WASH Advisors Meeting – Stockholm – August 2015.

Consolidated Feedback Form.

12 responses from 12 PNS representatives

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Question** | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Good** | **Very Good** | **Comments or suggested improvements?** |
| 1 | Did the logistics/arrangements/ facilities meet your expectations? |  |  | 4 | 8 |  |
| 2 | Did you get enough timely information prior to the meeting? |  |  | 2 | 10 | * Well prepared this time * Good use of wiki * Also good for post-reading * Not sure everybody had read them |
| 3 | Was the pre-reading useful and relevant? |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | * Could have been more targeted * Too many documents * Documents not used in the sessions * Could have been ‘must read’ and ‘nice to read’ |
| 4 | Did the meeting format meet your expectations? (Should there be more/less time for plenary, group or one on one discussions, presentations)? |  | 2 | 6 | 4 | * Group work would have been better for some topics. * No power points good * More time for developmental topics needed than emergency topics. * A facilitator would have been good * Good for PNS to be together physically. * More time for sharing experience please * More time for one on one or bilateral meetings * More time for introducing new ideas or technology. |
| 5 | Was the time managed well?  (do we need more meetings annually or a longer/shorter meeting once a year?) |  | 3 | 5 | 4 | * RC Movement problems took too much time * Emergency session too long * Need more time * Majority in favour extra meeting annually |
| 6 | Is it a good idea to continue having this meeting linked to Stockholm World Water Week? |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | * Can we have meetings in the field – too Eurocentric * 10 out of 12 endorsed continuing at Stockholm. * Possible WEDC as alternative? |
| 7 | Was enough time allocated per subject?  (Was there too many subjects?) | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | * Too many subjects * Too much emergency |
| 8 | Would you join us next year for a similar meeting?  (How may we improve?) |  | 1 | 2 | 9 | * All agreed yes |
| 9 | Please add further comments and suggestions if you wish | Generally positive feedback and supportive to the main conclusions – keep Stockholm and add an extra meeting per year.  Good that Non-ERU PNS are involved in ERU discussions.  Good that PNS had opportunity to influence the agenda.  Expected outcomes should be followed for each discussion and keep on track.  Several comments on ‘good atmosphere’ and ‘working environment’. | | | | |

**Thanks for your participation and feedback………**