

Questions	1. Were your expectations of the DEAR Fair achieved?	2. In your opinion were the objectives of the DEAR Fair achieved?	3. Do you consider the 'Fair' dimension (exhibition, showroom and networking of organisations/projects) of the event was accomplished, was reinforced or was undermined by the plenary/parallel programme? And why?	4. Were the topics and approaches offered by speakers at the plenary sessions relevant to your work?	5. How do you evaluate the overall quality of facilitation and presentations at the Fair?	8. Which aspects of the programme could have been done with better facilitation, and how?	10. How do you rate the logistics support provided in registering for participation in the Fair, arranging travel and accommodation?	11. How would you rate the overall success of this Fair?	12. What would you change for a future fair?	13. For you/your project, was any important issue left out from the programme? Which?	14. Do you have any other comments?
	8	8	I guess the two dimensions went together well.	4	9	Facilitation was OK. I had problem with the plenary panel discussions which have not been very relevant to my work. I see a point in bringing the EC / DEVOO hierarchy to speak to generate their commitment to DEAR but this has been at times quite boring.	9	8	I would explain better the options to present projects (we should see draft programme before declaring how we would like to present the project). And I wish we had more time to organize ourselves in "parallel panels".	I do not think there was anything like that.	Thanks. That was overall very fruitful event!
	9	9	accomplished	9	9		9	9			To organise specific stands/workshops for the presentation of existing international networks (for their presentation, etc.) to which some organisation could approach, know and get involved in
	10	10	accomplished !	10	10	More time needed to organise the participation in the workshops of different organisations. The parallel program arrived too late.	8	10	Improve the organisation of parallel workshops	Participation of partners from other continents !!!	
	8	7	informal networking good, workshops included too much presentations	10	8	workshops - less presentations more discussion, last panels were too fast and not so relevant	9	8	more (panel) discussions instead of presentations		
	10	10	The Fair Dimension has been reinforced by the plenary/parallel programme	10	8		10	10	we must continue like this every year		Thank you it would have been a nice accommodations and food for the fair would have been of a more sustainable character, such as less meat, more organic food, and hotels with a sustainable niche. One other thing that I would have appreciated is that since I had notified in advance that I eat a vegan diet it would have been nice that there was some food for me that I could eat, and I presume that there must have been others with allergies and such as well. As I whole I appreciated the fair a lot!
	8	8	It would maybe have been better to have the fair-part of the event in other times of the day, not at 6-8 in the evening. And also more time for networking and going around the fair would have been preferable. otherwise the fair-part was really good and inspiring.	7	7	I liked the programme since it was varied and with the parallel programmes you could tailor it to your own field. The plenary presentations have been chaired tighter. There were many delays and some people spoke too long. People talked about having discussions after the plenary sessions, but they were more like a Q and A. Some parallel programs were chaired by one of the participants, but some consisted of presentations of different programs, without any facilitation or interaction. So the workshops could also be facilitated better (either by the DEAR team or by one of the participating organisations.	8	8	shorter Days. Maybe have more parallel programmes so that it takes less time and you can attend more of what suits you and your work.	I would like to have seen even more about evaluation.	
	6	6	In my opinion the fair dimension needs a plenary/parallel program, as you only get real interaction and knowledge of different projects and organisations when you talk about it or hear more about it than is displayed. Moreover it is a lot to ask all the participants for 2 days to Brussels, so they should get a little more than just to display and network. It needs a program with content for the people to come to the fair.	6	6		7	6	Better facilitation of workshops and plenary sessions. Workshops not only consisting of presentations, but more like a dialogue, a workshop, for example on dilemma's which different projects face, lessons learned, good practices etc. This might also be facilitated better by the participants themselves, would they have approached earlier in the process. Now we only had a week to prepare the workshops. So also information to the participants could be more timely.	I would have loved to discuss some theoretical aspects of Development Education in itself. How can people really change minds, get involved? Which aspects in your project are essential for this? It is difficult to get feedback from taskmanagers. I don't know where to put this issue, but know that many projects have difficulties in this and therefore try not to change too much, do not use the contingency, as they do not want to bother the administration, but this is not in the benefit of the ac	Great to have the taskmanagers involved, great that this was organised. Nice hotel, good venue, great networkevent and very nice to have so many important people present.
