





## 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)
(394) <b>7.6</b>	1. The workshop achieved the objectives set	  (40)	                               (304)	I  (36)	  (12)	I  (2)	
(408) <b>8.0</b>	2. The quality of the workshop was of a high standard	I  (110)	                      (256)	I  (36)	I  (4)	I  (2)	
(402) <b>7.9</b>	3. The content of the workshop was well-suited to my level of understanding and experience	  (130)	              (200)	 I  (66)	I  (4)	I  (2)	
(434) <b>8.5</b>	4. The workshop was interactive and networking could be achieved	             II  (220)	              (184)	  (24)	I  (4)	I  (2)	
(436) <b>8.5</b>	5. Speakers and facilitators were well-prepared and knowledgeable on the subject matter	              (200)	             II  (216)	II  (12)	II  (8)		
(410) <b>8.0</b>	6. The duration of this workshop was neither too long nor too short	  (130)	                    (240)	  (30)	II  (8)	I  (2)	
(438) <b>8.4</b>	7. The logistical arrangements (accommodation, meals, refreshments, equipment) were satisfactory	             II  (220)	              (200)	I  (6)	II  (8)	II  (4)	
(440) <b>8.5</b>	8. Attending this workshop was time well spent	             I  (210)	              (200)	  (24)	I  (4)	I  (2)	
<b>8.2</b>	<b>AVERAGE TOTAL SCORE</b>						



## Comments and suggestions

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

### Workshop Sessions:

- As an institution employee as part of privatization, I am of opinion that participant could have been invited from the privatization administration.
- Normal
- The report prepared was not introduced in details. Also the results of the inventory was not fully shared. In this point we can mention the data confidentiality problem. However, the results (e.g. To what extent are BATs applied and within the scope of RIA which BATs have been assessed and to what extent and in which processes) can be shared by taking into account the data confidentiality.
- Sessions were interesting and informative.
- Sessions were very efficient.
- Workshop focused only on power plants. It didn't provide guidance to other companies for technical information. The knowledge on fully EU-oriented accession and situation of Turkey must be deeper.
- Sessions were sufficient but sometimes people digressed from the topic or the discussions were unnecessarily long.
- Turkey's problems and possible solutions were discussed rather than the RIA report. Assessment report was of secondary importance. I believe that mutual expressions of the opinions was very informative for the participants.
- Duration of the sessions were sufficient for listening efficiency.
- It was interesting and convenient for brain storming.
- Workshop sessions were well programmed in terms of duration and subject integrity as well.
- Duration of the sessions and the content were convenient.
- Duration of the sessions was enough and timing was successful.
- I will be better that this Workshop, which is of importance for our country, lasts longer. Also more participants should participate in the technical tours to abroad.
- Good
- It was very good. Perhaps, institutions can discuss the subject among themselves or the issues that they don't understand or cannot ask may be discussed so that the gaps in their mind can be filled.
- Large Combustion Plants (for 12 plants) in Turkey are in red line and therefore BAT technologies must be applied according to environmental legislation. Other LCPs should improve their emission values in stages. It is understood that the years 2018 and 2019 will be significant transition periods. The importance of RIA and the missing part were discussed
- Large Combustion Plants (for 12 plants) in Turkey are in red line and therefore BAT technologies must be applied according to environmental legislation. Other LCPs should improve their emission values in stages. It is understood that the years 2018 and 2019 will be significant transition periods. The importance of RIA and the missing part were discussed.
- The sessions were informative.
- Topics were beneficial and the presentations were of high quality.
- More time was needed for reviewing the RIA report.
- Personally the topics were a bit theoretical. If a pilot plant had been selected both in public and private sector within the scope of this project and the RIA report had been prepared regarding these plants, the topics would have focused on more practical information transfer rather than theoretical. However, I was informed about the RIA.
- It was, even if partially, suitable for its objectives



---

### **Facilitators:**

- They were very helpful.
- Facilitators were very interested. There was no problem. Similarly, the project team was also well-prepared. I thank everyone for their devoted work.
- The whole team, especially Miss Nazlı, thought everything for us to be comfortable. We thank Miss Nazlı.
- The team presented a sufficient and nice work.
- Their knowledge and skills were sufficient.
- They were technically-equipped but they could have known about Turkey's situation.
- They were cheerful and caring as usual. The hotel offered a good standard accommodation.
- The team did their work professionally.
- The team and their coordination were very successful.
- They were well-prepared.
- As the other workshops that I participated, this one was also very convenient. I would like to thank miss Nazlı once more for her attention and efforts.
- Travel, accommodation and refreshments etc. were perfect. Thank you all.
- The facilitators showed a caring, respectful and solution-oriented approach.
- Thank you all.
- Good.
- They had full knowledge of the subject and answered the questions properly.
- The organization was of quality.
- The organization team was very successful.
- Very good.
- It was very good as usual.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> day of the Workshop could have been longer. 2<sup>nd</sup> day was not enough.

---

### **Workshop level and content:**

- Good.
  - I would expect it to be more solution-oriented.
  - If evaluated out of 5, the score would be 4.
  - 2 days are not enough. It should be at least 3-4 days and more time should have been given for detailed discussion.
  - (Long) time given for question-answers section was efficient for our understanding.
  - The level was quite convenient.
  - Because the workshop was mostly related to the thermal power plants and plants firing solid fuels, it didn't contain much technical information for other plants firing liquid/gaseous fuels such as TUPRAS. However, I had a rough idea about the logic and approach of the competent authorities.
  - The workshop was of a compiling nature including other works.
  - It was perfect as it was informative and things to be done for the problems were discussed.
  - Future emission limits for private sector should be clearly evaluated. Although IED was referred to in the report, it will draw more interest to compare the limit values in the presentation.
  - I am of opinion that the content was suitable for the legislations that I have been working on and applying.
  - It was satisfying.
  - The content was clear and ensured that the participation was high.
  - I believe that the content was more related to energy generation plant owners rather than Provincial Directorates. I, personally, are interested in the result part but the workshop contained issues such as how the operators/owner of the plant will reach the solution.
  - In the content more examples on sector and applications should have been included. It seems that there is not a solution based on the result and the improvements in Turkey depend on the self-research/engineering/improvement services. The staff should be guided with technical application and experiences.
-



- It seems that the steps to be taken after IED is implemented could not be understood by the participants. These companies should be informed more about the issue and also about the seriousness of the work.
  - Good
  - Case examples similar to our country could be given.
  - The topics were understood. The content was good. Although some topics are not clear, it will become more clear in time. I believe that this project will be successful and achieve its objectives.
  - The content and level of the workshop was good.
  - RIA Report could have been presented in written form.
  - It was enough for 2 days.
  - It was quite good and the participation level was convenient.
  - It will be better to do the next Workshop (if any) in a volunteer LCP for the purpose of solving the existing problems.
  - I am of opinion that the workshop was also lack of science environments or universities or other companies finding solutions (improving and selling process) that have the technical knowledge and research and could enlighten us about improving the coal quality or other technical issues. Or in a separate session if these ideas, by taking technical details into account, had been shared with LCP operators and then this meeting had been organized, I think it would have achieved better results.
  - Examples about BATs and their application could have been given.
-