Ref. Ares(2018)2635755 - 22/05/2018

Co-funded by the







SITEX-II (Contract Number: 662152) Deliverable n°D3.4

Lessons learnt from the pilot training session

Authored by:	A. Narkūnienė, D. Justinavičius, P. Poškas, (LEI), P. Metcalf (ENSTTI), M. Rocher (IRSN), A. Mrskova (Decom), V. Detilleux (Bel V), F. Bernier (FANC), J. Dewoghelaëre (Mutadis), J. Miksova (CV REZ), K. Lange (CNSC)		
Edited by:	A. Narkūnienė	15/11/2017: AND	
Checked by:	A. Narkūnienė Work Package 3 Leader	17/11/2017: Mo	
Approved by:	D. Pellegrini, Coordinator	30/11/2017: 2000	

Date of issue of this report: **30.10.2017** Report number of pages: **22 + 143** appendices

 Start date of project:
 01/06/2015
 Duration: 30 Months

 Project co-funded by the European Commission under the Euratom Research and Training Programme on Nuclear Energy within the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme

 Dissemination Level

 PU
 Public
 X

 PP
 Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)
 X

 RE
 Restricted to a group specified by the partners of the SITEX-II project
 CO

 CO
 Confidential, only for partners of the SITEX-II project
 Co

Sustainable network for Independent Technical EXpertise of Radioactive Waste Disposal – Interactions and Implementation (SITEX-II)

The SITEX-II Project (Coordination and Support Action) was initiated in 2015 within the EC's Horizon 2020 programme to further develop the Sustainable Independent Expertise Function Network in the field of deep geological disposal safety. This Network is expected to ensure a capability for sustainable developing and coordinating, at the international level, joint and harmonized activities, related to the Expertise Function. SITEX-II brings together representatives from 18 organisations including regulatory technical support organisations, authorities, research organisations and specialists in risk governance and interaction with general public, including NGOs and an education institute. It is aimed at practical implementation of the activities defined by the former EURATOM FP7 SITEX project (2012–2013), using the interaction modes identified by that project. SITEX-II, coordinated by IRSN, is implemented through 6 Work Packages (WP).

WP1 - Programming R&D (lead by Bel V). The general objective of WP1 is to further define the Expertise Function's R&D programme necessary to ensure independent scientific and technical capabilities for reviewing a safety case for geological disposal. In this perspective WP1 will develop a Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) and define the Terms of Reference (ToR) for its implementation accounting for the preparatory work to be carried out in the framework of the JOPRAD project for construction of a Joint Programming of research for geological disposal.

WP2 - Developing a joint review framework (lead by FANC). The key objective of WP2 is to further develop and document in position papers and technical guides a common understanding of the interpretation and proper implementation of safety requirements in the safety case for the six phases of facility development (conceptualization, siting, reference design, construction, operational, post-closure). **WP3** - **Training and tutoring for reviewing the safety case** (lead by LEI). WP3 aims to provide a practical demonstration of training services that may be provided by the foreseen SITEX network. A pilot training module will focus on the development of training modules at a generalist level, with emphasis on the technical review of the safety case, based on national experiences, practices and prospective views. The training modules will integrate the outcomes from WP1, WP2 and WP4 and support harmonisation of the technical review processes across Europe.

WP4 - Interactions with Civil Society (lead by Mutadis). WP4 is devoted to the elaboration of the conditions and means for developing interactions with Civil Society (CS) in the framework of the foreseen SITEX network, in view of transparency of the decision-making process. The future SITEX network is expected to support development of these interactions at different levels of governance and at different steps of the decision-making process. Three thematic tasks, namely R&D, safety culture/review and governance will be addressed by institutional experts and representatives of CS within SITEX-II as well as externally through workshops with other CS organisations.

WP5 - Integration and dissemination of project results (lead by CV REZ). The overall objective of WP5 is to produce a synthesis of the results achieved within all the WPs of SITEX-II together with an Action Plan that will set out the content and practical modalities of the future Expertise Function network. WP5 will also foster the interactions of SITEX-II with external entities and projects, as well as the dissemination of SITEX-II results so as to allow possible considerations from outside the project in the process of developing the future SITEX network.

WP6 - Management and coordination (lead by IRSN).

Contact: D. Pellegrini (IRSN), SITEX-II Coordinator delphine.pellegrini@irsn.fr

Further details on the SITEX-II project and its outcomes are available at <u>www.sitexproject.eu</u>



Sustainable network for Independent Technical EXpertise of radioactive waste disposal - Interactions and Implementation

ABSTRACT

This report is the fourth deliverable prepared by the SITEX-II project group for Work Package 3 *Training and tutoring for reviewing the Safety Case*. One of the objectives of Work Package 3 was to develop and test in practise a training module with main focus on Regulatory review of Safety Case process, methodologies and challenges. The implementation of pilot training session gave the opportunity to get feedback from the 18 trainees. The present report provides the results of training evaluation by the participants (trainees, lecturers) and the summary about lessons learnt. Organisation of pilot training session served as a tool to analyse the potential and capabilities of lecturers to contribute to training service of SITEX network. Obtained feedback provides valuable suggestions for further improvement and development of the training service of the future SITEX network in the field of preparation of experts in safety of geological disposal.



CONTENT

1	Introduction		
2	Evaluation of the training development		
3	Evaluation of pilot training session	6	
	3.1 Detailed evaluation of general features	7	
	3.2 Detailed evaluation of lectures	9	
	3.3 Detailed evaluation of workshops (Exercises)	13	
	3.4 Suggestions for future session	16	
4	Evaluations of pilot training session by lecturers	17	
5	Evaluation of trainees' knowledge		
6	Lessons learnt	20	
7	Future SITEX training		
8	References		
9	Annexes	24	
	9.1 Evaluation form for trainees		
	9.2 Evaluation form for lecturers		
	9.3 Evaluation sheets of trainees		

9.4 Evaluation sheets of lecturers



1 Introduction

To review the Safety Case of a deep geological repository, experts with wide ranges of competencies are required. During the SITEX 7FP project (2012–2013), five different types of experts being involved in the technical review process were identified (generalist experts, environmental experts, numerical modellers, risk experts, experts in long-term safety) and their necessary knowledge and skills were compiled into "experts' profiles". According to the Terms of Reference [SITEX, 2014a], Training and Tutoring will be one of the services provided by this network. A plan for competence development in expertise of radioactive waste disposal safety was developed [SITEX, 2014b], including the setting up of a training programme.

Work Package 3 (WP3) of SITEX-II aims at demonstrating the implementation of a training service, including both technical and management aspects, by developing and testing a training module devoted to all experts involved in the Safety Case review process and generalist experts in particular. As such the first module of the proposed programme was selected for the demonstration. Duration of one week was decided upon for the demonstration and several topics were selected for presentation.

The tasks under the activities in WP3 have been fulfilled by cooperation among technical safety organisations, research organisations, nuclear regulatory authorities, Civil Society experts and the European Nuclear Safety Training and Tutoring Institute (ENSTTI).

The topics identified for inclusion in the general training module were the following: radioactive waste management, the safety basis and the legal and regulatory framework, disposal concepts, the safety case, safety assessment, design optimisation and management of uncertainty, interacting processes, development of limits, controls and conditions, supporting research and the regulatory review process.

The technical and management aspects were tested by making use of the course development and evaluation scheme used by ENSTTI as part of its management system. The system provides for course preparation by way of course development and evaluation processes, the latter undertaken by course participants and lecturers. The former involves syllabus development, lecturer selection, registration and general course administration.

Task 3.3 of WP3 of SITEX-II project has been devoted to the implementation and testing in practice the training module on Regulatory review of Safety Case of geological disposal.

This deliverable presents the summary of the training session evaluations provided by the trainees, their achievements in general and lessons learnt to be considered in the future.

2 Evaluation of the training development

Syllabus

Development of the training course description and syllabus was undertaken by iteration of the proposals provided by ENSTTI, LEI, IRSN within WP3 (for more details see [SITEX-II. 2017a]). This process was effective and produced a balanced training agenda within the constraints of the one



week period adopted for the pilot training session. From the pilot training session feedback possibly more emphasis should have been given to disposal concepts and design optimisation. The topic of uncertainty management was not included and should be considered in future courses. There was considerable interest in the actual Safety Case review and this is a topic for broader consideration in the future.

Registration

The registration process was undertaken through the ENSTTI system and functioned adequately. It had been decided that registration should be limited to around twenty participants with priority being given to participants from SITEX-II project organisations. In total twenty-one persons registered with five being from non-SITEX-II organisations and eighteen persons attended. Thirteen lecturers were also registered. The registration mechanism functioned adequately, for any future courses decisions would have to be taken in respect of differentiation between SITEX network member organisations and others.

Financial aspects

It was decided that as this was a pilot training course no fees from trainees would be levied and costs related to organization. Cost for travels and accommodations for lecturers were covered within the SITEX-II project budget. Cost for travels and accommodation for trainees were covered by their organisations. A funding model will have to be developed for future training events.

3 Evaluation of pilot training session

The trainees were invited to evaluate the pilot training session by filling the evaluation form provided by ENSTTI. The evaluation form consists of several sections such as for the evaluation of general features, detailed evaluation of lectures, evaluation of workshops (exercises), suggestions for future session. The filled evaluation forms (copies) are presented in Annex 9.3.

In total eighteen trainees took part in the training event. The trainees' organisations were classified as regulatory authorities (7 trainees), technical support organisations (7 trainees) and research organisations (4 trainees) (Fig. 1). The training course attracted equally participants from regulatory authorities and technical support organisations; research organisations also found it to be interesting.

Based on the overall evaluation, the pilot SITEX training session was given a mark 18.4 out of 20.





Fig. 1. Participants (trainees) of SITEX pilot training course by different type of organisation

3.1 DETAILED EVALUATION OF GENERAL FEATURES

While evaluating the content of the module, the possible answers were the following:

- Nothing new;
- Too general;
- Well-balanced;
- Too detailed;
- Too advanced.

The overall rating of the training course was mostly reported as "well-balanced" mostly as 83 percent (15 out of 18) of the trainees selected this option. Two trainees reported the content of the training module as "Too general". The remark as "sometime too detailed" was given by one participant under his rating of the overall training as "well-balanced".

Answers about the following general aspects were collected:

- Your evaluation of Module content;
- Practical information, logistic;
- Time management;
- Number of trainees;
- Interactive elements;
- General quality of teaching, lectures;
- Interest of technical visits;
- Interest of workshops;



- Your teaching tools;
- Quality of handouts;
- Training room.



The evaluation summary of the general aspects is presented in Fig. 2.

Fig. 2. Summary of the evaluation of general features of SITEX pilot training course

As it could be seen from the figure Fig. 2, the content of the module was reported equally as "Excellent" and "Good" by 89 percent of trainees in total, while one participant reported it as "Average". Very similar evaluation appeared to be for the time arrangement. Practical information, number of trainees, interactive elements, general quality of teaching methods and training room were identified more times as "Excellent" (by 9-10 out of 18 trainees, 44-50 %) than "Good" (by 6-7 out of 18 trainees, 33-39 %). Average score for the mentioned aspects was indicated by one or two trainees. The training room was rated as "Excellent" by 11 trainees and "Good" by 6 trainees. There were trainees who gave no response (one or two out of 18, 11 % of the total number of trainees).

Technical visits have not been organized and thus their evaluation was not performed. A large number of respondents (7) did not provide their evaluation regarding the "Interest of workshops". The title of this aspect do not contain term "Exercises" and thus it could be reasonable to relate this to the fact that some trainees might not relate this line to the evaluation of their impression on the practical exercises during the training.



The evaluation of aspects "Your teaching tools" and "Quality of handout" received no response from four or five trainees and as well as the remark as "Do not understand question" for teaching tools and remark "More handouts". As there were received more ratings as "Good" and "Average", put together, than "Excellent", some actions should be taken to improve these aspects.

3.2 DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURES

The evaluation of the trainees' interest in the topic presented in each lecture is summarised in **Error! Reference source not found.**



Fig. 3. Summary of the trainees' interest in the topic presented in each lecture in the SITEX pilot training course

As it could be seen from the figure the greatest interest (almost 90 percent) was expressed for geological disposal programmes (Lecture A.3), geological disposal concepts and challenges (Lecture A.4) and regulatory review and assessment processes and its challenges (Lecture C.1).

15 out of 18 trainees (83 %) expressed great interest in the topics related to regulatory expectations of the Safety Case (Lectures B.1-B.2) and to the recent experience with regulatory review of French Safety Case for radwaste disposal in clayey formation (Lecture E.1).

In general, all topics were identified as being of great interest by the majority of participants. Weak interest in several topics might be attributed to the trainee's current activities that might be more focused on other aspects than Safety Case review. At early stages of the disposal programme



implementation, topics relevant to the disposal concept or stakeholder involvement have a potential to be focused on.

Fig. 4 presents the results of the evaluation of transfer of knowledge to the trainees. The first two lectures were devoted to the overview of national radioactive waste management and disposal programmes in several countries (Lithuania and Ukraine, Lectures A.1 and A.2) and to draw of the context of the overall radwaste disposal process, differences in strategies, etc. rather than to transfer a specific knowledge or specific practise. Thus, the rating as "Good" transfer of knowledge by more than 66 % of the respondents is reasonably sufficient.

Among the rest lectures, the topics on stakeholder engagement and introduction to Pathways Evaluation Process (PEP) (Lecture D.3) and about geological disposal concepts and challenges (Lecture A.4) were rated mostly as "Excellent" (by 12 out of 18 trainees) and "Good" (5 out of 18 trainees) (Fig. 4).



Fig. 4. Summary of transfer of know-how by each lecture in the SITEX pilot training course

Other topics, which were evaluated as transferring the know-how in excellent way too (by 10-11 trainees out of 18, i.e. 55-61 % of the respondents) and in a good way (by 4-7 trainees out of 18, i.e. 22-38 %) are: regulatory review and assessment process and its challenges (Lecture C.1), Regulatory expectations of the safety case (Lecture B.1-B.2) and design and conduct of supporting research programmes (Lecture D.1).

Topics related to overall regulatory process and technical and scientific expertise requirements (Lecture A.5), regulatory review, moving from conceptualisation to implementation (C.2), Summary of current programmes and future joint programming (Lecture D.2) received slightly



more rating as transferring know-how in a "Good" (9-10 out of 18 trainees) way than in "Excellent" way (6-8 out of 18 trainees).

Several topics, such as geological disposal programmes (Lecture A.3), recent experience with regulatory review of French safety case for radwaste disposal in clayey formation (Lecture E.1), design and conduct of supporting research programmes (Lecture D.1), summary of current programmes and future joint programming (Lecture D.2) received the "Average" rating in the perspective of transferring of know-how by 3-5 trainees (16-28 %). Thus, these areas could be advised for updating/improvement while preparing future trainings.

In summary, it is evident from the presented figures that the content and transfer of the knowhow got evaluations as "Excellent" and "Good" by a large majority of the participants. This indicates a high quality of the training module itself and a good basis for further improvements.

The suggestions/recommendations given to the lecturers are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. Suggestion for the lecturers (Question No. 2.14 in the evaluation form for trainees)

Suggestions, recommendations, comments	Issue related to:
 Do not intercept the exercises with the lecture (it is hard to switch on it and be focus). Work process was organized more effectively on Wednesday. 	Organisation (setting the agenda)
 A handout with an abstract of each presentation could be very helpful (in addition to the slides) Often very much text on slides, which is very helpful reading everything again alone, but during the presentation I even didn't need to start reading or looking at them as I would have never finished reading until it was switched to the next slide. Text could not support the presentation this way. Charts could be used more (text should be readable). 	Organisation (preparation of material)
 Present SITEX before. More examples on real safety case. More examples from the practise. Illustrate by practical examples. Some more interaction exercises perhaps. For lecture A.4 Geological disposal concepts: general information on the properties of different host rocks was missing. However, the presentation of Bel V was complementary. As it was the first session given for this training it is true that some presentations (generally about regulatory body role and IRSN) lack a little bit of example. It could be an improvement to show more examples of experience (more images and photos also is a plus). 	Content of current training module (lecture, exercise material)
 Discuss real reviews of disposal safety case including all stages of development, i.e. Generic/pre-constructional through site selection to construction. More technical issues, experience of countries during siting, construction, URL activities, main issues and challenges for 	Content of future training (setting the training programme, objectives, etc.)



Suggestions, recommendations, comments	Issue related to:
different host rock formations, challenges for different design	
concept (copper, concrete, steel,).	
• Because of different dialects it is helpful to try to talk slow and	Organisation (giving a
clear.	lecture)
• 1 trainee had problems to understand some of lecturers because	
they were struggling to find the right words.	
• Do not miss the slides. Sometimes the lecturers switched to the	
next slide too quickly, without enough explanation.	

As it could be seen, the suggestions for the lecturers can be grouped according to the issue they are related to (related more to organisation or to training content).

The recommendations about the topics to be included in this module are shortly presented in Table 2. Analysis of the provided recommendations showed that some of the suggestions are dedicated to the lectures already developed for this training module, while the others are suggested to be included in the training programme for future training.

Table 2. Suggestions of additional topics to be included in the lectures (Question No. 2.15 in the evaluation form for trainees)

 General overview of waste management situation in European countries and waste streams. Geological disposal in all countries. Which solution is chosen for each country. 1 trainee found comparison about different concepts very interacting (a c different types of empirity used intermetionally) 	Recommendations, suggestions	Issue related to:
 Interesting (e.g. different types of canisters used internationally), but it was said too little about this slide. Lecture D.3 could do with more examples and possibly more details on positives and negatives. "Real" representatives of civil society could bring a different angle to the discussions. 	 General overview of waste management situation in European countries and waste streams. Geological disposal in all countries. Which solution is chosen for each country. 1 trainee found comparison about different concepts very interesting (e.g. different types of canisters used internationally), but it was said too little about this slide. Lecture D.3 could do with more examples and possibly more details on positives and negatives. "Real" representatives of civil society could bring a different angle to the discussions. 	Content of current training module (lecture, exercise material)



Recommendations, suggestions	Issue related to:
 A lecture on siting process experience (Switzerland, e.g.). A presentation from NGO's (e.g. MKG) on their experience and expectations during participation along the decision-making process. Technical topics. 	Content of future training (setting the training programme, objectives, etc.)
• FEPS.	
Waste conditioning techniques.	
 Comparison of the existing "waste container" solutions, their advantage and disadvantages. 	
 A separate lecture on main waste degradation processes (with examples), "waste-container" interactions; tectonics->host rock properties 	
 Underground laboratories research. 	
 Uncertainty management. 	
 A separate lecture on treatment of uncertainties. 	
 Review of safety assessment. 	
 Difference in approach to review of operational+post-closure safety cases. 	
 A lecture on "how to write a regulatory guide" on specific topic or "how to write an advice" on the specific document presented by operator. 	
 Sample questions to be considered and discussion of regulatory expectation for satisfying that in the safety case. i.e. worked examples. 	

