

Name (optional)				
Place		country Esbug	ک	ate 15.03
Profession Mabashan	afficer	Affiliation		
Sex:	☐ Male	Female		
1. ORGANISATIONAL A 1.1 Organisation of the Not suitable			Suitable	¥
1.2 The technical equipa Not suitable	ment used during t ① ② ③ ④		Suitable	
2. CONTENTS			ñ.	
2.1 The workshop's cont Not Interesting	ent were ① ② ③ ④) S 6 7 ® 9 C	Interesting	
2.2 The structure of the Not Suitable	workshop program ① ② ③ ④	0 0 0 0 0) Suitable	
2.3 Were the workshop' Inconsistent		nt with your expectations (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10)		
2.4 Were the workshop' Inconsistent	s content consister ① ② ③ ④) Consistent	
2.5 Were the workshop' Not well develop	s contents well de ped ① ② ③ (Well developed	
3. METHODOLOGIES				
3.1 The tools and mater Not appropriate	als used during the	e workshop were ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧	M Appropriate	
3.2 The methodologies of Not appropriate	-	3 4 5 6 7 8	M Appropriate	
3.3 The activities organ	zed were ① ②	3 4 5 6 7 8	① Useful	



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ② ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS 1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable 1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Suitable 2. CONTENTS 2.1 The workshop's content were Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Interesting 2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Well developed	Place		Country	Date
1. Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑥ Ø Suitable 1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑥ Ø Suitable 2. CONTENTS 2.1 The workshop's content were Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Interesting 2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ④ Appropriate	Profession		Affiliation	
1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable 1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable 2. CONTENTS 2.1 The workshop's content were Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Interesting 2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑩ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑩ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ ④ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ ④ Appropriate	Sex:	☐ Male	Female	
1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable 1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable 2. CONTENTS 2.1 The workshop's content were Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Interesting 2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑩ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑩ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ ④ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ ④ Appropriate	1. Organisational as	PECTS		
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable 1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was., Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable 2. CONTENTS 2.1 The workshop's content were Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑪ Interesting 2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑪ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑩ ① Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑩ ⑩ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ ④ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ ④ Appropriate			he workshop was,	
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑥ ② ⑩ Suitable 2. CONTENTS 2.1 The workshop's content were Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑪ Interesting 2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑪ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑩ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ ⑨ Ռ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate	and a market and framework from Tolk for a new men			Suitable
2. CONTENTS 2.1 The workshop's content were Not interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting 2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑩ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	1.2 The technical equipme	ent used during t		2000年
2.1 The workshop's content were Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Interesting 2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑩ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate	Not suitable	0 2 3 4	S 6 7 8 (9)	Suitable
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Interesting 2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Appropriate	2. CONTENTS			
2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑩ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate	2.1 The workshop's conte		0	32 <u>-</u> 3 8 8
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑥ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable 2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate	Not Interesting	①②③④	0 5 6 7 (8)9	1 Interesting
2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ② ⑧ ⑨ ① Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Appropriate	2.2 The structure of the w			The same same
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent 2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	Not Suitable	0 2 3 4	56789	
2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	2.3 Were the workshop's	content consister	nt with your expectatio	ns?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	Inconsistent	① ② ③ ④	5678(9)	Consistent
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent 2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	2.4 Were the workshop's	content consister	nt with your needs?	
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well developed 3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	(B) 마음 (1) (1) [10] (B) [10] (B)			Consistent
3. METHODOLOGIES 3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate	2.5 Were the workshop's	contents well dev		V 8024 88 88 88 88
3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	Not well develope	d (1) (2) (3) (6	95678(9)	Well developed
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate 3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	3. METHODOLOGIES			
3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	3.1 The tools and materia	s used during the	e workshop were	
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Appropriate 3.3 The activities organized were	Not appropriate	0 2	3 4 5 6 7	8 (9) (1) Appropriate
3.3 The activities organized were	3.2 The methodologies us	ed were	,	
3.3 The activities organized were Not useful ①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑥ ②⑥①Useful	Not appropriate	① ②	3 4 5 6 7	S
Not useful	3.3 The activities organize	ed were	(N	<u> </u>
		TALL THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY	3 4 5 6 7	® ® ® Useful



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was. Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation wag:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name	(optional)											man List			
Place					Co	untry	,	FIN	J L A	N	D			Date	15.3.20
Professi	on Superulsing	senio	r coo	-g/ro	iot Aff	iliatio	on	C_{Γ}	h-cl	n al		anct	iors agei	w	
Sex:			□ Mai	le		□ F	emal	e			Ñ				
1. OR	GANISATIONAL A	SPECT	s												
1.1 Or	ganisation of the f Not suitable		s used ② ③							Ø		Suitab	le		
1.2 Th	e technical equipr Not suitable	The second second		ring t	V Carlonian Co.	Charles and Charles and	To Company	The second second		(M)		Suitab	le		
2. Cor	NTENTS														
	workshop's cont	ent we	re												
	Not Interesting	①	2	3 4	S	6	7	8	S	((0))	Intere	sting		
2.2 The	e structure of the v Not Suitable	Programme Company	op pro		nme ⑤			8	蔥	00		Suitab	le		`
2.3 We	ere the workshop's Inconsistent	conte ①	nt con						ctati	ions (III)		Consis	tent		
2.4 We	re the workshop's Inconsistent	conte	nt con	siste	_	-	-	100	ls?	. @		Consis	tent		
2.5 We	ere the workshop's Not well develop	(% %SEE	3 /33-243	0.00	velor ④(100		D (B ()	Q	Well d	eveloped		
3. ME	THODOLOGIES												ž.		
3.1 The	e tools and materi Not appropriate	als use	d durii ①	ng th	e wo	rksh ④	op v ⑤	vere ⑥	 Ø	8	9	Ø	Appropriat	e	
3.2 The	e methodologies u Not appropriate	sed we	ere ①	2	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	9) (M	Appropriat	e	
3.3 The	activities organi Not useful	zed we	ere	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	00	Useful		



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ② ⑧ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Æ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑥ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations? Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ◎ ⑨ ① Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name	(optional)	JAH	1161			
Place	Tallan		Country	, Estons	a	Date 19-15.0
Profes	sion SACIAL W	oleer	Affiliatio	on Tallow	r Rison	
Sex:		□ Male	,À€	emale	,	
	RGANISATIONAL ASP rganisation of the fac Not suitable		or the works ④ ⑤ ⑥		Suitable	
1.2 T	he technical equipme Not suitable	nt used duri ① ② ③	ing the work ④ ⑤ ⑥	and form and	Suitable	
	ONTENTS ne workshop's conten Not Interesting		9 S C	0 7 (8) 9 10	Interesting	
2.2 Th	ne structure of the wo	orkshop prog ① ② ③	gramme was ④ ⑤ ⑥		Suitable	
2.3 W	ere the workshop's c Inconsistent	ontent cons ① ② ③	istent with y ④ ⑤ ⑥	and the same of	Consistent	
2.4 W	ere the workshop's c Inconsistent	ontent cons ① ② ③		our needs?	Consistent	
2.5 W	ere the workshop's o			0 0 8 0 0	Well developed	
3. M	ETHODOLOGIES					
3.1 Ti	ne tools and materials Not appropriate	s used during	g the worksh ② ③ ④) (i) Appropriat	e
3.2 TI	ne methodologies use Not appropriate	ed were	234	\$ 6 7 8 (9	e
3.3 TI	ne activities organize Not useful	d were	2 3 4	\$ 6 7 8 /	9 0 Useful	



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑤ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations? Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ② ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name (optional)	
Place Country Estenia Da	ate 15,02
Profession Affiliation	
Sex:	
1. Organisational aspects	
1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Suitable	
1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Suitable	
Not suitable 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	
2. CONTENTS	
2.1 The workshop's content were Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Interesting	
2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Suitable	
2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑩ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent	
2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ Ø ⑧ ⑨ Consistent	
2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑩ Well developed	
3. METHODOLOGIES	ě
3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Appropriate	
3.2 The methodologies used were Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑩	
3.3 The activities organized were Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑩ Useful	



4. SK	ILLS OF THE	Ехрі	ERT:	SIN	CHA	RGE	OF	THE	Wo	RKS	НОР								
4.1 Ca	pability of m	ode	ratir	ng th	e w	orksl	hop				01.2								
Poor		1	2	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	9	Q	Е	xcell	ent					
4.2 Th	e interaction	bet	wee	n ex	pert	s an	d pa	rtici	pant	s wa	as	1 .	902						
	Non exister	nt		①	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	風	00	St	timul	ating			
4.3 Yo	ur level of in	volv	eme	nt a	nd a	ctiv	e pa	rticip	oatio	n wa	as:								
	Very low			0	0	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	9	00	V	ery h	gh			
5. Ат	MOSPHERE I	N T	HE \	Nor	RKSH	ЮР	ROC	M											
5.1 Co	mmunication	n ins	ide	the	grou	ps h	as b	een.					Savi						
	Poor			①	2	3	4	-		Ø	8	9	Ø,	E	xcelle	nt			
5.2 Int	eraction bet	wee ①	n th ②	0.00	orksl ④	115	11122	10000	9225	0.200	 Ø	Ε	xcell	ent					
	w useful do o	you	feel	that	t the	con	tact	s yo	u ma	ade v	with	the	othe	r wo	orksh	op part	cicipants w	ill be fo	r future
	Not very us	eful				0	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	(3)	9	00	Usefu	ıl		
6. GE	NERAL EVAL	.UAT	ΓΙΟΝ	1															
6.1 Th	e workshop į	prog	ram	me	was.									7.					
	Not Interes	sting			1	2	3	4	(S	6	0	8	9	M)		Interes	ting	
6.2 Th	e workshop į	prog	ram	me	was		192015	MELEN	0.2244	72000	C19224	90000	58200	1-0	7				
	Not involvi	ng			1	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	00	7		Involvir	ng	
6. Co	MMENTS:																		
																		4.5	



