



Workshop evaluation for participants

20 answers were analyzed.

1.1. I am

Choice	Count	Percent
National Reference Centre	9	45.00%
National Focal Point	6	30.00%
European Topic Centre	0	0.00%
Other Participant	5	25.00%
Not answered	0	0.00%
Total	20	100%

1.2. Have you attended previous Eionet workshops?

Choice	Count	Percent
None	10	50.00%
1-3 times	4	20.00%
4-10 times	6	30.00%
More than 10 times	0	0.00%
Not answered	0	0.00%
Total	20	100%






















2.1. How did you find the workshop overall?

Choice	Count	Percent
Poor	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	1	5.00%
Good	13	65.00%
Excellent	6	30.00%
Not answered	0	0.00%
Total	20	100%

2.2. Agenda and objectives

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Not answered
2.2.1 Are the objectives of the workshop clear?	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	11 (55.00%)	9 (45.00%)	0 (0.00%)
2.2.2 Is the agenda of the workshop clear?	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.00%)	8 (40.00%)	11 (55.00%)	0 (0.00%)
2.2.3 Is the background material useful?	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.00%)	10 (50.00%)	7 (35.00%)	0 (0.00%)
2.2.4 Was the right mix of topics covered?	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.00%)	11 (55.00%)	7 (35.00%)	0 (0.00%)
2.2.5 Were the background documents useful to you in your daily job?	0 (0.00%)	4 (20.00%)	13 (65.00%)	3 (15.00%)	0 (0.00%)
2.2.6 Did you share the documents or other information with your colleagues?	1 (5.00%)	6 (30.00%)	6 (30.00%)	7 (35.00%)	0 (0.00%)
2.2.7 Were the objectives of the workshop achieved?	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.00%)	10 (50.00%)	8 (40.00%)	0 (0.00%)
























2.2. Agenda and objectives

2.2.1 Are the objectives of the workshop clear?	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
2.2.2 Is the agenda of the workshop clear?	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
2.2.3 Is the background material useful?	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
2.2.4 Was the right mix of topics covered?	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
2.2.5 Were the background documents useful to you in your daily job?	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
2.2.6 Did you share the documents or other information with your colleagues?	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
2.2.7 Were the objectives of the workshop achieved?	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	

3. Workshop content and programme

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Not answered
3.1 Relevance of the agenda for your work	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.00%)	11 (55.00%)	7 (35.00%)	0 (0.00%)
3.2 Balance of content between European and country level	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.00%)	15 (75.00%)	3 (15.00%)	0 (0.00%)
3.3 Facilitation / Chairing (if applicable)	0 (0.00%)	5 (25.00%)	5 (25.00%)	10 (50.00%)	0 (0.00%)
3.4 Use of practical examples/ case studies	2 (10.00%)	5 (25.00%)	9 (45.00%)	4 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)
3.5 Quality of presentations	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.00%)	6 (30.00%)	11 (55.00%)	0 (0.00%)
3.6 Engagement with ETC partners, if applicable	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.00%)	14 (70.00%)	3 (15.00%)	0 (0.00%)
3.7 Exchange of information and experiences	1 (5.00%)	1 (5.00%)	10 (50.00%)	8 (40.00%)	0 (0.00%)

3. Workshop content and programme














3.1 Relevance of the agenda for your work	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
3.2 Balance of content between European and country level	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
3.3 Facilitation / Chairing (if applicable)	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
3.4 Use of practical examples/ case studies	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
3.5 Quality of presentations	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
3.6 Engagement with ETC partners, if applicable	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
3.7 Exchange of information and experiences	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	

Anonymous User	Date 16/01/2015	Answer No response.
-----------------------	------------------------	----------------------------

5. Organisational aspects

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Not answered
5.1 Travel arrangements prior to workshop	1 (5.00%)	1 (5.00%)	4 (20.00%)	14 (70.00%)	0 (0.00%)
5.2 Secretariat support	1 (5.00%)	1 (5.00%)	4 (20.00%)	14 (70.00%)	0 (0.00%)
5.3 Working conditions during this workshop (conference room facilities, equipment etc.)	0 (0.00%)	2 (10.00%)	6 (30.00%)	12 (60.00%)	0 (0.00%)
5.4 Convenience of the location	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (15.00%)	17 (85.00%)	0 (0.00%)


5. Organisational aspects

5.1 Travel arrangements prior to workshop	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
5.2 Secretariat support	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
5.3 Working conditions during this workshop (conference room facilities, equipment etc.)	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	
5.4 Convenience of the location	Poor	
	Satisfactory	
	Good	
	Excellent	
	Not answered	