3.3 DETAILED EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS (EXERCISES)

13 trainees (out of 18) expressed their great interest in the practical exercises; one trainee indicated his average interest in practical activities (Fig. 5). No response was given four times. The section of the evaluation form dedicated to the evaluation of workshops does not have indication of term "Exercises" in it and thus this might be a reason for that number of "No response".





Fig. 5. Results of the trainees' evaluation of their interest in practical exercises

While evaluating the usefulness of the practical exercises 13 trainees indicated them as "Well balanced" and one trainee indicated as "Too general" (Fig. 6).



Fig. 6. Results of trainees' evaluation of usefulness of practical exercises

The overall evaluation of the practical exercises as "Excellent" is high (50 %), three trainees out of 18 (17 %) identified them as "Good", Fig. 7. However above 30 % of the respondents did not provide their rating. This, once again, might be related to the evaluation form as not indicating term "Exercise" in line with term "Workshop" and lack of communication on this aspect. On the



other hand, it may indicate that some respondents possibly had difficulties to rate these activities. Following this, it could be reasonable to take some actions related to getting more responses as well as to improve the practical exercises.



Fig. 7. Results of overall evaluation of the practical exercises

Some comments/suggestions were provided by the trainees for the practical exercises in terms of organisation and content (what additional topics should be included). The summary is provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Suggestions of trainees for the practical exercises in terms of organisation and content (Questions No. 3.2, 3.3 in the evaluation form for the trainees)

Suggestions, recommendation	Issue related to:
 More workshops (exercises), possible 1 per training day. We did understand at the beginning that we were supposed to do (level of details, need to specify the rules) during PEP exercise. Sometimes there was too much information. A little less but instead a summary of what we have learned today (as slides with questions like "what did you learn about?", "How does it work, which steps to take in order to?" and group discussion) would deepen the knowledge instead of overloading the participants. It was perhaps assist the tutees if there was no information regarding the detail of waste and disposal concept to help in developing specific targets, etc. The danger with retaining the scope at a wide and generic level is that participants simply relate the lecture/guidance (e.g. SSG-31) rather than considering how these should be applied. The exercises have been very creative, entertaining and helpful. 	Organisation (communication, clear definition)
• A lecture about opinions and methods to keep memory of the	Content of future
(D-N°:3.3) – Lessons learnt from the pilot training module	15
Dissemination level: PU	



Suggestions, recommendation	Issue related to:
disposal could be interesting.	training (setting the
 Integration of operational safety with post-closure requirements. 	training programme,
 A workshop on review of the "actual" (existing) document. 	objectives, etc.)
 A workshop on the immediate "solution" of the unexpected problem. 	
• Could be interesting to combine such training with an actual visit to URL (like Mont-Terri, HADES, Bure).	

3.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE SESSION

A part of the evaluation sheet was dedicated to express recommendations, suggestions for the training events in the future. The suggestions of trainees for the improvement of the Module are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Suggestions of trainees for the improvement of the Module (Question No. 4.1 in the evaluation form for trainees)

Comment, recommendation	Issue related to:
 To understand the safety case in its full complexity it would be helpful to get a paper summarizing in a very short way with text and diagram (understood as from IAEA SSG-23), the most important facts and steps as during the presentations there were covered so many info and sub-branches of the topic that I missed the overview. I didn't really understand the safety case until the exercise. This summary should be given to the participants on the first or second day but at least before the exercise. 	Organisation (preparation of material)
More interaction between lecturers and trainees in the lectures.More interactive exercises.	Organisation (giving a lecture, exercises)
 Do not interrupt the exercise with another lecture as it happened on Tuesday. 	
 More example, pictures for the most generic presentation B1/C1/D1. A few more exercises. PEP exercise is ok as a basis, but needs of improvement. 	Contentofcurrenttrainingmodule(lecture,exercisematerial)
 Some of the topics could be extended and discussed in more detail. 	Content of future training (setting the training programme, objectives, etc.)

Trainees of the pilot SITEX training expressed their interest in a tutorial in the following topics and/or another ENSTTI course (if exists on such topic) related to:

• Decommissioning;



- Radiotoxicity (waste inventory);
- Waste conditioning technique;
- Inspections (waste);
- Radwaste management safety;
- Geological disposal concepts and challenges in different countries;
- Interaction processes between regulator and operator;
- More examples of safety case reviews, plus and negative points from reviews;
- Course on TSO and course relate stakeholders and to PEP;
- Design and conduct of repository R&D programmes;
- Some of the R&D topics (waste, spent fuel degradation, e.g.);
- Waste degradation processes;
- Overview of thermo-hidro-mechanical-chemical processes in geological repository;
- Monitoring;
- Safety case;
- Biosphere assessment (modelling)
- Modeling.

As it could be seen there is a wide spectrum of topics identified as interesting for the participants of the pilot training session to go for more detailed analysis of particular issues in the perspective of regulatory review.

4 Evaluations of pilot training session by lecturers

In total seven lecturers provided their evaluation of the pilot training session and their lectures, exercises. From the perspective of general features four out of seven respondents participated in the preparation of training content, three out of seven lecturers participated in the preparation of timetable of pilot training session. It should be noted that several topics were developed by several co-authors and the co-author participated in the preparation of the content and timetable. The lecturers from the Associated Group of SITEX-II project did not participate in the development of training module and the timetable as they were not involved directly in WP3 activities. Almost all (six) responded lecturers actively participated in the preparation of content (key words, synopsis) for their lecture (exercise). For one lecturer it was addressed by the co-author of the lecture.

While evaluating their lectures almost all lecturers indicated the right duration and only one lecturer think his lecture was too detailed and too long. Six respondents noted that the trainees were active and one "No response" was observed on this aspect. It was also highlighted by several lecturers that they felt their lectures providing interactivity, clear pictures and schemes; providing practical examples illustrating presented principles; that it was a good balance between a broad overview of the R&D part and technical/more detailed description of the needs and it could be interesting to go into more details about 1 or 2 needs with dedicated and technical presentations.

Among the weakness of the lectures, the respondents saw the needs to shorten some information, to mention safety issue more, to improve the style of presentation making it less formal. One lecturer acknowledged some of his personal difficulties with English language. One lecturer acknowledged that giving the broad overview he felt sometimes "not enough prepared" for some technical issues that were overviewed. A negative point in shortening the oral



presentation of the lecture and going fast through some slides was also given by one lecturer for himself. One of the lecturers pointed out that if knowing the participants' composition these might have been better targeted.

Based on the mentioned aspects, the lecturers had some suggestions to improve their current lecture by adding more information and reviewing it again with project partners, by better formulation of lecture's goal and scope, by making the lectures more illustrated, by coupling the lecture with more technical presentations on certain issues.

Majority of the lecturers do not stay with trainees during the all pilot training session (five days), thus not all of them could provide the feedback about the practical exercises. Three lecturers (leading the practical exercises and observing during the exercises) provided their evaluation on these activities. They all pointed out the right duration of the exercises, active trainees. Regarding the success of participants during the exercises two lecturers rated it as "Good" and one lecture rated it as "Very good". Leading lecturers highlighted that the exercise was very interesting and had good feedback and trainees working in groups were quite enthusiastic. Neither particular weaknesses of exercises nor the suggestions for their improvements were identified.

While providing their experience feedback and comment of the pilot training session the lecturers mentioned the following aspects:

- very good preparation of lectures and exercises;
- it seems to be a good start;
- participants seemed to be interested and thus the lecturer has the feeling to answer to a real demand.

Some suggestions to be considering for future training sessions were also given as follows:

- lecturers should be aware of content of other lectures no to repeat information;
- to foresee 1-2 more scientific-technical presentation on challenges/issues that are suggested by TSOs;
- it could be interesting to do PEP exercise after presentations on specific safety case reviews.

Based on the evaluation provided by the lecturers it could be concluded that the pilot training session went considerably well, it attracted the right audience, confident and experienced lecturers and have a good basis for further improvement.

5 Evaluation of trainees' knowledge

Following the lectures and practical exercises, the trainees were given an exam. The exam sheet was developed by all lectures in the form of questions with multiple choices of answers. The exam questions could be found in the project deliverable D3.3 (SITEX-II, 2017b) dedicated for all training module material developed within the Project.

In total 17 trainees took the final exam; one trainee did not take the exam due to justifiable reasons (unexpected health related issues). The maximal possible mark for the final exam was 20. The distribution of the marks is presented in Fig. 8.



Sustainable network for Independent Technical EXpertise of radioactive waste disposal - Interactions and Implementation



Fig. 8. Results of the final exam taken at the end of the SITEX training

The average mark among the group was 13.7. It could be seen that in only three trainees out of 18 received a mark lower than the average. Six trainees obtained the mark between 14 and 16, five trainees got a mark between 16-18, and one between 18 and 20. Based on these results it could be concluded that quite a large number of trainees (12 out of 17, i.e. 70%) received a rather high mark and exceeded the average mark. One of the reasons for uneven distribution could be the experience in the field of radioactive waste disposal the one could be named as the new comers (with the experience of several months in the field) and more experienced experts (with experience more than decade) took part in this pilot training session. The training module being developed was dedicated to experts who already know the basics of the radioactive waste management and disposal, safety principles, international guidance, etc. The prerequisites for applicants in terms of having certificates of particular training before coming to SITEX training were not set strictly, but the requested/recommended knowledge was listed in the training course description (SITEX-II, 2017a). Besides the links and recommendations were provided to all trainees for taking some eLearning modules developed by the IAEA to gain or refresh their basic knowledge of radioactive waste management and disposal.



6 Lessons learnt

The effective collaboration within WP3 led the training module material to be ready for testing at the pilot training session. The module material developed was based on extensive experience gained by different organisations such as research organisations, technical support organisations, regulatory authorities, civil society organisations. A wide range of topics included in the module demonstrates the complexity and broad scope of the radioactive waste disposal process and the variety of aspects to be covered along the implementation and licensing of a geological disposal facility. The module material also includes the recent findings from ongoing geological disposal programmes and thus gives the participants the opportunity to understand and learn a lot about the current status, key findings and remaining challenges of geological disposal implementation process.

The key lessons learnt were as follows:

- There is a great interest in training on regulatory review of the safety case for geological disposal and on a variety of related processes/activities necessary to support the regulatory review. The review process requires the adequate understanding of the geological disposal concept, overall requirements for repository implementation, safety case development and safety case review, managing of an independent R&D programme, interaction with various stakeholders, etc.
- The potential of the lecturers for the future SITEX training is high as the content and transfer of know-how got evaluations "Excellent" and "Good" by a large majority of the trainees.
- Based on the overall evaluation by trainees, the pilot SITEX training session was given a mark of 18.4 out of 20.
- Summarizing the feedback provided by the lecturers, it was concluded that the pilot training session went considerably well, it attracted both the appropriate and active audience and the confident and experienced lecturers, and finally have a good basis for further improvement.
- 70 % of trainees received a rather high mark and exceeded the average mark.
- Despite a high rating of positive evaluations of the lectures and exercises, there is still room for further improvements. Suggestions provided by the trainees were grouped as related to organisational aspects, related to the content of developed module and related to the content of future training.
- The feedback received indicated a number of topics where participants felt more detailed training would be of benefit specifically related to regulatory review and assessment.

The experience of development and implementation of the pilot SITEX training session, evaluation of the feedback from all participants form an extensive basis for further development of the training and tutoring services to be provided by the SITEX network.



7 Future SITEX training

It can be concluded that the pilot training course was successfully implemented both technically and administratively and that within the SITEX member organisations the necessary expertise is available to present such training events. The financial implications for future training will have to be given detailed consideration, and budgetary estimates can be made on the experience gathered form the pilot training. The large number of lecturers involved in the pilot course would make future events of with a similar number quite expensive, a factor that will have to be considered in the funding model for future events.

Two possibilities can be contemplated for future training activities, both being integrated with the activities of future SITEX network (Fig. 9):

- Participation in a full modular training programme would involve participants committing to a series of different activities (training courses, laboratory visits, review project, etc.);
- the second option is participation in a series of training events over a defined period involving general training module similar to the pilot course and a number of specialized training focussed on the topics of participant's interest.

Both options have advantages and disadvantages, administration of the training programme proposed would require more resources, but would provide a more thorough and demonstrable output and providing sufficient persons register and commit to the full programme, it would provide a more sustainable programme. A series of discrete courses would be more straightforward to administer, but their presentation would be contingent on the level of interest expressed at the time of the course and there would be more uncertainty. The viability of either option depends on the numbers of participants anticipated to be interested for each option and the funding model determined.

Based on the discussions at the final SITEX-II plenary meeting the example of a first set of more specialized training to be developed in the near future could include:

- Training on technical review of Safety Case for geological disposal: from conceptualisation to implementation accompanied with training in application of review grids and application this tool for real safety case; the presentation of results and experience at the workshop of SITEX network working group dedicated for technical review of Safety Case;
- Training on interaction with civil society along implementation of geological disposal (interaction with R&D, intergenerational governance, social science, citizen science in relation to geological disposal, etc.) accompanied by comprehensive demonstration and analysis of PEP tool. The feedback could be discussed at the workshop of SITEX network working group dedicated for further development of tools and methods for interaction with civil society;
- Training on disposal concept development and R&D to support the review of Safety Case for geological disposal (development of disposal concept, setting the research programme (i.e. safety requirements driven R&D), managing the research, integration of site characterisation results in safety assessment, repository design and engineering, environmental impact assessment and to support geoscientific understanding of site, etc.) accompanied by visits to scientific labs, URLs.



Generic training for all experts

tested in pilot training session



Fig. 9. Example of modular SITEX training programme

(D-N°:3.3) – Lessons learnt from the pilot training module Dissemination level: PU Date of issue of this report: 30/11/2017



The first two topics might be of interest of generalist and risk experts primarily. The third topic would be of interest of generalist primarily, but it could also serve as introductory training for environmental experts, risk experts, numerical modellers. Later on the dedicated training on particular topic could be developed considering the needs of mentioned experts. A part of training material could be also integrated later in the training of experts of other profiles.

Assuming that an ongoing training effort will be put in place by the future SITEX Network, ENSTTI has included a training on regulatory review of safety case (SC) of geological disposal (common core module) in its 2018 programme. Decisions will have to be made on the nature of future training activities SITEX members to pursue and the funding model to be adopted early in 2018 to firm up details of the course.

8 References

SITEX-II. 2016. Synthesis of existing practices for training and tutoring of experts in geological disposal safety. *EC H2020 Euratom SITEX-II project deliverable N*°: 3.1.

SITEX-II. 2017a. Development of a training module for generalist experts in geological disposal. EC H2020 Euratom SITEX-II project deliverable N°: 3.2

SITEX-II. 2017b. Material for training module for generalist experts in geological disposal. *EC H2020 Euratom SITEX-II project deliverable N°: 3.3*



9 Annexes

9.1 EVALUATION FORM FOR TRAINEES

enstti



Training COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

SITEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY **REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"**

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1	Content of Module :				
	Nothing new Too general	Well-balanced	Too detailed	Too a	dvanced
		Exceller	nt Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation of Module content				
1.3	Practical information, logistic				
1.4	Time management				
1.5	Number of trainees				
1.6	Interactive elements				
1.7	General quality of teaching, lecture	s 🗌			
1.8	Interest of technical visits				
1.9	Interest of workshops				
1.10	Your Teaching tools				
1.11	Quality of handouts				
1.12	Training room				

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

High

Average

2.1.2	Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer			
	Excellent	Good	Average	Low
OVERVIE DEVELO	EW OF THE UKR/ PMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	L RW MANAGEN	IENT PROGRAM AND RECENT
2.2.1	Your interest in t	the topics present	ed	
	High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance of kr	now-how and know	wledge transfer	
	Excellent	Good	Average	Low
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest in t	the topics present	ed	
	High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of kr	now-how and know	wledge transfer	
	Excellent	Good	Average	Low
GEOLOG 2.4.1	Your interest in t	the topics present	ed	
242	Importance of kr	- Average	- Low	
				Π,
	Excellent	Good	- Average	Low
OVERAL REQUIR	L REGULATORY	PROCESS AND	TECHNICAL ANE	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest in t	the topics present	ed	
	High			
2.5.2	Importance of kr	now-how and know	wledge transfer	
	Excellent	Good	Average	Low
REGULA	TORY EXPECTA	TIONS OF THE S	AFETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest in t	the topics present	ed	
	High	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.6.2	Importance of kr	now-how and know	wledge transfer	
	Excellent	Good Good	Average	Low

REGULA	TORY REVIEW	AND ASSESSMEN	T PROCESS A	ND ITS CHALLENGES
2.7.1	Your interest	in the topics presente	ed	
	High	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.7.2	Importance of	know-how and know	/ledge transfer	
	Excellent	Good	Average	Low
REGULA	TORY REVIEW	/, MOVING FROM C	ONCEPTUALIS	ATION TO IMPLEMENTATION
2.8.1	Your interest	in the topics presente	ed	
	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.8.2	Importance of	know-how and know	ledge transfer	
Ε	Excellent	🗆 Good 🗆 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
DESIGN	AND CONDUC	T OF SUPPORTING	RESEARCH P	ROGRAMMES
2.9.1	Your interest	in the topics presente	ed	
	□ High	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.9.2	Importance of	know-how and know	ledge transfer	
Γ	Excellent	🗖 Good 🗖 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
SUMMAR			AND FUTURE J	IOINT PROGRAMMING
2.10.1	Your interest	in the topics presente	ed	
	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.10.2	Importance of	know-how and know	/ledge transfer	
Γ	Excellent	🗖 Good 🗖 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
STAKEH		GEMENT AND INTRO	ODUCTION TO	PEP
2.11.1	Your interest	in the topics presente	ed	
	🗖 High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.11.2	Importance of	know-how and know	ledge transfer	
Ε	Excellent	🗆 Good 🗖 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
RECENT RADWAS	EXPERIENCE TE DISPOSAL	WITH REGULATOR	Y REVIEW OF	FRENCH SAFETY CASE FOR
2.12.1	Your interest	in the topics presente	ed	
	🗖 High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.12.2	Importance of	know-how and know	ledge transfer	
Ε	Excellent	🗖 Good 🗖 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
RECENT SAFETY	EXPERIENCE CASE FOR GE	S AND TOPICAL ISS OLOGICAL DISPOS	SUES WITH RE	GULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH
2.13.1	Your interest	in the topics presente	ed	
	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	

2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

	Excellent	🗖 Good 🗖 Average	Low	
2.14	Your suggesti	on for lecturers (for examp	ole, "show more examples")	
2.15	What addition	al topics should be include	ed in the Lectures?	

