible part of this conflict appears to be between the project manager and the RS Entity leaders. But it was also possible to see other issues:

- Parts of the team do not respect the project manager as the project leader. They think that only they know how to do the work.
- There is a strong visible difference between the professional identity of the RS Entity leaders who are Mental Health professionals and the Federation Entity leader who is not a Mental Health expert. Although they get along well enough with each other a professional discourse in the group is clearly monopolized by the RS Entity leaders.
- Between the project components there is a certain level of criticism because of the different "velocities" in the Federation and in the RS. Everybody acknowledges that the implementation of the project is more complex in the Federation because of the different administrative structure but that does not change the fact that there is a certain level of frustration between the "slow ones" and the "fast ones".
- The project officers sometimes end up in a complicated situation because they have a rather big group of bosses above them who sometimes give them contradictory indications.
- The Health Ministry in the Federation seems to intervene quite directly with the project team without always using the correct channel. In the RS this problem apparently does not exist but the Entity leaders clearly understand themselves less as part of a project team and more as members of their Ministry.
- There is visibly no real connective team spirit although there is apparently a clear capacity to work together.
- The project manager is visibly trying to develop a project team conscience but is not really accompanied in this by his team members.
- Another issue in this first group conversation was the fact that especially one of the Entity leaders from RS seemed to feel the need to constantly defend herself of potential accusations against her or the RS team although in reality nobody expressed such accusations. It was not possible to receive an answer from her about the 'why' of this defensive behavior.

In the second conversation with the project team the consultant summed up his observations to the project team. The project team basically confirmed the adequacy of the diagnosis: They agreed that there were conflicts between them, they agreed that problems were worse in the beginning and better now, they agreed that several problems still persisted, they agreed that the role of the project

manager was ambiguously defined and did not make his role easy, they agreed that there was mistrust in the group and they wholeheartedly agreed that the project had been successful up to now but at a very high personal price and unacceptable levels of permanent stress. As to how to solve such problems they visibly had rather contradictory ideas. The project officers from the RS and the Federation expressed a certain willingness to work towards a better cooperation and the existence of a real project team. The Entity leaders from the RS expressed more doubts about so much need for intensive collaboration and seemed to prefer that every team works for themselves. All participants agreed that it was a good idea to see that the project situation is different in the Federation than in RS, and being more complicated in the Federation a real equilibrium between the teams could only be achieved by augmenting the Federation staff. But at this point also criticism was repeated, that the Federation Staff on the level of the Entity Leaders hat changed several times, while RS had been personally and professionally constant. On all sides it was felt that more staff might be helpful on both sides.

Another issue brought up by the consultant was the fact that the term "Entity Leader" is confusing for the project since what is relevant is their professional expertise. This was acknowledged by everybody. Nevertheless, it was also highlighted again that the linkage to each Ministry is a key feature of the project that must be protected in the future. Suggestions by the consultant to define the role of the project manager in a clearer way, giving him a real chance to lead the project team, was not well received by the RS Entity Leaders (the Federation Entity Leader could not assist to this second meeting). The whole team picked up very positively on the idea that as a team they might need coaching (clinical supervision) in the future, so to give them a chance to deal with conflicts immediately. And then in spite of all these reactions another long discussion began about how in the beginning of the project in one of his first reports the project manager had criticized the RS team and how angry they had felt about it. So this second conversation showed not only a high level of conflict in the group but also the existence of old unsolved conflicts which, although they were partially overcome, still generate anger and mistrust. The consultant suggested practically that in the future they should discuss a draft version of a new report always between them first, but that obviously the final decision of what report is being handed in must be in the hands of the project manager.

5.2 Conversation with the Project Manager

In the individual conversation with the project manager he expressed visible concerns about the work of the project. He sees himself in a complicated position in which he is supposed to lead and

coordinate the project but in reality his leadership is not respected and many people try to tell him what to do. The Entity leaders from the RS don't like him giving them indications and think that professionally he has nothing to say to them. Furthermore there are the Ministries which on one side are friendly and cooperative but on the other side constantly try to influence and interfere with the project team. In the RS this is less controllable for him (although it is his strong impression) but in the Federation this is very visible. The project manager likes the project and would like to make an effort to change the situation. He feels, all in all, the situation has gotten better, but it is still not good. He also feels that the relationship with XY is problematic. Although it has gotten more fluent it is a fact that they signed the contracts of everybody in the project, they pay the salaries and they maintain full control of all of these activities. Every time he needs something he has to ask for it and then gets what he wants more or less rapidly. But he has no direct access to the accountant, he cannot give direct orders to the accountant, he cannot even see the data of the accountant whenever he wants to. Also his capacity e.g. to change a member of the team does not exist. Also it is not him who decides when they have vacation. In summary he is responsible for everything but his project leading capacities rest exclusively on his diplomatic capacities and luck.

