



## Evaluation STUDY TOUR 2, 22 – 26 February 2016, Finland

### Statistical Information

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

<b>Study Tour 2 - Finland</b>
<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>

### 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)
(55) <b>9.2</b>	1. Understanding of the institutional structures in Finland for implementing legal requirements related to large combustion plants.	IIII (50)	I (5)	
(40) <b>6.7</b>	2. The Study tour has helped to better understand the institutional responsibilities and structures <i>required</i> for the transposition and implementation of the EU acquis regarding LCPs.	II (20)	IIII (20)	
(30) <b>5.0</b>	3. The Study tour has helped to better understand the potential challenges to be faced by Turkish institutional structures in control of LCP operations.		IIII I (30)	
(50) <b>8.3</b>	4. The Study tour has strengthened the technical understanding on how large combustions plants operate in the EU.	IIII (40)	II (10)	
<b>7.3</b>	<b>AVERAGE TOTAL SCORE</b>			



### Study tour and Presentations

Please rate the following statements in respect of this study tour:

Score	Aspect of Workshop	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Average (6)	Acceptable (4)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (0)
(50) <b>8.3</b>	1. The study tour achieved the objectives set	II (20)	III (24)	I (6)			
(44) <b>7.3</b>	2. The quality of the study tour was of a high standard	I (10)	III (24)	I (6)	I (4)		
(46) <b>7.7</b>	3. The content of the study tour was well-suited to my level of understanding and experience	II (20)	I (8)	III (18)			
(42) <b>7.0</b>	4. The study tour was interactive and networking could be achieved	I (10)	II (16)	II (12)	I (4)		
(50) <b>8.3</b>	5. The facilitators were well-prepared and knowledgeable on the subject matter	III (30)	I (8)	II (12)			
(52) <b>8.7</b>	6. The duration of the different components of the study tour were neither too long nor too short	III (30)	II (16)	I (6)			
(36) <b>6.0</b>	7. The logistical arrangements (accommodation, meals, refreshments, equipment) were satisfactory	I (10)		III (18)	II (8)		
(54) <b>9.0</b>	8. Attending this study tour was time well spent	III (40)	I (8)	I (6)			
<b>7.8</b>	<b>AVERAGE TOTAL SCORE</b>						



### **Study tour Sessions:**

- There was some trouble about translation. Due to constant changing of project's language assistants, translator had difficulty in some translations. Although this issue is indicated before, recruitment of an expert translator is not done. The sessions were good. Especially at VTT, really nice information was given.
- The duration of the sessions was sufficient and relevant with the Study Tour. From the institutions and organizations which are visited, some evaluations relevant to project were taken. Pretty good.

---

### **Facilitators:**

- The team has comprehensive knowledge about the subject and they are eager. Extremely successful.
- The translator could be better. A better hotel could be arranged. The hotel rooms were too small, cold and far away from the city.
- There was some trouble about translation. Translation has not been made completely. Some of the subjects were passed without completely translated- briefly. There was a brief translation in technical subjects which were explained in detail.
- Logistic opportunities and organization should be more satisfying.
- Generally, organization team has sufficient background relevant to study tour aims. There were some minor flaws about car organization and translation.

---

### **Study tour level and content:**

- I took quite an advantage even if I don't know the subject at all.
  - Good.
  - Some technically useful facilities were visited.
- 