Place	() = -4)	į	Country					Date
Profession	on			9	Affiliatio	on				
Sex:	5		Male		□F	emale	9			
1. OR	GANISATIONAL AS	PECTS								
	ganisation of the fa		ised fo	or the	works	hop	was	/	/	
	Not suitable				\$ 6				00	Suitable
1.2 The	e technical equipme	ent used	d durir	ng the	e work	shop	was			
	Not suitable	D 2	-	-		Ø	(C) (Land 10)		00	Suitable
2. Con	NTENTS									
2.1 The	workshop's conte	nt were							/	
	Not Interesting	① (2	3	4	⑤ ⑥	0	8	9	Ø	Interesting
2.2 The	structure of the w	orkshop	progr	ramn	ne was			1	ž.	
	Not Suitable	O C	3	4	⑤	0	8	Ø	(1)	Suitable
2.3 We	re the workshop's	content	consis	stent	with y	oure	xpe	ctatio	ons?	
	Inconsistent	① (2	3	4	⑤ ⑥	0	8	Ø	00	Consistent
2.4 We	re the workshop's	content	consis	stent	with y	ourr	need	s?	Ž	
	Inconsistent	① (2	3	④	®	Ø	8	Ø	00	Consistent
2.5 We	re the workshop's								7	
	Not well develope	d ①	2 3	(4)	(S) (6 (7	9 (9	00	Well developed
3. ME	THODOLOGIES									
3.1 The	tools and materia	s used o	during	the	worksh	ор и	ere.			/
	Not appropriate		①	② (3 4	(\$)	©	Ø	® /	M Appropriate
3.2 The	methodologies us	ed were	2						/	
	Not appropriate		1	2	3 4	(5)	6	Ø ,	8 (9 ⁽¹⁾ Appropriate
3.3 The	activities organize	ed were		028		828	822		10220 1	/
	Not useful		0	2	③ ④	(5)	6	Ø	8	Output District Control of the co



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP	
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop	
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent	
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was	*
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑤ Stimulating	
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:	
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high	
5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room	
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been	
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ Ø ⑩ Excellent	
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was	
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Excellent	
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be collaborations?	for future
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 熥 Useful	
6. GENERAL EVALUATION	
6.1 The workshop programme was	
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting	
6.2 The workshop programme was	
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Involving	
6. COMMENTS:	



Name (optional)	
Place Talla Sokottatel country Estovia	Date 13-16
Profession Affiliation Mixistry of Jus	stice
Sex:	
1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS	
1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was	
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ N Suitable	
1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop wask.	
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ 🎾 ⑩ Suitable	
2. CONTENTS	
2.1 The workshop's content were	
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Interesting	
2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was	
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑩ Suitable	
2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?	
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 🌋 Consistent	
2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?	
2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Consistent	
2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Well developed	
Not well developed U U U U U U W Well developed	i i
3. METHODOLOGIES	
3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were	
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 颅 Approp	riate
3.2 The methodologies used were	
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ 🖗 ⑩ Approp	riate
3.3 The activities organized were	
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful	



4. Skills of the experts in charge of the Workshop
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future
collaborations? Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ W Useful
Not very userur
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ M Involving
6. COMMENTS:
*



Name (optional) AUNECI NAME
Place Sokos HOTEL VIRV Country ESTONIA Date 14-13
Profession PROBATION OFFICER Affiliation TALLINNA VANGLA
Sex:
1. Organisational aspects
1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ M Suitable
1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ∭ Suitable
2. CONTENTS
2.1 The workshop's content were
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suitable
2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent
2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs? Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Consistent
2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed? Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Well developed
3. METHODOLOGIES
3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ﴾ Appropriate
3.2 The methodologies used were
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Appropriate
3.3 The activities organized were
Not useful



4. SKI	LLS OF THE	Ехрі	ERTS	IN	CHA	RGE	OF.	THE	Wo	RKS	HOP	•						
4.1 Ca Poor	pability of m	odei ①	-					Ø	8	9	J	E	Excelle	nt				*
4.2 Th	e interaction Non existe		wee	n ex	pert	s an	d pa	rtici ⑤	pant ⑥	s wa	s ®	9	<u>)</u>	Stim	ulat	ing		ř(
				586	**	Ĭ	1000		T	1374	12.7%	Ĭ		J				
4.3 Yo	ur level of in	volv	eme	0.000	100000	1000000	7.5	777	200	200	Marine a	9	(1)			1		
	Very low			①	(<u>c</u>)	(3)	•	٩	w	7	M	9	w	Very	nig	n		
5. Ат	MOSPHERE	IN TI	HE V	Nor	RKSH	ЮР	ROC	M										
5.1 Co	mmunicatio	n ins	ide	the	grou	ps h	as b	een.										
	Poor									Ø	8	Ø	0	Exce	llen	t		
5.2 Int	eraction bet	wee	n th	e w	orks	пор	part	icipa	nts	was.								
	Poor	0	2	3	4	(3)	6	7	8	Ø	1	E	Excelle	nt				
	w useful do orations?	you	feel	tha	t the	cor	tact	s yo	u ma	ade v	with	the	other	work	sho	o parti	cipants will be	for future
	Not very u	seful				1	2	3	④	(\$)	6	7	18	9 0)	Useful	ĺ	
6. GE	NERAL EVAI	LUAT	LION	1														8
6.1 Th	e workshop	prog	gram	me	was									9				
	Not Intere	sting	3		1	2	3	4	(3)	(6	7	(8	9)	(9)			Interesting	
6.2 Th	e workshop Not involvi		gram	me	was ①	 ②	3	4	(5)	6	7	8	9	60			Involving	
6 CO	MMENTS:				-								/					
	IVIIVIEN 13.																	
		_							_	_				-			-)-	
			8 8				437											



Name	(or	otional)	70	1110	9	V	ay	f-;	A	m	68	うへ	Co	7							
Place							U	Cou	intry		Fi	16	29.	d				Date	15,	3.2	20
Profess	ion	senio	r spe	ecia	rli	st		Aff	liatiç	n											
Sex:						Male		,	⊠ Fe	emal	е										
1. OF	RGAI	VISATION	IAL ASI	PECT	S																
		isation of	100	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	360	ed f	or th	ne w	orks	hop	was			<u>,,</u>							
		t suitable				3							000		Suit	table	1				
S(1904) (202		20 5307 949	5		(4	9 5	324		745	2.			-								
1.2 Th		chnical e		nt u			1111111111	-	100		1		-cod		c	eserter Fo					
	NC	t suitable	9	(I)	2	3	4	9	•	Ø	0	9	900		Sun	table					
2. Co	NTE	NTS																			
		rkshop's	conter	t we	ere	•;								140							
		t Interes				3	4	(3)	6	7	8	9	AD.	{	Inte	erest	ing				
2.2 Th		ucture of									0	9	00		c		ä				
	NC	t Suitable	9	W	(2)	3	•	(2)	X	W	0	(1)	W		Sun	table	2				
2.3 W	ere t	he works	hop's c	onte	ent c	onsi	sten	t wi	th y	oure	expe	ctati	ions	7							
		onsisten		1	2	3	4	-	00000		-/	9	1		Cor	nsist	ent				
R24 (2012/2012)			2010/19/24/10									95-220									
2.4 W		he works	50	10000	100	7000	10 April 10	200	-	0.00	-	Carte	(M)				Design 10				
	Inc	consisten	t	①	2	3	4)	(3)	6	Ø	(8)	9	0		Cor	nsiste	ent				
2.5 W	ere t	he works	hop's c	onte	ents	well	dev	elor	ed?			,									
	No	t well de	velope	D t	(2	0 (3	0	0	0	0	0 78	5 0	(0	We	II de	veloped				
			18								<i>(</i> *)						Ø.				
3. M	THO	DOLOGI	ES																		
2.4 75	117020100	arter arabat san			a alv			-12/2/2012	ara ia	2002											
3.1 In		ols and m		s use	ea at	A STATE OF THE STA						 Ø	®	9	Œ		Appropriate				
	INC	t approp	ilate			(I)	•	9	w.	9	•	v	w.	9	X	94	Appropriate	1			
3.2 Th	e me	ethodolog	gies use	d w	ere																
	No	t approp	riate			1	2	3	4	(5)	6	7	8	9	9	0	Appropriate	9			
3.3 Th		tivities o	rganize	d w	ere.	 ①	2	3	(A)	(5)	(B)	7	(0)	<u></u>) (4	t teafer!				
	IAC	t useful				W	6	(1)	•	W	W	V	(0)	(9)	1	W	Useful				