5.3   Conversations with Organization XY (Project Administration)

The director of XY also brought her accountant to the conversation. Nevertheless she did most of the talking. She acknowledged that the project situation initially had been difficult but that it had gotten better. She explained that for her it is a very strange situation to be legally and financially completely responsible for this project but at the same time she has no right to really get involved with the contents of the project. XY is an organization not only involved with administrating projects but actually has a very clear focus on health issues. So from her perspective she would like to be more involved in the project. It represents 50 % of her institutional budget but she is not supposed to get too much into it. She expressed her willingness to continue like this but also her hope that structurally it might change a little bit. When asked if she would accept to be allowed closer into the coordination of the project but only under the leadership of the project manager she hesitated a little bit and then said "Yes", she was willing to do that. In other words, from her side, she would be willing to act not as director of the project but as an assistant in administrative affairs to the project manager.

5.4   Individual Conversations with Project Staff Federation

In the individual conversations with the project staff of the Federation the entity representative projects a calm and friendly personality. She expresses her conformity with the team and also

explains that she gets along well with the project manager. She talks about the difficult beginning of the project and her development from project officer to Entity Leader. She says she gets along well with her colleagues from the RS, whom she respects professionally a lot. She also feels that the overall cooperation in the project is not ideal and that yes, the situation in the Federation is quite different to the RS. Her judgment of the conflicts is that they are the result of the project structure and the practical realities of the country. She gets along very well with the deputy minister for mental health and feels he is not interfering with her work. The conversations with the project officers basically confirm this positive picture, although they are a little more outspoken about the high tension in the project team, about contradictory indications sometimes of what they are supposed to do and about good communication on a personal level but bad group spirit. Especially one of them is competent mental health professional who is very careful to not express critique, but it is clear that her professional knowledge is underused in the project. It is also clear that she is not at all sure if she wants to continue working in this project.

5.5 Individual Conversations with Project Staff RS

In the individual conversations with the project staff in the RS it is very visible that the two Entity leaders and one of the project officers have a very severe criticism of the project manager and literally try to convince the consultant that the best solution is to take him out. Nevertheless their criticism is always vague. When asked what they are really accusing him of it is always the same strange story: The difficulties they had with him in the beginning and their feeling that he is more loyal to SDC than to them, the fact that they think discussions with him are difficult, that they think he treats staff wrongly etc. But the expressed criticism is always broad, never specific. Especially with the two Entity leaders the level of anger is very impressive. For the consultant it is not clear if this anger is really so strong or if they are expressing this anger more strongly because they fear that the consultant will suggest to give more power to him. But what is clear is that the communication between them and him is in a very bad state. Apart from this in both conversations it is obvious that both Entity leaders have put lots of work into the project, that they like it and that they really want to achieve success. Nevertheless they feel they have not been valued enough and they feel that their professional input has been used for the project but never in all its dimensions appreciated. They also feel that on a professional level they have not had partners in the project. They feel a little bit like they are doing the work for everybody, everybody uses them but then they are not being appreciated by the project directorship. For the consultant in these individual conversations it is impressive to see how misunderstood they feel or –to put it differently- how strong a victim's discourse they have, while all the time being rather aggressive about it. It's like they take control of

the conversation in an endless discourse of how misunderstood they are and how little their situation in the RS is appreciated and find it difficult to allow the consultant to ask questions. Actually the office premises they are working in are within a Mental Health Center and are extremely limited. In the conversation with the project officers it becomes clear that they are very loyal to the project but there is a strong difference between them. One of them is a professional and really has a lot to say and is a very big asset to the project. The other project officer has more administrative qualities. The interaction between both is not always ideal but basically okay. Nevertheless the professional one of the two is not sure if she wants to work in the project much longer. In summary the RS staff presents itself as a good working group which does not feel harassed by their Minister but they express strong difficulties towards the project manager. It also is not very clear if the project officers, especially the professional amongst them, have a right to their own opinion.

5.6   Conversations with Deputy Health Ministers in Federation and RS

Both Deputy Ministers, although belonging to very different political structures, representing different Entities and being of very different character express very similar ideas about the project. They both like the project very much, they both think the project has been extremely successful and will continue to be successful. They both recognize conflicts in the team but they don't think that these conflicts are too important. They are both quite happy with the control they have over the project and they feel that the current project setup gives them real ownership. They think that SDC is maybe worrying too much, they understand the reality of the conflict; they don't think any action should be taken, but if the donor insists they are willing to deal with it.

6 Analysis

6.1 Is there or is there not an important problem?

One of the key questions to decide in this review was the question if there is or is not an important problem. If not, how come there had been such a strong perception of team problems on the side of SDC? If yes, how come the project up to now has been comparatively successful?