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops High Average Low
3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops
3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) Excellent Good Average Low
3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

4.1	Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module
4 .2	Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this module? Yes No If so, which one?
4 .3	Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? Yes No If so, which one?
Name	
Organizat	tion
Country	
E-mail	
Phone nu	ımber

In Date

Signature



Sustainable network for Independent Technical EXpertise of radioactive waste disposal - Interactions and Implementation

9.2 EVALUATION FORM FOR LECTURERS

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY LECTURER

SITEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1	Did you participate in preparation of the Module content?	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
1.2	Did you participate in preparation of timetable of the Module?	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
1.3	Did you prepare the content (key words, synopsis) for your lecture (workshop)?	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
_ 1.4	Comments	

SELF EVALUATION OF LECTURE

LECTURI	ETITLE
3.1.1	Duration of your lecture Right duration Too detailed too long Too short I don't know
3.1.2	Attendees behavior Passive Active
3.1.3	Interactivity and questions by the participants Attendees were enough inquisitive Too many questions misunderstandings Ianguage barriers
3.1.4	Self evaluation: highlights of your lecture

3.1.5	Self evaluation: weaknesses of your lecture
-------	---

■ 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture

SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

WORKSH	IOP
4.1.1	Working Group title
4.1.2	Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know
4.1.3	Attendees behavior Passive Active
4.1.4	How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working group?
4.1.5	Self evaluation: highlights of your working group
4.1.6	Self evaluation: weaknesses of your working group
4.1.7	Suggestion to improve your working group

FUTURE SESSION

5.1	Your experience feedback and comments on this training session				
5.2	General suggestions to improve the training course in future				

Name	
Organization	
Country	
E-mail	
Phone number	

In Date	}
---------	---

Signature



Sustainable network for Independent Technical EXpertise of radioactive waste disposal - Interactions and Implementation

9.3 EVALUATION SHEETS OF TRAINEES

enstti

14



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module #

	Nothing new Too	general	Well-bal	anced	Too deta	iled Too a	Too advanced	
				1	1			
				Excelle	nt Goo	od Avera g e	e Low	
1.2	Your evaluation of N	Iodule cor	itent		X			
1 .3	Practical informatio	n, logistic			X			
1.4	Time management			\Box	\boldsymbol{X}			
1 .5	Number of trainees					X		
1.6	Interactive elements			\mathbf{X}				
1 .7	General quality of te	aching, leo	ctures		\mathbf{X}	und		
1.8	Interest of technical	visits						
■ 1.9	Interest of workshop	s					_1	
1.10	Your Teaching tools					X		
■ 1.11	Quality of handouts					X		
1.12	Training room				X			

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

🖾 _{Hiah}

□_{Average} □_{Low}

do not understand
2.1.2	Importance of	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	□ _{Excellent}	💢 Good	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
OVERVIE DEVELO	EW OF THE UKRAI PMENTS	INIAN NATIONAL	RW MANAGEME	ENT PROGRAM AND RECENT
2.2.1	Your interest in	the topics pres	ented	
3	₩ _{High}	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance of I	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	□ _{Excellent}	🛛 Good	□ _{Average}	
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL F	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest in	n the topics pres	ented	
	₩ High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of I	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	Kaverage	Low
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL (CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest ir	the topics pres	ented	
	.⊠ _{High}	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.4.2	Importance of I	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	⊠ _{Excellent}	□ Good	□ Average	Low
overali Require	L REGULATORY P EMENTS	ROCESS AND TE	CHNICAL AND S	CIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest in	the topics pres	ented	
	🕱 _{High}	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.5.2	Importance of I	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	Excellent	X Good	□ Average	□ _{Low}
REGULA	TORY EXPECTATI	ONS OF THE SAF	ETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest in	the topics pres	ented	
	⊠ _{High}	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.6.2	Importance of k	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	□ _{Excellent}	🛛 _{Good}	□ _{Average}	□ _{LOW}

RE	EGULATORY REVIEW	AND ASSESSMEN	F PROCESS AND	ITS CHALLENGES
	2.7.1 Your intere	st in the topics pre	esented	
	⊠ _{High}	□ _{Average}	\Box_{Low}	
	2.7.2 Importance	of know-how and	knowledge trans	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	⊠ _{Good}	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
RE	GULATORY REVIEW	, MOVING FROM Co it in the topics pre	ONCEPTUALISAT sented	ION TO IMPLEMENTATION
	🕅 High	Average		
	2.8.2 Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	🚡 🗆 Excellent	⊠ Good□ Averag	ge 🗆 Low	
DE	SIGN AND CONDUC 2.9.1 Your interes	T OF SUPPORTING t in the topics pres	RESEARCH PRO	GRAMMES
	□ _{High}	Average		
	2.9.2 Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge transf	fer
	□ Excellent	🔀 Good 🗆 Averag	je 🗆 Low	
SUN	MMARY OF CURREN	T PROGRAMMES AI	ND FUTURE JOIN ented	IT PROGRAMMING
	□ _{High}	Average	\Box_{Low}	
2	.10.2 Importance o	of know-how and ki	nowledge transf	er
	□ Excellent	🔀 Good 🗆 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
STA	KEHOLDER ENGAG	EMENT AND INTRO	DUCTION TO PER	Þ
Stakeholder (Adely)	$\frac{11.1 \text{ Your interest}}{(\alpha \beta kr)}$	in the topics prese X (before) Average	ented Low	
PcP (Julien) 2.	11.2 Importance o	f know-how and kr	owledge transfe	2r
	Excellent Adely	∑ Good□ Average	e 🗆 Low	
RECI DISP	ENT EXPERIENCE W OSAL IN CLAY FOR	ITH REGULATORY I	REVIEW OF FREM	NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE
■ 2.	12.1 Your interest	in the topics prese	nted	
	X _{High}	□ _{Average}	Low	
2.	12.2 Importance of	know-how and kn	owledge transfe	г
	Excellent	Good Average	Low	

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

■ 2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

□ _{High}

□_{Average} □_{Low}

■ 2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

□ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low

had	Pro	blems f	o understan	1 some
e la contra de la	the	(cotures	because	they

2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

4

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops High Average Low
■ 3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops $\square_{Nothing new}$ Too general $\swarrow_{Well-balanced}$ Too detailed $\square_{Too advanced}$
<i>i</i> ∎ 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\Box_{Excellent} \qquad \blacksquare_{Good} \qquad \Box_{Average} \qquad \Box_{Low}$
■ 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
■ 3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

■ 4.1	Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module more interaction between lecturers and trainees in the lectures
■ 4.2 }	Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this module?
■ 4.3	Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? Yes INO If so, which one?

Name	Angelika Krischer
Organization	GRS
Country	Germany
E-mail	angelika krischer@grs.de
Phone number	

In Lithuania

Date 16.06.17

Signature

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

14

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module *

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-ba	alanced	Too detail	ed Too ad	lvanced
	\Box			X	_		LJ
			×.				
				Excelle	ent Good	Average	Low
■ 1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module con	itent	d b		\Box	
1 .3	Practical inform	nation, logistic		V			
1.4	Time managem	ent					
1.5	Number of trai	nees		M			
1.6	Interactive eler	nents					
1 .7	General quality	of teaching, led	ctures	M			
1.8	Interest of tech	nical visits	\sim				
■ 1.9	Interest of wor	kshops	~]	
1.10	Your Teaching	tools					
■ 1.11	Quality of hand	outs	\sim				- T
1.12	Training room				V	لي	

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

🖾 _{Hiah}

□_{Average} □_{Low}

	S. /			
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ _{Average}	\Box_{Low}
OVERVIE DEVELO	EW OF THE UKR PMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	L RW MANAGEM	IENT PROGRAM AND REC
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
3	R/High	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	₩ High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	^f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	
GEOLOG	ICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	High	□ Average	Low	
2.4.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	□ _{Low}
OVERALI REQUIRE	L REGULATORY	PROCESS AND T	ECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
OVERALI REQUIRE 2.5.1	L REGULATORY EMENTS Your interest i	PROCESS AND T	ECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
OVERALL REQUIRE 2.5.1	L REGULATORY EMENTS Your interest i	PROCESS AND T n the topics pre	ECHNICAL AND sented	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
OVERALI REQUIRE 2.5.1	EREGULATORY EMENTS Your interest i High Importance of	PROCESS AND T n the topics pre <i>Average</i> know-how and	ECHNICAL AND sented Low knowledge trans	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
OVERALI REQUIRE 2.5.1 2.5.2	EREGULATORY EMENTS Your interest i High Importance of Excellent	PROCESS AND T n the topics pre <i>Average</i> know-how and <i>Good</i>	ECHNICAL AND sented Low knowledge trans	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
OVERALI REQUIRE 2.5.1 2.5.2 REGULAT	EREGULATORY EMENTS Your interest i High Importance of Excellent	PROCESS AND T n the topics pre <i>Average</i> know-how and <i>Good</i>	ECHNICAL AND sented Low knowledge trans Average	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
OVERALI REQUIRE 2.5.1 2.5.2 REGULAT	EREGULATORY EMENTS Your interest i High Importance of Excellent FORY EXPECTAT	PROCESS AND T n the topics pre <i>Average</i> know-how and <i>Good</i> IONS OF THE SA	ECHNICAL AND sented Low knowledge trans Average	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
OVERALI REQUIRE 2.5.1 2.5.2 REGULAT 2.6.1	EREGULATORY EMENTS Your interest i High Importance of Excellent FORY EXPECTAT Your interest i High	PROCESS AND T n the topics pre <i>Average</i> know-how and <i>Good</i> IONS OF THE SA n the topics pre <i>Average</i>	ECHNICAL AND sented Low knowledge trans Average SFETY CASE sented Low	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
OVERALI REQUIRE 2.5.1 2.5.2 REGULAT 2.6.1	EREGULATORY EMENTS Your interest i High Importance of Excellent TORY EXPECTAT Your interest i High Importance of	PROCESS AND T n the topics pre <i>Average</i> know-how and <i>Good</i> TONS OF THE SA n the topics pre <i>Average</i> know-how and I	ECHNICAL AND sented Low knowledge trans Average FETY CASE sented Low knowledge trans	scientific expertise sfer <i>Low</i>

REGULATORY REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND ITS CHALLENGES ■ 2.7.1 Your interest in the topics presented 🔟 _{High} Average DIOW ■ 2.7.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low REGULATORY REVIEW, MOVING FROM CONCEPTUALISATION TO IMPLEMENTATION \blacksquare 2.8.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average D Low □ _{Hiah} ■ 2.8.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer • U Excellent 🛛 Good 🖓 Average Low DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH PROGRAMMES 2.9.1 Your interest in the topics presented High Average DIOW ■ 2.9.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer M Excellent Good Average Low SUMMARY OF CURRENT PROGRAMMES AND FUTURE JOINT PROGRAMMING 2.10.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average 🗆 _{Hiah} 2.10.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND INTRODUCTION TO PEP ■ 2.11.1 Your interest in the topics presented High \Box_{low} 2.11.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low RECENT EXPERIENCE WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF FRENCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE DISPOSAL IN CLAY FORMATION 2.12.1 Your interest in the topics presented ₩ High Average Low 2.12.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low

3/3

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

Average Low Hiah

■ 2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

Excellent Good Average Low

14

2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...) Lecturers were very experienced and having a lot of two weedge about this topic, thus their presentation were very interesting, with examples

■ 2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

His enough for gue ralists as artroph dion, More specific topics wild be given tofor in nest training event (risits to labs)

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

- 3.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops ₩_{High} □_{Average} □_{Low}
- 3.1.2 Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops Nothing new Too general Well-balanced Too detailed Too advanced

■ 3.2 Your suggestion for organization of Workshops

"A was very good to do some macti-cal exercice to work in proceps god performed different role, and baten two evaluation was monoled about

3.3

14

What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

workip in groups and behaviour during played meeting petween different parteis (operator and regulator)

FUTURE SESSION

.

■ 4.1	Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module
■ 4.2 }	Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this module?
	□ Yes □ No If so, which one?
-	
■ 4.3	Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? \Box Yes \Box No
	If so, which one?

	Name	
	Organization	
	Country	
	E-mail	
. () К	Phone number	

Date	Ir			Date		neter-	1200-1-1-12	
------	----	--	--	------	--	--------	-------------	--

Signature

enstti

14

4



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module :

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	Too detailed	be ooT b	vanced
			K		C	J
			Excel	lent Good	Average	Low
1 .2	Your evaluation	n of Module cor	itent			
1.3	Practical inform	nation, logistic				
1.4	Time managem	nent				
1.5	Number of trai	nees				
1.6	Interactive eler	ments				
1.7	General quality	of teaching, lea	tures 📋		-]
1.8	Interest of tech	nnical visits N	ь. А · 🛛			
1.9	Interest of wor	kshops				
1.10	Your Teaching	tools				
1.11	Quality of hand	outs				
1.12	Training room					

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

G._{Hiah}

⊠_{Average} □_{Low}

2.1.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	🕊 Good	□ _{Average}	
OVERVIE DEVELO	EW OF THE UKRA	AINIAN NATIONA	AL RW MANAGEM	ENT PROGRAM AND RECENT
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented (Ah	e Chernoby Wasle is
;	₩ _{High}	□ Average		aware about it].
2.2.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent [−]	K _{Good}	□ Average	
GEOLOG	ICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	⊠ _{High}	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	⊠ Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	
GEOLOG	ICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	₩ High	□ Average	Low	
2.4.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge trans	sfer
	₽ Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
overali Require	L REGULATORY EMENTS	PROCESS AND T	FECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest i	n the topics pre	esented	
	🖬 High	□ Average	Low	
2.5.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge trans	sfer
	□ Excellent	🔁 _{Good}	□ Average	Low
REGULA	TORY EXPECTAT	IONS OF THE SA	AFETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest i	n the topics pre	esented	
	🖾 _{Hiah}	□ Average		
2.6.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge trans	sfer
	K Excolleget			

	REGULATORY REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND ITS CHALLENGES	
	■ 2.7.1 Your interest in the topics presented	
	High C Average Low	
	2.7.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer	
	□ _{Excellent} Good □ _{Average} □ _{Low}	
	REGULATORY REVIEW, MOVING FROM CONCEPTUALISATION TO IMPLEMENTATION	
	High D _{Average} D _{Low}	
	■ 2.8.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer	
	► Excellent Sood Average Low	
	DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH PROGRAMMES 2.9.1 Your interest in the topics presented 	
	₩ High □ Average □ Low	
	2.9.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer	
	🗆 Excellent 🛛 🖾 Good 🗆 Average 🛛 🖓 Low	
	SUMMARY OF CURRENT PROGRAMMES AND FUTURE JOINT PROGRAMMING 2.10.1 Your interest in the topics presented	
	□ _{High} □ _{Average} □ _{Low}	
	2.10.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer	
	□ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low	
	STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND INTRODUCTION TO PEP	
	2.11.1 Your interest in the topics presented	
2	Average Low	
	2.11.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer	
	🛱 Excellent 🛛 Good Average 🖓 Low	
	RECENT EXPERIENCE WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF FRENCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE DISPOSAL IN CLAY FORMATION	
	2.12.1 Your interest in the topics presented	
	High DAVerage DLow	
	2.12.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer	
	□ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low	

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

High Average Low

2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

Excellent Good Average Low

As it was the first service given for this training, it's true that nome presentations (Cenerally about RB role & iRSN) Park a Little bit of example. It could be an improvement to show more example of experience. (more images & photos abo it's a plus)

2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

For the topic, I think it was quite complete.

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

■ 3.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops P High P Average P Low ■ 3.1.2 Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops -4 1 ■ 3.1.3 Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) Excellent Good Average Low ■ 3.2 Your suggestion for organization of Workshops we did understand at the beginning what we were supposed to do (level of debails, need to specify the rules) during the evercise PEP exercising What additional topics should be included in the Workshops? 3.3 ಒಡವರು ಗೊಂಡುತ e set i ja e set i A D. S. Harris and

FUTURE SESSION

■ 4.1 Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module

I don't have any in mind. Haybe more exemple, pictures for the most generalistic presentation BICCIDI

04 	■ 4.2)	Would you be i module? □ Yes	interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this \Box No
		If so, which one	ie?
	18		

■ 4.3 Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI?
 ☑ Yes □ No

If so, which one?

I will see the offers on ENSTTI website.

