

Training seminar on the EU and Peacebuilding

Evaluation Feedback Forms (Total: 16 forms)

1) Content of the training seminar:

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
9	7			

Comments (which sessions were most useful and why? Which sessions did you find less useful and why?):

Most useful:

- Small group session on the EU institutions with experts: 7 (suggestion to make this session longer:1)
- Ekaterina Dorodnova's presentation on the EEAS: 5
- Andrew Sherriff's presentation: 5
- Devising an advocacy strategy: 4 (suggestion to make this session longer:1)
- Roxana Cristescu's presentation: 3
- Martina Weitsch's presentation(s): 3
- Good combination of presentations and group works: 2
- The second day more useful than the first one: 2
- The power analysis: 1
- Josephine Liebl's presentation: 1
- Collecting questions: 1

Less useful:

- Collecting questions: 2 (suggestion that participants could have sent their questions in advance: 1; suggestion to move this session after the 'basic facts' section: 1)
- Martina Weitsch's presentation on Day 2: 1
- Basic EU facts (already known, too long): 2
- Ekaterina Dorodnova's presentation was too vague: 1
- Nothing about EU funding (would be good to make this explicit in the concept note: 1)

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
9.5	6.5			

Comments:

- Very Useful/Clear document: 12

- Power Analysis will be used beyond the training: 3

Suggestion:

- List of contact details of the different desk officers : 1
- Design some simulation cases which could be used in the working groups : 1
- Provide a background document on EPLO, to save time during the 1st day: 1
- Prepare visual aid to better understand how EU and EEAS plan policy and programming, for instance timelines and decision-making processes for MAFF, CSPs, RSPs, IfS AAP, etc: 1
- Add a graphic representation of the EU institutions and how they relate to each other : 1
- Add a glossary for the acronyms: 1
- Make it clearer in the cover note that it is necessary to have a look at the background documents in advance, preferably with an internet connection to look at all the useful links: 1

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

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
8.5	7.5			

Comments

- Some presentations a bit overloaded with detailed information, suggestion to allocate them more time (not to decrease the content): 2
- Sufficient time for questions : 2
- Very well adapted to questions from and needs of the group : 1
- Some presentations not detailed enough / too vague : 1
- Case studies could be built upon: 1
- Knowledge and quality of resource persons and presentations: 8 (in particular Roxana Cristescu: 2; Andrew Sherriff: 1; Josephine Liebl: 1; Ekaterina Dorodnova: 1; Martina Weitsch: 1; the fact they were available for discussion throughout the whole training, including coffee breaks: 1)
- Request to get all PowerPoint presentations after the training: 1
- Good timing, facilitation and programme management : 2
- Session on basic facts on the EU was a bit long : 1
- Good balance between presentations and working in small groups : 1.

4) Methodology of the programme: how did you rate the structure of the training seminar and the methodologies used to engage participants?

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
7.5	7.5	1		

Comments:

- Good mix of group work and input/presentations: 5

- Use of small groups was very good: 3
- Designing an advocacy strategy was a useful exercise: 1
- Very good facilitators: 1
- Interactive structure: 1
- Good mix of oral and visual presentations (i.e. presentations with and without PPT): 1
- About the working group session on EU institutions, it was more difficult to address questions about the relationships between the different institutions: 1
- Unfortunate confusion over the time allocated to the last exercises in small groups, which affected the planning of the groups: 1

Recommendations:

- Address the wide variety of EU experience in the room: 2 (suggestion to separate more experienced participants from “new” ones for some activities, to better adapt the explanations: 1)
- The composition of the working groups could be better thought through by making sure there is a connection between the 1st and the 2nd working group sessions, “so that the questions could be more effectively addressed”: 1
- Spend less time on input during the 1st day in order to move more quickly into group work on strategizing: 1
- Organise more practical exercises: 1
- Allocate more time at the beginning to get to know more about other participants and the organisations they work for. It could have been useful for the plenary discussions: 1
- Add the location, and full name of organisations on the participants list: 1
- Time for designing advocacy strategy was appropriate: 1

5) Usefulness of the seminar:

How much did you learn at the seminar? Please give examples.

- The complexity of different EU institutions and decision-making process : 10 (including the European Parliament in particular: 1)
- Dynamics between different institutions: 5 (including rivalries: 1; lack of coordination: 1)
- Designing an advocacy strategy: 5
- How to approach EU staff: 2
- The EU institutions’ working methods: 1
- The conflict / peacebuilding related tools: 1
- EPLO’s work: 1
- Timing to try and influence EU programming: 1

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

- Who to approach and how: 5

- Supporting/Transmitting the information to in-country and regional partners for advocacy towards the EU: 4
- Supporting EPLO's work: 3
- Dealing with EU delegations : 2
- Working on specific EU projects: 2
- Dealing with European Parliament: 2
- Dealing with EUSR: 1
- Use of online tools for advocacy: 1
- Take Brussels specialized media into account when devising an advocacy strategy: 1

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

Suggestions for other kinds of training seminars:

- Training on fundraising: 6 (a full training or adding a section in the current training)
- Training on EU project management: 3

Suggestions for improving the training seminar:

- More time at the beginning to get to know other participants (introduction in pairs for instance): 2
- Ensure that resource person is not too dominant during group work for designing an advocacy strategy: 2
- Reduce the "basic facts" part: 2 (instead require participants to already be prepared on this: 1)
- Send PowerPoint presentations to participants after the seminar: 1
- The number of participants could be increased: 1
- Good number of participants: 1
- Discuss more advocacy success stories: 1
- Spend more time on "how to" design an advocacy strategy: 1
- More time, extend the seminar schedule until 17:30: 1
- Spend more time on technical details for those who already know about the EU: 1
- A day of study visit and meetings: 1
- Venue too dark and no desk to take note, but nice garden: 1
- List with emails of all participants: 1
- Excellent organisation and logistics, methodology and content: 1
- Spend more time on policy and planning cycles (CSPs, MAFF, etc): 1