Given the findings summarized above the consultant believes that there is sufficient evidence to think that "yes, there is a problem" and "yes, it must be dealt with". Obviously a certain amount of problems is a predictable side effect of the reality of trying to carry out a joint Mental Health project in a deeply divided country. Nevertheless, this does not need to produce such deep and personalized animosities as was possible to observe in this review. The fact that conflicts were repeated and fought through in front of the consultant with high levels of emotional involvement that are actually currently not important and in reality have been partially overcome is a strong indicator of free floating feelings of resentment, anger and mistrust in the project group. Furthermore, in fact all participants interviewed, except the deputy health Ministers, confirmed the existence of these problems. Also, as SDC had already summed up in the terms of reference for the consultant, the project setup contains a series of elementary ambiguities and contradictions. When setting up a project in a deeply divided country with such strong structural contradictions it is to be expected that not only the normal amount of problems occurs but actually a bigger amount. If these contradictions are furthermore deepened in the development of the project (massive change of personnel in the Federation, massive disequilibrium between professional know-how in RS and in the Federation, massive structural differences not reflected in the project setup), then actually it is quite surprising that the project has worked up to now. Currently we do not have a project team, in reality there are two project teams, we have a project manager who is supposed to lead the project but has no power and we have two Ministries who are clearly interested in the project but not necessarily in real cooperation. The so-called Entity Leaders have an ambiguous definition of where they belong to. On one side they represent the Ministries, they are part of the Ministries and they are chosen by their Ministries. Their real bosses are the Deputy Ministers. On the other hand they are supposed to be part of a project team and follow the indications of the project manager. And finally, to make confusion total, their administrative bosses in terms of the project with whom they sign their contract, is the Association XY. So undoubtedly, there is a problem, a big problem, in this project. Nevertheless one must ask, how come then, it has still been comparatively successful up to the present?

It seems probable that the following factors are relevant here:

- Up to now the key focus of the project has been the development of rules and regulations. In many aspects outcome and output of the project have been identical. Nevertheless, when one reads the reports, it becomes obvious that in spite of the fantastic work done the real application of change on the ground still has to happen. The project up to now had to develop the basis for many things but not yet their full application. And in many aspects it was possible to collaborate with these issues while not really needing to overcome internal division. And the places where one would be interested to learn more, e.g. not only that trainings were carried out but also what impact they had, we have no information up to now or we are told that certain important issues will be dealt with later. So, one hypothesis to explain the relative success of the project up to now is because of the issues it had to deal with. The content of the project up to now did not require a completely integrated flexible and mutually helpful team.

- A second explanation for the relative success of the project is the individual price paid by the project members. Levels of stress have been high in the Federation, the Entity representative changed several times. Currently, at least two of the project officers are on the verge of resigning, and so are the Entity representatives of the RS, who show clear signs of burnout. Everybody acknowledges high level of stress and this will sooner or later lead to resignation and/or illness.

In synthesis it is the opinion of the evaluator that there is a real problem and that it should be dealt with quickly because if not, the success story of the project up to now might end rather abruptly. The only stake holders who have a relative gain from all this are the respective Ministries which – although this is formally one project- closely control and shape their half of the project.

6.2 SWOT Analysis

6.2.1 Strengths

Everybody likes the project and everybody considers the basic goals of the project to be good and they want to carry it out. The project aims at a reformation of the Mental Health system and therefore must be closely associated to the involved Ministries. This has been achieved up to now. A further strength of the project is the resilience of the project members. In spite of high levels of stress and a doubtful organizational structure they have resisted up to now. A final strength of this

project is that in spite of the reality of the deeply divided country it makes an effort to develop structures of cooperation on the ground which facilitates the development of one of the most neglected sectors in the public health system and which include the long range of mental consequences for a population affected by the consequences of war and poverty and complex processes of internal migration. Project officers, especially the young staff, show a very high level of discipline and commitment. The professional know-how of some of the Entity representatives (RS) is really useful for the project.

6.2.2 Weaknesses

The structural setup of the project is ambiguous and contradictory. The project manager, who is supposed to lead the project, has no real project leadership power. The legal responsibility is with an institution that is not supposed to intervene with the contents of the project. The key project members who are sent to the project by their Ministries are not defined by their professional expertise or by the specific task they develop within the project but by their provenience. That means their key reference is always out of the project and not within the project. Furthermore there is a clear disequilibrium between the part belonging to the RS and the part belonging to the Federation. A pseudo-equilibrium was constructed in which both sides received supposedly the same amount of professionals but actually referring to rather different administrative setups. The project manager up to now has not managed to introduce a regular team culture. Personal animosities between some of the staff are high. The presence of dragged out conflicts in the team are visible.