Name	Aurélie GALZY
Organization	Bel V
Country	Belgium
E-mail	aurelie.galzy@belv.be
Phone number	0032 471 51 36 67

In 16/06/17 in Date Kaunas Signature

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

14

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module 3

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	Too detailed	Too adv	vanced
		Ļ	×		Ĺ	
			Excell	ent Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	of Module conte	ent 💢			\Box
1.3	Practical inform	nation, logistic	X			
1.4	Time managem	ent	×		J]
1.5	Number of trair	nees	×			
1.6	Interactive elem	nents	X			
1.7	General quality	of teaching, lect	ures 💢			
1.8	Interest of tech	nical visits			X	
1.9	Interest of work	shops	X			Ē
■ 1.10	Your Teaching t	ools				
1.11	Quality of hando	outs	×			
1.12	Training room		×]	

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

□ _{Hiah}

Xaverage D Low

2.1.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	□ _{Good}	XAverage	□ _{LOW}
overvie develo	EW OF THE UKR PMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	L RW MANAGEM	IENT PROGRAM AND RECE
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
}	□ _{High}	Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	□ Good	Average	Low
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	. PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	□ _{High}	⊠ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	□ Good	XAverage	□ _{Low}
		CONCEPTS AND		
241	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
- 2.1,1				
247	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	Good	X _{Average}	Low
OVERAL REQUIRI	L REGULATORY EMENTS	PROCESS AND 1	FECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	₩ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.5.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	⊠ _{Excellent}	□ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
REGULA	TORY EXPECTA	TIONS OF THE SA	AFETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	🗙 _{Hiah}	Average	\Box_{Low}	
262	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
- 2.0.2				

*

REGULA	TORY REVIEW	AND ASSESSMENT	PROCESS AND	TTS CHALLENGES
2.7.1	Your intere	st in the topics pre	sented	
	⊠ _{High}	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.7.2	Importance	of know-how and k	knowledge trar	osfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
REGULA	TORY REVIEW	, MOVING FROM CO	ONCEPTUALISA	TION TO IMPLEMENTATION
	□ _{High}	Average		
2.8.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge tran	sfer
~ [□ Excellent	Good Averag	je 🛛 Low	
DESIGN	AND CONDUC	T OF SUPPORTING	RESEARCH PRO	DGRAMMES
2.9.1	Your interes	t in the topics pres	ented	
	High	□ _{Average}	\Box_{Low}	
2.9.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge tran	sfer
C] Excellent	Good Averag	e 🗆 Low	
2.10.1	Your interest	t in the topics pres	ented	
» د ۱۵ ح 🔳		- Average	Low	<u>,</u>
= 2.10.2			iowledge trans	ster
L	J Excellent	🕺 Good 🗆 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
STAKEHO	LDER ENGAG	EMENT AND INTRO	DUCTION TO P	EP
2.11.1	Your interest	in the topics prese	ented	
	High	□ _{Average}	Low	
2.11.2	Importance o	of know-how and kn	iowledge trans	fer
×	Excellent	Good Average	e 🗆 Low	
RECENT E DISPOSAL	XPERIENCE W	ITH REGULATORY : MATION	REVIEW OF FRI	ENCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE
2.12.1	Your interest	in the topics prese	nted	
	⊠ _{High}	Average		
2.12.2	Importance o	f know-how and kn	owledge trans	fer
	Excellent			

(10)

3/3

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

High

■ 2.13,2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

□ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low

■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...)

A handout with an abstract of each presentation could be very helpful (in addition to the slides).

2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS EXERCISES

- 3.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops Exercises Average \Box_{Low}
- 3.1.2 Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops Exercises Nothing new Too general Well-balanced Too detailed Too advanced
- 3.2 Your suggestion for organization of Workshops

14

■ 3.3 What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module 4.1 All in all the training gives an excellent overview of relevant issues (If the training can be continued, I will recommend it in my organiasation very much indeed ! Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this 4.2 module? X Yes □ No If so, which one? - safety case - interaction processes between regulata and operata Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? 4.3 🗆 No Yes If so, which one? on demand

Name	Dr. Awistina Bücken
Organization	Federal Office for the Safety of Nuclean Waste Management
Country	Gremany
<mark>≫E-</mark> mail	+49 (0) \$0 18333-1863
→Phone number	christina briecker @ ble bund de

In Kaunas Date 16.06.2017

Signature C. Buder

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

14

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module :

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	Too detailed	d Too ad	vanced
					Ĺ	
			Excell	ent Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module cor	ntent 🗌		\geq	
1 .3	Practical inform	nation, logistic		\square		
∎ 1.4	Time managem	ient		2		
1.5	Number of trai	nees		\square		
1.6	Interactive eler	ments		Z		
1.7	General quality	of teaching, le	ctures 📋	1		
1.8	Interest of tech	nical visits				
1.9	Interest of wor	kshops				
■ 1.10	Your Teaching	tools	Z			
1.11	Quality of hand	outs				
1.12	Training room			4		

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

□ _{Hiah}

Average

	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	Ø Good	□ _{Average}	Low
OVERVIE DEVELC	EW OF THE UKR PMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	L RW MANAGEM	IENT PROGRAM AND RECENT
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
}	□ _{High}	☑ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	لم Good	□ Average	Low
GEOLO	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	☑ _{High}	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	🛛 _{Good}	□ Average	□ _{Low}
GEOLOO	SICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	⊠ _{High}	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.4.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	☑ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
overal Require	L REGULATORY EMENTS	PROCESS AND T	ECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	⊠́ _{High}	□ Average	Low	
2.5.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ Average	Low
REGULA	TORY EXPECTAT	IONS OF THE SA	AFETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest i	in the topics pre	esented	
	ର୍ଯ୍ୟ _{Hiah}	□ Average	Low	
	J			
2.6.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran:	sfer

REGULA	ATORY REVIE	N AND ASSESSMENT	PROCESS AND	ITS CHALLENGES
2.7.1	Your intere	est in the topics pre	sented	
	🛛 _{High}	□ _{Average}	Low	
2.7.2	Importance	e of know-how and k	nowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	Low
REGULA Ĵ ■ 2.8.1	TORY REVIEV	V, MOVING FROM CO		TION TO IMPLEMENTATION
	1 uich			
2.8.2	Importance	of know-how and k	- Low	sfer
•	🗆 Excellent	Good Averag	ge 🗆 Low	
DESIGN ■ 2.9.1	AND CONDUC Your intere:	ET OF SUPPORTING	RESEARCH PRC ented	GRAMMES
	□ _{High}	Ø _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.9.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
Ε	□ Excellent	🗍 Good🛛 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
SUMMAR	Y OF CURREN	NT PROGRAMMES AN	ND FUTURE JOI	NT PROGRAMMING
2.10.1	Your interes	it in the topics pres	ented	
	^{∟⊥} High	Average	Low	
2.10.2	Importance	of know-how and kr	nowledge trans	fer
L] Excellent	🗆 Goodӣ Averag	e 🗆 Low	
STAKEHO	LDER ENGAG	EMENT AND INTRO	DUCTION TO PE	P
2.11.1	Your interes	t in the topics prese	ented	
	⊠ _{High}	Average	Low	
2.11.2	Importance of	of know-how and kn	owledge transf	Îer
Ķ	Excellent	□ Good□ Average	e 🗆 Low	
RECENT E DISPOSAL	EXPERIENCE V IN CLAY FOR	NITH REGULATORY I	REVIEW OF FRE	NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE
2.12.1	Your interest	in the topics prese	nted	
	⊠ _{High}	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.12.2	Importance c	of know-how and kn	owledge transf	er
	Excellent	Good Average	Low	

ž

3/3

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

□ _{High} Average Low

1

■ 2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

Excellent Good Average Low

■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...) Some more interactive orarises porage ? ■ 2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

lifterence in approach to review of operational + post- closure cality aces

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops High Average
■ 3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops $\square_{Nothing new}$ Too general $\square_{Well-balanced}$ Too detailed $\square_{Too advanced}$
; ■ 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\Box_{Excellent} = \Box_{Good} = \Box_{Average} = \Box_{Low}$
a 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
■ 3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

1

4.1	Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module
	More interactive occernices?
■ 4.2	Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this module?
	Yes INO
	If so, which one?
4 .3	Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? \square No
	If so, which one?
	Not swe what is available

Name	CHRIS GLAUGTER
Organization	ENORDOWNENT AGENCY
Country	<u>u.e.</u>
E-mail	dvic glaistops environment - agency goo ule
Phone number	07790 774- 718

In Date 16/06/17

.

Signature C. Mart

h.

enstti

14



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module :

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	⊤oo detailed	Too ad	vanced
					L	
			Excell	lent Good	Average	Low
■ 1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module con	tent 🗌	1		
1.3	Practical inform	nation, logistic				
1.4	Time managem	ent]	
1.5	Number of trainees					
■ 1.6	Interactive elements					
1.7	General quality	of teaching, led	ctures 🖌			
1 .8	Interest of tech	inical visits				
1.9	Interest of worl	kshops		<u>. </u>		. 1
1.10	Your Teaching t	cools				
1.11	Quality of hand	outs		7		
1 .12	Training room		\mathbf{A}			

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

🗆 _{Hiah}

Average Low

	-		-	[].
	⊔ Excellent	™ Good	└─ Average	Low
overvie develo	W OF THE UKR PMENTS	AINIAN NATION	AL RW MANAGEN	IENT PROGRAM AND RECENT
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pr	resented	11 1 -1
}	☑ _{High}	□ _{Average}	\Box_{Low}	Very interesting
2.2.2	Importance of	f know-how and	l knowledge tran	sfer diff approach
	Excellent	Good	□ Average	Low Clemobyl.
GEOLOG	ICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		0
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pr	resented	
	High	\square _{Average}	\Box_{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	f know-how and	l knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	Good	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
GEOLOG	ICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AN	D CHALLENGES	
2.4.1 Your interest in the topics presented				
	₩ _{High}	□ Average	Low	
2.4.2	Importance of	f know-how and	l knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	□ _{Low}
overali Require	_ REGULATORY EMENTS	PROCESS AND	TECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest	in the topics pr	esented	
	₽ High	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	6 and crewner
2.5.2	Importance of	f know-how and	l knowledge tran	sfer
	⊠ _{Excellent}	□ Good	Average	Low
REGULA ⁻	TORY EXPECTA	TIONS OF THE S	AFETY CASE	
	Your interest	in the topics pr	esented	
2.6.1				
2.6.1	⊠ _{Hiah}	□ Averade	\Box_{Low}	
2.6.12.6.2	☑ _{High} Importance of	Average f know-how and	□ _{Low} I knowledge tran	sfer

2/2

REGULATORY REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND ITS CHALLENGES ■ 2.7.1 Your interest in the topics presented I High Average DIOW ■ 2.7.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low REGULATORY REVIEW, MOVING FROM CONCEPTUALISATION TO IMPLEMENTATION 14 ■ 2.8.1 Your interest in the topics presented 1 High □ _{Average} □ _{Low} ■ 2.8.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer [∼] □ Excellent □ Good□ Average D Low Very good all round presentation DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH PROGRAMMES ■ 2.9.1 Your interest in the topics presented I High ■ 2.9.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer ☑ Excellent □ Good□ Average Low SUMMARY OF CURRENT PROGRAMMES AND FUTURE JOINT PROGRAMMING Found thus bit canfusing between JUPRAX SITEX. ■ 2.10.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average Low □ _{Hiah} ■ 2.10.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Low High Average Low examples and possibly 2.11.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer more detail on toe A Excellent Good Average Low we's. Very interesting RECENT EXPERIENCE WITH DET DISPOSAL IN C DISPOSAL IN CLAY FORMATION ■ 2.12.1 Your interest in the topics presented □ _{Hiah} Average Low 2.12.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer □ Excellent □ Good□ Average Low

3/3

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1	Your interest	in the	topics	presented
--------	---------------	--------	--------	-----------

_	
Lich .	- Average
пічн	AVELAY

14

 \Box_{Low} aqe

■ 2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

□ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low

■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...)

	<u>Umr</u>
÷	

■ 2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops Market High Average Low
■ 3.1.2 }	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops \square Nothing new \square Too general \square Well-balanced \square Too detailed \square Too advanced
■ 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\square_{Excellent} \boxed{\square}_{Good} \square_{Average} \square_{Low}$
■ 3.2 [°]	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
■ 3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

1

Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module 4.1 I THINK MORE EXAMPLES OF SAFETY CASE REVIEWS, PLUS AND NEGATIVE POINTS FROM REVIEWS Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this 4.2 module? 1 Yes □ No If so, which one? R.D. MONITORING. Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? 4.3 🗆 Yes D No If so, which one? NOT CLEAR WHAT COURSES ARE ON OFFER WILL NEED TO LOOK.

Name	COLIN CAMPISELL
Organization	ENVIRONMENT AGENCY
Country	UNITED KINGDOM
E-mail	colin.compbell@environment-agency, gov.uk
Phone number	

Date 16 06 2017. In

Signature

Colin Campbell

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

11.0

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module ?

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	Too detailed	Too adv	vanced
			X		L	
			Excell	lent Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module con	tent 💢			
1 .3	Practical inform	nation, logistic	×			
1 .4	Time managem	ent	Ú	X		
1.5	Number of train	nees		\mathbf{x}		
1.6	Interactive elen	nents		X		D
1 .7	General quality	of teaching, lec	tures 📈]	
■ 1.8	Interest of tech	inical visits				
1.9	Interest of work	ks hops	X			J
■ 1.10	Your Teaching tools		×			
■ 1.11	Quality of hand	outs	\Box_{\prime}			
1.12	Training room		×		_ ا	J

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

Hiah

□_{Average} □_{Low}
			Knowledge trut	
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
OVERVI DEVELC	EW OF THE UKR PMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	AL RW MANAGEN	IENT PROGRAM AND RECE
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
;	High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	AGood	□ Average	Low
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
		□ _{Good}	□ Average	□ _{Low}
GEOLOG				
2.4.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	High	□ Average	Low	
2.4.2	High Importance of	Average	□ _{Low} knowledge tran	sfer
2.4.2	High Importance of Excellent	□ _{Average} ^f know-how and □ _{Good}	Low knowledge tran Average	sfer
2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIR	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY EMENTS	Average f know-how and Good	Low knowledge tran <i>Average</i> ECHNICAL AND	sfer Low SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
 2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIR 2.5.1 	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY EMENTS Your interest	Average know-how and Good PROCESS AND T	Low knowledge tran <i>Average</i> ECHNICAL AND esented	sfer Low SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
 2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIR 2.5.1 	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY EMENTS Your interest	Average t know-how and Good PROCESS AND T in the topics pre Average	Low knowledge tran <i>Average</i> ECHNICAL AND esented <i>Low</i>	sfer Low SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
 2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIR 2.5.1 2.5.2 	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY EMENTS Your interest High Importance of	Average t know-how and Good PROCESS AND T in the topics pre Average t know-how and	Low knowledge tran <i>Average</i> ECHNICAL AND esented <i>Low</i> knowledge tran	sfer
 2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIRI 2.5.1 2.5.2 	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY EMENTS Your interest High Importance of Excellent	□ _{Average} f know-how and □ _{Good} PROCESS AND T in the topics pre □ _{Average} f know-how and □ _{Good}	Low knowledge tran Average ECHNICAL AND esented Low knowledge tran Average	sfer SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE sfer Low
 2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIRI 2.5.1 2.5.2 	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY MENTS Your interest High Importance of Excellent	□ Average f know-how and □ Good PROCESS AND T in the topics pre □ Average f know-how and □ Good	Low knowledge tran Average ECHNICAL AND esented Low knowledge tran Average	sfer Low SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE sfer Low
 2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIRI 2.5.1 2.5.2 REGULA 	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY EMENTS Your interest High Importance of Excellent	Average know-how and Good PROCESS AND T in the topics pre Average know-how and Good TIONS OF THE SA	Low knowledge tran Average ECHNICAL AND esented Low knowledge tran Average	sfer Low SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE sfer Low
 2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIRI 2.5.1 2.5.2 REGULA 2.6.1 	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY MENTS Your interest High Importance of Excellent TORY EXPECTAN	Average know-how and Good PROCESS AND T in the topics pre Average know-how and Good TIONS OF THE SA in the topics pre	Low knowledge tran Average ECHNICAL AND esented Low knowledge tran Average AFETY CASE esented	sfer Low SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE sfer Low
 2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIR 2.5.1 2.5.2 REGULA 2.6.1 	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY EMENTS Your interest High Importance of Excellent TORY EXPECTAT Your interest	Average know-how and Good PROCESS AND T in the topics pre Average know-how and Good TIONS OF THE SA in the topics pre Average	Low knowledge tran Average ECHNICAL AND esented Low knowledge tran Average AFETY CASE esented Low	sfer Low SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE sfer Low
 2.4.2 OVERAL REQUIR 2.5.1 2.5.2 REGULA 2.6.1 2.6.2 	High Importance of Excellent L REGULATORY EMENTS Your interest High Importance of Excellent TORY EXPECTAT Your interest High Importance of	Average know-how and Good PROCESS AND T in the topics pre Average know-how and Good TIONS OF THE SA in the topics pre Average know-how and	Low knowledge tran Average ECHNICAL AND esented Low knowledge tran Average AFETY CASE esented Low knowledge tran	sfer Low SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE sfer Low

2 / 2

ŝ,

REGULA	TORY REVIEW AN	ND ASSESSMENT	PROCESS AND I	TS CHALLENGES
■ 2.7.1	Your interest i	n the topics pres	ented	
	High	Average		
2.7.2	Importance of	know-how and ki	nowledge transi	fer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
REGULA	TORY REVIEW, M	OVING FROM CO	NCEPTUALISATI	ON TO IMPLEMENTATION
2.8.1	Your interest in	the topics prese	ented	
	High	[∐] Average	Low	
2.8.2	Importance of I	know-how and kr	nowledge transf	er
	Excellent [∃ Good□ Average	e 🗆 Low	
DESIGN	AND CONDUCT C	F SUPPORTING F	ESEARCH PROG	SRAMMES
2.9.1	Your interest in	the topics prese	ented	
	🕅 _{High}	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	±
2.9.2	Importance of k	now-how and kn	owledge transf	er
Ż	Excellent [Good Average	e 🗆 Low	
SUMMAR'	Y OF CURRENT P	ROGRAMMES AN	D FUTURE IOIN	
2.10.1	Your interest in	the topics prese	nted	
	High	Average	\Box_{low}	
■ 2.10.2	Importance of k	now-how and kn	owledge transfe	er
×	Excellent 🗆	Good□ Average	Low	
STAKEHO	LDER ENGAGEM	ENT AND INTROD	UCTION TO PER)
2.11.1	Your interest in	the topics preser	nted	
l	⊐ _{High}	Average		
2.11.2	Importance of kr	now-how and kno	wledge transfe	r
	Excellent	Good Average	Low	
RECENT E DISPOSAL	XPERIENCE WITH IN CLAY FORMA	I REGULATORY R	EVIEW OF FREN	ICH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE
■ 2.12.1	Your interest in t	the topics presen	ited	
Ç	High	□ _{Average} [Low	
■ 2.12.2	mportance of kn	iow-how and kno	wledge transfei	r
À	Excellent 🛛	Good ^[] Average	Low	

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

□ _{High}

1

□_{Average} □_{Low}

■ 2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

Excellent Good Average Low

■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...)