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPER	TS IN	CHA	RGE	OF.	THE	Wo	RKS	НОР				
4.1 Capability of modera	ting th	e wo	orksl	пор					*			
	2 3	4			7	8	9	900	E	xcell	lent	
4.2 The interaction betw	een ex	pert	s an	d pa	rtici	pant	s wa	s	102273	9 <u>32</u> 51		R
Non existent	0	2	Ø	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	0	Stimulating	
4.3 Your level of involver	nent a								No.E.W	50400		
Very low	①	2	3	④	(\$)	©	Ø	(8)	9	100	Very high	
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE	: Woi	RKSH	ЮР	ROC	M							
5.1 Communication insid	e the	grou	ps h	as b	een.	ñ.,			2007			
Poor	①	2	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	Ø	0	Excellent	
5.2 Interaction between	the w	orksl	пор	part	icipa	nts	was.					
Poor ①(2 3	4	(5)	6	0	18	9	0	E	xcel	lent	
5.3 How useful do you fe collaborations?	el tha	t the	con	tact	s yo	u ma	de v	vith	the	othe	er workshop part	icipants will be for future
Not very useful			1	2	3	4	(\$)	6	Ø	8		ıl
6. GENERAL EVALUATION	ОИ											ñ p
6.1 The workshop progra	mme	was.								è	11	
Not Interesting		1	2	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	9) 900	Interesting
6.2 The workshop progra	amme	1		•	•				•	•	<i>≥</i> √	an wa
Not involving		①	2	(3)	(4)	(5)	6	(7)	8	9		Involving
6. COMMENTS:												
			011									



Place						Cou	intry									Date	10	5. 3	3.	2
Profess	sion					Affi	liatio	n												
Sex:				√ale			⊠ F∈	emal	e											
1.0	RGANISATIONAL AS	PECT	s						9											
1.1 0	rganisation of the fa	cilitie	s us	ed f	or th	ne w	orks	hop	was	•••										
	Not suitable			Transaction Co.			77.21		8	10 may 1997	Ø		Su	itabl	е					
1.2 Tł	ne technical equipm	ent u	sed	duri	ng ti	he w	orks	hop	was											
	Not suitable							100000000000000000000000000000000000000	8		OP)	ļ	Su	itabl	e					
2. Co	NTENTS																			
	e workshop's conte	nt we	ere	8																
	Not Interesting		2		4	(3)	6	7	8	9	100)	Int	eres	sting					
2.2 Th	e structure of the w	orksh	nop	prog	ram	me	was.													
	Not Suitable	1	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	W		Su	itab	le					
2.3 W	ere the workshop's	conte	ent c	onsi	sten	ıt wi	th y	oure	expe	ctati	ions	?								
	Inconsistent	1	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	0		Co	nsis	tent					
2.4 W	ere the workshop's	conte	ent c	onsi	sten	it wi	th y	ouri	need	s?										
	Inconsistent	1	2	3	④	(3)	6	Ø	8	1	0		Co	nsis	tent					
2.5 W	ere the workshop's	conte	ents	well	dev	elop	ed?													
	Not well develope	-	100	27.	200				9 (9 (0	0	W	ell d	eveloped					
3. M	ETHODOLOGIES																			
3.1 Th	e tools and materia	ls use	d du	uring	the	wo	rksh	ор и	ere.											
	Not appropriate			1	2	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	9	(10	Appropriate	(0)				
3.2 Th	e methodologies us	ed w	ere																	
	Not appropriate			1	2	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	9)	100	Appropriate	E				
3.3 Th	e activities organiz	ed w	ere.																	
	Not useful			1	2	3	4	(3)	6	7	8	9)	10	Useful					



4. SH	CILLS OF THE	EXPE	RTS IN	CHAI	RGE	OF	ГНЕ	Wo	RKS	HOP							
4.1 C	apability of n	-	ting th			Part Control of Control	Ø	(R)	® .	· (10)	E	xcell	ont				
FUUI		•		٠	•	9	v	9	100		L	ACC III	enc				
4.2 T	ne interactio		and the second second	No. of the last of	-	4	17 1 1 1	-	-			•	4341		nativalism seems		
	Non existe	ent	①	2	(3)	4	(5)	6	Ø	1	9	0	St	imul	ating		
4.3 Y	our level of i	nvolve	ment a	nd a	ctive	e pai	rticip	atio	n wa	as:							
	Very low		0	2	3	④	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	00	Ve	ery h	gh		
5. A	TMOSPHERE	IN TH	E W OF	RKSH	ЮР	ROC	M										
5.1 C	ommunicatio	on insid	le the	grou	ps h	as b	een.										
	Poor		①		15 may 15 may 15 miles		(3)		Ø	8	9	(10)	E	celle	nt		
5.2 In	teraction be Poor	_	the wo	orksh ④	(S)	parti ⑥	cipa ⑦	nts v	-	00	Ε	xcell	ent				
	ow useful do oorations?	you fe	eel that	the	con	tact	s you	ı ma	de v	vith	the	othe	r wo	rksh	op part	ticipants will be fo	future
	Not very u	iseful			0	2	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	(9)	100	Usefu	A.	
6. G	ENERAL EVA	LUATI	ON														
6.1 T	he workshop	progr	amme	was.	0.00	120		22		- 22	-	22	2				
	Not Intere	esting		①	2	3	4	(5)	6	7	8	9	10			Interesting	
6.2 T	he workshop	progr	amme	was.		5885	-60	540	2233	123	342	10201	75277				
	Not involv	/ing		①	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	O)			Involving	
6. C	OMMENTS:																
						Valle.											
				-		-			-	-	-	-					
				_			_										



Nam	e (optional)													
Place	· Greifswald					Cou	ıntry		Ses	-m	any	_		Date 15/03/
Prof	ession Research	Ler				Aff	iliatio	on	Un	ive	22	17	by of Greij	levald
Sex:			×	1ale			□ F	emal	e				<i>y</i> 0 0 1	
	ORGANISATIONAL A Organisation of the f Not suitable	acilitie	s use	100	798 CL 5971	1000			was ®	The second	9	e (s	Suitable	
1.2	The technical equipn Not suitable	THE PARTY OF THE P	-	durii 3	ng ti	ne w	orks ⑥	-	_	 9	@	5 10	Suitable	
	CONTENTS The workshop's conto Not Interesting	200	-		4	(3)	6	· Ø	8	9	(10)	×	Interesting	
2.2	The structure of the v Not Suitable	anamana di Sili Gildan							8	9	1		Suitable	
2.3	Were the workshop's Inconsistent			onsi ③				our e		ctati ⑨	ons?	-	Consistent	
2.4	Were the workshop's Inconsistent	conte ①		1	_	1000	4.00	_	need ®		®	ar.	Consistent	
2.5	Were the workshop's Not well develop								D (8	0 @			Well developed	
3.1	M ETHODOLOGIES													
3.1	The tools and materian Not appropriate	als use									8	9	M Appropri	ate
3.2	The methodologies u Not appropriate	sed we			2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	Appropri	ate
3.3	The activities organi: Not useful	zed w			2	3	④	(5)	6	Ø	8	9) 🚳 Useful	