6.2.3 Opportunities

At the end of this first phase of this project and before starting into the next phase is an excellent opportunity to confront and deal with the problems of the project. This is a new phase and it is perfectly possible to get all stake holders to accept slightly changed conditions. After all, nobody wants to destroy the project. The only question is if the difficulties are acknowledged now and acted upon when they still can be solved or if they are only dealt with once it is too late. Right now, it is still not too late.

6.2.4 Threats

One of the key threats is that as the project is still relatively successful one is tempted to accept the resistance for changes in the Ministries and in the project team itself and deny what is happening.

To do this will either provoke a falling apart of the project or a major crisis further along. When that happens probably the only way to save the project would be to completely divide it up between the Ministries and totally forget about real cooperation. This unfortunately is not a terrible threat for the Ministries involved but it is a very profound threat to the original idea of the project. Even if all necessary changes are carried out now it can still happen that the project loses one or the other of its members because visibly things have gone very far already but this risk can probably be dealt with if the structures from now on become more trustworthy.

7 Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the structural setup of the project is basically changed. In the future the project manager must really be the project leader and should be called "Project Director". This means that he signs the contracts of all employees, that he decides on their vacation (obviously according to the law), and that he has direct access to the accountant. It is the opinion of the consultant that the project can stay at XY but the roles must be redefined. The director of XY in this case has to be an administrative assistant or sub-director to the Project Director, and as far as this project is concerned clearly under his command.

2. The term "Entity Leader" should be abolished and replaced by "Professional Expert and Liaison Officer". Both Ministries should, as they have up to now, select and suggest these professionals but they must be confirmed by the Project Director. They are chosen according to basic criteria agreed upon with the Project Director and the donor, some of which are indicated below. Once this/these person/s is/are chosen they answer to the Project Director. The Project Director for the time of the project is their boss. The persons chosen for this task should be two for RS as up to now and two for the Federation and should be mental health experts. In the RS and in the Federation the work task is so big that the designated job percentages should be augmented, but always also reflecting the more complex situation in the administrative structure in the Federation. Therefore if possible the percentages in the RS should be 2 x 75% and in the Federation 2 x 100%. If this is not possible for financial reasons and in the RS the percentages stay at 2 x 50%, then in the Federation the percentages must be raised to 2 x 75%. Each of these four persons in the future would have two tasks:

   a) They continue to be the key linkage to the Ministries which chose them and inform the project team regularly about their activities of liaison.

   b) Each one of them is responsible for specific tasks, for example according to the four lines of action of the project, or if there are only three lines, then 2 might subdivide a very big line of action, and the others each take one. Obviously at some point all four of them have to work on the same project line, but it is always one of them, which has the lead.

3. It is recommended that in each sub-team the project officers are augmented. Instead of two it would be better to have four. Each one should be assigned to specific tasks within the lines of action and thus actually constructing inter-entity cooperative pairs in reference to specific subjects. In the future the project officers must become full team members with clearly designated tasks and not just "helpers" to the Professional Experts and Liaison Officers.

4. It is recommended that the project staff in the RS receive their own project premises, with offices with more room to work in.

5. The Project Director once every two months should hold full day team meetings with the whole team either in Sarajevo or in Banja Luka. Every two weeks a two-hour skype conference should take place by the whole project team. Project reports are not only prepared by members of the team but also discussed by the full team before being sent out. Team meetings are documented. The Project Director is accountable to the Steering Committee. He is nevertheless also accountable to his team, especially in terms of obligation of information, of transparency, of facilitating regular team discussions and of taking clear decisions.

6. The Ministries link up to the project through the specialists chosen by them, but do not control the project through them. They receive information through them, but their place to monitor and control the project is in the steering committee. When they have urgent issues to discuss they do so in the steering committee or through the Project Director. They abstain from trying to give direct instructions to the members of the project they have selected. All of this is proposed not to limit the involvement of the Ministries in the project but to better differentiate between dimensions of project execution and dimensions of monitoring and control.

7. The project team for the period of one year should receive regular coaching (clinical supervision) sessions to help them deal with past issues they have not overcome yet, to help them deal with the now envisioned changes and develop a new culture of cooperation and of open and useful, but respectful discussion. This could happen in 4 full day team workshops, or in more frequent but shorter sessions. The Project Director should receive in addition his own coaching space for discussing the difficulties of directing this project (1 hour every week in the next 4 months, directly or by Skype, then every two weeks).

8. Team members should be given a chance within this new structure for 12 months. If after 12 months the Project Director still has difficulties in managing the team he should be changed. If XY cannot adapt to this situation of subordination in the next 12 months they should be changed. If team members cannot adapt to this change in the next 12 months and cannot learn a style of work based on mutual respect and cooperation they should be changed.