



## Evaluation TRAINING PROGRAMME, PART 1 - OFFICIALS, 25 – 27 November 2015, Izmir and Soma LCP, Turkey

### Statistical Information

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

<b>Training for Officials – Part 1</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)
(145) <b>9.1</b>	1. The training has helped strengthen my understanding of the distinct roles of the LCP operator and environmental regulator (competent authority) in controlling the emissions to air from LCPs	 (130)	 (15)	
(145) <b>9.1</b>	2. The training has helped strengthen my understanding of the health impacts of emissions and of best available techniques (BAT) for emissions control at LCPs	 (130)	 (15)	
(140) <b>8.8</b>	3. The training has helped develop my understanding of the identification of BAT for new and existing LCPs	 (120)	 (20)	
(115) <b>7.2</b>	4. The training has helped develop my understanding of operational issues affecting the implementation of BAT at existing LCPs	 (70)	 (45)	
<b>8.5</b>	<b>AVERAGE TOTAL SCORE</b>			



## Training

Please rate the following statements in respect of this training:

Score	Aspect of Workshop	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Average (6)	Acceptable (4)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (0)
(128) <b>8.0</b>	1. The workshop achieved the objectives set	II (20)	IIII IIIII II (96)	II (12)			
(116) <b>7.3</b>	2. The quality of the workshop was of a high standard	I (10)	IIII IIIII (80)	III (18)	II (8)		
(126) <b>7.9</b>	3. The content of the workshop was well-suited to my level of understanding and experience	III (40)	IIII III (72)	II (12)		I (2)	
(104) <b>7.4</b>	4. The workshop was interactive and networking could be achieved	II (20)	IIII II (56)	III (24)	I (4)		
(66) <b>7.3</b>	5. Speakers and facilitators were well-prepared and knowledgeable on the subject matter	I (10)	IIII (40)	II (12)	I (4)		
(124) <b>7.8</b>	6. The duration of this workshop was neither too long nor too short	III (40)	IIII III (72)	I (6)	I (4)	I (2)	
(124) <b>7.8</b>	7. The logistical arrangements (accommodation, meals, refreshments, equipment) were satisfactory	II (20)	IIII IIIII (80)	III (24)			
(138) <b>8.6</b>	8. Attending this workshop was time well spent	IIII II (70)	IIII II (56)	II (12)			
<b>7.7</b>	<b>AVERAGE TOTAL SCORE</b>						



## Comments and suggestions

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

### Training Sessions:

- Duration of sessions is convenient and ideal. The presentations of the trainers and their performance was good.
- Training sessions are at sufficient level.
- It was good.
- Successful.
- Training sessions were good but the durations were very short, more time should have been given and the subjects should have been addressed in more detail since the subjects are very important.
- In the abbreviations of technical terms, if Turkish or English could have been chosen and used and also they could have been identified in the beginning of the subject it would have been better. Slide hard copy documents should have been bigger and more readable.
- Duration of sessions and breaks were well organized and sufficient.
- Training sessions were very good but during the technical tour I noticed some problems that I believe resulted from lack of communication of the installation.
- It achieved its goal regarding the subjects in the training program.
- The organization of the sessions were good. Experts were experienced in their field and were eager to answer the questions. Although the subjects were intense they helped well.
- Duration of training could be shorter, since long duration may not be good as it is mentally and physically tiring. Because it was an intense training in terms of knowledge.



---

### **Facilitators:**

- We thank Ms. Nazlı for her efforts.
  - The organization was finalized successfully owing to the outstanding contributions of Ms. Nazlı from the organization team.
  - It was very nice.
  - It was at sufficient level.
  - It was good.
  - Helpful, sincere and friendly. Thank you.
  - The organization was pretty good. Information was sufficient. I also thank Ms. Nazlı for her attention, efforts and being cheerful.
  - Very nice. Ms. Nazlı's effort was good.
  - Ms. Nazlı from organization team was very devoted and successful.
  - I really appreciated Ms. Nazlı's attention, understanding and support for the organization of hotel, food, transportation and logistical support.
- 





---

### **Training level and content:**

- Level and content was nice.
- Very good.
- Successful.
- I believe that the training was very beneficial for understanding the LCP emission removal methods.
- Level was good but I am of opinion that the content was superficial.
- I think it was sufficient.
- The training requires technical knowledge due to its content. It was clearer for those having sufficient technical knowledge. Also, I believe that the interpretation team should have comprehensive knowledge of these technical subjects so that they can make more reliable interpretations. We have difficulty understanding some subjects due to interpretations.
- The content was too technical. I am of opinion that it is not necessary to provide such comprehensive and technical knowledge and details.
- Convenient.
- Training level was high and the content was satisfying.
- Everything was sufficient and perfect. I think that maybe site visit and the training could have been one week in total, it would have been more efficient.
- Content and level of the training was ideal but number of practices could be increased.

---

It was a bit bothering to have the same food (chicken) for two days.