4. SKII	LS OF THE	Ехр	ERTS	IN	СНА	RGE	OF.	THE	Wo	RKS	НОР						
41 Car	ability of m	oder	ratin	g th	e w	orks	hon								Ď		
Poor	domity of in	(I)	(2)					(7)	(8)	9	200	F	kcelle	ent			
FOOI		9	•	9	•	•	•	v	•	9	~	-	vce iie	2116			
4.2 The	interaction	bet	wee	n ex	pert	s an	d pa	rtici	pant	s wa	S						
Metal Mark	Non existe			1	2	3	-	-	6	7	8	9	00	Stimula	ating		
	IVOIT CAISTE			_			~	(77 7)	-	-	300	17.76	7	5	6		
4.3 You	r level of in	volv	eme	nt a	nd a	ctiv	e pa	rticir	atio	n wa	as:						
	Very low			1	1	3	1	Other wall	0.425	7	(8)	9	(1)	Very hi	gh		
				11000	(T)	276	6556				8000)/03/F006(60/F00)	910		
5 AT	MOSPHERE	IN TI	HE V	Nor	SKCF	IOP	ROC	M									
J.AII	VIOSFIIERE	IIV 11	IIL W	VOI	11131	101	NOC	/IVI									
5.1 Cor	nmunicatio	n ins	ide	the	grou	ps h	as b	een.									
	Poor	10.1855								Ø	8	9	000	Excelle	nt		
					1 (1 ()			00000	(2 00 ,00)	-	(100	ALCON IN	1000000		nae.		
5.2 Inte	eraction bet	wee	n th	e w	orks	пор	part	icipa	nts	was.							
	Poor	1	2	-	4			-	-	_	M	E	xcelle	ent			
																	1 5000000000000000000000000000000000000
		you	feel	tha	t the	cor	ntact	s yo	u ma	ide v	vith	the o	other	worksho	op partio	cipants will be for	future
collabo	rations?					_		_	_				_	6 X	~		
	Not very u	seful				Œ	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9 10	Useful		
											5						
6. GE	NERAL EVA	LUAT	LION	ı													
6.1 Th	workshop	nron	ram	ma	was												
O.T THE	Not Intere	ā (#)		me	was	··· (2	3	4	(5)	6	7	(8)	9	00		Interesting	
	Not intere	Sung	5		Q.	6	, 0		9	′ •	V	0	9	SA.		miteresting	
6.2 The	workshop	prog	ram	me	was												
	Not involv	2 30			1	2	3	4	(5)	6	0	8	9	600		Involving	
					1992	10/4736	153	0708	877.E	100	2370	2778	SHARE	×0.300			
6. Co	MMENTS:																
											V			54			
_						100		1012									



Place 3	sokos i	HOTEL	. VIR	2 U	c	ountry	ŧ	57	ON	1/4			Date 1415.
Profess	ion PROB	ATION	OFFIC	tr	Δ	ffiliatio	on /	PRI	50	NO	OF TALLIA	IN	
Sex:				Male		□F	emale	9					
1. OF	RGANISATIO	ONAL AS	PECTS										
1.1 Or	ganisation Not suita		cilities (25 (22.2)	3200	works	10.00	_	7012200	®	Suitable		
1.2 Th	ne technical Not suita			d durin						00	Suitable		
2. Co	NTENTS												
2.1 The	e workshop Not Inter			 D 3	4	3 6) Ø	8	9	0	Interesting		
2.2 The	e structure Not Suita		100000000000000000000000000000000000000	progr 3		e was	2	8	9	0	Suitable		
2.3 W	ere the wor Inconsiste			consis			V Production			77.1.0.104	Consistent		
2.4 W	ere the wor Inconsiste			consis						(1)	Consistent		
2.5 W	ere the wor Not well						6 (7	D (@	9) (10)	Well develor	oed	
3. M	ETHODOLO	GIES											
3.1 Th	e tools and Not appr		s used	during ①(the w	orksh) ④	op w	ere.	 Ø	® (Ф Ф Аррі	ropriate	ı
3.2 Th	e methodo Not appr		ed were	e								ropriate	•
3.3 Th	e activities Not usefu		ed wer		② (3	3 4	⑤	6	Ø	® (0	9) (0 Use	ful	



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations? Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ② ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name	(optional)					
Place	Pallun	·	Country	ESTON) M Dat	e 15.03.
Professi	ion Directo	~	Affiliation	Tallun	Pusan	
Sex:		□ Male	☐ Fema	ale		
1. OR	GANISATIONAL AS	PECTS				
1.1 Or	ganisation of the fa	cilities used for	the worksho	p was		
	Not suitable		9 5 6 7	The second secon	Suitable	
1.2 Th	e technical equipme	ent used during	the worksho	n was		
- FEE	Not suitable	0000		AND THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY	Suitable	
2. Cor	NTENTS					
2.1 The	e workshop's conter		1204 123 1214 F	as was need of	8	
	Not Interesting	D 2 3	4 5 6 6	7890	Interesting	
2.2 The	structure of the w	orkshop progra	ımme was			
A14. 111.	Not Suitable	0 2 3 6		0 9 0	Suitable	
2.3 We	ere the workshop's o	content consist	ent with your	expectations?		
	Inconsistent	000			Consistent	
2.4 We	ere the workshop's o	content consist	ent with your	needs?		
	Inconsistent		Đ (S (Ó (Z	0 0 0 0	Consistent	
2.5 We	ere the workshop's o	contents well d	eveloped?	V.		7
	Not well develope			Ø ® Ø W	Well developed	
3. ME	THODOLOGIES					
3 1 The	e tools and material	ls used during t	he workshop	were	a a	
J.2 1110	Not appropriate			6 7 8 9	Appropriate	
3.2 The	e methodologies use	ed were				
	Not appropriate		2 3 4 5	6 7 8 6	Appropriate	
3.3 The	e activities organize	ed were			N 2	
		(A) (5 dw	



4. SK	ILLS OF THE I	EXPE	RTS	IN (CHA	RGE	OF'	ГНЕ	Wo	RKS	НОР									
4.1 Ca Poor	pability of m	100 march 100 miles	ating	en p <u>ure</u> s ver	10 mg 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ALC: 10 TO 1	1000	Ø	8	100 May	100	E	xcelle	ent					¥	
4.2 Th	e interaction Non existe			ı ex ①	1200	1	d pa ④		pant ⑥	s wa	-	9)DQ	St	imula	ting				
4.3 Yo	ur level of in	volve	emer	nt a	nd a	ctive	e pa	rticip	atio	n wa	as:	1.								
	Very low			0	2	3	④	(5)	6	Ø	8	9	00	Ve	ery hi	gh				
5. AT	MOSPHERE	IN TH	łE W	V OF	RKSH	ЮР	ROC	M							į.					8
5.1 Co	mmunicatio	n insi	ide t	he s	grou	ps h	as b	een.												
	Poor	ia more		①	2	3	100	(5)	THE COMMENTS OF	Ø	8	9	900	Ex	kcelle	nt				
5.2 Int	eraction bet Poor	weei ①				пор (\$)		-	nts (-	 00	E	xcell	ent				į		
	ow useful do orations?	you 1	feel	that	t the	con	itact	s yo	u ma	ade v	vith	the o	other	r wo	rksho	p parti	cipant	s will b	e for	future
	Not very u	seful				0	2	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	9	9	Usefu	ļ			
6. GE	NERAL EVA	LUAT	ION			ě														
6.1 Th	e workshop	prog	ramı	me	was															
	Not Intere				0	2	3	4	C	6	Ø	8	9	00	(Inte	esting		
6.2 Th	e workshop Not involv		ramı	me	was ①	 ②	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	((10)			Invo	lving		
6. C o	MMENTS:												/			,				
	- %					96														309072



Name	(optional)		
Place		Country	Date
Profess	ion	Affiliation	
Sex:		☐ Male ☐ Female	
1. OF	RGANISATIONAL A	SPECTS	
		acilities used for the workshop was	
	Not suitable	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 🍇 Suitable	,
1.2 Th	ne technical equipm	nent used during the workshop was	
	Not suitable	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 💯 Suitable	
2. C o	NTENTS		
2.1 Th	e workshop's conte	ent were	
	Not Interesting	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ M Interesting	
2 2 Th	e structure of the v	workshop programme was	
2.2.111	Not Suitable	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Suitable	
2.3 W		content consistent with your expectations?	,
	Inconsistent	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Consistent	
2.4 W	ere the workshop's	content consistent with your needs?	
	Inconsistent	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 💯 Consistent	
2.5 W	ere the workshop's	contents well developed?	
		ed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Well develope	ed
3. M	THODOLOGIES		,
3.1 Th	e tools and materia	als used during the workshop were	
	Not appropriate		priate
3.2 Th	e methodologies u	sed were	
	Not appropriate		priate
3.3 Th	e activities organiz	zed were	
	Not useful	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ᠓ Usef	vi.