	8	8	A Little bit, there were to many plenary sessions, and strange to have the biggest networking session late at the evening.	9	9		10	8	More time for networking and info about future calls	I never had the chance to present	Organic and fair trade meals. With more focus on vegetarian food.
	7	7	It was accomplished and reinforced but not as expected because there was too little time for visiting and connect with other organizations	7	8	No comment by now	9	9	More free space for networking with other participants during exhibition	Short talk with EU Commissioner Mimica and workshop	No
	7	6	It was globally accomplished but on 1st day, the time for visiting the exhibition was reduced because of a plenary too long in the morning. The parallel programme was too much about projects presentations and not enough networking and reflexion about practices.	4	5	Parallel programme, by insisting on the exchange of practices.	8	7	More time for networking, more participants, more time about practices (and less about description of projects). More link with other DG in EC.	Not really.	Thank you!
	7	7	I thought they complimented each other... however, it would have been nice to have had more discussion time and less presentation.	8	7	It would have been good if some of the presentations had been shorter - and more time given for some discussion particularly on those sessions which were delivered by project managers.	8	8	Limited the time people can present / talk for and make sure there is always time for discussion. Give more planning time for the workshops so people can provide a more stimulating programme.	NO - all things covered	
	5	5	undermined, there was no time at all to speak to each other or to visit the stands. It was also disappointing that it was a mere internal meeting without any real visitors from "outside" The exhibition part was great - though - more time to interact would have been nice instead of one or two of the plenaries. Showroom programme for projects was nice but a bit too dense. I don't think it was undermined by the plenary, but maybe in general the programme was just too dense. As regards plenary, the evaluation session was too much. It would have been an absolutely great presentation in one of the prior cluster meetings!	6	5	all informations came in at very short hand and the whole announcement was different to what finally had to be prepared so that a lot of work was done for the basket in advance of the fair	7	5	More time for networking, more participants, more time about practices (and less about description of projects). More link with other DG in EC.	no real workshops on tools present once and this was far too much for the scarce time that would have been better used for project presentations of similar at least 2 hours each of the 2 days.	no
	7	8	More free time to visit the other stands. Provide possibility to add a second participant for each project (also in charge of the project) to switch the presence of the stands. Precious the presence of task managers. Very important the participation by all the levels of DevCo.	9	8	The workshop organisation was in parts a bit chaotic, though fair enough, logistics were high.	6	8	programme a bit less dense and space for networking. If EC attends on such high level - maybe give more time for exchange with the projects, if (as said so many times during the plenary) this was such an important event for the DG	It was quite a strong focus on formal learning and advocacy. More information and exchange about the next calls: this would have been an excellent opportunity to get direct feedback from the CSO.	Thank you for the great organisation and for certainly the best meeting of all the ones that took place in Brussels during the last three years
	8	9	The plenary sessions were too abstract and not enough close to the ground. Next time I wish that the Fair will be opened to any citizens interested in the subject.	8	7	Eliminate the workshops in the afternoon of the second day in order to facilitate the dismantling of the stands and the departures	9	9	See above	Interesting perspectives for the future, we'll work on it.	Congratulations to all for your excellent work. I hope to participate in the next edition!
