Civil Society Dialogue Network Training Seminar  
Advocacy towards the EU on Funding for Peacebuilding, 9-10 March 2017  

EVALUATION FEEDBACK FORM

1) Content of the training seminar:

**Session 1 – Thursday morning: Welcome and objectives 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>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did not respond: 1

**What worked well:**
- Effective
- Useful
- Clear x3 (in setting the tone, aims and objectives of the training (1); in giving an overview of the training and plan (1))
- Helped participants in thinking objectives through
- Ensured objectives are attained throughout the training

**What worked less well:**
- Would have been good to have more background reading
- Would have been useful to receive PowerPoint presentations ahead of time in order to study

**Session 2 – Thursday morning: EU institutions and funding programmes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did not respond: 1

**What worked well:**
- Good/excellent overview x3 (on trust funds (1))
- Very clear x3
- Concise
- Useful x2
- Very informative
- Good foundation for following sessions
- Right introduction to kick start
• Table conversation and opportunity to engage with speakers in small groups were enjoyable
• Helped in getting a clearer picture of EU institutions organigrammes
• Helped in getting a clearer picture of EU funding programmes

What worked less well:
• A lot of information to digest
• Easier to follow with more visual supplementations x2 (Nicolas did not have a presentation)
• Would have been nice to hear more about the differences of the instruments (Longer-term funds, work funded by DEVCO), which is interesting when thinking about how to get funding from another instrument other than IcSP
• Would have been good to show large acronyms next to the PowerPoint presentations
• Too general

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 3 – Thursday afternoon: EU funding cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What worked well:
• Well tied to the previous sessions
• Good to know when + how to influence and when not to
• Good to know what can and can’t be done in terms of advocacy at each stage
• Valuable Q&A with resource people
• Appreciated Nicolas’ intervention
• Session always to be kept in seminars

What worked less well:
• Would have been better to show an organigramme of decision-making cycles
• Lunch did not help to stay focused
• Would have liked to hear more on the process of submitting an application (time it takes to get the funding decision)
• Q&A could be extended
• Too general

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 4 – Thursday afternoon: Case studies of past advocacy strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What worked well:
- Interesting x2 (to hear about a campaign followed closely (1); to know more on other NGO experiences (1))
- Very useful
- Very good insights
- Very relevant
- Good example of how a well-designed strategy does not necessarily lead to the expected results
- Good to have a mix between an advocacy strategy on policy for a very specific issue and a much broader strategy for funding for peacebuilding
- Great idea to have a partner come and share their experiences
- Ben's presentation was very practical
- The case-study on Yemen was a good learning opportunity to see how you can achieve a specific goal by advocating to the relevant stakeholders
- Kloé’s intervention was particularly good for understanding how advocacy works
- Gave the possibility to better understand an issue
- The case-study on the MFF was useful and practical

What worked less well:
- Need of more of this sharing experience between and during the seminar
- Possibly illustrate on an organigramme how one case links to the other and how it compares to “official” decision making
- Too fast x2
- Less relevant than the rest of the seminar
- Less focused than the rest of the seminar
- Would have been good to have more structure laying out the “how”
- The case-study on Yemen was not relevant (for the participant’s work)
- Would have been good to have more lobby examples

Session 5 – Friday morning: Welcome and reflections on Day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What worked well:
- Very informative
- Enriching
- Fun
- Energising
- Clear
- Concise
- Great that some of the questions left on the previous day were immediately answered and participants were presented with relevant resources
- Great way to grab attention
- Good to have a Q&A Session on what was learned the day before x2
- Chocolate is always good
Session 6 – Friday morning: Discussion with EU officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did not respond: 1

What worked well:
- Excellent/good opportunity x3 (to get the insider’s point of view on the issues (1); to network (2))
- Good mix / diverse group / different officials x5
- EU officials spoke frankly
- EU officials gave practical tips
- Increased the understanding of the challenges they face
- Appreciated openness of the EU officials
- Really useful insights into EU relationships and priorities
- It served as a reality check
- Good to hear what is good and bad advocacy from an EU official’s perspective

What worked less well:
- Too much into details on themes that are not well-known for everyone
- Possibly include a Member State representative
- Smaller break-out groups like in Sessions 2 would have been appreciated
- Some of the discussions maybe took too much time from other discussions
- It would have been good to have a longer session
- It would have been good to have a less formal Q&A
- Sometimes disturbing that EU officials do not know more about their own organisation/institution
- Need more time to debate