■ 2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops High Average Low
■ 3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops \square Nothing new \square Too general \swarrow Well-balanced Too detailed \square Too advanced
; • 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization)
■ 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
■ 3.3	DIDN LIKE PEP EXERCISE : Before the EXERCISE BUT AFTER THAT I WAS HAPPY, ITS INTERESTING TOOL. What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

4.1 Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this 42 1 module? ł NO □ Yes If so, which one? Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? 4.3 X Yes □ No Overview of Thereno - hydro-mechanacol-clienical processes in geological repository DARIUS Name JUSTINAVIČIUS LITHUANIA Organization Country darius. just novicoure lei, et E-mail Phone number

In

Date 20170616

Signature

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

14

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module :

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	Too detailed	Too adv	vanced
			M	ر	L	_]
			Excell	ent Good	Average	Low
■ 1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module con	tent 🗋	Y		
1.3	Practical inform	nation, logistic				
1.4	Time managem	ent	Ĺ	5		
1.5	Number of train	nees	D,	5		
1.6	Interactive eler	nents	1	C		
1.7	General quality	of teaching, led	tures 🖌			
1.8	Interest of tech	inical visits				
1.9	Interest of worl	kshops		_		
1.10	Your Teaching t	tools		V)		
1.11	Quality of hand	outs		√_		-
1.12	Training room		LJ	~		

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

High

□_{Average} □_{Low}

2.1.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ _{Average}	
overvie Develo	EW OF THE UKRA PMENTS	ainian nationa	AL RW MANAGEM	ENT PROGRAM AND RECENT
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
ž	也 _{High}	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
GEOLÔG	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	High High	□ Average	Low	
2.3.2	Importance of	^F know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	No _{High}	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.4.2	Importance of	[*] know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ _{Average}	Low
OVERAL REQUIRI	L REGULATORY EMENTS	PROCESS AND T	FECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.5.2	Importance of	[*] know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
REGULA	TORY EXPECTAT	TIONS OF THE S	AFETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	□ _{High}	Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.6.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	Average	

REGULATORY REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND ITS CHALLENGES ■ 2.7.1 Your interest in the topics presented High Average \Box_{low} ■ 2.7.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low REGULATORY REVIEW, MOVING FROM CONCEPTUALISATION TO IMPLEMENTATION ■ 2.8.1 Your interest in the topics presented 🖄 High Average Diow ■ 2.8.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer - 🛱 Excellent 🛛 🗆 Good 🗆 Average Low DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH PROGRAMMES 2.9.1 Your interest in the topics presented High High Average 2.9.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer M Excellent Good Average Low SUMMARY OF CURRENT PROGRAMMES AND FUTURE JOINT PROGRAMMING 2.10.1 Your interest in the topics presented 过 _{High} Average Low 2.10.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND INTRODUCTION TO PEP ■ 2.11.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average □ _{High} DIOW 2.11.2 /mportance of know-how and knowledge transfer 🗹 Excellent 🛛 Good 🖓 Average Low RECENT EXPERIENCE WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF FRENCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE DISPOSAL IN CLAY FORMATION 2.12.1 Your interest in the topics presented High High Average Low 2.12.2/Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Good Average Excellent Low

3/3

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented
High D _{Average} Low
2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer
□ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low
■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples")
2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

11

4/4

÷

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

	■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops
04	■ 3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops \square Nothing new \square Too general \square Well-balanced Too detailed \square Too advanced
	■ 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\Box_{Excellent}$ \Box_{Good} $\Box_{Average}$ \Box_{Low}
	■ 3.2 [°]	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
	3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module 4.1

Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this 4.2 module? 1 Yes □ NO If so, which one? Perign and conduct of upporting K and O programmed Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? 4.3

V Yes 🗆 No

If so, which one? -11-

Centantor Porkal LEI

gistautor. portion of lei It +340 612 19448

Lothumia

Name

1

Organization

Country

E-mail

Phone number

In Kaunal, lithuania Date 2014.06.15 Signature

enstti



Training

ND

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

14

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module :

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-ba	lanced	Тоо	detailed	Too adv	/anced
		2	Ľ	X			L	J
				Excelle	ent	Good	Average	Low
1 .2	Your evaluation	n of Module cor	itent			R		
1 .3	Practical inform	mation, logistic		R.				
1 .4	Time managem	ient		Ø			}	
1.5	Number of trai	nees		\mathbf{X}				
1.6	Interactive eler	ments		\bowtie				
1.7	General quality	of teaching, lea	ctures	LJ		X		
1.8	Interest of tech	nnical visits						
1.9	Interest of wor	kshops				X	1]
■ 1.10	Your Teaching	tools				X		
1.11	Quality of hand	outs				X		
1.12	Training room			X]

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

🗶 _{Hiah}

□_{Average} □_{Low}

2.1.2	Importance of	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	□ _{Excellent}	🔀 Good	Average	Low
OVERVIE DEVELO	EW OF THE UKRA	INIAN NATIONAL	. RW MANAGEME	ENT PROGRAM AND RECENT
2.2.1	Your interest in	n the topics pres	ented	
1	🕅 High	□ Average	Low	
2.2.2	Importance of	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	□ _{Excellent}	🕱 _{Good}	□ Average	□ _{Low}
GEOLOG	SICAL DISPOSAL I	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest in	n the topics pres	ented	
	High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	⊠ Excellent	Good	Average	□ _{Low}
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL (CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest ir	the topics pres	ented	
	⊠ _{High}	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.4.2	Importance of	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	⊠ _{Excellent}	□ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
OVERALI REQUIRE	L REGULATORY P EMENTS	PROCESS AND TE	CHNICAL AND S	CIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest ir	n the topics pres	ented	
	🖾 _{Hiah}	Average		
2.5.2	Importance of I	know-how and K	nowledge transl	fer
18	Excellent	🕱 Good	Average	Low
REGULA	TORY EXPECTATI	ONS OF THE SAF	ETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest in	the topics pres	ented	
	A _{High}	Average	Low	
2.6.2	Importance of I	know-how and k	nowledge transf	fer
	□ _{Excellent}	K Good	□ _{Average}	

÷

REGUL	ATORY REVIE	W AND ASSESSMENT	PROCESS AND) ITS CHALLENGES
2.7.1	Your intere	est in the topics pre	sented	
	🛛 _{High}	□ _{Average}	\Box_{Low}	
2.7.2	Importance	e of know-how and	knowledge trar	nsfer
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	
REGUL	ATORY REVIEW	N, MOVING FROM C	ONCEPTUALISA	TION TO IMPLEMENTATION
2 .8.1	Your intere	st in the topics pre	sented	
	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.8.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge tran	sfer
-	🗹 Excellent	Good Averag	ge 🛛 Low	
DESIGN	AND CONDU	CT OF SUPPORTING	RESEARCH PRO	OGRAMMES
2.9.1	Your intere	st in the topics pres	ented	
	🗆 _{High}	🕅 Average	Low	
2.9,2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge trans	sfer
1	🛱 Excellent	Good Averag	le 🗆 row	
SUMMAF	Y OF CURREN	NT PROGRAMMES A	ND FUTURE JOI ented	NT PROGRAMMING
	⊠ _{High}	Average		
2.10.2	Importance	of know-how and ki	nowledge trans	fer
	Excellent	🗆 Good 🔀 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
CTAKELLO		~		
2.11.1	Your interes	EMENT AND INTRO	DUCTION TO PE	Ρ
	- High	Average	Low	_
	importance (и кпоw-how and kn	owledge transf	fer
R*	×			
	Excellent	└ Good└ Average	e Low	
RECENT E DISPOSAL	Excellent EXPERIENCE V IN CLAY FOR	U Good Average	RÉVIEW OF FRE	NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWAS
RECENT E DISPOSAL 2.12.1	Excellent EXPERIENCE V IN CLAY FOR Your interest	U Good Average WITH REGULATORY I MATION in the topics prese	RÉVIEW OF FRE	NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWAS
RECENT E DISPOSAL 2.12.1	Excellent EXPERIENCE V IN CLAY FOR Your interest <i>High</i>	Good Average	RÉVIEW OF FRE	NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWAS

11/ 32

52

□ Excellent □ Good⊠ Average □ Low

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

□_{High} □_{Average} □_{Low}

14

2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

Excellent Good Average Low

2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...) Illustrate by practical acamples.

2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

Uncertaintier management Woste conditionning tochnies Underground laboratories research

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

3 .1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops Image ----------	--
■ 3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops $\square_{Nothing new}$ Too general $\square_{Well-balanced}$ Too detailed $\square_{Too advanced}$	
, ■ 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\Box_{Excellent}$ Good $\Box_{Average}$ \Box_{Low}	
■ 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops	
■ 3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?	

FUTURE SESSION

1

Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module
Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this module? \Box Yes \bowtie_{NO}
If so, which one?
Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? \bowtie Yes \square No
If so, which one? Waste conditioning taking

Name	Pochet Guillaume
Organization	FANC
Country	Belgium
E-mail	guillaume. pochet @ fonc. for. be
Phone number	0032474790172

Date 16/06/2017

Signature

In

Joely

enstti

14



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module :

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	Too detaile	d Too ad	vanced
			\checkmark		L	
			Excell	ent Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module cor	ntent 🗹			
1.3	Practical inform	nation, logistic	1			
1.4	Time managem	nent	Í]	1
1.5	Number of trai	nees	V			
1.6	Interactive eler	ments	\checkmark			
1.7	General quality	of teaching, le	ctures 🗾		h-mad	
1 .8	Interest of tech	nnical visits			'	
1 .9	interest of wor	kshops	M			1
1 .10	Your Teaching	tools	Y			
■ 1.11	Quality of hand	outs	3			-
1.12	Training room		Y			

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

🗹 _{Hiqh}

□_{Average} □_{Low}

2.1.2	Importance of	know-how and I	knowledge trans	sfer
	☑ _{Excellent}	□ _{Good}	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
OVERVIÉ DEVELO	EW OF THE UKRA PMENTS	INIAN NATIONAI	L RW MANAGEM	ENT PROGRAM AND RECENT
2.2.1	Your interest i	n the topics pre	sented	
3	ビ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance of	know-how and I	knowledge tran	sfer
	☑ Excellent	Good	□ Average	□ _{Low}
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest i	n the topics pre	sented	
	⊠ _{High}	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	know-how and l	knowledge trans	sfer
	☑ Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
GEOLOO	GICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest i	n the topics pre	sented	
	🗹 _{High}	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.4.2	Importance of	know-how and I	knowledge tran:	sfer
	☑ Excellent	🖾 _{Good}	□ Average	□ _{Low}
OVERAL REQUIRI	L REGULATORY F	PROCESS AND T	ECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest in	n the topics pre	sented	
	र्ष्य _{High}	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.5.2	Importance of	know-how and l	knowledge trans	sfer
	🖾 _{Excellent}	Good	□ Average	Low
REGULA	TORY EXPECTAT	IONS OF THE SA	FETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest in	n the topics pre	sented	
	M _{Hiab}		DLow	
2.6.2	Importance of	know-how and I	knowledge trans	sfer
	₫ _{Excellent}	Good	Average	Low

2/2

271	Your intere	st in the topics pro	contod	
	ार्ण र्ण			
	High	└ Average	Low	
2.7.2	Importance	of know-how and	knowledge trar	nsfer
	Excellent	Good	□ _{Average}	Low
REGULA	TORY REVIEW	, MOVING FROM C	ONCEPTUALISA	TION TO IMPLEMENTATION
2.8.1	Your interes	st in the topics pre	sented	
	🗹 _{High}	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.8.2	Importance	of know-how and I	knowledge tran	sfer
· [Z Excellent	🗆 Good 🗆 Avera	ge 🗆 Low	
DESIGN A	AND CONDUC	T OF SUPPORTING	RESEARCH PRO	DGRAMMES
2.9.1	Your interes	st in the topics pres	sented	
	🗹 _{High}	□ _{Average}		
2.9.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge trans	sfer
V	Excellent	Good Average	ge 🗆 Low	
SUMMAR	Y OF CURREN	IT PROGRAMMES A	ND FUTURE JOI	INT PROGRAMMING
SUMMAR [•] 2.10.1	Y OF CURREN Your interes	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres	ND FUTURE JO	INT PROGRAMMING
SUMMAR` ■ 2.10.1	Y OF CURREN Your interes In High	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres	ND FUTURE JOP Rented	INT PROGRAMMING
SUMMAR` 2.10.1 2.10.2	Y OF CURREN Your interes M _{High} Importance o	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k	ND FUTURE JOB ented Low nowledge trans	INT PROGRAMMING
SUMMAR [*] 2 .10.1 2 .10.2	Y OF CURREN Your interes M _{High} Importance o Excellent	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k Good Averag	ND FUTURE JOB eented D _{LOW} nowledge trans	INT PROGRAMMING
SUMMAR [*] 2.10.1 2.10.2 X	Y OF CURREN Your interes High Importance of Excellent	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k Good Averag EMENT AND INTRO	ND FUTURE JOB sented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans je Low DUCTION TO PI	INT PROGRAMMING S fer EP
SUMMAR [*] 2.10.1 2.10.2 STAKEHO 2.11.1	Y OF CURREN Your interes W High Importance of Excellent LDER ENGAG Your interest	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k Good Averag EMENT AND INTRO	ND FUTURE JOS sented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans ge Low DUCTION TO PI ented	INT PROGRAMMING S fer EP
SUMMAR [*] 2.10.1 2.10.2 STAKEHOL 2.11.1	Y OF CURREN Your interes W High Importance of Excellent LDER ENGAG Your interest W High	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k Good Averag EMENT AND INTRO t in the topics pres	ND FUTURE JOB sented Low nowledge trans ge Low DUCTION TO PI ented	INT PROGRAMMING Sfer EP
SUMMAR [*] 2.10.1 2.10.2 STAKEHOI 2.11.1 2.11.2	Y OF CURREN Your interes W High Importance of Excellent LDER ENGAG Your interest M High Importance of	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k Good Averag EMENT AND INTRO t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and ki	ND FUTURE JOP sented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans je Low DUCTION TO Pl ented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans	INT PROGRAMMING Sfer EP
SUMMAR [*] 2.10.1 2.10.2 STAKEHOI 2.11.1 2.11.2 2.11.2	Y OF CURREN Your interes Importance of Excellent LDER ENGAG Your interest High Importance of Excellent	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k Good Averag EMENT AND INTRO t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and kr	ND FUTURE JOR eented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans je Low DUCTION TO Pl ented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans e Low -	INT PROGRAMMING Sfer EP
SUMMAR [*] 2.10.1 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.1 2.10.1 2.10.2 2.1	Y OF CURREN Your interes <i>High</i> Importance of Excellent LDER ENGAG Your interest <i>High</i> Importance of Excellent	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k Good Average EMENT AND INTRO t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and kr Good Averag	ND FUTURE JOR eented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans Je Low DUCTION TO PR ented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans e Low - REVIEW OF FRE	INT PROGRAMMING Sfer EP fer ENCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWA
SUMMAR 2.10.1 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.1 2.10.1 2.10.1 2.10.1 2.10.1 2.10.2	Y OF CURREN Your interes Importance of Excellent LDER ENGAG Your interest High Importance of Excellent XPERIENCE V IN CLAY FOR Your interest	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k Good Average EMENT AND INTRO t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and kn Good Average VITH REGULATORY MATION in the topics prese	ND FUTURE JOR eented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans je Low DUCTION TO PR ented <i>Low</i> nowledge trans e Low - REVIEW OF FRE	INT PROGRAMMING Sfer EP fer ENCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWA
SUMMAR [*] 2.10.1 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.1 2.10.1 2.10.1 2.10.2 2.11.1 2.11.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.11.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.10.2 2.11.2 2.12.2 2.1	Y OF CURREN Your interes High Importance of Excellent LDER ENGAG Your interest Migh Importance of Excellent XPERIENCE V IN CLAY FOR Your interest High	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and k Good Averag EMENT AND INTRO t in the topics pres <i>Average</i> of know-how and kn Good Averag VITH REGULATORY MATION in the topics prese <i>Average</i>	ND FUTURE JOP sented \Box_{LOW} nowledge trans je \Box Low DUCTION TO PI ented \Box_{LOW} nowledge trans e \Box Low . REVIEW OF FRE ented \Box_{LOW}	INT PROGRAMMING Sfer EP fer
SUMMAR [*] 2.10.1 2.10.2 2.11.1 2.11.2 2.12.2 2.1	Y OF CURREN Your interes High Importance of Excellent LDER ENGAG Your interest High Importance of Excellent XPERIENCE W IN CLAY FOR Your interest High Importance of	IT PROGRAMMES A t in the topics pres Average of know-how and k Good Averag EMENT AND INTRO tin the topics press Average of know-how and kn MATION in the topics press Average f know-how and kn	ND FUTURE JOP iented \Box_{LOW} nowledge trans- ie \Box_{LOW} DUCTION TO Pl ented \Box_{LOW} nowledge trans- ented \Box_{LOW} iowledge transf	INT PROGRAMMING Sfer EP Fer ENCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWA

 RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

14

□_{High} □_{Average} □_{Low}

■ 2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

Excellent Good Average Low

■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...)

Do not intercept the exercice with lecture (it's hard to switch on it and be in facus). · Work process was organised more effectively on Wednesday.

2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

Review of safety assessment FEPS General overvieur of waste management situation in European countries and waste streams

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops High Average Low
■ 3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops \square Nothing new \square Too general \square Well-balanced Too detailed \square Too advanced
, ■ 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\square_{Excellent} = \square_{Good} = \square_{Average} = \square_{Low}$
■ 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
3 .3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

1

Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module 4.1

Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this 4.2 module? ¥. Ves □ No If so, which one? Radwaste managements safety 4.3 Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? Yes □ No If so, which one? Radwaste management (storage, treatment, disposal facilities) safety Valence Name C

Name	Kateryon Fuzik
Organization	SSTC NRS
Country	Ukraine
E-mail	kv_fuzik@sstc.com.uq
Phone number	

In Kaunas Date 16 June 2017

Signature

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

14

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module ...

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-bal	ance	d Too	detailed	Too adv	anced
	L		Sector	l so d	etailed		L	L
				Exc	ellent	Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module con	itent		\mathbf{X}			
1.3	Practical inform	nation, logistic				X		
■ 1.4	Time managem	ient			X			
1 .5	Number of trai	nees		Ø	Ū			
1.6	Interactive eler	nents					×*	
1 .7	General quality	of teaching, lea	tures	\Box	D		, J	
1.8	Interest of tech	nical visits 🏹 🔬	tupperd					
■ 1.9	Interest of wor	kshops 200	not sked	\square	Δ	X		
1.10	Your Teaching	tools			Π		X	
1.11	Quality of hand	outs more!					×	
1.12	Training room			Ø				_

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

the context = good have you understand = average the context

2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

High

□_{Average} □_{Low}

2.1.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

.