	8	8		7	6	I would have better animated the debate, to make it a little more lively.	7	8	Involve citizens		great atmosphere and lot of efforts from different organizations and im just wondering who can take all this and promote it to the EU citizens
	9	10	was accomplished, although a little bit was taken away from plenary	7	7	the parallel workshops, maybe less projects in one room and be more discussion rather presentations of activities	9	9	just a bit less parallel workshops which were actually presentations rather workshops	no	
	8	8	The Networking was not facilitated.	8	8	the whole facilitation was very well done.	10	9	insert a facilitated networking	none	Thanks



9	9	The layout etc was wonderful, however in terms of networking the only real time you got to meet others was during lunch etc. It was a bit difficult to find time to visit the other organisations as there was no dedicated time due to the plenary and parallel programmes. I found this a great pity as there was so many and we only got to know those nearby, never getting a chance to meet the others in the side rooms.	9	9	Facilitated very well, from parallel programmes and plenary	10	10	More time to network and interact with other organisations, a chance to get to know one another more.	No	n/a
8		It was accomplished and it was a very good part of the event. It was reinforced, because the plenary programme has allowed everyone to face and deepen actual and important topics (such as refugees reception and inclusion), to know innovative and attractive tools for the global citizenship education (projects' presentations), to consider the future challenges of DEAR program and to debate on key issues such as monitoring and evaluation.	8	8	the parallel workshops should be less	7	8	more organized networking or even project ideas brainstorming sessions	na	The fair was an important and useful for exchange, discussion and new opportunities for relationship and collaboration. It also stimulated reflection on the implementation and the results of our project in relation to the others and the whole programme
9	9	It would be good to have more time for visiting exhibition and especially talking with exhibitors which would help networking at the same time	8	8	the notice board for networking, signaling its existence during the plenary sessions and allowing time for writing and reading suggestions	9	8	one more day, maybe on Saturday, open to the public; a list of the projects with brief descriptions, links and contacts	No, I don't think	Not really. It would be interesting to hear more about the future of DEAR but perhaps this is not the place neither the time
8	9	It was undermined because there was not enough time to explore the stands and there was no organised activity on it.	9	8	Visit of exhibition only - rephrased everything the participants were saying and in the other one I attended, the workshops started 45 minute too late.	10	9	There should be more changes of interaction between the project promoters.	No	Thank you so much for hosting this great event! Thank you for organizing such an event and I am really satisfied with how it went and the visibility it brought to our projects.
10	9	The 'FAIR' dimension appeared to me more useful than expected. Overall it took me up until the DEAR Fair to find you what you as organizers wanted to achieve.	10	10	Related to (8): In previous DEAR meetings there was dedicated time for exchange with task managers. This maintains to be crucial, as not everything can be solved via email.	9	9	Next time it would then be useful to invite people from outside the DEAR projects - for really having an external audience that gets to learn about DEAR projects, their goals and achievements.	The focus was very much on development education. A bigger focus on awareness raising and watch dog role of CSOs with support of DEAR funding would be very much appreciated.	
6	7	It was a little undermined by the plenary programme. I think that the both things were complementary because, for example, in the parallel sessions the organisations involved disseminated their work and projects, but the information was also available at the organisations' stands.	7	8		7	7	A flash mob about Development Education	Nothing	No, thank you all
8	8		8	8	Nothing to add.	8	9	Maybe the main space should congregate all the stands. The separation in three rooms potentially neglected some of the organisations and their projects.	None.	No.
8	8	The overall organization was very good & well balanced. A bit more time for networking and visits of the stands by officials would be suggested.	8	7	very good & professional	7	8	good to have high level speakers. This is even more important if the Fair is open to non-converted. For the "converted", concrete and to-the-point arguments are more relevant.		The National/Regional/Local Authorities (+EU institutions) dimension of DEAR could be more developed in the next ones for instance, to see how they are working with CSOs on the topic. The concrete examples of DEAR projects & also the evaluation part was very much appreciated. Fair relevant & helpful. Congratulations!