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ② ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Æ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations? Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ② ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 颁 Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name	(optional)			
Place			Country	Date
Professi	ion		Affiliation	
Sex:		☐ Male	☐ Female	
1. OR	GANISATIONAL AS	SPECTS		
1.1 Or	ganisation of the fa	acilities used for t	he workshop was	
	Not suitable	① ② ③ ④		Suitable
1.2 Th	e technical equipm	ent used during t	he workshop waş	Х.
manager 1970.	Not suitable	① ② ③ ④		Suitable
			1	
2. Co	NTENTS			
2.1 The	e workshop's conte	ent were	./	
	Not Interesting	O O O O	0 6 8 8 9 0	Interesting
2.2 Th	e structure of the w			complia
	Not Suitable	0 2 3 4	S 6 7 8 9 0	Suitable
2 3 We	ere the workshop's	content consister	nt with your expectations?	
2.5 ***	Inconsistent	COLUMN TO SECURE CONTRACTOR OF THE PERSON	S 6 7 9 9 0	Consistent
2.4 We	ere the workshop's	content consister	nt with your needs?	
	Inconsistent	① ② ③ ④	0 6 6 7 8 9 0	Consistent
		3.3	10 No.	
2.5 We	ere the workshop's			447.41.000.000
	Not well develop	ed ① ② ③ (9 S 6 7 A 9 0	Well developed
2 1/1-	TUODOLOGIES			
3. IVIE	THODOLOGIES			-
3.1 Th	e tools and materia	als used during the	e workshop were	
			3 4 5 6 7 8	9 ⁽¹⁾ Appropriate
		107788 2003	ener one new physical region of	elect Alles to the district di
3.2 Th	e methodologies u	sed were	The commence of the second	SULLY COLUMN 100 10
	Not appropriate	① ②	3 4 5 6 7 6	⑨ ⑩ Appropriate
Name - Name - Company	in . Association approximation resources or ex-	CARAM CONCESSION		
3.3 Th	e activities organiz	ed were	3 4 5 6 7 8	(c) (ii) Heaful
	NOT HEATIN	(1) (2)	(8) (7) (0) (6) (19)	CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR O



4. JKI	LLS OF THE I	LAFL	KIS	iiv C	-MA	NGL	Or.	ITIL	vvc	KKS	ПОР						
4.1 Ca	pability of m	oder	ating	the	e wo	orks	hop			_		1				i.	
Poor		①	2	(3)	4)	(5)	6	7	(8)	9	X	E	xcell	en	t		
4.2 Th	e interaction	betv	veen	ex	pert	s an	id pa	rtici	pant	ts wa	as		,			1	
	Non existe	nt	(D	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	Ø	0	5	Stimulating		
4.3 Yo	ur level of in	volve	mer	nt aı	nd a	ctiv	e pa	rticip	oatio	n w	as:						
	Very low										8	9	0	١	Very high		
5. AT	MOSPHERE I	IN TH	IE W	/or	KSF	ЮР	ROC	M									
5.1 Co	mmunicatio	n insi	de ti	ne g	grou	ps h	as b	een.			ı ı						
	Poor		(1	2	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	(A)	9	0	1	Excellent		
5.2 Int	eraction bet Poor											E	xcell	len	t		
	w useful do orations?	you f	eel t	hat	the			es Politica					(1.14) Q		190 U 8100	ipants will be for	future
	Not very us	seful				0	2	3	④	(5)	6	Ø	®	9	W Useful		
6. GE	NERAL EVAL	.UAT	ION														
6.1 Th	e workshop	progr	amr	ne v	vas.								,				
	Not Interes	sting			1	2	3	4	(\$	(6	7	P	9	Q	0	Interesting	
6.2 Th	e workshop	progi	amr	ne v	vas.								. 1			•	
	Not involvi	ng			1	2	3	4	(5)	6	7	8	Ø	Œ	D	Involving	
6. C o	MMENTS:				5												
							-										



Name (optional) 0 54	, DAN	
Place Minhly of	she country German	Date 15.3.1
Profession	Affiliation	
Sex:	Male □ Female	
	CTS ties used for the workshop was 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	Suitable
(6 5)	used during the workshop was 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Suitable
2. CONTENTS 2.1 The workshop's content Not Interesting	vere D	/ Interesting
2.2 The structure of the wor Not Suitable	shop programme was 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Suitable
1/79 1/2	ntent consistent with your expectations? ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ Ø ⑩	Consistent
4 9	ntent consistent with your needs?	Consistent
2.5 Were the workshop's co Not well developed	ntents well developed? ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨	Well developed
3. METHODOLOGIES		
3.1 The tools and materials of Not appropriate	sed during the workshop were ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧	Appropriate
3.2 The methodologies used Not appropriate	were ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧	Appropriate
3.3 The activities organized Not useful	were ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧	9 10 Useful



4. SKIL	LS OF THE E	XPEF	RTS IN	CHAI	RGE	OF	THE	Wo	RKS	HOP					
4.1 Cap Poor	ability of mo	odera ① (iting th ② ③	e wo	rksl ⑤	пор (<u>6</u>)	Ø	8	9	6	E	xcell	ent	*	
4.2 The	interaction Non exister			pert:							6	(10)	Stimulating	3	
4.3 You	r level of inv Very low	volve		nd a								1	Very high		
5. ATM	/IOSPHERE I	N TH	e Woi	RKSH	ЮР	ROC	M								
5.1 Con	nmunicatior Poor	n insid	de the i	group ②	ps h ③	as b	een.	6) Ø	8	9	(1)	Excellent		
5.2 Inte	raction bet Poor	ween ①	the wo	orksh ④	10p	parti ⑥	icipa ⑦	nts (was	/. (1)	E	xcell	ent		
	v useful do v rations? Not very us												_ /	articipants will be for for	uture
6. GEN	IERAL EVAL	UATI	ON												
6.1 The	workshop Not Interes		amme	was.	 ②	3	4	(5)	6	7	8	9	6	Interesting	
6.2 The	workshop Not involvi		amme	was. ①	 ②	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	(8)	9	(1)	Involving	
6. Con	MMENTS:														



Name	(optional)	Gri	<i>t</i> -	a	hn	5+	in		La	d	MI	3_			
Place							Co	untry			-				Date
Profess Sex:	ion probal	ion	of	bica O N	_ √ale		Control of the last of the las	iliatio	COST A	lill	ist	ny w	60	of	Justice - Westen
1. OF	RGANISATIO	NAL AS	PECT	S										40	mencia
1.1 Or	ganisation o Not suitabl		cilitie ①	es us ②	ed f	-	100	orks ⑥	hop ⑦	was ®	 (9)	00		Suitable	9
1.2 Th	e technical e Not suitabl	The second second second	ent u ①		70.	100	The second second	orks ⑥		100	1000	@	(Suitable	ė
	NTENTS e workshop' Not Interes		nt we	ere ②	-	4	S	6	· ⑦	8	9	100	Y	Interes	ting
2.2 Th	e structure o Not Suitab		orksh ①	(2)	orog 3		-	was. ⑥	V.	8	9	@	/	Suitabl	е
2.3 W	ere the work Inconsister	enggger re n er rener r								40002000	ctati ⑨		,	Consist	ent
2.4 W	ere the work Inconsister		onte ①	ent c	ons 3			th yo	E (C (A))	1000	s? ⑨	0		Consist	ent
2.5 W	ere the work Not well de			10 10 12			velop	100		D @	D (D a	D <	Well de	eveloped
3. M	THODOLOG	IES													
3.1 Th	e tools and r Not appro		s use									8	9	®	Appropriate
3.2 Th	e methodolo Not appro		ed w	ere	①	2	3	4	(5)	6	7	8	9	(A)	Appropriate
3.3 Th	e activities o		d w	ere	(D)	2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	•	Useful



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP	
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Excellent	
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent	V 3
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating	,
Non-existent	
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:	
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ Ø ⑨ ⑩ Very high	
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM	
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been	
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩< Excellent	
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ∰ Excellent	
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants w collaborations?	ill be for future
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ 🔊 ⑨ ⑩ Useful	
6. GENERAL EVALUATION	
6.1 The workshop programme was	
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interest	ing
6.2 The workshop programme was	
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involvin	g
6. COMMENTS:	



Name	(optional)					
Place	Tallin	M	Country	Estoma		Date 15.03-2013
Professi	on Can	manager	Affiliation	Tallin	y Prison	
Sex:		Male	□ Fema	ale		
	GANISATIONAI ganisation of th Not suitable	L ASPECTS ne facilities used for th ① ② ③ ④			Suitable	9
1.2 Th	e technical equ Not suitable	ipment used during t ① ② ③ ④			Suitable	
	NTENTS e workshop's co Not Interestin		\$ 6 (7890	Interesting	Δ*
2.2 The	e structure of th Not Suitable	ne workshop program ① ② ③ ④		® 9 O	Suitable	
2.3 We	ere the worksho Inconsistent	op's content consister ① ② ③ ④			Consistent	
2.4 We	ere the worksho Inconsistent	op's content consister ① ② ③ ④	s 6 0	needs? 8 9 00	Consistent	
2.5 We		op's contents well dev loped ① ② ③ ④		<u></u>	Well developed	
3. ME	THODOLOGIES	i				
3.1 The	e tools and mat Not appropria	erials used during the ate ① ②	workshop ③ ④ ⑤	were 6 7 8 9) ((()) Appropriate	e
3.2 The	e methodologie Not appropria	s used were te ① ②	3 4 5	0 6 7 <u>®</u> (D	e e
3.3 The	e activities orga Not useful		3 4 5	06780) (1) Useful	