2.1.2	Importance of	. know-how and	knowledge tran	ster
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	Low
OVERVIE DEVELO	EW OF THE UKR, PMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	L RW MANAGEN	IENT PROGRAM AND RECEN
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
}	対 High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	Good	□ Average	□ _{Low}
GEOLOG	SICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	□ _{High}	Werage	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	[°] know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	Average	Low
GEOLOG	SICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	□ _{High}	🕫 Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.4.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	Low
OVERALI	L REGULATORY	PROCESS AND 1	FECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
2.5.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	Good	□ Average	□ _{Low}
REGULA	TORY EXPECTAT	TIONS OF THE SA	AFETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.6.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	Average	Low

	REGULA	ATORY REVIE	W AND ASSESSMEN	T PROCESS AND	ITS CHALLENGES
	■ 2.7.1	Your inter	est in the topics pr	esented	
		High	□ Average		
	2.7.2	Importance	e of know-how and	knowledge trans	sfer
		□ _{Excellen}	t ⁹⁹ Good	□ _{Average}	Low
1	REGULA		W, MOVING FROM C	CONCEPTUALISAT	ION TO IMPLEMENTATION
	2.0,1				ereise erepopped
	. 202	High	□ Average	Low	entertaining) el
	2.8.2		e of know-how and	knowledge trans	fer and C
		Li Excellent		ige 🗆 Low	
	⑦. ↓ DESIGN 2.9.1	AND CONDU Your intere	CT OF SUPPORTING	RESEARCH PRO	GRAMMES
			Π.		
	292	High	- Average	Low	e
					er
	L		R GOODLI Avera	ge ⊔Low	
	D.2 SUMMAR ■ 2.10.1	Y OF CURRE	NT PROGRAMMES A st in the topics pres	ND FUTURE JOIN	NT PROGRAMMING
		₩ High	Average	Low ve	sport and not dear to me
	2.10.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge transf	er
	C	Excellent	Ø Good□ Averag	ge 🛛 Low	
	D.3 STAKEHO ■ 2.11.1	LDER ENGAC	GEMENT AND INTRO	DUCTION TO PE	Ρ
2		🛱 _{High}		Low	
	2.11.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge transf	er ith yestuday
	¥	Excellent	🎬 Good 🗆 Averag	ie 🗆 Low	exercise very nice) exercise very nice
	E. A RECENT E DISPOSAL	XPERIENCE	WITH REGULATORY RMATION	REVIEW OF FREI	NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE
	2.12.1	Your interes	t in the topics pres	ented	
	[⊐ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
	2.12.2	Importance d	of know-how and kr	nowledge transfe	۲
		Excellent	Good Averag	e 🗆 Low	τ.

E2 RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

1

□_{High} □_{Average} □_{Low}

Excellent Good Average Low

2 $\frac{1}{2}$ Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...)

because of the different dialacts its helpful to by to talk slow and clear

- charts cauld be used more (text should be readable!) often very much text on the slides, which is very helpful when reading everything again alone but dwing the presentation leven didn't need to start reading or looking *
- 2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

I found the containson about the different concepts very interesting (e.g. different types of canisks used internationally), but it was said too little about this slide. I was curious to find out maxe (you normally see concepts on alone standing, seeks them as summarked was nice)

* at them as I would have noter finished reading of until it was switched to the next slide => text couldn't support the presentator this way

^{2.13.2} Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

4

Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops 3.1.1 High Average Low Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops 3.1.2 Nothing new Too general Well-balanced Too detailed Too advanced Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) 3.1.3 Excellent Good □_{Average} □_{Low} (almost excellent) **3.2** Your suggestion for organization of Workshops What additional topics should be included in the Workshops? 3.3 opped a leduce about the opinions & methods to keep memory of the disposal could be interesting (there is also an international group discussion this topic and meeting, I think, in France a few times a year) the exercises bead to have been very Creative, entertaining and

-> The exercises beaution have been very Creative, entertaining and helpful. I enjoyed them very much. Same for the game, but as it toole so long I was shuggeling very much with feeling hungry and then you cannot focus that well anymore at the ending game

-> Sometimes it was too much information. A little teninfo but instead a summary of what we have learned today (as slides and group discumion) would deepen the (knowledge instead of Overloading the participants. ("what did you leave about....?") ("what did you leave about....?")

FUTURE SESSION

 4.1 Your to understand helpfulle to ge and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw and the draw<	suggestions for the improvement of the Module is the safety case in its full complexity it would be it a paper summarizing in a very short way with text gramm [] is the decorption if the most important facts and steps e presentations there were covered no many info and of the topic that imposed the overview. I didn't really the dyou be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this ule? s
IT SO,	which one?
3	
■ 4.3 Would	d you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? s \Box No
If so,	which one?
# understand the safety case to the participants on the	writil the exercise. This summary should be given first or second day belt at least before the exercise.
Name	Kim-Manisa Mayer
Organization	GB
Country	Gemany
E-mail	kim-marisa, mayer @ grs. de
Phone number	
in Kaunar	Date 16 th June 2017
Signature	1 e-terning 1 here
* IAEA c-lemming material mode no clear explanation found	the about the regulatory review That The why my answers were wrong, The M

I could not succeed this (important) module to due to that maybe too complicate questionstanswer-choises for non-native speakers

6/6

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

14

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	d Too detail	ed Too ac	lvanced
	L	$ \sqcup $	X	_		Ĺ
			Exce	ellent Good	Average	Low
■ 1.2	Your evaluation	of Module cont	ent 🗌	. 🔊		
1.3	Practical inform	ation, logistic		X		
1.4	Time manageme	ent	X			
1 .5	Number of train	ees		X		
1 .6	Interactive elem	ients		X		
1 .7	General quality	of teaching, lect	ures 📈	_		
1.8	Interest of tech	nical visits		X		
1.9	Interest of work	shops	×	1		
1.10	Your Teaching to	ools		X		5
1.11	Quality of hando	outs		X		
1.12	Training room		X	1		

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

High

□_{Average} □_{Low}

2.1.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

1

	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	Low
OVERVII DEVELC	EW OF THE UKR PMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	AL RW MANAGEN	IENT PROGRAM AND RECEN
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
}	High	□ Average	Low	
2.2.2	Importance o	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	Good	□ Average	Low
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	Good	Average	Low
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	⊠_ High	□ Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.4.2	Importance of	[•] know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	Cood	□ Average	Low
OVERALI	L REGULATORY EMENTS	PROCESS AND T	ECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	□ _{Hiah}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.5.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	Good	□ _{Average}	Low
REGULA	TORY EXPECTAT	TIONS OF THE SA	AFETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest i	n the topics pre	esented	
	□ _{High}	□ Average	Kow	
2.6.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	Low

2/2

ЭŬ

REGULA	ATORY REVIEW	VAND ASSESSMEN	T PROCESS AND	ITS CHALLENGES			
2.7.1	Your intere	st in the topics pre	esented				
	□ _{High}	□ _{Average}	Low				
2.7.2	Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer						
	□ _{Excellent}	□ _{Good}	Average	Low			
REGULA	TORY REVIEW	, MOVING FROM C	ONCEPTUALISA	TION TO IMPLEMENTATION			
■ 2.8.1	Your intere	st in the topics pre	sented				
	□ _{High}	□ _{Average}	Low				
2.8.2	Importance	of know-how and I	knowledge trans	sfer			
~ (🗆 Excellent	Good Avera	ge 🗆 Low				
DESIGN	AND CONDUC	T OF SUPPORTING	RESEARCH PRC	OGRAMMES			
2.9.1	Your interes	st in the topics pres	sented				
	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}				
2.9.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer			
C	Excellent	Good Average	ge 🗆 Low				
SUMMAR	Y OF CURREN	IT PROGRAMMES A	ND FUTURE JOI	NT PROGRAMMING			
2.10.1	Your interes	t in the topics pres	sented				
	🕅 High	Average	Low				
2.10.2	Importance of	of know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer			
	Excellent	🛛 Good 🖉 Averag	je 🗆 Low				
STAKEHO	LDER ENGAG	EMENT AND INTRO	DUCTION TO PE	ΕP			
2.11.1	Your interest	t in the topics pres	ented				
	🗙 _{High}	Average	Low				
2.11.2	Importance o	of know-how and ki	nowledge transf	fer			
×	Excellent	Good Averag	e 🗆 Low				
RECENT E DISPOSAL	XPERIENCE V	VITH REGULATORY	REVIEW OF FRE	NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE			
2.12.1	Your interest	in the topics prese	ented				
I	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}				
2.12.2	Importance o	f know-how and kr	owledge transf	er			
	Excellent		e 🗆 Low				

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

□ _{High}

Average Low

■ 2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

Excellent Good Average Low

2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...) More examples from the practice

■ 2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

1.4

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops High Average Low
■ 3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops \square Nothing new \square Too general \forall Well-balanced Too detailed \square Too advanced
a 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization)
■ 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
■ 3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

■ 4.1 Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module

Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this 4.2 module? 1 Yes Yes D No

If so, which one? In geological disposal concepts and challenges on diferent doutries.

If so, which one? If there is a cours on TSO and cours relate stakeholder and to PGP.

Name

1

lladleng Georgieva GI-BAS

mgeolyieva@geology.bas.bg

Bulgaria

Organization

Country

E-mail

Phone number

In Signature

Date

enstti

G



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

11

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module :

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	Too detailed	Too adv	vanced
	\sqcup		Ĺ		L	
			Excell	ent Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module con	itent 🗌	Y		
1.3	Practical inform	nation, logistic	Σ			
1.4	Time managem	ient	Y]	: 1
1.5	Number of train	nees		\checkmark		
1 .6	Interactive eler	nents			Y	Ĵ
1 .7	General quality	of teaching, led	tures	Y		
■ 1.8	Interest of tech	inical visits				
1.9	Interest of worl	<shops< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></shops<>				
1 .10	Your Teaching t	cools				
■ 1.11	Quality of hand	outs				-
I 1.12	Training room			L		

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

D High

□_{Average} □_{Low}
2.1.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

2.1.2	Importance of know-now and knowledge transfer					
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	Low		
overvie Develo	EW OF THE UKR PMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	L RW MANAGEN	IENT PROGRAM AND RECENT		
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented			
;	High	□ Average	□ _{Low}			
2.2.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer		
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	Low		
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS				
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented			
	⊡∕ _{High}	□ Average	□ _{Low}			
2.3.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer		
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}		
GEOLOO	GICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES			
2.4.1	Your interest in the topics presented					
	⊠∕ _{High}	□ Average	□ _{Low}			
2.4.2	Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer					
	□ Excellent	Good	□ Average	Low		
	L REGULATORY	PROCESS AND 1	FECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE		
2.5.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented			
	⊡∕ _{High}	Average	Low			
2.5.2	Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer					
	□ Excellent	Good	□ Average	Low		
REGULA	TORY EXPECTA	TIONS OF THE S	AFETY CASE			
2.6.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented			
	⊟ _{High}	□ Average	\Box_{Low}			
2.6.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge trar	sfer		
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ _{Average}			

14

.2

REGULA	ATORY REVIE	W AND ASSESSMENT	PROCESS AND	ITS CHALLENGES
2.7.1	Your inter	est in the topics pre	sented	
	High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.7.2	Importance	e of know-how and l	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellen}	t Good	□ _{Average}	Low
REĢULA	TORY REVIE	W, MOVING FROM CO	ONCEPTUALISAT	ΓΙΩΝ ΤΟ ΙΜΡΙ ΕΜΕΝΤΑΤΙΩΝ
∮ 2.8.1	Your intere	est in the topics pres	sented	
	d _{High}	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.8.2	Importance	e of know-how and k	nowledge trans	sfer
• [⊐ Excellent	Good Average	ge 🗆 Low	
DESIGN	AND CONDU	CT OF SUPPORTING	RESEARCH PRO	GRAMMES
2.9.1	Your intere	st in the topics pres	ented	-
	High	□ _{Average}		
2.9.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
È	Excellent	□ Good□ Averag	e 🗆 Low	
SUMMAR				
2.10.1	Your interes	st in the topics prese	ented	NT PROGRAMMING
	∀ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.10.2	Importance	of know-how and kr	owledge transf	fer
] Excellent	Good Average	e 🗆 Low	
STAKEHOI	LDER ENGAG	EMENT AND INTRO	DUCTION TO PE	P
2.11.1	Your interes	t in the topics prese	inted	
۱	🗹 _{High}	□ _{Average}		
2.11.2	Importance (of know-how and kn	owledge transf	er
Y	Excellent	□ Good□ Average	Low	
RECENT E DISPOSAL	XPERIENCE V	with regulatory f Rmation	REVIEW OF FRE	NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE
2.12.1	Your interest	in the topics prese	nted	
k	High	□ _{Average}		
■ 2.12.2 I	mportance c	of know-how and kno	owledge transfe	26
	Excellent	Good Average	Low	

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

🗆 _{Hiqh}

Average Low

2,13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

Excellent / Good Average Low

1 ■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...) -> general information Lecture geological disposal concepts (A.4) on the properties of diff. Rost locks was missing, haverer the presentation of Bel'V was complementary

■ 2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures? a separate lecture on main & waste degradation processes (with examples), "waste - container", interactions; techtonics - host rocks properties lecture on siting process experience (suitzerland, "REAL" representatives of civil society could Bring a different angle to the discussions a presentation from N60's (e.g. MK6) on their experience and expectations during their participation in along the decision - making process · a lecture on "how to write a regulatory guide"

on a specific topic or " how to write an advice on the presented by operator specific document lecture on treatment of uncertainties separate · comparison of the existing "waste container" solutions, their advantages & disadvatages

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops 3.1.1 High Average Low ■ 3.1.2 Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops Nothing new Too general Well-balanced Too detailed Too advanced :4 ■ 3.1.3 Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) Excellent \Box_{Good} $\Box_{Average}$ \Box_{Low} **3**.2 Your suggestion for organization of Workshops after at the end of every training more workshops, possible 1 per baining dag

■ 3.3 What additional topics should be included in the Workshops? "(existing) a workshop or review of the "actual" (existing) a workshop on "solution" of the unexpected problem

could be interesting to combine such training with an actual risit of URL (like Borne Mont-Terri, HADES, Beurre...)

5/5

FUTURE SESSION

2

= 4.1 Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module some of the topics could be extended e more de discussed in more detail a few more exercises

Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this 4.2 module? 1 NYPS. D No BODG(BRAK) If so, which one? RADIOTORICITY (WASTE INVENTORY) SOME OF THE RED TOPICS (WASTE DECTADATION, IS) EXISTING MONITORING TECHNIQUES Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? 4.3 Yes D NO If so, which one? WASTE DEGRADATION PROCESSES BIOSPHERE ASSESSMENT (MODELLING) INSPECTIONS (WASTE) DECOMISSIONING Maryna Surkova Name FANC Organization Belgium Country MARYNA. SURKOVA @FANC, FOOV. BE E-mail +32/0)493677014 Phone number

16/06/2017

Signature

Date

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

14

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module 3

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanc	ed Too	detailed	Too adv	anced
			×		_	L	J
			E>	kcellent	Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	itent 🗌]	Í			
1.3	Practical inform]	À			
1.4	Time management			J	X]	
1.5	Number of trainees]	à		
1.6	Interactive eler]	A			
1.7	General quality	ctures 📋	J	A	3		
1.8	Interest of tech]				
1.9	Interest of wor	Interest of workshops			A]	
■ 1.10	Your Teaching	tools			À		
■ 1.11	Quality of hand	outs			α		
■ 1.12	Training room				\propto		

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

High

Average □_{Low}

2.1.2	Importance o	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	Good	□ _{Average}	Low
OVERVI DEVELC	EW OF THE UKR DPMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	AL RW MANAGEN	IENT PROGRAM AND RECEN
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	,
)	🔯 High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.2.2	Importance o	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	Good	Average	Low
GEOLO	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	₩ High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ Average	□ _{Low}
GEOLOG	GICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	High High	Average	Low	
2.4.2	Importance of	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
TÍ.	Excellent	Good	Average	Low
overal. Require	L REGULATORY EMENTS	PROCESS AND T	ECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest i	in the topics pre	esented	
	□ _{High}	Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.5.2	Importance of	know-how and	knowledge trans	sfer
	□ Excellent	□ _{Good}	Average	□ _{Low}
REGULA	TORY EXPECTAT	IONS OF THE SA	FETY CASE	
2.6.1	Your interest i	n the topics pre	sented	
	🕅 _{High}	□ Average	Low	
2.6.2	Importance of	know-how and l	knowledge trans	sfer
	Excellent	🗆 _{Good}	□ _{Average}	Low
	v (5	

2/2

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

RHiah

Average Low

2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

Excellent Good Average Low

2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...) Present SITEX before Idle example from real softy case.
2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

Geogical disposal in alcountry / which solution choosed

REGULATORY REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND ITS CHALLENGES ■ 2.7.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average Hiah DIOW ■ 2.7.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low REGULATORY REVIEW, MOVING FROM CONCEPTUALISATION TO IMPLEMENTATION ■ 2.8.1 Your interest in the topics presented (Hiah ■ 2.8.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer È Excellent 🛛 Good□ Average 🛛 Low DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH PROGRAMMES ■ 2.9.1 Your interest in the topics presented A High Average Diow ■ 2.9.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer **K**Excellent Good Average Low SUMMARY OF CURRENT PROGRAMMES AND FUTURE JOINT PROGRAMMING ■ 2.10.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average □ _{Hiah} DIOW 2.10.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND INTRODUCTION TO PEP 2.11.1 Your interest in the topics presented 🗙 _{Average} □ _{Hiah} DIOW 2.11.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low RECENT EXPERIENCE WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF FRENCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE DISPOSAL IN CLAY FORMATION ■ 2.12.1 Your interest in the topics presented **凶**_{High} Average Low 2.12.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average 🗆 Low

3/3

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

14

3.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops

Average
Average
Low

3.1.2 Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops

Nothing new
Too general
Well-balanced
Too detailed
Too advanced

3.1.3 Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization)

Excellent
Good
Average
Low

3.2 Your suggestion for organization of Workshops

3.3 What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

■ 4.1 Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module

■ 4.2)	Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this module?
	If so, which one?
_	
4.3	Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI?
	If so, which one?

