



## Evaluation TRAINING PROGRAMME, PART 1 - OPERATORS, 17 – 19 November 2015, Kızılcahamam, Turkey

### Statistical Information

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

<b>Training for Operators – 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)
(195) <b>8.5</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	I (160)	II (35)	
(205) <b>8.9</b>	2. The training has helped strengthen my understanding of the social reasons for emissions control and of best available techniques (BAT) for emissions control at LCPs	III (180)	 (25)	
(205) <b>8.9</b>	3. The training has helped me identify and propose BAT for a new LCP	III (180)	 (25)	
(195) <b>8.5</b>	4. The training has helped me identify and propose BAT for an existing LCP	I (160)	II (35)	
<b>8.7</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)
(182) <b>8.3</b>	1. The workshop achieved the objectives set	 (40)	 II (136)	I (6)			
(198) <b>8.6</b>	2. The quality of the workshop was of a high standard	 (80)	 (112)	I (6)			
(192) <b>8.7</b>	3. The content of the workshop was well-suited to my level of understanding and experience	 (90)	II (96)	I (6)			
(212) <b>9.2</b>	4. The workshop was interactive and networking could be achieved	 (140)	 (72)				
(192) <b>9.1</b>	5. Speakers and facilitators were well-prepared and knowledgeable on the subject matter	 (130)	II (56)	I (6)			
(180) <b>7.8</b>	6. The duration of this workshop was neither too long nor too short	 (80)	 (72)	 (18)	 (8)	I (2)	
(190) <b>8.3</b>	7. The logistical arrangements (accommodation, meals, refreshments, equipment) were satisfactory	 (100)	 (72)	I (6)	 (12)		
(208) <b>9.0</b>	8. Attending this workshop was time well spent	II (120)	I (88)				
<b>8.6</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:

- It was very fruitful.
- It was nice. It will be more fruitful for interpreting the BAT documents.
- It was very convenient and beneficial.
- The content of the training was very good.
- Training sessions were very efficient.
- The trainers had enough knowledge. It was pleasing and impressive.
- Successful.
- I think that focusing on individual studies in the training sessions facilitated to achieve the training's objectives.
- The content and trainers were sufficient.
- Duration of sessions (including breaks) is acceptable, but I think that the training should have been 4 days or for 3 days it should have been on Wednesday-Thursday-Friday.
- It would have been better if 2 pages had been shown instead of 4 pages.



### **Facilitators:**

- Pretty good. Thank you.
- Very convenient and useful.
- The organization was very nice.
- The team was sincere, cheerful, wise and caring.
- It was well organized.
- The organization was nice. The choice of accommodation was good.
- Transportation was very successful. However, a more central place should have been chosen instead of Kızılcahamam. All facilities in the hotel should have been benefited.
- Very nice.
- Thank you for the efforts of the organization team.
- I am of the opinion that the organization team was very nice and it would have been better if the place where the organization was held had been more social and had more opportunities.
- The organization responded to every need sufficiently and quickly.
- Especially the cheerful welcome of Ms. Nazlı Akkuş was very nice for us. Every detail was considered. Ms. Nazlı helped us a lot. We thank her very much. Her ability to solve problems is praiseworthy. The interpreters were also very good. We again thank the whole team.
- The team was nice. The accommodation could have been in a more central location. The team (including interpreters) was successful.
- The organization was pretty good. Only if the place had been in a more central location, would the transportation (to our plant) have been easier. Also if the last day had been Friday, it would have been so much easier for us to go back.



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

- There was not much information for refineries.
- Very convenient and useful.
- The training level and content was good. Refinery sector could have been more mentioned. It was good in general.
- It was satisfying and efficient.
- Subject contents and presentations were valuable.
- It was nice as content. The level of the training was good but the important subjects should have been supported by more tangible examples.
- Successful.
- I think that the level was sufficient however, the content should be simplified for everyone to understand clearly.
- A training with a more intense technical assessment through BREF is needed for the sector.
- Content was rich. We wish that the next training will be mostly solution oriented.
- It would be great if everyone had been given a certificate. Hope to participate the future trainings.
- The training should have been supported by tangible examples.

Note: The training should have been from Tuesday to Friday, so we could have had the opportunity to rest on weekend.

I have gained an insight about a difficult subject. I thank those who have contributed to the organization.