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨ W Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations? Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑥ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name (optional)				_
Place TALLINN		Country & ST	Date 15.03	1
Profession		Affiliation		
Sex:	Male	☐ Female		
1. Organisational as	SPECTS			
1.1 Organisation of the fa	cilities used for th	e workshop was		
Not suitable	0 2 3 4		Suitable	
1.2 The technical equipm				
Not suitable	0 2 3 4	S 6 7 8 9 W	Suitable	
2. CONTENTS				
2.1 The workshop's conte	nt were	NOW HE WAS I WAY BEING		
Not Interesting	0 2 3 4	\$ 6 7 8 9 0	Interesting	
2.2 The structure of the v				
Not Suitable	0 2 3 4	5 6 7 8 9 0	Suitable	
2.3 Were the workshop's	content consisten	t with your expectations?		
Inconsistent		S 6 7 8 9 0	Consistent	
2.4 Were the workshop's	content consisten	t with your needs?		
Inconsistent	0 2 3 4	5 6 7 8 9 0	Consistent	
2.5 Were the workshop's	contents well dev			
Not well develop	ed (1) (2) (3) (4)	0 6 7 8 9 0	Well developed	
3. METHODOLOGIES		9	4	
3.1 The tools and materia	als used during the	workshop were		
Not appropriate	① ②	3 4 5 6 7 8 5	D	
3.2 The methodologies u	sed were		and the second	
Not appropriate	① ②	3 4 5 6 7(8)	9 ⁽¹⁾ Appropriate	
3.3 The activities organiz		सक्तर च		
Not useful	_ O O	3 4 5 6 7 8	9 (10 Useful	



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ W Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ Ø ® ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ /Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ② ⑥ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name	(optional)	4			
Place	Tallin		Country	Estowa	Date 15-05
Profess	ion social wo	wher/m	Affiliation	Tallin	Prison
Sex:		□ Male	🗷 Female		
1. OF	RGANISATIONAL ASI	PECTS			8
1.1 Or	ganisation of the fac	ilities used for t	he workshop v	was	
	Not suitable	0 0 3 4			8
1.2 Th	e technical equipme				
	Not suitable	0 2 3 4	56 7	8 9 M Suitable	
2. Co	NTENTS				
2.1 Th	e workshop's conter	it were		s /	
	Not Interesting	0 2 3 4) S 6 7	Ø ⑨ ⑩ Interesti	ng .
2.2 Th	e structure of the wo			na na galliga	
	Not Suitable	0 2 3 4	\$ 6 7	8 9 M Suitable	
2.3 W	ere the workshop's o	ontent consiste	nt with your e	xpectations?	
	Inconsistent	0 2 3 4	\$ 6 7	8 🕅 Consiste	nt
2.4 W	ere the workshop's o	ontent consiste	nt with your n	eeds?	
	Inconsistent	0 2 3 4	§ © Ø	Ø ⑨ ⑩ Consiste	nt
2.5 W	ere the workshop's o	ontents well de	veloped?		
	Not well developed	4023	Đ (S) (G) (Z) ® 👰 🐠 Welldev	veloped
3. M	ETHODOLOGIES	£			
3.1 Th	e tools and material	s used during th	e workshop w	ere	
	Not appropriate	0 2	3 4 5	67/800	Appropriate
3.2 Th	e methodologies use	ed were		DAS 501 2000 24% Asia	
	Not appropriate	0 0	3 4 5	6 7 8 🕱 0	Appropriate
3.3 Th	e activities organize	d were			
	Not useful	(I) (2)	3 4 5	6 7 8 9 0	Useful



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 凝 Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ 🎉 ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ﴾ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ◎ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations? Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ 👿 ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. General Evaluation
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ M Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ M Involving
6. COMMENTS: Nery Well done! Thoules!



Name	(optional)						
Place	Talling	C	Country	Estou	Ja	Date	15.0
Profession	on Probetronal	ficen A	Affiliation	Paiso	h		
Sex:] Male	☐ Female	•			
1. OR	GANISATIONAL ASPECTS						
1.1 Org	anisation of the facilities	used for the	workshop	was			
1000A: 1000A	Not suitable ① ③	239(367	8 9 0	Suitable		*
1.2 The	technical equipment use	d during the	workshop	was			
	- 이 사람이 가는 없는 생각을 하고 있어야 한다면 하는 것이 없는 것이 없는데 다른 그들이 없는데 없다.		\$ 6 7	8 9 1	Suitable		
2. Con	ITENTS			-			
	workshop's content were				V.		
E.E. 1119		2 3 4	\$ 6 7	8 9 1	Interesting		
2.2 The	structure of the worksho	p programm	ne was				
		D 3 4 0		8 9 (10)	Suitable		
2.3 We	re the workshop's conten			/			
	Inconsistent ① (2340	56 0	8 9 (10)	Consistent		
2.4 We	re the workshop's conten	t consistent	with your r	needs?			
2.7 ***			\$ 6 7	8 9 1	Consistent		
2.5 We	re the workshop's conten	ts well devel	loped?				
	Not well developed ①			0 8 9 (10	Well developed		
3. ME	THODOLOGIES						9
2 1 Tho	tools and materials used	during the v	workshop w	vere.			
3.1 THE	tools and materials used Not appropriate	① ② ③	3 4 S	6 7 8 9	Appropriat	е	
3.2 The	methodologies used wer	e					
	Not appropriate		3 4 5	6 7 8 6	Appropriat	e	
3.3 The	activities organized wer	·e					
212 1116	Not useful		3 4 5	6 7 8 9	(M) Useful		



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑥ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name	(optional)	TAT.	TAN	IA	Zl	IF.	TSI	AN	IKC	24							
Place 5	OKOS V	iru.	407	E	_		Cou	intry	E	57	ON	IIA)			Date /	15.03.1
Profess	ion PROB	BATIOI	VO	FIC	ĈE	ĸ	Affi	liatio	n 7	He	FF	RI	SC	NOI	FTALL	INN	
Sex:					1ale			⊠ F∈	mal	e							
	RGANISATIO ganisation Not suitab	of the fa	cilitie									(1)	S	Suitable			
1.2 Th	e technical Not suitab		100	sed (17 19 10 10 10 10			0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000			Þ	5	Suitable			
	NTENTS e workshop Not Intere			re		4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	Ø	1	nterestii	ng		
2.2 Th	e structure Not Suital			(2)	0.00					8	9	Ø	5	Suitable			
2.3 W	ere the wor Inconsiste		conte ①		- 1		t wi			0000	ctati	ons?		Consiste	nt		
2.4 W	ere the wor Inconsiste			nt c		200	1	1	100	100	10000	900	(Consiste	nt		
2.5 W	ere the wor Not well o								0 (2	D (8	0 @		Į I	Well dev	eloped		
3. M	THODOLO	GIES															
3.1 Th	e tools and Not appro		s use									8	9	ø ,	Appropriat	e	
3.2 Th	e methodol Not appro		ed w	ere		2	3	4	(3)	6	Ø	8	9	òó /	Appropriat	e	
3.3 Th	e activities Not usefu	(ed w	ere		2	3	4	⑤	6	Ø	8	9	A	Useful		



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP	
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ Ø ⑩ Excellent	
Tool O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was	
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Stimulating	
4.2 Versulated of transference and pattern contribution contributions	
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ W Very high	
very low a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM	
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been	
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Excellent	
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Æ Excellent	
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 颁 Excellent	
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future for the following states of the contact of the	ure
collaborations?	
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ 🂆 ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful ·	
6. GENERAL EVALUATION	
6.1 The workshop programme was	
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 🎉 Interesting	
6.2 The workshop programme was	
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving	
6. COMMENTS: THANK YOU FOR YNV FORTION	
TARTON SOCI TON STOCKETTING	



Name (optional)
Place Tallin - Country Estonia Date 15/3/2
Profession Cil Sevent Affiliation TRISO Sovice, Ireland.
Sex:
1. Organisational aspects
1.1 Organisation of the facilities used for the workshop was
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 阪 Suitable
1.2 The technical equipment used during the workshop was
Not suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ W Suitable
2. CONTENTS
2.1 The workshop's content were
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ W Interesting
2.2 The structure of the workshop programme was
Not Suitable ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 🔎 Suitable
2.3 Were the workshop's content consistent with your expectations?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 倾 Consistent
2.4 Were the workshop's content consistent with your needs?
Inconsistent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 凝 Consistent
2.5 Were the workshop's contents well developed?
Not well developed ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 🏧 Well developed
3. METHODOLOGIES
3.1 The tools and materials used during the workshop were
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Appropriate
3.2 The methodologies used were
Not appropriate ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ᠓ Appropriate
3.3 The activities organized were
Not useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ W Useful



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Æ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 风 Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ 阪 Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
Ban on time and Rept to afinda. Everyone had - postuling to purticipate



