



Evaluation DISSEMINATION WORKSHOP 2, 2 June 2016, Istanbul, Turkey

Statistical Information

- 1.1 Workshop
 1.2 Name and Surname of Participant (evaluator)

Dissemination Workshop 2
OVERALL SCORE

Your expectations

Please indicate to what extent specific expectations were met, or not met:

Score	My Expectations	My expectations were met		
		Fully (10 points)	Partially (5 points)	Not at all (0 points)
(365) 7.4	1. The Workshop has helped to improve or confirm my understanding of the role of the LCP Inventory and database.	 (240)	 (125)	
(405) 8.1	2. The Workshop has helped to understand where Turkey stands as concerns the needs for improving the environmental performance of LCPs.	 (310)	 (95)	
(405) 8.1	3. The Workshop has given an appropriate picture of possible public institutional arrangements in support of improving environmental performance of LCPs.	 (310)	 (95)	
(405) 8.1	4. The Workshop has provided a starting point for further environmental regulatory action with regard to LCPs..	 (310)	 (95)	
(340) 6.8	5. The Workshop has made clear how authorities and operators can make further steps in their cooperation towards achieving better air quality in Turkey	 (190)	 (150)	 (0)

7.7 AVERAGE TOTAL SCORE



Seminar and Presentations

Please rate the following statements in respect of this workshop:

Score	Aspect of Workshop	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Average (6)	Acceptable (4)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (0)
(372) 7.9	1. The workshop achieved the objectives set	III (80)	 I (248)	I (36)	II (8)		
(384) 8.2	2. The quality of the workshop was of a high standard	I (110)	 (232)	II (42)			
(382) 8.0	3. The content of the workshop was well-suited to my level of understanding and experience	I (110)	 (240)	 (24)	I (4)	II (4)	
(398) 8.5	4. The workshop was interactive and networking could be achieved	 (190)	 I (168)	I (36)	I (4)		
(430) 9.0	5. Speakers and facilitators were well-prepared and knowledgeable on the subject matter	 II (270)	 II (136)	 (24)			
(394) 8.4	6. The duration of this workshop was neither too long nor too short	III (180)	 (160)	I (36)	III (12)	III (6)	II (0)
(400) 8.3	7. The logistical arrangements (accommodation, meals, refreshments, equipment) were satisfactory	 II (220)	 III (144)	 (30)	I (4)	I (2)	I (0)
(406) 8.5	8. Attending this workshop was time well spent	 I (160)	 III (224)	III (18)	I (4)		

8.4 AVERAGE TOTAL SCORE



Comments and suggestions

I have the following comment and/or suggestions in addition to questions already answered:

Workshop Sessions:

- Durations were very short and groups were very crowded. Extending the duration and limiting the number of participants will increase the efficiency. For example, due to the limited duration of sessions even question and answer session were limited.
- Workshop management was good but should be managed better. Q&A was weak.
- Clinics could have been longer.
- Time was enough and sessions were efficient.
- All sectors could be brought together more often. A summary booklet may be provided.
- It was good.
- Workshop sessions were well organized.
- Sessions were very efficient.
- Sessions and presentations were at reasonable level.
- Workshop were interactive and fit the purpose of it. But I believe it was a bit crowded. (for the participants)
- It was suitable for the purpose of the workshop and implemented in a proper setting.
- Time management was absolutely well.
- Duration was quite limited. Most of the questions could not be asked.
- Time was not enough in terms of subjects and practices.
- Sessions and duration were enough but the time for clinics was not enough. Moreover, some authorities from the plants could have been given the floor or could make a brief presentation regarding the current situation of the plants in order to have a better understanding of the current situation of LCPs in Turkey.
- Duration was sufficient, workshop was explanatory and informative.



Facilitators:

- There were some deficiencies in the organization. In the hotel, the participants were not allowed to benefit from the hotel as the other guests did. I do not think that this is proper. Also participants have some trouble in the registration to hotel because the organization team arrives at hotel after the participants.
- Well-done!
- I thank very much Mr. Russell and Ayberk for their presentation.
- The discussions were very useful.
- It was very good.
- Facilitators and organization team were experienced.
- Everything was well organized except photo shooting.
- Organization team and facilitator were very helpful and caring as usual.
- I thank those who contributed to the workshop and for their efforts.
- It was very good as usual.
- The team was good.
- It was successful.
- They were very successful.
- Miss Nazlı was very successful, self-devoting and tolerant from the beginning until the end of the workshop.
- I thank them for their efforts. I thank especially Miss Nazlı Akkaş for her efforts as is in the 1st Workshop.

Workshop level and content:

- The level was good, but the content was a little scattered, I think the efficiency could be increased if the subjects are categorised and organized well.
- Why is the participation of NGOs so weak? Inviting only TEMA shows that it is only a symbolic intention for the participation of non-governmental organization.
- It was good.
- The content and level was suitable for my knowledge and experience. The content got rich with the participation of NGOs, public institutions and operators.
- The level and content was good.
- Good.
- It was sufficient.
- The last dissemination workshop should have been more detailed.
- It helped to improve my understanding of the topics and terminology as in general it was theoretical and based on application and process to understand.
- The clinics for different topics were very useful. However, timing was also a little problematic. The duration was not enough because the issues talked during sessions left unresolved.