7	8	The parallel programme reinforced the Fair but was too full of activities (plenary sessions + workshops) which, in my opinion, didn't allow enough time for visiting other project's stands and networking.	9	9		9	9	See question 7. Plus - offer Fair Trade products, use recycling bins and think more about sustainability. Bear in mind that these Actions deal exactly with these issues and event such this should lead by example. Also, I'm sure everything would be easier if all the talks were in English, taking headphones just because of 10 minutes of talk or 1 question was quite annoying. And I'm afraid that renting all the headphones was not cheap as well.	What about more information about next EC calls? We tried to look for partners, it would be nice to know what we should concentrate on a bit...	I really appreciate that there were Task managers. I always welcome any opportunity to meet with her in person. And you did a very good job, as this was the first year of the fair.
6	8	I think that some plenaries were not necessary or were too long, although I understand that there were important people. However, more direct contact with them (walk amongst exhibitions) within the given time would be maybe more useful. The parallels and plenary about evaluation I find on the other hand useful and a good supplement to the "Fair" scheme.	4	7	Some clustering the organizations according to their field of operation would be helpful. You would know who deals with what and can better target whom to speak first. Grouping according to topics would make the first contact a bit easier. Also presentation of the whole organization, not just the concrete Action, might be useful next time (both).	10	7	The "fair" should be open at least to relevant stakeholders and when possible to the interested public. It's a pity to keep this impressive amount of information, materials and expertise just between us, the DEAR family (staff and beneficiaries).		Great initiative! Congratulations for the great efforts made by the support team!
8	8	In order to achieve "a greater Fair" dimension, the participation of at least 2 project representatives should be foreseen so that tasks and participation to different programme activities can be shared.	8	8	The parallel workshops should have been announced before, so that the participants would have more time to actually elaborate a workshop design and facilitate it accordingly.	8	8	the parallel programme was really interesting, I would love to see it expanded.		Yes, the potential links between my project and other similar projects should be promoted by the DEAR Team not after project completion, but at the very beginning of the intervention. The DEAR Team should exploit synergies between similar projects by ensuring adequate contacts between projects' coordinators.
8	7	plenary gave a great general overview, while parallel program was rich of content but I wish we had more time for the parallel sessions.	7	7	of interest in relation to the session, and for instance suggest few questions that could be included in a round-table to be discussed ... More guidance in the preparation of the session would have helped avoid the focus on standard presentations of projects, with poor interaction between different projects in the same session.	8	8	More preparation of the sessions, and more guidance by the Support Team	No ... probably, more time for networking and visiting the exhibition would have been positive.	Thank you for the opportunity to meet organized by project promoters and representatives, gaining experience and developing new idea
7	7	The plenary sessions reinforced the "Fair" dimension. In my opinion, however, the presentation of projects should avoid the standard presentation of the projects' outcomes. More debate, round tables about topics would be more interesting ...	6	9		7	8	the parallel programme was really interesting, I would love to see it expanded.		Logistical information on how to organise the stand and on the presentation sessions should come earlier.
9	9	Everything was well-balanced and well-proportioned	10	9	Marketplace and Plenary	10	9	More discussions during workshops	Everything essential was included	
7	7	The Fair dimension seems to be too much of a side activity of the event. It was very good to have the plenaries and the parallels slots so I don't think this undermined the "fair" dimension. What I think undermined this was for example the fact that in end of day 1, instead of visiting the fair, everyone went down to have snacks...it would have helped if the snacks were being served in the same floor as the fair (if it was logistically possible of course)	8	7		7	7	More interaction between the project recipients		
10	9		10	9		9	10	Nothing special! It was great!! (maybe just the networking slot being facilitated and near the "fair" itself.		Please repeat it in the future.
Average results		7.94	8	7.56	7.83		8.46	8.29		
1. expectations achieved?	2. objectives achieved?	3. 'Fair' dimension vs. plenary/parallel programme?	4. speakers/ plenary sessions relevant?	5. facilitation / presentations better?	6. programme could have better facilitation?	10. logistics support, travel and accommodation?	11. overall success of this Fair?	12. change for a future fair?	13. any important issue left out from the programme? Which?	14. comments?