Harence Lorenchi IRSN Prance

maxence brenchip ism for

Name

Organization

Country

E-mail

Phone number

In Haunas

Date 16/06/2017



enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module #

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-bal	anced	Too detailed	Too adv	/anced
	\sqcup		l			L	L.
				Exceller	nt Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module con	itent	M			
1.3	Practical information, logistic			с¥			
1.4	Time management				\mathbf{v}		
1.5	Number of trainees			Ľ√			
1.6	Interactive elements						2
1.7	General quality of teaching, lectures			¥J.			
1.8	Interest of technical visits						
■ 1.9	Interest of workshops						
■ 1.10	Your Teaching 1	tools					
■ 1.11	Quality of hand	outs		D			-
1.12	Training room			N			

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

High

□_{Average} □_{Low}

■ 2.1.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

:4

Excellent Good Average Low OVERVIEW OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL RW MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS ■ 2.2.1 Your interest in the topics presented ☑ _{High} □_{Average} □_{Low} 1 ■ 2.2.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL PROGRAMS 2.3.1 Your interest in the topics presented ₩ High Average Diow ■ 2.3.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer ₩ Excellent □ Good Average Low GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL CONCEPTS AND CHALLENGES 2.4.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average Low W_{Hiab} 2.4.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer C Excellent Good Average Low OVERALL REGULATORY PROCESS AND TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE REQUIREMENTS 2.5.1 Your interest in the topics presented 🖞 _{High} Average Low ■ 2.5.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low REGULATORY EXPECTATIONS OF THE SAFETY CASE 2.6.1 Your interest in the topics presented 🗹 _{High} □ Average Diow ■ 2.6.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

↓
Excellent
□
Good
□
Average

Low

REGULATORY REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND ITS CHALLENGES 2.7.1 Your interest in the topics presented 🛱 _{Hiah} DIOW ■ 2.7.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low REGULATORY REVIEW, MOVING FROM CONCEPTUALISATION TO IMPLEMENTATION ■ 2.8.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average Low 2.8.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer [∼] ↓ Excellent □ Good□ Average Low DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH PROGRAMMES 2.9.1 Your interest in the topics presented D High □ Average Diow ■ 2.9.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low SUMMARY OF CURRENT PROGRAMMES AND FUTURE JOINT PROGRAMMING ■ 2.10.1 Your interest in the topics presented ₩ _{Hiah} □_{Average} □_{Low} 2.10.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer , ↓ Excellent □ Good□ Average Low STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND INTRODUCTION TO PEP ■ 2.11.1 Your interest in the topics presented 🖬 _{High} Average Low 2.11.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer ↓ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low RECENT EXPERIENCE WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF FRENCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE DISPOSAL IN CLAY FORMATION 2.12.1 Your interest in the topics presented High Average Low 2.12.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

■ 2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

🗘 _{High} Average Low

2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

✓ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low

■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...)

Please do not miss the slides. Sometimes the lecturers switched to the next slide. - too quickly, witcut enough explanation.

2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

FEPS

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

.

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops
■ 3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops \square Nothing new \square Too general \square Well-balanced Too detailed \square Too advanced
3	
■ 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\Box_{Excellent} = \Box_{Good} = \Box_{Average} = \Box_{Low}$
■ 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
■ 3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

4 1 Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module Marse Do not interrupt the exercise with another lectures as it happened on Tuesday PEP exercise is of as a lasis but needs implorement. Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this 4.2 module? 1 🗋 Yes D No If so, which one? 4.3 Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? 1 Yes □ No If so, which one? MODELLING OLERSII TORAREVSKYI Name SSTC NRS Organization URRAINT Country ov tokarevsky @ sstc. com ug E-mail Phone number + 380 97 89 414 99

In Vaunas Date 16,06.17

Signature (Blaced

enstti



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

1

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module :

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-balanced	Too detailed	Too ad	vanced
	${\boldsymbol{\sqcup}}$		X	.]	-	
			Excell	ent Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	of Module cont	ent 🄀			
1 .3	Practical inform	ation, logistic	X			
1 .4	Time manageme	ent	X		<u>.</u> _	
1.5	Number of train	ees	×			
1.6	Interactive elem	ents		×	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
1.7	General quality o	of teaching, lec	tures 🛃			
■ 1.8	Interest of techr	nical visits	K			
1.9	Interest of works	shops		X		
■ 1.10	Your Teaching to	ols		\mathbf{X}		
I 1.11	Quality of hando	uts	×4			
1.12	Training room		X	_		J

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

Hiah

□_{Average} □_{Low}

4

2.1.2	Importance o	f know-how and	knowledge tran	ster
	Excellent	Hood	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
OVERVIE DEVELO	EW OF THE UKR PMENTS	AINIAN NATIONA	L RW MANAGEN	IENT PROGRAM AND RECEN
2.2.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
;	🇭 _{Hiah}	□ _{Average}		
2.2.2	Importance o	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	🞾 Good	□ Average	Low
GEOLÕG	GICAL DISPOSAL	PROGRAMS		
2.3.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	🖻 High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.3.2	Importance o	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	ี Good	□ Average	□ _{Low}
GEOLOG	SICAL DISPOSAL	CONCEPTS AND	CHALLENGES	
2.4.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
	🕰 High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.4.2	Importance o	f know-how and	knowledge trar	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	🖉 Good	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
OVERAL	L REGULATORY	PROCESS AND T	ECHNICAL AND	SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE
2.5.1	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
2.5.2	Importance o	f know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ Excellent	🔀 Good	□ Average	□ _{Low}
	Your interest	in the topics pre	esented	
- 2.0.1	□ _{Hiah}	Re copies pic		
2.6.2	Importance o	f know-how and	knowledge trar	nsfer

🔀 Good

□ _{Excellent}

□ _{Average}

Low

2/2

2.7.1				C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
	Your intere	est in the topics pre	esented	
	□ _{High}	🛛 Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.7.2	Importance	e of know-how and	knowledge tran	sfer
	□ _{Excellent}	₩Good	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
REĢULA	TORY REVIEW	V, MOVING FROM C	ONCEPTUALISA	TION TO IMPLEMENTATION
2.8.1	Your intere	st in the topics pre	sented	
	□ _{High}	🕅 Average	\Box_{Low}	
2.8.2	Importance	of know-how and k	knowledge trans	sfer
• [∃ Excellent	🔀 Good 🗆 Avera	ge 🗆 Low	
DESIGN /	AND CONDUC			
2.9.1	Your interes	st in the topics pres	sented	GRAMMES
	□ _{Hiab}		Π.	
2.9.2	Importance	of know-bow and k	- LOW	for
Γ.				i ei
	Excention		Je 🗆 LOW	
SUMMAR				
■ 2.10.1	Your interes	t in the topics pres	ND FUTURE JOIN	NT PROGRAMMING
	ingn	Average	-low	
2.10.2	Importance d	of know-how and kr	-owledge trapsf	for
■ 2.10.2	Importance o	of know-how and kr	nowledge transf	fer
2.10.2	Importance (Excellent	of know-how and kr ⊠ Good□ Averag	nowledge transf	fer
STAKEHOL	Importance of Excellent	of know-how and kr Good Averag	nowledge transf e Low DUCTION TO PE	fer
 2.10.2 STAKEHOL 2.11.1 	Importance of Excellent -DER ENGAG Your interest	of know-how and kr Good Averag EMENT AND INTROL in the topics prese	nowledge transf e Low DUCTION TO PE	fer
 2.10.2 STAKEHOL 2.11.1 	Importance of Excellent DER ENGAG Your interest	of know-how and kr Good Averag EMENT AND INTROL in the topics prese Average	DUCTION TO PE	fer P
 2.10.2 STAKEHOL 2.11.1 2.11.2 	Importance of Excellent DER ENGAG Your interest High mportance o	of know-how and kr Good Averag EMENT AND INTROL in the topics prese <i>Average</i> of know-how and kn	DUCTION TO PE ented Ducklow	fer P
 2.10.2 STAKEHOL 2.11.1 2.11.2 2.11.2 	Importance of Excellent DER ENGAG Your interest High mportance of Excellent	of know-how and kn Good Averag EMENT AND INTRO in the topics prese <i>Average</i> If know-how and kn Good Average	nowledge transf e	fer P er
 2.10.2 STAKEHOL 2.11.1 2.11.2 2.11.2 RECENT EXDISPOSAL 	Importance of Excellent DER ENGAG Your interest <i>High</i> mportance of Excellent (PERIENCE W IN CLAY FOR	of know-how and kr Good Averag EMENT AND INTROM in the topics prese <i>Average</i> of know-how and kn Good Average (ITH REGULATORY F MATION	nowledge transf e	fer P er NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWAST
 2.10.2 STAKEHOL 2.11.1 2.11.2 2.11.2 RECENT EXDISPOSAL 2.12.1 	Importance of Excellent DER ENGAG Your interest High mportance of Excellent (PERIENCE W IN CLAY FOR Your interest	of know-how and kr Good Averag EMENT AND INTROL in the topics prese Average of know-how and kn Good Average ITH REGULATORY F MATION	nowledge transf e	fer P er NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWAST
 2.10.2 STAKEHOL 2.11.1 2.11.2 2.11.2 2.11.2 2.11.2 2.12.1 2.12.1 2.12.1 	Importance of Excellent -DER ENGAG Your interest J High mportance of Excellent KPERIENCE W IN CLAY FOR Your interest	of know-how and kr	nowledge transf e	fer P er NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWAST
 2.10.2 STAKEHOL 2.11.1 ^ 2.11.2 I 2.11.2 I 2.11.2 I 2.12.1 Y 2.12.1 Y 2.12.2 Ir 	Importance of Excellent DER ENGAG Your interest High mportance of Excellent KPERIENCE W IN CLAY FOR Your interest High mportance of	of know-how and kn	nowledge transf e	fer P er NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWAST

×.

3/3

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

□ _{High}

-1

□_{Average} □_{Low}

■ 2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

□ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low

■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...)

■ 2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures? Technicals Topics

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops
■ 3.1.2 }	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops \square Nothing new \square Too general \square Well-balanced Too detailed \square Too advanced
3 .1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\mathcal{M}_{Excellent} = Good = \frac{\Box_{Low}}{\Box_{Average}}$
■ 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
■ 3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

1

4.1	Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module	
-----	--	--

■ 4.2	Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this module?
	If so, which one?
■ 4.3	Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI?
	If so, which one?

Name	Premys/ Moucka
Organization	CV ~ REZ
Country	THE GRECH REPUBLIC
E-mail	phemysl. moucka @ curez.cz
Phone number	+420 731 160 840

V. BONIA S ature In

16.6.2017 Date

Signature

6/6

enstti

14



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module :

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-ba	lanced	Too detaile	d Too ad	vanced
		Y	L		_	L	
				Excelle	ent Good	Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	n of Module cor	ntent		Ξ,		
1.3	Practical inform	nation, logistic			Z,		
1.4	Time managem	nent			5		
1.5	Number of trai	nees		Ø			
■ 1.6	Interactive eler	nents			J		
1.7	General quality	of teaching, le	ctures	12			
1.8	Interest of tech	nical visits	NO				
1.9	Interest of wor	kshops	1-	4		J	
1.10	Your Teaching	tools			Z		
■ 1.11	Quality of hand	outs					
1.12	Training room			4			

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

Average Low High

■ 2.1.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer ■Good □_{Average} □_{Low} Excellent OVERVIEW OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL RW MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS ■ 2.2.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average Hiah ł ■ 2.2.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Good Average Low Excellent GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL PROGRAMS ■ 2.3.1 Your interest in the topics presented 🖬 _{High} Average Low ■ 2.3.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL CONCEPTS AND CHALLENGES ■ 2.4.1 Your interest in the topics presented ☑ High - Iow Average ■ 2.4.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low OVERALL REGULATORY PROCESS AND TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE REQUIREMENTS ■ 2.5.1 Your interest in the topics presented High Average Low ■ 2.5.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low REGULATORY EXPECTATIONS OF THE SAFETY CASE ■ 2.6.1 Your interest in the topics presented High Average Low ■ 2.6.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low

REGULA	TORY REVIEW	V AND ASSESSMENT	PROCESS AND	ITS CHALLENGES
2.7.1	Your intere	st in the topics pre	sented	
	High	□ _{Average}	\Box_{Low}	
2.7.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge tran	sfer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ _{Average}	
REGULA	TORY REVIEW	, MOVING FROM CC	NCEPTUALISA	TION TO IMPLEMENTATION
■ 2.8.1	Your intere	st in the topics pres	ented	
	🛛 High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Loiv}	
2.8.2	Importance	of know-how and k	nowledge tran	sfer
- [Excellent	Good Averag	je 🗆 Low	
DESIGN	AND CONDUC	T OF SUPPORTING	RESEARCH PRO	OGRAMMES
2.9.1	Your interes	t in the topics pres	ented	
	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.9.2	Importance	of know-how and ki	nowledge trans	sfer
C	Excellent	🐱 Good 🗆 Averag	e 🗆 Low	
SUMMAR	Y OF CURREN	IT PROGRAMMES AN	ID FUTURE JOI	NT PROGRAMMING
2.10.1	Your interes	t in the topics prese	ented	
	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.10.2	Importance	of know-how and kr	owledge trans	fer
	Excellent	Good Average	e 🖸 Low	
STAKEHO	LDER ENGAG	EMENT AND INTRO	DUCTION TO PE	ΕP
2.11.1	Your interest	in the topics prese	nted	
	High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.11.2	Importance o	of know-how and kn	owledge transf	fer
	Excellent	Good Average	Low	
RECENT E DISPOSAL	XPERIENCE V IN CLAY FOR	VITH REGULATORY F	EVIEW OF FRE	NCH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE
2.12.1	Your interest	in the topics prese	nted	
[High	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}	
2.12.2	Importance o	f know-how and kno	owledge transf	er
V	Excellent	Good Average	Low	

14

■ 2.15 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

(ANALE QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED AND) DISCUSSIVEN of REGULATION ERELEATION FOR INTISFYING THAT IN THIS STEAM CASE. IE. WONKE) EXAMPLES.

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops High Average Low
3.1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops \Box Nothing new \Box Too general \Box Well-balanced Too detailed \Box Too advanced
, ■ 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\square_{Excellent} \square_{Good} \square_{Average} \square_{Low}$
■ 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops IT waves PERMAS ASSIST THE TUTBES IF THEEE
■ 3.3	OF WASTE & DISPORAL CONCOPT TO MOL W DEVELOPING SPECIFIC TARGETS ETC. * What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?
	INTEGRATION OF OPPRATIONAL SAFETT WITH POST CLOSURE LEQUIRMONTS.

* THE DANGER MITH RETAINING THE SLOPE AT A WIDE & GERIERA LEVEL IS THAT PARTICIPANTS SIMPLY RELATE THE CERTIRES/ GUIDANCE (EG. 556-31) RATHER THAN CONSIDERING HOW THESE SHOULD BE APPLIED.

FUTURE SESSION

	■ 4.1 Your suggestions for the improvement of the Module <u>Get</u> EALUCE comments
14	 4.2 Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this module? Yes If so, which one?
	■ 4.3 Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? Yes \Box No
	ANTECTENTE THE DUALITY MOND BE SIMULATE
	Name Tim MALSNAM Organization ONR
	Country Click
	E-mail $\pi M \cdot M A \pi S M A \cdot C \circ N \cdot 6 \circ V \cdot M$ Phone number $\frac{744}{0} 203 028 0415$

In KAUNAS Date 12-16 June 2017

Signature

m

 $\partial_{\mathbf{b}}$

enstti

14



Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY TRAINEE

SİTEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1 Content of Module i

	Nothing new	Too general	Well-ba	lanced	Too detai	led Too ad	vanced
			L	1			
				Excelle	nt Good	d Average	Low
1.2	Your evaluation	of Module con	tent		X		\Box
1.3	Practical inform	nation, logistic		\mathbf{X}			
1.4	Time managem	ent			×		
1.5	Number of trair	nees				X	
1 .6	Interactive elen	nents				X	
■ 1.7	General quality	of teaching, lec	tures	\Box	J	X	
1 .8	Interest of tech	nical visits					
1.9	Interest of work	shops			X	J	51
■ 1.10	Your Teaching t	ools					
1.11	Quality of hand	outs			X		
1.12	Training room			×		ل	

DETAILED EVALUATION OF LECTURE

OVERVIEW OF LITHUANIAN NUCLEAR AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

■ 2.1.1 Your interest in the topics presented

□ _{Hiah}

XAverage Low

2.1.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

2.4

💢 Good Average DIOW □ _{Excellent} OVERVIEW OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL RW MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS 2.2.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average Low □ Hiah ; ■ 2.2.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL PROGRAMS 2.3.1 Your interest in the topics presented High Average ■ 2.3.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Average GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL CONCEPTS AND CHALLENGES 2.4.1 Your interest in the topics presented □ Average High 2.4.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low OVERALL REGULATORY PROCESS AND TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE REQUIREMENTS 2.5.1 Your interest in the topics presented Average DIOW □ _{Hiah} ■ 2.5.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average REGULATORY EXPECTATIONS OF THE SAFETY CASE 2.6.1 Your interest in the topics presented □ Average High D low 2.6.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer Excellent Good Average Low

2/2

REGULA	TORY REVIEW A	ND ASSESSMENT	PROCESS AND I	TS CHALLENGES
2.7.1	Your interest i	n the topics pres	ented	
	High	□ Average	□ _{Low}	
2.7.2	Importance of	know-how and k	nowledge trans	fer
	Excellent	□ _{Good}	□ _{Average}	□ _{Low}
REGULA	TORY REVIEW, M	OVING FROM CO	NCEPTUALISATI	ON TO IMPLEMENTATION
2.8.1	Your interest in	n the topics pres	ented	
	High High	□ Average	Low	
2.8.2	Importance of	know-how and kr	nowledge transf	- er
٦ (🗆 Excellent 🛛 🔎	Kgood□ Averag	e 🗆 Low	
DESIGN	AND CONDUCT C	F SUPPORTING F	RESEARCH PROC	GRAMMES
■ 2.9.1	Your interest in	the topics prese	ented	
	High	□ _{Average}	Low	
2.9.2	Importance of k	now-how and kn	owledge transf	er
×	Excellent C] Good Average	e 🗆 Low	
SUMMAR	Y OF CURRENT P	ROGRAMMES AN	D FUTURE IOIN	
■ 2.10.1	Your interest in	the topics prese	nted	
	□ _{High}	Average	□ _{Low}	
2.10.2	Importance of k	now-how and kn	owledge transfe	er
	Excellent 🔀	Good Average	Low	
STAKEHOI	_DER ENGAGEME	ENT AND INTROD	UCTION TO PEP)
■ 2.11.1	Your interest in	the topics preser	nted	
[⊐ _{Hiah}	Average		
■ 2.11.2	mportance of kr	now-how and kno) Wiedge transfe	r
	Excellent 🛛			
		20.8	_ 2011	
RECENT EX DISPOSAL	XPERIENCE WITH	REGULATORY R	EVIEW OF FREN	CH SAFETY CASE FOR RADWASTE
■ 2.12.1 Y	′our interest in t	he topics presen	ted	
×	(_{High} I	□ _{Average} [Low	
■ 2 .12.2 II	mportance of kn	ow-how and kno	wledge transfer	
	Excellent 🗌 (Good Average	Low	

 \bigcirc

 \bigcirc

3/3

RECENT EXPERIENCES AND TOPICAL ISSUES WITH REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE FINNISH SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL

■ 2.13.1 Your interest in the topics presented

High

□_{Average} □_{Low}

■ 2.13.2 Importance of know-how and knowledge transfer

□ Excellent □ Good□ Average □ Low

chalenges for \$

■ 2.14 Your suggestion for lecturers (for example, "show more examples"...) techical more ISSUES PACP durin countries 7/11 What additional topics should be included in the Lectures?

