



Evaluation RIA WORKSHOP 27 – 28 April 2015, Izmir, Turkey

Statistical Information

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

RIA Workshop 1
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)
(130) 7.2	1. The workshop has clarified how a Regulatory Impact Assessment will be carried out using information that was collected in the process of developing the LCP Inventory.	 (80)	 (50)	
(150) 7.9	2. The Workshop has helped to understand damage costs that derive from NO _x , SO ₂ and Particulate Matter.	I (110)	 (40)	
(140) 7.4	3. The Workshop explained the types of investments that may be required for LCPs that are not compliant with legal requirements.	 (90)	 (50)	
(145) 7.6	4. The Workshop has contributed to increasing my understanding of engineering solutions for pollution control in power plants.	 (100)	 (45)	
(130) 7.2	5. The Workshop has well clarified the determination of compliance deadlines.	 (80)	 (50)	
7.5	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)
(142) 7.5	1. The workshop achieved the objectives set	I (10)	IIII IIII II (96)	IIII I (36)			
(136) 7.2	2. The quality of the workshop was of a high standard	II (20)	IIII IIII (80)	IIII I (36)			I (0)
(130) 7.2	3. The content of the workshop was well-suited to my level of understanding and experience	I (10)	IIII IIII (80)	IIII I (36)	I (4)		
(124) 7.3	4. The workshop was interactive and networking could be achieved	II (20)	IIII IIII (80)	III (18)	I (4)	I (2)	
(122) 7.2	5. Speakers and facilitators were well-prepared and knowledgeable on the subject matter	II (20)	IIII IIII (80)	III (18)		II (4)	
(142) 7.5	6. The duration of this workshop was neither too long nor too short	IIII (40)	IIII IIII (80)	II (12)	II (8)	I (2)	
(78) 4.1	7. The logistical arrangements (accommodation, meals, refreshments, equipment) were satisfactory		IIII (40)	II (12)	I (4)	IIII IIII I (22)	
(148) 7.9	8. Attending this workshop was time well spent	IIII (40)	IIII IIII II (96)	II (12)			
7.0	AVERAGE TOTAL SCORE						



Comments and suggestions

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

Workshop Sessions:

- Arranging the meeting halls which the Workshop is held in classroom order would be beneficial. For following the presentation, taking notes etc at the same time, the meeting order with chairs is not appropriate. The durations of the sessions and the duration of the workshop should be extended. There is an intense information flow within two days. More time should be allowed for the questions.
- It was good.
- Meeting hall should be selected suitable for participants. (chair with armrest, table, equipments etc.)
- The meeting hall was not suitable for the Workshop.
- It would be good to argue situations (on plantly basis) of existing plants as (on plantly basis) Investment Options, as well.
- Good.
- There should be more detailed information about RIA. The stages of RIA and how to perform impact analysis should be shown in example facilities.



Facilitators:

- About the hotels which arranged for the workshop, they should be more delicate. According to contract the hotels should be 4 stars, however all 4 star hotels are not the same.
 - It was strong.
 - Lunch/dinner was so bad. Organization issue should be arranged better.
 - Very good.
 - The meeting hall was airless and dark. It couldn't be used efficiently since some people accommodate in the hotel. It could be a better meeting room.
 - The hotel rooms were not hygienic. Also, the televisions were not operative.
-



Workshop level and content:

- Exemplifications about the informing subjects should increase. Applications for different sectors provide the subjects' being understood better.
- It was well arranged.
- The hotel choose was very under the average. The meeting hall was small. Air conditioning and foods were troubled.
- I'm thinking that for other large combustion plants (other than coal), a content should be prepared, as well.
- Very good.
- Good.
- There was a dense information flow technically. Hence, as long as we don't have a technical basic background, it won't be a productive process. This situation is valid for civil servants, especially.
- Necessities to use local lignite in stations, the best pollution removal methods
- Addition of costs over people's health which are caused by existing situations, without improvement, to the calculations and sharing this with interested authorities
- Addition of subjects about improvement of fuel (lignite) before bringing to the facility
- Mentioning the subjects about technological transfers in the workshops
- Presenting the information about reserves, heating values and pollutant rates about the energy resources in the country, to authorities
- Interrogating the efficiency of issues like encouragement of energy, credit etc.