Summary of initial evaluation findings for the process of developing the NoK

Ideas for future KNEU workshops and conferences

One objective of the [KNEU](#) project is to analyse the issues involved in establishing a prototype Network of Knowledge and identify ways in which difficulties can be overcome. To do this, WP4 of the KNEU project seeks the op (N = 24) and perspectives of knowledge providers and users through a variety of methods. The evaluation findings are being fed back into the project as well as circulated to participants to enable an interactive process where lessons are learned and applied as the project progresses. This document is a summary of the evaluation findings to help with future KNEU workshops and conferences.

Workshop Highlights	Workshop Improvements	Ideas for future workshops
• Representation from different countries with a focus on scientific community was good. • Discussion topics were selected by participants. . • Discussion groups were open and allowed active participation. . • Facilitators listened to participants and responded to suggestions. • Prototype presented was not imposed but stimulated discussions and ideas. • Dissemination of recommendations allowed participants to include comments not fully picked up in workshop.	• Verbal presentation of the prototype helped participants understand the Powerpoint sent prior to the workshop. • The multi-directionality of knowledge flow across NoK could have been clearer. • Recommendations document from the workshops could have been circulated to participants sooner. • Aims of the workshop could have been clearer. • Topics selected by participants focused on wider issues (e.g governance) and could have focused more on the design of prototype. • Policy makers, managers and practioners could have been better represented. . • Facilitators did not always maintain a neutral role by joining the discussions which could have made it more difficult for participants to get certain points across. • Cultural diversity across groups could have been better e.g. no Icelandic scientists identified.	• Communicate aims and objectives of activities clearly. • Explore the use of Skype meetings to present prototype to participants prior to workshops. • Explore the use of sub groups to examine and understand information prior to workshops. • Consider the use of more dynamic tools to present complex issues and non linear processes (e.g Prezi) and deliver workshop as a whole. • Provide more notice on forthcoming activities to promote participation and avoid diary clashes. • Ensure timely follow up to maintain participant engagement. • Ensure outputs from all three regional workshops equally influence prototype revision. • Make sure other groups are included in the process even if in different discussions.

Conference Highlights	Conference Improvements	Ideas for future Conferences
• Conference was structured very well, particularly the break out groups. • Information sent before the conference was useful and indicated that participation was expected, not just listening. • Summaries presented to the conference from group sessions were good. • Facilitation was strengthened by the scientific background and contextual understanding. • Cochrane Collaboration presentation was useful. • Policy interaction errors in past projects were useful to discuss. • Cultural mix was good with Southern and Eastern countries well represented. • Presentation on prototype was clear. • Project website is a good source of information.	• Conference aims and role of participants could be clearer. Expectations prior to the conference included a technical event to discuss biodiversity, the beginning of the network and the development of the network. • Clear aims for groups could have made discussions more focused. • Committed participants already familiar with the NoK could have been encouraged to focus on future requirements of the NoK. • Summaries from group discussions could have been more comprehensive. • Pre event documents could have been shorter. • The conference could have included more social scientists (society perspective, communication, network building, and economists), private sector, national level and policy makers. • Participation from non native speakers could have been improved with shorter sessions and/ or regular breaks. • How participants can stay informed about KNEU and involved in NoK could have been clearer. • Follow up documents summarizing conference outcomes could have been sent to participants sooner. • Next steps in the project and how information from the conference will be used could have been clearer. • Communication about participation in the case studies could have been more consistent.	• Identify aims for break out group topics for focused discussions. • Capture all issues raised in group discussions fully. For example, using a facilitator and transcriber and participants amending output summaries during event. • Include contribution from other sectors (e.g, knowledge brokers, participation experts and policy makers.) • Provide consistent, timely messages to encourage participation and clearly communicate aims and knowledge needs for each activity.