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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What worked well:
- 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))

Suggestions:
- 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”

Criticisms:
- Organigrams too tiny, difficult to read

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session 3 – Thursday afternoon: Influencing the EU institutions: Case studies of past advocacy strategies

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 4 – Friday morning: Discussion with EU officials

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>Between good and average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Experienced
- Knowledgeable
- Clear roles
- Good timing for the pauses
- Excellent logistics
- Amazing
- Nice hotel
4) **Usefulness of the seminar:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you find the seminar useful?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much did you learn at the seminar? Please give examples.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The structure of the EU <strong>x7</strong> (the difference between the EEAS and DEVCO (1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Functioning of the EU <strong>x5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advocacy approaches and institutions to target <strong>x9</strong> (importance to lobby at a personal level (1); possibility to target the Parliament (1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EU policies on peacebuilding <strong>x2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The complexity of the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How to relate to each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Importance of lobbying at a personal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EU jargon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Importance of timing <strong>x2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learned what changed since the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EU’s orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EPLO’s function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will you apply what you learned in your work? Please give examples.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Most certainly <strong>x2</strong> (in terms of entry points, delegation-level work (1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes <strong>x15</strong> (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))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Probably not <strong>x1</strong>, as my organisations engage with capitals, but will recommend to my organisation to become more active towards the EU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.