Civil Society Dialogue Network
Training Seminar on Peacebuilding Advocacy towards the EU, 20-21 June 2019

EVALUATION FEEDBACK FORM

1) Content of the training seminar:

Session 1 – Thursday morning: Setting the scene: Manoeuvring the EU bubble

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What worked well:
- Diversity of presentations
- Very practical approach
- Good/interesting presentations x5
- Good introduction x3
- Clear overview x3
- Good informal approach
- Good engagement by participants

Suggestions:
- Send presentations x2
- Use visualisation

Criticisms:
- Too fast
- Too much information x3

Session 2 – Thursday morning: Who is “the EU”? Group exercise on the EU institutions and peacebuilding

<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>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What worked well:
- Useful to understand EU Institutions x7
- Useful to identify who to target x2
- Useful to answer to questions that came up in the group
- Useful questions
- Good use of group work
- Good to keep it interactive x3
• Good to get to know other participants (good to mix groups on 2\textsuperscript{nd} day)
• Good background material \textbf{x2}
• Good to have EPLO staff at the table

**Suggestions:**
• More time to address the questions
• Short theoretical presentation
• Clearer objective would have been useful
• More guidance from EPLO

**Criticisms:**
• A bit repetitive with the content of the mapping of actors
• Different level of knowledge
• Mapping what we know was too long and messy
• Chaotic because not enough knowledge
• Too long

---

**Session 3 – Thursday afternoon: Building advocacy from information: Parallel discussions on EU processes on geographic and thematic issues**

<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></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What worked well:**
• Interesting/good speakers \textbf{x12}
• Honest and critical approach of the speakers
• Useful \textbf{x5} (to understand blockages and challenges \textbf{x1})
• Interesting to address direct questions to officials
• Good to have smaller groups

**Suggestions:**
• Do immediate feedback from groups \textbf{x2}
• Encourage speakers to be frank (mention Chatham House rules)
• More time for practical information
• Make the session longer
• Have a rotation so that everybody can hear everything
• Not very concrete discussions in group B

**Criticism:**
• Didn’t share enough what was said in the other group
• Stijn was too reserved
• Lack of advice on how to work with
Session 4 – Friday morning: Advocacy tips from inside the institutions: Discussion with EU officials on peacebuilding and the EU institutions

<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></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What worked well:**
- Useful tips \(^\times 8\)
- Interesting/good presentations \(^\times 9\)
- Learned useful things on the MFF
- Interesting to address direct questions to officials \(^\times 2\)
- Good to have speakers from different institutions

**Suggestions:**
- Specifically address the questions asked on the previous day
- Provide overview of each institutions before
- Encourage speakers to be frank (mention Chatham House rules)
- Make longer Q&A

**Criticisms:**
- Too fast
- Difficult to follow due to lack of knowledge in EU architecture
- Difficult to focus – better in parallel groups

Session 5 – Friday morning: Influencing the EU institutions: Learning from best practices and lessons learnt from past and ongoing advocacy strategies

<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></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What worked well:**
- Interesting \(^\times 2\)
- Useful \(^\times 7\) (especially on ‘innovative’ strategies \(^\times 1\))
- Good to have different sized organisations
- Good examples

**Suggestions:**
- Also provide examples of failure \(^\times 2\)
- Be more concrete and focused on wins
- Provide visualisation

**Criticism**
- Did not understand the point of Julien’s presentation
- Oxfam and QCEA not interesting
- Oxfam and QCEA difficult to follow
- Too broad
- Too much repetition of tips
Session 6 – Friday afternoon: From theory to practice: Developing a personal EU advocacy plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What worked well:
- Useful **x12** (to focus on clear advocacy issues and targets **x3**)
- Necessary
- Supportive environment
- Positive 1-minute presentations

Suggestions:
- Provide more guidance **x2**
- Have an EPLO staff at the table **x3**
- Have EPLO staff engaging on single plans
- Provide a template **x3**
- To do more in detail
- To receive feedback on the 1-min advocacy plan

Criticisms:
- Too lonely
- Would have preferred talking more with EU officials instead of doing the exercise
- Lacked a clear structure
- Too much time for the amount of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

What worked well:
- Clear
- Useful **x7**

Suggestions:
- More documents on approach of MS on peace and security
- More information on EP groups' positions on peace and security and MEPs interested in peacebuilding
- Additional documents on best practices in advocacy
- Provide organigrams in advance
- Group together those with similar targets.
- Have feedback on the 1-min advocacy plan

Criticisms:
- Too long **x2**
3) How would you rate the overall facilitation of the training seminar and the quality of the presentations?

<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></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What worked well:
- Good x9
- Knowledgeable
- Warm
- Interactive
- Participative x2
- Positive atmosphere in the room
- Clear presentations x3
- Timely x2
- Dynamic
- A lot of time for questions

Suggestions:

Criticisms:
- Some presentations were rushed
- Second day was less focused
- Occasionally interfered too much with the panel

4) Usefulness of the seminar:

Did you find the seminar useful?
- Yes x17
- Since organisation already collaborate with EU, would have been more useful for others
- Useful for networking x3
- Useful to interact with EU x2

How much did you learn at the seminar? Please give examples.
- More about EU institutions x14
- Advocacy tips in general x7
- Identifying advocacy targets x5
- Importance of personal relations with EU officials
- Learned more on the MFF x2
• Assess power and decision-making capacity
• Other people’s problems
• Other organisations’ funding structures
• Get examples of CSO advocacy
• Identify negative aspects that could undermine advocacy
• Learnt more about EPLO

Will you apply what you learned in your work? Please give examples.
• Yes x13
• Carry out advocacy with more confidence
• More focused targeting x7
• Clearer messaging
• Will develop new strategies x3
• Will engage with some speakers
• More engagement with the EP
• More engagement with the Council and MS
• Do more mapping x2
• Develop advocacy towards the EU
• Strengthen networks developed at the seminar

5) Please give your suggestions for improving the training seminar or further comments:
• Provide more advocacy examples x2 (including about failed strategies x1)
• Do separate groups (Brussels-based; field-based; people doing research; projects)
• Do follow up on advocacy plans
• More informal sharing moments to meet participants
• Sharing presentations with participants x2
• Squeeze it in one day, make less group work. Give 10 minutes to prepare advocacy plan, not 1,5 hours.
• Make it longer (3 days)
• Bring in officials who usually do not meet civil society
• Do more small groups and less plenary
• Share talking points of speakers
• Do more quizzes to test knowledge
• Do follow up sessions