Name	(optional)			
Place	Tallian		Country Eslowia	Date 15,03,20
Profess	sion probation	officer	Affiliation	
Sex:	/	// □ Male	Female	
1. 0	RGANISATIONAL AS	PECTS		
	rganisation of the fa		ne workshop was	
	Not suitable		567890	Suitable
1.2 Th	ne technical equipme	ent used during t	he workshop was	
	Not suitable	0 2 3 4	S 6 7 8 9 0	Suitable
2. Co	NTENTS			
2.1 Th	e workshop's conte	nt were		
	Not Interesting	0036	0 5 6 7 8 9 0	Interesting
2.2 Th	e structure of the w	orkshop program	nme was	
	Not Suitable	0 2 3 4	S 6 7 8 9 0	Suitable
2.3 W	ere the workshop's	content consister	nt with your expectations?	
	Inconsistent	① ② ③ ④	S 6 7 8 9 W	Consistent
2.4 W	ere the workshop's	content consister	nt with your needs?	
	Inconsistent	0 2 3 4	S 6 (7) 8 9 10	Consistent
2.5 W	ere the workshop's			
	Not well develope	:d ① ② ③ @	9 3 6 7 8 9 0	Well developed
3. M	ETHODOLOGIES		ž.	
3.1 Th	e tools and materia	Is used during the	e workshop were	
	Not appropriate	0 0	3 4 5 6 7 8 6) (1) Appropriate
3.2 Th	e methodologies us	ed were		
	Not appropriate	0 2	3 4 5 6 7 8	D
3.3 Th	e activities organize	ed were		
	Notucoful	ന മ	3 4 5 6 6 8	n m usaful



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ② ® ⑨ ⑥ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for futur collaborations? Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name (optional) LEAN.	A SEPA		
Place TALLINA	Country \in	570219	Date 15-03
Profession 30 CIAL WORKER	Affiliation	TALINON.	PR150N
Sex:	Male 🗵 Femal	e	
1. Organisational aspects			
1.1 Organisation of the facilities us	ed for the workshop	was	
	3 4 5 6 7		Ĩ
1.2 The technical equipment used	during the workshop		
Not suitable ① ②	3 4 5 6 7	8 9 🕅 Suitable	Ĺ
2. CONTENTS			
2.1 The workshop's content were	20		
	3 4 5 6 7	8 9 1 Interest	ing
2.2 The structure of the workshop	nrogrammo was		
	3 4 5 6 7	Suitable ®	ì
2.3 Were the workshop's content of	onsistent with your	expectations?	
	3 4 5 6 7	3 <u>3.5 3 3.5 3.5 4.5 5.4 5.5 4.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5</u>	ent
2.4 Were the workshop's content of	consistent with your	needs?	
Inconsistent ① ②	3 4 5 6 7		ent
2.5 Were the workshop's contents	well developed?	×-	
Not well developed ① ②	3 4 5 6 6	D ® 💇 🛈 Wellde	veloped
3. METHODOLOGIES	8		
3.1 The tools and materials used d	uring the workshop v	vere	
Not appropriate	00000	© Ø 8 9 Ø	Appropriate
3.2 The methodologies used were.			
Not appropriate	0 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 0	Appropriate
3.3 The activities organized were.		TUR 1000 000-2000000 1000	
Notuseful	0 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 0	Heaful



4. JKI	LLS OF THE I	EXPER	(15 IIV	СПА	KGE	UF	INE	VVC	KKS	ног						90	
4.1 Ca _l Poor	pability of m			e wo			7	8	9	(1)	Е	xcelle	ent				
4.2 Th	e interaction Non existe			(pert							9	00	Stir	nula	ting		Ý.
4.3 Yo	ur level of in Very low	volver	ment a								9	(1)	Vei	ry hiį	gh		
5. Ат	MOSPHERE I	IN THI	E Wo	RKSH	ЮР	ROC	M										
5.1 Co	mmunication Poor	n insic		grou ②					Ø	8	9	1	Exc	eller	nt		
5.2 Int	eraction bet Poor	-		orksl ④				1 -		-	E	xcell	ent				
	w useful do orations? Not very u		eel tha	t the	cor	atact ②	s yo 3	1700000 8	ade v				OLEK W	ksho D	p part Usefu	icipants will be f Il	or future
6. G E	NERAL EVAI	LUATI	ON														
6.1 Th	e workshop Not Intere		amme	was ①	-	3	4) (5	6	(T	8 () @ (0			Interesting	
6.2 Th	e workshop Not involvi		amme	was ①	-	3	4	(5)	6	Ø	8	9	0			Involving	
6. Co	MMENTS:															W	
					il de la companya de						4 14						
				==8	USS.	90										X	



Name (optional)	THEL GAV	1-N			
Place Tallin	·	Country	Estonia	Date	5.3.1
Profession GOVENOR	3	Affiliation	Hirister of I	rstice. Iveland	
Sex:	□ Male	☐ Fem	ale		
1. ORGANISATIONAL AS	PECTS				
1.1 Organisation of the fa		ne worksho	p was		
Not suitable	0 2 3 4			able	
8 8 8	80.8	F 18 18			
1.2 The technical equipm Not suitable	ent used during t ① ② ③ ④			shla	
Not suitable	0000		7) (8) (9) (10) Suita	ible	
2. CONTENTS					
2.1 The workshop's conte	nt were		_		
Not Interesting	0 2 3 4	S 6	⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Inter	resting	
5 5 TO 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10					
2.2 The structure of the w Not Suitable	rorksnop program ののののの	ime was ദാരി	7 8 9 0 Suita	ablo	
Not Suitable			D @ @ Junt	ible	
2.3 Were the workshop's	content consister	nt with you	r expectations? 🥕		
Inconsistent	① ② ③ ④	\$ 6	7 8 9 W Cons	sistent	
2.4 Ware the workshop's	content consister		rnoode2		
2.4 Were the workshop's Inconsistent	① ② ③ ④		/	sistent	
miconialistem.	~ ~ ~ ~			107.00 P. 11.00	
2.5 Were the workshop's			/		
Not well develope	ed (1) (2) (3) (6	Đ (S) (G)	7 8 9 Ø wel	developed	
2. Meruppougos					
3. METHODOLOGIES					
3.1 The tools and materia	Is used during the	workshop	were		
Not appropriate			060890	Appropriate	
6.9 b					
3.2 The methodologies us	sed were (1) (2)	@ @ @	00000	/	
Not appropriate	W @	(a) (b) (c)		Appropriate	
3.3 The activities organize	ed were		/		
Not useful		3 4 6	36789/0) Useful	



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP	
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent	
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Stimulating	
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧②⑩ Very high	
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM	
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent	
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent	
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for futucollaborations? Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ Ø ⑩ Useful	ure
6. GENERAL EVALUATION	
6.1 The workshop programme was Not interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting	
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving	
6. COMMENTS: Very good usocichop - gained a lot of information	



Name	(optional)	MAR.	30	KO	V3E			
Place	PRISON	TALL	INN	Countr	y E.	57001	1 <u>A</u>	Date 15.03.a
Profes	sion PRISON	U OFIC	ER	Affiliat	ion y	R150	N	_ 11:
Sex:] Male	×	Female			
1.0	RGANISATIONA	L ASPECTS						
1.1 C	rganisation of t	he facilities	used for	the work	shop wa	s		
	Not suitable	1000	2 3 4			and and	Suitable	
1.2 T	he technical equ	uipment use	d during	the worl	kshop wa	ıs		
	Not suitable		2 3 4			Jest arm	Suitable	
2. Co	ONTENTS							5
	ne workshop's c	ontent were	e					
	Not Interesti		236	D (5) (6	6 0	® ®	Interesting	
2.2 TI	ne structure of t	he worksho	p progra	nme wa	s			
	Not Suitable	① (2 3 4) (S) (E)	0 0	9 0	Suitable	
2.3 W	ere the worksh	op's conten	t consiste	nt with	your exp	ectations?		
	Inconsistent	(D)	2 3 4	3 (3	9 0	9 200	Consistent	
2.4 W	ere the worksh	op's conten	t consiste	ent with	your nee	ds?		
	Inconsistent		2 3 6				Consistent	
2.5 W	ere the worksh	op's conten	ts well de	eveloped	17	7		
	Not well dev					® Ø 0	Well developed	
3. N	IETHODOLOGIE	s						
3.1 T	he tools and ma	terials used	during th	ne works	hop wer	e ^		
	Not appropri	ate	D @	3 4) (3) (6)	0		te
3.2 T	he methodologi	es used wei		n s <u>am</u> ak sen	pov so <u>se</u> at sveno	e nego escencial	V -	
	Not appropri	ate	O Q	3 4	0 6	Ø ®	(Marian Appropria	ite
3.3 T	he activities org	ganized we	re				N N	
	Not useful		① ②	3 4	9 (5) (6)	⑦ ⑧	9 W Useful	



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ 🕲 ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ∭ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS: It was given useful for my work,



Name	(optional)	KATCIN	LEPP!	le		
Place	TACLI'N	JN.	Country	ESTON	A Date	15.03.2
Profes	sion CASE	MANAGER	Affiliatio	ņ 🔨		
Sex:		□ Ма	le 🔼 Fe	male		
	RGANISATION rganisation of Not suitable	the facilities used	for the works 3 4 5 6		Suitable	
1.2 T	he technical ed Not suitable	quipment used du ① ② ①	uring the works ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	hop was ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩	Suitable	
FH 54	ONTENTS ne workshop's Not Interest	content were ting ① ②	3 4 5 6	7800	Interesting	
2.2 Th	ne structure of Not Suitable	the workshop pr e ① ②(ogramme was ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	0 0 000	Suitable	
2.3 W	ere the works Inconsisten	hop's content coi t ① ②(our expectations?	Consistent	
2.4 W	ere the works Inconsisten	hop's content cont	nsistent with yo 3 4 5 6		Consistent	
2.5 W		hop's contents w veloped ① ②			Well developed	
3. M	IETHODOLOGI	ES				
3.1 T	he tools and m Not approp	naterials used dur riate (I	ing the worksh	op were ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ①	M Appropriate	ĸ.
3.2 T	he methodolog Not approp	gies used were oriate	D 2 3 4	S 6 7 8	Appropriate	
3.3 T	he activities o Not useful	rganized were	D 2 3 4	\$ 6 7 8	(1) Useful	