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

■ 3.1.1	Your interest in the topics presented in the Workshops
3 .1.2	Your evaluation of the usefulness of the Workshops \square Nothing new \square Too general \square Well-balanced \square Too detailed \square Too advanced
■ 3.1.3	Your overall evaluation of the Workshops (content and organization) $\Box_{Excellent} = \Box_{Good} = \Box_{Low}$
■ 3.2	Your suggestion for organization of Workshops
■ 3.3	What additional topics should be included in the Workshops?

FUTURE SESSION

1

4.2	Would you be interested in a tutorial in one of the topics presented on this
Ĵ	□ Yes □ No
	If so, which one?
8	
4.3	Would you be interested in another course offered by the ENSTTI? \Box Yes \Box No
	If so, which one?

Country

E-mail

Phone number

In Kaunas

Date 2017-06-16

zybartas, patasius@vatesi, lt +37052261574

Signature

France

Lithuania



Sustainable network for Independent Technical EXpertise of radioactive waste disposal - Interactions and Implementation

9.4 EVALUATION SHEETS OF LECTURERS
-7

Technical Expertise network

Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY LECTURER

SITEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

■ 1.1	Did you participate in preparation of the Module content?	🔀 Yes 🔲 No
1.2	Did you participate in preparation of timetable of the Module?	Yes 🗆 No
■ 1.3	Did you prepare the content (key words, synopsis) for your lecture (workshop)?	🗙 Yes 🗌 No
■ 1.4	Comments	
<u>SELF I</u>	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	
LECTUR	E TITLE	
■ 3.1.1	Duration of your lecture Right duration Too detailed too long Too short	don't know
■ 3.1.2	Attendees behavior Passive Rective	
3 .1.3	Interactivity and questions by the participants Atten	dees were enougl
	□ Too many questions □ misunderstandings □ I	anguage barriers
3.1.4	Self evaluation: highlights of your lecture	
	SOME MORE DETAILS COULD BE	-
	ADDED	
	INTERACTIVITY, CLEAR PICTUR	EP
	AND SCHEMES	

SHORTENING OF SOME INFORMATION SAFETY ISSUE SHOULD BE MENTIONED MORE

3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture

TO ADD HORE INFORMATION AND REVIEW IT AGAIN WITH PROJECT PARTNERS

SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

WORKSHOP

;

■ 4.1. 1	Working Group title SITEX training course on Regulatory review
4.1.2	Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know
■ 4.1.3	Attendees behavior
4.1.4	How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working group?
■ 4.1.5	Self evaluation: highlights of your working group
■ 4.1.6	Self evaluation: weaknesses of your working group
■ 4.1.7	Suggestion to improve your working group

14

Your experience feedback and comments on this training session 5.1 VERY GOOD PREPARATION OF LECTURES AND EXERCISES

General suggestions to improve the training course in future 5.2 LECTURERS. SHOULD BE AWARE OF CONTENT 1 OF OTHER LESTONS NOT TO REPEAT INFORMATIONS.

Name	ADELA MESKOUA
Organization	DECOMY a.S.
Country	SLOUALIA
E-mail	mrskova @ gmail. com
Phone number	V

Date 16. 6 - 2014

In LAUNAS Signature Mikady

Technicel Expertise network

□ language barriers

1

Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY LECTURER

SITEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

■ 1.1	Did you participate in preparation of the Module content?	🔀 Yes 🗀 No
1 .2	Did you participate in preparation of timetable of the Module?	🗋 Yes 🔀 No
■ 1.3	Did you prepare the content (key words, synopsis) for your lecture (workshop)?	🔀 Yes 📋 No
1 .4	Comments	
<u>SELF I</u>	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	
LECTUR	TITLE	
■ 3.1.1	Duration of your lecture $\square_{Right\ duration}$ $\square_{Too\ detailed\ too\ long}$ $\square_{Too\ short}$ \square	l don't know
■ 3.1.2	Attendees behavior	
	Passive Active	
a 3.1.3	Interactivity and questions by the participants Atter Atter	ndees were enough

- □ Too many questions □ misunderstandings
- 3.1.4 Self evaluation: highlights of your lecture

3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture

1

SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

WORKSHOP

ţ

■ 4.1.1 Working Group title

RSC

- 4.1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration 🗆 Too long 🛛 Too short 🖾 I don't know
- 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive **Active**
- 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working group? 🗹 Very good 👘 □ Good □ Satisfactory □ Not satisfactory
- 4.1.5 Self evaluation: highlights of your working group

The evenue were very itensmost and hedd the good furthered. People in the groups were great another and self evaluation: weaknesses of your working group

■ 4.1.7 Suggestion to improve your working group



Name	BERNIER FREDERIC
Organization	FANC
Country	BELGIUM
E-mail	FREDERIC. BERNIER @ FAVE. FGOU.BE
Phone number	+ 32 439 38 69 66

In KAUNAS Date 14 /06 /2017

Signature

14

Technicel Expertise network

Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY LECTURER

SITEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

GENERAL FEATURES

1.1	Did you pai	ticipate	in prepara	ation of the M	odule conter	nt?	🗆 Yes 🔽 No	
1 .2	Did you participate in preparation of timetable of the Module? 🔲 Yes 🔟 No							
1 .3	Did you pre for your lec	pare the ture (wo	e content (prkshop)?	(key words, sy	nopsis)		🗆 Yes 🗰 No	
1 .4	Comments	THE	ABOVE	ISSUES	NERE	ADDR	RESSED	
	a diamana ang tanang ta	BY	THE C	Со-АИТНО	ROFTA	IE L.	ECTURES	

SELF EVALUATION OF LECTURE

LECTURE TITLE

■ 3.1.1	Duration of your lecture Right duration Too detai	led too long 🛛 Too she	ort 🔲 I don't know
3.1.2	Attendees behavior		,
3.1.3	Interactivity and questions by inquisitive	the participants	Attendees were enough
	□ Too many questions	🗆 misunderstandings	🗆 language barriers
3 .1.4	Self evaluation: highlights of	your lecture	
	PRACTICAL EXAM	PLES ILLUSTIC	CATINO
	PRESENTED P.	RINCIPLES	

 3.1.5 Self evaluation: weaknesses of your lecture *IF UNOWING THE PARTICIPANT COMPOSITION MIGHT HAVE BEEN BETTER TARGETED*
 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture *BETTER FORMULATION OF TS GOAL + SCOPE*

SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

WORKSHOP

3

■ 4.1.¶	Working Group title N/A
■ 4.1.2	Duration of your working group □ Right duration □ Too long □ Too short □ I don't know
4.1.3	Attendees behavior
■ 4.1.4	How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working group?
■ 4.1.5	Self evaluation: highlights of your working group
■ 4.1.6	Self evaluation: weaknesses of your working group
4.1.7	Suggestion to improve your working group

Ĵ.

5.1 Your experience feedback and comments on this training session

NA

14

General suggestions to improve the training course in future 5.2

Name	L. NACHMILNER	
Organization	CIR	
Country	CZECH REPUBLIC	
E-mail	LUMNACH @ GMAIL.COM	
Phone number	+ 420 602 220 804	

In :

12-6-2017

Signature

kames nature Meul

Redisselitze Weste Disposel

1

Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY LECTURER

MUTIC

SITEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

1.1	Did you participate in preparation of the Module content?	Yes INO
1.2	Did you participate in preparation of timetable of the Module?	Yes INO
1 .3	Did you prepare the content (key words, synopsis) for your lecture (workshop)?	Yes INO
1.4	Comments	
SELE	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	
LECTUR	E TITLE	
LECTUR ■ 3.1.1	E TITLE Duration of your lecture Right duration KToo detailed too long Too short	l don't know
LECTUR ■ 3.1.1 ■ 3.1.2	E TITLE Duration of your lecture Right duration Too detailed too long Too short Attendees behavior C Passive Active	l don't know
LECTUR 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3	E TITLE Duration of your lecture Right duration Too detailed too long Too short Attendees behavior Passive Active Interactivity and questions by the participants Atten	I don't know ndees were enoug
LECTUR 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3	E TITLE Duration of your lecture Right duration Too detailed too long Too short Attendees behavior Passive Active Interactivity and questions by the participants Atter inquisitive Too many questions Imisunderstandings	l don't know ndees were enoug language barriers
LECTUR 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.1.3	E TITLE Duration of your lecture Right duration Too detailed too long Too short Attendees behavior Passive Active Interactivity and questions by the participants Inquisitive Too many questions Imisunderstandings Self evaluation: highlights of your lecture	l don't know ndees were enoug language barriers

■ 3.1.5 Self evaluation: weaknesses of ye	our lecture
---	-------------

■ 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture Do re illustrated

11

SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

WORKSHOP

}

- **4.1.1** Working Group title
- 4.1.2 Duration of your working group
 □ Right duration □ Too long □ Too short □ I don't know
- 4.1.3 Attendees behavior □ Passive □ Active
- 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working group?
 □ Very good □ Good □ Satisfactory □ Not satisfactory
- 4.1.5 Self evaluation: highlights of your working group

■ 4.1.6 Self evaluation: weaknesses of your working group

■ 4.1.7 Suggestion to improve your working group

14

Your experience feedback and comments on this training session 5.1 It could be interesting to do "PEP exercise" after presentations of specific safety case reviews General suggestions to improve the training course in future 5.2 ž.

Name	Rocuez Muriel
Organization	IRSN
Country	Fr,
E-mail	muricle rocher a the irsn. fr.
Phone number	+ 33 - 1 - 58 35 79 63

In Kaunas Date 16 june 2017

Signature

14



1

Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY LECTURER

SITEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

1.1	Did you participate in preparation of the Module content?	🗆 Yes 🖬 No
1.2	Did you participate in preparation of timetable of the Module?	Ves thing
1.3	Did you prepare the content (key words, synopsis)	
	for your lecture (workshop)?	Yes 🗆 No
1.4	Comments	
		••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
ELF	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	
ELF	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	
ELF ECTUR 3.1.1	EVALUATION OF LECTURE TITLE Puration of your lecture Right duration Too detailed too long	don't know
ELF ECTUR 3.1.1 3.1.2	EVALUATION OF LECTURE Uration of your lecture Right duration Too detailed too long Too short	don't know
ELF ECTUR 3.1.1 3.1.2	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	don't know
ECTUR I 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	<i>don't know</i> dees were enoug
ECTUR 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3	EVALUATION OF LECTURE Puration of your lecture Right duration Too detailed too long Too short I Attendees behavior Passive Active Interactivity and questions by the participants Atten Inquisitive misunderstandings I	don't know dees were enoug
ECTUR I 3.1.1 I 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.1.3	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	don't know dees were enoug anguage barriers

## 1'D LILE TO IMPROVE THE STYLE OF PRES MAKE 17 LESS FORMAL 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture }	ENJATT
MAKE 17 LESS FORMA(
 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture <i>SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP</i> WORKSHOP 4.1.1 Working Group title 4.1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Uvery good Good Satisfactory Not satisfactory 	
 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 4.1.7 Working Group title 4.1.8 Working Group title 4.1.9 Attendees behavior Description Description Description Statisfactory 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Description Description Description Statisfactory 4.1.6 Suff understing highlights a function of the sum of	
SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP WORKSHOP 4.1.1 Working Group title 4.1.2 Duration of your working group	
SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP WORKSHOP 4.1.1 Working Group title 4.1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Very good Good Satisfactory Not satisfactory	
 <i>SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP</i> WORKSHOP 4.1.1 Working Group title 4.1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Uvery good Good Satisfactory Not satisfactory 	
SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP WORKSHOP 4.1.1 Working Group title A1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Very good Good Satisfactory Not satisfactory	
 WORKSHOP 4.1.1 Working Group title 4.1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Very good Good Satisfactory Not satisfactory 	
 4.1.1 Working Group title 4.1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Very good Good Satisfactory 	
 4.1.1 Working Group the 4.1.2 Duration of your working group <i>Right duration</i> <i>Too long</i> <i>Too short</i> <i>I don't know</i> 4.1.3 Attendees behavior <i>Passive</i> <i>Active</i> 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working <i>Very good</i> <i>Good</i> <i>Satisfactory</i> <i>Not satisfactory</i> 	
 4.1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Very good Good Satisfactory Not satisfactory 	
 4.1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration Too long Too short I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Very good Good Satisfactory 	
 Right duration ☐ Too long ☐ Too short ☐ I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior ☐ Passive ☐ Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working ☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Not satisfactory 4.4.5 Colf conduction highlights afore unrealized active 	
 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive Active 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working Very good Good Satisfactory Not satisfactory 	
 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working <i>Very good</i> Good Satisfactory Not satisfactory 	
□ Very good □ Good □ Satisfactory □ Not satisfactory	group?
4.1.5 Seir evaluation: nignlights of your working group	
	1011-0-011-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-
• 4.1.6 Solf evolution: weaknesses of your working group	
= 4.1.6 Self evaluation, weaknesses of your working group	
4.1.7 Suggestion to improve your working group	

.

-44

3

Your experience feedback and comments on this training session 5.1

Please see comments as a trainee

1

General suggestions to improve the training course in future 5.2

Name	Oleksii Makapeuskyi	
Organization	SSTC NRS	
Country	ULKRAINE	
E-mail	ov tokarovsky@sstc.com.uc	
Phone number	+380 978941499	

In Kaupes Date 16.06.17

Signature

Huaj

Action cities and the second s

Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY LECTURER

SITEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

1.1	Did you participate in preparation of the Module content?	X Yes 🗆 No
1.2	Did you participate in preparation of timetable of the Module?	X Yes □ No
■ 1.3	Did you prepare the content (key words, synopsis) for your lecture (workshop)?	Q(Yes □ No
1 .4	Comments	
SELF	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	
LECTUR	RE TITLE	
■ 3.1.1	Right duration Too detailed too long	l don't know
3 .1.2	Attendees behavior	
■ 3.1.3	Interactivity and questions by the participants Atten	idees were enough
	□ Too many questions □ misunderstandings □ I	anguage barriers
■ 3.1.4	Self evaluation: highlights of your lecture I have the feeling that it was a good between a brand over our of the a	balarce 2x D rads
	and a fectioned more defailed by	circloh of
	they preads.	- prote of
	It could be intreading to go into proce aboved non 2 poeds into dedicate	shold and
	todavial mesculations	1

■ 3.1.5 Self evaluation: weaknesses of your lecture Given the brock overview that was pescelet felt someliker "fot enough reques, for some bedweet issues presentel -I well 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture Couple the lecture with more todwal pesentations on actor issues. :4 1 SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP WORKSHOP ■ 4.1.1 Working Group title 4.1.2 Duration of your working group □ Right duration □ Too long □ Too short □ I don't know 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Passive □ Active ■ 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working group? Very good □ Good □ Satisfactory □ Not satisfactory ■ 4.1.5 Self evaluation: highlights of your working group ■ 4.1.6 Self evaluation: weaknesses of your working group 4.1.7 Suggestion to improve your working group

FUTURE SESSION (I was not present 5.1 Your experience feedback and comments on this training session It can to be a good that! Participale carted to be illevolved out I have the failing that we are assumented to a real atoms General suggestions to improve the training course in future duity 16 whole cause). 5.2 14 posontation on important challenges / issues ; Ha are indeligated by TSO's -

Detillect Valor Name Bel Organization BE Country Valer / detilleer @ belv. be E-mail 00 \$ 494599581 Phone number

aunal-Signature

Date 15/66/2017

3

Retirective Waster Dispersel

Training

COURSE EVALUATION BY LECTURER

SITEX TRAINING COURSE ON "REGULATORY REVIEW OF THE SAFETY CASE FOR GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL"

■ 1.1	Did you participate in preparation of the Module content?	🗆 Yes 📈 No
■ 1.2	Did you participate in preparation of timetable of the Module?	🗌 Yes 🕅 No 👘
■ 1.3	Did you prepare the content (key words, synopsis) for your lecture (workshop)?	¥Yes □No
1 .4	Comments FANC Decides I should reflace my calley	m Koen
	Romaests and so I was very lately isno	hed in my
	presentation - Again Sony for Keat.	
SELF	EVALUATION OF LECTURE	
LECTUR	ETITLE	
■ 3.1.1	Duration of your lecture	I don't know
■ 3.1.2	Attendees behavior	
a 24 2		
a 3,1,3	inquisitive Atter	idees were enough
	□ Too many questions □ misunderstandings □	language barriers
3 .1.4	Self evaluation: highlights of your lecture	
	I tried to be fast to save time for	exercise
	So sometimes I was thinking and lade	ing Jahops Lost

Due to heavy charge at the office, I had the time to prepare the presentation, but not to prepare My-self. (■ 3.1.6 Suggestion to improve your current lecture 1 SELF EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP WORKSHOP ■ 4.1.1 Working Group title B-Signion. ■ 4.1.2 Duration of your working group Right duration 🗆 Too long 🛛 Too short 🖓 I don't know ■ 4.1.3 Attendees behavior Active Passive ■ 4.1.4 How do you evaluate the success of the participants during the working group? 🗆 Very good 🛛 🖾 Good 🔅 🗆 Satisfactory □ Not satisfactory ■ 4.1.5 Self evaluation: highlights of your working group See conducions of Fredric Barrin 4.1.6 Self evaluation: weaknesses of your working group idm ■ 4.1.7 Suggestion to improve your working group

1

5 .1	Your experience feedback and comments on this training session
■ 5.2	General suggestions to improve the training course in future
}	

Name	WOUTERS JEAN_PIERRE
Organization	FANC BELGIUM
Country	BELGUM
E-mail	jean-pierre. Wouters @ fone for be
Phone number	00 32 496 58 2983

In KAUNASS Date 13/06/2017

Signature