



Civil Society Dialogue Network

Training Seminar on Peacebuilding Advocacy towards the EU, 29-30 June 2017

EVALUATION FEEDBACK FORM

1) Content of the training seminar:

Session 1 – Thursday morning: Basic facts about the EU

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
10	11			
<p>What worked well:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good/effective presentations: x4 • Useful/fruitful presentations: x3 • Good use of time • Deep, detailed, focused • Good to have different people presenting different institutions: x4 (it brings dynamism (1); good to share experience (1)) • Good facilitation for participants with different levels of EU knowledge • Active participants • Good background documents: x2 (especially the power analysis (1)) <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be good to receive copies of the Power Points to get back to the info later • More time for the “speed dating” with resource people x3 • Provide more anecdotes • It would be nice to have a very basic introduction “treating us as 5 year olds” <p>Criticisms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organigrammes too tiny, difficult to read 				

Session 2 – Thursday morning: How the EU operates in conflict-affected countries (Andrew Sheriff)

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
12	8	1		

What worked well:

- Great/useful: **x4** (to understand how to engage with delegations (1); to have an overview (1))
- Good part about EU-CSO relations
- Thorough presentation
- Really good Q&A
- Interesting **x2** (for case studies/examples (2); for description of practice (1))
- Good addition to/worked well with the morning session: **x3**

Suggestions:

- Focus more on the perception of the different institutions
- Talk about how local conflict expertise affect the work of the EU
- Support the presentation with images, graphics and pictures

Criticisms:

- Too detailed
- Heavy, difficult to stay focused

Session 3 – Thursday afternoon: Influencing the EU institutions: Case studies of past advocacy strategies

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
12	9			

What worked well:

- Good/excellent/interesting: **x8** (especially Crisis Action's (3), especially EPLO's (1))
- Eye-opening
- Useful to understand decisions to make during advocacy strategies
- Good Q&A

Suggestions:

- Talk more about success-stories and not-so-success stories
- Use power point presentations so that you can go back to get information
- Talk about advocacy towards military/arm industry as well

Criticisms:

- Shame to have missed the third case study

Session 4 – Friday morning: Discussion with EU officials

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
14	7			

What worked well:

- Encouraging
- Helpful **x7** (to deconstruct perceptions about the EU **(1)**; to understand how they see the role of civil society **(1)**; especially European Commission official **(1)**; to understand the EU actors' working environment **(1)**; to understand how to maximise our impact with the EU in very practical terms **(1)**)
- Interesting to learn about the perception of civil society capabilities
- Very practical answers
- Honest and humble panellists
- Good timing
- Great opportunity
- Eye-opening (especially on the tips for entry points)

Suggestions:

- Encourage participants to think of questions in advance
- Do this on day 1, so that day 2 is dedicated exclusively to the work group
- Put it after session 1 and 2

Session 5 – Friday afternoon: Group exercise

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
15	4		1	

Did not respond: 1**What worked well:**

- Very empowering/enriching **x2**
- Great/good opportunity **x8** (to apply real life situations into advocacy towards the EU **(1)**; to apply information and knowledge shared earlier **(3)**; to interact more with each other / build team work **(4)**; to understand how other organisations work on advocacy
- Enabled more engagement with peers
- Hands-on work
- Good challenges
- Very educative/informative **x2**
- Good facilitation **x2** (Thanks Colin **(1)**)

Suggestions:

- Use less time
- Provide more information before the session, for instance with concept papers / more reading **x2**
- Provide some introduction to basic policy and advocacy work
- Use a more structured process led by the facilitator

Criticisms:

- Not the best format to present the strategies
- Frustrating due to the different backgrounds in the group

2) How would you rate the quality of the background documents that were distributed in advance of the training seminar?

Excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
14	6			

Did not respond: 1

- Comprehensive **x2**
- Relevant
- Sent early enough
- Informative **x2**
- Useful (also after the training)
- In-depth
- Right amount
- Brilliant

Suggestions:

- Provide something about the different instruments
- Provide something about the planning/implementation cycle
- Avoid printing them (email is enough)
- Provide the list of participants in advance

3) How would you rate the overall facilitation of the training seminar and the quality of the presentations?

excellent	good	Between good and average	poor	very poor
14	6	1		

Comments:

- Experienced
- Knowledgeable
- Clear roles
- Good timing for the pauses
- Excellent logistics
- Amazing
- Nice hotel

4) Usefulness of the seminar:

Did you find the seminar useful?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes (to build capacity (1); to provide answers (2); to understand the EU (3); to provide clarity and orientation (1); very relevant to my work (1); to meet people based in different locations (2); good balance between information and practical tools)
How much did you learn at the seminar? Please give examples.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The structure of the EU x7 (the difference between the EEAS and DEVCO (1))• Functioning of the EU x5• Advocacy approaches and institutions to target x9 (importance to lobby at a personal level (1); possibility to target the Parliament (1))• EU policies on peacebuilding x2• The complexity of the EU• How to relate to each other• Importance of lobbying at a personal level• EU jargon• Importance of timing x2• Learned what changed since the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty• EU's orientation• EPLO's function
Will you apply what you learned in your work? Please give examples.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Most certainly x2 (in terms of entry points, delegation-level work (1))• Yes x15 (in future advocacy strategies (7); in forging partnerships (2); in engaging with the EU institutions/delegations (5); in looking for funding opportunities (1); in promoting a report/research (2); in showing what my organisation can offer instead of begging for funding (1); in my research (1); engaging with non-EU actors (1); in mapping stakeholders to engage with (1))• Probably not (x1), as my organisations engage with capitals, but will recommend to my organisation to become more active towards the EU

5) Please give your suggestions for improving the training seminar or further comments:

Suggestions:

- Provide more case studies and practical examples
- Print double-sided handouts to save trees
- Make it last longer **x3** (increase to three days **(1)**)
- Give opportunities to participants to present examples of their work
- Provide an overview of the EU instruments and policies relevant to peacebuilding
- Invite more guest speakers from the EU
- Create a “question board” with specific questions coming up throughout the sessions
- Make a quick session on policy and advocacy tools and tips
- Make participants share their interest in attending (maybe adding it to the bios)
- More analysis on existing policies (strengths and weaknesses) – each EPLO person provide a 20 minutes overview of a specific thematic and we choose who to listen to
- Provide all maps in A3 format, so that they are easier to read.