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦(⑧)⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
A A District Profes for A process of the state of the state of the profession of the profession of the state
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ Ø ⑧ ⑨ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨(⑩) Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨(⑩) Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future
collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. General Evaluation
of Selferine Evictorium
6.1 The workshop programme was
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
Hot interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
HOURING OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR
6. COMMENTS:
6. COMMENTS:

DISCUSS TIME WAS NEEDED MORE TIME FOR TO DISCUSS TIME WAS VERY LESS TO SOLVE IN THE PROBLEMS WITH TERMS LIKE " HIGH DIS L'OFFENDER AND DANGEROUSNESS"

?NDERSTANDING



Name	(optional)	MARIK	A	LAA	NEM	AE		
Place	VIRUV	ANGLA	Co	untry	RES	71		Date 15.03. (
Profess	ion service	probation	office Af	filiation				
Sex:		□ Ma	le	Ď Fema	ale			
1.0	RGANISATION	AL ASPECTS						
		the facilities used	for the v	vorksho	p was			
	Not suitable	① ② ③	27 177227 1222			0	Suitable	
061 (240 SHD40					AL MONOGOD			
1.2 Th	non-filter of an interest of the second of t	uipment used du ① ② ③			p was	(11)	Suitable	
	Not suitable	U & C	9 60 6			4	Suitable	
2. Co	NTENTS							
		content were						
	Not Interesti		3 4 3	0 6	7 8 9	00	Interesting	Q
	81 8 C M				A-E			
2.2 Th	4	the workshop pr ① ② ②			8 (9	(1)	Suitable	
	Not Suitable	W & C	3) (4) (5				Sultable	
2.3 W	ere the worksh	op's content cor	nsistent w	ith you	expectati	ons?	*	
	Inconsistent	and the second of the second o			® ®		Consistent	
1 and 1 horrowskie			11.14.11 4 0.004.204.104.104.104.104.104.104.104.104.104.1	()				
2.4 W		nop's content cor ① ② ①	nsistent w ③ ④ ⑤) (M)	Consistent	
	Inconsistent	W & (D G			7 49	Consistent	
2.5 W	ere the worksh	nop's contents w	ell develo	ped?				
		eloped ① ②			Ø ®	0	Well developed	
				0				
3. M	ETHODOLOGIE	:S						
2 1 Th	a table and m	aterials used duri	ing the w	orkshon	woro			
3.1 11	Not appropr		(a)	4) (S	® Ø	(B) (B)		re
	посарріорі			T T				.
3.2 Th	e methodolog	ies used were		00 - 30 <u>41</u> 801 - 4 044	H. M.			
	Not appropr	iate C	D Ø 3	4 (6 7	(B)	M Appropriate Output Description Output Description Description Output Descrip	te
2274	o activities	ganized were						
3.3 11	Not useful	gariized were	D (2) (3	4) (3)	6 7	(B)	9 00 Useful	



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ② ⑧ ⑨ ⑪ Useful
6. General Evaluation
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name	(optional)	Maary	(G2	There	4				
Place	Tarke pain	ew New		Country	Fal	ouia		Date	15.03.1
Profess	ion			Affiliațion	1				
Sex:			Male	☑ Fer	male				
	RGANISATIONAL rganisation of the Not suitable	facilities u	U. (1.20)	-	op was. ⑦ ⑧	9 (10)	Suitable		
1.2 Th	ne technical equip Not suitable			the worksh ⑤ ⑥		 (9 (0)	Suitable		
	NTENTS e workshop's con Not Interesting	~ ~) (3 (6)	⑦ ⑧	9 📵	Interesting		
2.2 Th	e structure of the Not Suitable	workshop ① ②			⑦ ®	9 0	Suitable		
2.3 W	ere the workshop Inconsistent	o's content ① ②	consiste ③ ④	(1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		tations?	Consistent		
2.4 W	ere the workshop Inconsistent	o's content ① ②		A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	ur need: ⑦ ⑧	(9) (10	Consistent		
2.5 W	ere the workshop Not well develo) ⑦ ⑧	90	Well developed	0	
3. M	ETHODOLOGIES			7)					
3.1 Th	e tools and mate Not appropriat		luring th	e worksho ③ ④	p were. ⑤ ⑥	 78	D Appropriat	te	
3.2 Th	e methodologies Not appropriat		 O @	3 4	\$	Ø ® (Appropriate	te	
3.3 Th	e activities organ	nized were	 O 2	3 4	S 6	78	(1) Useful		



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Stimulating
4.3 Verse level of involvement and antique posticionation was
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was: Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Very high
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧) ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. Atmosphere in the Workshop room
8 2
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨) ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The weekshar programme was
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:
D'un satisfied!
I'm satisfied:



Place	Tarte	Jangler ()	Country Easti	Date 1415.03.13
Profess		٥	Affiliation	
Sex:		□ Male	[™] Female	
1.0	RGANISATIONAL	ASPECTS		
1.1 0	rganisation of the	facilities used for t	e workshop was	
	Not suitable	① ② ③ ④	(5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) Suita	ble
1.2 Th	ne technical equip	oment used during t	e workshop was	
	Not suitable	0 2 3 4	⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suita	ble
2. Co	NTENTS	ä		
	e workshop's cor	ntent were		
	Not Interesting		\$ 6 7 8 9 1 Inter	esting
2.2 Th	e structure of the	workshop progran	ne was	
	Not Suitable	O 2 3 0	⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Suita	ble
2.3 W	ere the workshop	o's content consister	t with your expectations?	
	Inconsistent .	O O O O		istent
2.4 W	ere the workshop	s's content consiste	t with your needs?	
	Inconsistent	①②③④		istent
2.5 W	ere the workshop	o's contents well de	eloped?	
		oped ① ② ③ (developed
3. M	ETHODOLOGIES			
3.1 Th	ne tools and mate	rials used during th	workshop were	
	Not appropriat	e ①②	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	Appropriate
3.2 Th	ne methodologies	used were		
	Not appropriat	~ ~	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	Appropriate
3.3 Th	ne activities orga	nized were	· process	
	Not useful	① ②	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Useful



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was
Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ① Stimulating
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Very high
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was
Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Excellent
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for futur collaborations?
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑩ ⑩ Useful
6. GENERAL EVALUATION
6.1 The workshop programme was
Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Interesting
6.2 The workshop programme was
Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ Involving
6. COMMENTS:



Name (optional)		
Place	Country	Date
Profession	Affiliation	
Sex:	☐ Male ☐ Female	
1. ORGANISATIONAL ASPEC	тѕ	
1.1 Organisation of the facilit	ies used for the workshop was	
Not suitable ①		itable
1.2 The technical equipment	used during the workshop was	
Not suitable ①	23456789 Su	itable
2. CONTENTS	/ \	
2.1 The workshop's content w	ere	
		teresting
2.2 The structure of the works	hop programme was	
Not Suitable ①	23456789 DC-su	itable
2.3 Were the workshop's cont	ent consistent with your expectations?	
Inconsistent	23456789 M Co	nsistent
2.4 Were the workshop's cont	ent consistent with your needs?	
	**************************************	onsistent
2.5 Were the workshop's cont	ents well developed?	
Not well developed (D 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 💆 w	ell developed
3. METHODOLOGIES		
3.1 The tools and materials us	ed during the workshop were	2
Not appropriate	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	Appropriate
3.2 The methodologies used v	vere	Ŋ.
Not appropriate	023956789/	Appropriate
3.3 The activities organized v	vere	
Not useful	0 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Useful



4. SKILLS OF THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE OF THE WORKSHOP					
4.1 Capability of moderating the workshop Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent					
4.2 The interaction between experts and participants was Non existent ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Stimulating					
4.3 Your level of involvement and active participation was:					
Very low ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Ø Very high					
5. ATMOSPHERE IN THE WORKSHOP ROOM					
5.1 Communication inside the groups has been Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent					
5.2 Interaction between the workshop participants was Poor ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Excellent					
5.3 How useful do you feel that the contacts you made with the other workshop participants will be for future collaborations?					
Not very useful ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Useful					
6. GENERAL EVALUATION					
6.1 The weekshap reserves weeks					
6.1 The workshop programme was Not Interesting ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Interesting					
6.2 The workshop programme was Not involving ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ Involving					
6. COMMENTS:					