6. Time allocation

	Too short	Fine	Too long	Not answered
6.1 Length of the Eionet workshop	0 (0.00%)	19 (95.00%)	1 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)
6.2 Length of time allocated to discussions and Q&A	1 (5.00%)	16 (80.00%)	3 (15.00%)	0 (0.00%)
6.3 Length of time allocated to country level experiences	3 (15.00%)	16 (80.00%)	1 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)
6.4 Time for networking including social events	3 (15.00%)	17 (85.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

6. Time allocation



7. Please name the 3 most valuable pieces of information you have gained from this workshop.

User	Date	Answer
Anonymous User	23/06/2015	Situation in other countries EEA know activity key issues
Anonymous User	23/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	19/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	17/06/2015	Update on all ongoing activities and involvement of countries in development of reports and update of climateAdapt (important for non-EU member states as access to information is sometimes limited) Specific country activities which are relevant for current projects (e.g. prioritisation of risks- criteria (NL), Monitoring report and vulnerability assessment of Germany, etc.)
Anonymous User	17/06/2015	understand more the European level develop countries information related to CC networking
Anonymous authenticated user	16/06/2015	details regarding the planning of the future EEA work programme ongoing work on MMR/scoreboard/climate adapt activities and its relevance in 2017 overview on DG Climate activities
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Info on the report on Monitoring, reporting and evaluation - good timing and valuable for the present work. Info from ECDC Info on reports on impacts and vulnerability together with extreme weather events
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	- improvements on climate-adapt - good examples provided by the countries during the facilitated discussion
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Updated information on current and future work, especially underway reports. Share of good practices for multilevel cooperation. Climate-ADAPT improvement avenues.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	what others do what are EEA plans case studies
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	EEA 2016 Report on Cl. Change progress Discussion on adaptation in urban areas Discussion on MRE activities
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Update on working plans, discussion on current and planned reports, update on adaptation activities around EU
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Progress in EEA 2016 report CCI impacts... Examples of MRE in national level Adaptation in urban areas
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	- contacts from other countries - data available at the climate-adapt homepage - data to become available with the next reports
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	EEA present and future activities Climate Adapt Adaptation Indicators need to be defined, that's a very fuzzy thing
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Copernicus presentation Work plan for 2016 Update on country situation

8.1 Ideas for further improving Eionet workshops - Address additional topics?

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	4	20.00%
No	16	80.00%
Not answered	0	0.00%
Total	20	100%

If yes, please specify

User	Date	Answer
Anonymous User	23/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	23/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	19/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	17/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	17/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous authenticated user	16/06/2015	brainstorming sessions should be prepared by EEA with a short background document (challenge, objective, available information)
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Consider smaller groups for discussions and develop on the topic of converging DRR and CCA that was initiated.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Focus on cities and local level Baltic region
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Provide more detail on country experiences
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.

8.2 Do you consider communication between EEA and NRCs between workshops sufficient?

Choice	Count	Percent
Yes	19	95.00%
No	1	5.00%
Not answered	0	0.00%
Total	20	100%

If no, please provide suggestions

User	Date	Answer
Anonymous User	23/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	23/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	19/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	17/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	17/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous authenticated user	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	- review the list and details of NRCs - provide periodic info of EEA projects and plans
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.

8.3 Which forms of communication do you prefer between Eionet workshops?

Choice	Count	Percent
eMail	19	95.00%
Eionet Forum	8	40.00%
Social media platforms	2	10.00%
Webinar	4	20.00%
Newsletter	6	30.00%
Not answered	0	0.00%
Total	20	100%

Any additional comments

User	Date	Answer
Anonymous User	23/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	23/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	19/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	17/06/2015	As already discussed with some EEA staff at the meeting: Some activities (e.g. update of country page on ClimateAdapt) are linked to EU reporting or other EU initiatives. As non-EU member state we kindly ask you to inform us regularly about these activities. Thank you very much.
Anonymous User	17/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous authenticated user	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	As there was to much time allocated for feedback discussions in the break-out groups together with long coffee breaks in an area not being very suitable for networking and discussions, the program seemed in total a bit to "airy" i.e. time not being efficiently used.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Widening the scope of possible counterparts Getting a better understanding of common challenges and realistic outcomes for the near future on adaptation work at EU level
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	Thank you very much for the facilities and kindness of all the EEA staff
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.
Anonymous User	16/06/2015	No response.