Session 7 – 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>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did not respond: 1

What worked well:
- Very enriching/great opportunity to brainstorm x3 (with people from different organisations and backgrounds (1))
- Necessary
- Well thought
- Useful x2
- Great to put what learned into practice x5
- Made you realise what you have learned
- Excellent exercise x2
- Well-lead discussion
- Showed a good example/way of how to advocate
- Good engagement
- Stimulates ideas and dialogue
- Good to have an expert facilitating
2) How would you rate the quality of the background documents that were distributed in advance of the training seminar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Useful x5
- Relevant x2
- Gave an idea of what to expect
- Helpful

Problems:
- Too dense

Recommendations:
- Would have liked more x2
- Would have liked further readings
- Would add the PowerPoints to the initial pack x2 (to write notes directly on them and to have them on hand for the practical exercise (1))
- Add updated power analysis
- Would have been good to ask organisations to bring more examples

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:
- Clear presentations
- In time with the schedule
- One of the best seminars ever attended
- Diverse group of people
- The good setting ensured the discussion flowed
- It was good to draw together takeaways and learnings with the facilitators
- Sonya and Ben were amazing, cheerful and always sticking to the agenda
- Sonya was excellent
- Entire EPLO team was professional and competent

Problems:
- Presentations sometimes difficult to understand

Recommendations:
- More detailed PowerPoints would help understand
- Speak loudly and slower

4) Usefulness of the seminar:

Did you find the seminar useful?
- Yes x17 (very 6)
- Useful to be used as an introduction to a constant learning by doing
- Gave good takeaways

How much did you learn at the seminar? Please give examples.
- Useful teamwork.
- Great mix of learning styles.
- Better understanding of EU funding instruments x7 (where peacebuilding sits in the instruments (1); more clarity about specific funding instruments (1))
- Better understanding of how to advocate towards EU institutions x7 (learned advocacy tips (1))
- Learned who to engage in advocacy at the EU level x6
- Learned where NGOs are effective at the EU level.
- Better understanding of how to put together an advocacy strategy and to target relevant stakeholders x2
- Learned to integrate and put together the aspects learned during the seminar.
- Learned the importance of an office in Brussels to advocate towards the EU institutions and/or an office in-country to advocate towards the delegations.
- Better understanding of the EU x6
- Better understanding of the role of collective action in funding advocacy x3 (understanding of its leverage (1))
- Learned practical examples of advocacy activities x2 (valued a lot the practical strategy design exercise (1)).
- Useful to have a complete and strategic way of thinking about advocacy.
- Learned what to watch out for
Learned what other organisations are out there
Learned the importance of providing recommendations
Learned the existence of trust funds

Will you apply what you learned in your work? Please give examples.

- Will use it in future advocacy strategies x4
- Will engage my organisation in collaborative/cross-sector funding approaches
- Will push my organisation to engage on collective action
- Will use it in my organisation’s current campaigning work
- Will use it when coordinating meetings with field analysts
- This seminar will serve as useful background knowledge and may be useful in the future when applying/looking for EU funding x3 (when devising strategies to apply for EU funds (1))
- Will use for future work within CSOs or EU institutions
- Will do more travels to Brussels
- Will engage with a broader range of EU actors and provide them with reports and information from the field
- Will apply in external engagement
- Will use the EU advocacy table/template x2
- Will partner with some of the organisations present at the seminar
- Will use to engage with the EU both at HQ and delegation level
- Will share the documents and the key findings internally in my organisation x2
- Will help my organisation better understand the funding prospects
- Have already devised a strategy to influence a specific fund to include peacebuilding and civil society
- Will use it while writing an article on EU support to peacebuilding
- Will use it when working in coalitions with other peacebuilding organisations

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

- Should provide the PowerPoint on the day
- The exercise was helpful but could have gone deeper
- It would be good to have more experience sharing between participants
- Participants should do their reading (homework) before they come
- Would be good to have representatives from partner countries
- More panels with different actors
- Would be good to have everyone’s contact details shared via mail x2
- Would be good to share EPLO’s past advocacy templates
- Would be good to have small break-out groups with EU officials like it happened with resource people
- More time with EU officials
- More focused practical sessions
- More attention to people’s comfort level / experience of advocacy before going into activity
- Think about doing a webinar
- Think about involving journalist/media
- Would have been good to link humanitarian and peacebuilding for building coalitions