

## Questionnaire replies' evaluation

### Scope

In order to evaluate the training course which took place in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> of October 2004 in Mytilene, the MCDA-RES team has developed a questionnaire which was circulated to the participants. The aim of the questionnaire was to evaluate the workshop as a whole, as well as the course material. The feedback gained is quite crucial so as to understand how the MCDA-RES Tool kit was perceived from people whose work involves decision making in the area of renewable energy sources.

### Numerical results of the questionnaire

Below the average score results of the questionnaire are shown. They were derived by adding the scores in each question and then the number was divided with the total number of questionnaires received.

To what extent have the following goals been achieved (on a five-point scale, with **1 not at all**, and **5 very much**).

- I obtained a good overview of the subject of renewable energy sources 3.7
- I obtained a good overview of the subject of multi-criteria decision aid 4.3
- The relevance of the workshop was clear to me 4.3
- I am now better able to read, position and appreciate articles/seminars on this topic 4
- My analytical and empirical skills have improved 3.6

Evaluate the course material in terms of quality, suitability and usefulness (on a five-point scale, with **1 very bad**, and **5 very good**).

- The course outline 4
- MCDA-RES Tool kit
  - Ease of learning 3.6
  - The information given by the MCDA-toolkit 4.3
  - The outline of the MCDA-toolkit in 8 steps 4.3
  - The clarification of each step by means of the case study 4.2
  - User friendliness of the 8 step approach 4
  - The importance of the MCDA-toolkit for people working with RES 4.2
  - User friendliness of the toolkit 3.86
- Promethee method
  - Ease of learning 4.3
  - Ease of use 3.7
  - Overall performance 3.7
- Regime method
  - Ease of learning 3.86
  - Ease of use 3.4
  - Overall performance 3.6
- NAIADE method
  - Ease of learning 4.3
  - Ease of use 4.2
  - Overall performance 3.4

- The slides/Powerpoint presentations 4.3
- The assignments 3.6
- The transparency of the overall procedure 4.2

## Conclusions and remarks

1. Despite the fact that the participants come from different backgrounds, most of them have understood the subject of renewable energy sources and multi-criteria decision aid.
2. The participants' analytical and empirical skills were improved and they are more familiar with the topic of decision making for RES projects after their participation in the workshop.
3. The MCDA-RES Tool kit was relatively easy to learn, it is quite informative and the eight steps used are considered to be useful and quite clear to the users.
4. The participants conclude that the Tool kit is important for people working with RES projects.
5. All multi-criteria analytical methods scored well concerning the ease of learning and ease of use, with the participants showing a slight preference to the NAIADÉ method.
6. The Promethee method is perceived by the participants as a slightly better performer against the Regime and NAIADÉ method.
7. The multi-criteria methods used seemed to be better understood at a certain extent by people who have a background on environmental sciences and economics.
8. The transparency of the methods is a quite vital subject. Overall, participants found that the MCDA-RES Tool kit improved the decision-making process for renewable energy projects.