

*Results of the Evaluation of the UNCTAD/WAIPA
Training Workshop on IPA Policy Advocacy
Busan, Republic of Korea
18-19 November 2005*

Overall. The results of the evaluation show that all of the participants who returned the exit questionnaire (7 out of 9) are satisfied with the training workshop. The participants very much appreciated the opportunity to study about investment promotion agency (IPA) policy advocacy. This was a new topic for IPA officials attending the training, and focused on how the unique position of IPAs could be strategically leveraged to bring to the attention of decision makers the issues and possible solutions for policies that affect their investor clientele.

There were, in total, 9 participants from the following countries: Cambodia, Fiji, Malaysia, Maldives, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea and Samoa. The project sponsored the travel and per diem of participants from the Least Developed Countries (LDCs). As the host country, the Korea Trade-Investment Promotion Agency provided logistical support.

The workshop was opened by Mr. Youn-soo Rah, Director of Investment Planning at Invest Korea, on behalf of the host country and on behalf of the World Association of Investment Promotion Agencies (WAIPA). The Investors Panel to discuss investor aftercare issues was chaired by Ms. Nazha Benabbes Taarji, Chief of the Investment Promotion Section at UNCTAD, and included the CEO and Vice President of Odfjell Terminals Korea and the Head of Operations for Clariont Songworn. A special presentation on the case of the Investment Ombudsman of Korea was made by Mr. Sang-kwang Lee of the Ombudsman's Aftercare Team. A copy of the full programme and the list of participants is attached.

The following data is based on the 7 evaluation questionnaires returned at the end of the workshop.

1. General Aspects of the Workshop.

Scale: 5=excellent
4=very good
3=good
2=poor
1=very poor

Average responses for:	
Organization	4.40
Audio/Visual Equipment	4.43
Quality of Trainers/Lecturers	4.57
Facilities	4.57
Documentary Material	4.43

Analysis: Overall, the workshop received very high marks from the participants on all aspects of the workshop. The questionnaires show that the participants were particularly impressed by the quality of trainers/lecturers and workshop facilities.

2. Length of the Workshop.

Too Long: 0
Long Enough: 4
Too Short: 3

Analysis: The training workshop was run as a two day event, with a half day dedicated to a comprehensive wrap-up exercise. A majority were satisfied with the length of the workshop. A number of respondents felt the workshop was too short. No participant felt that the workshop was too long.

3. Evaluation of Documentary Materials.

Scale: 5=excellent
4=very good
3=good
2=poor
1=very poor

Average responses for:

Presentation	4.33
Technical/Analytical Expertise	4.71
Clarity	4.50
Comprehensiveness	4.43

Analysis: The documentary materials for the workshop received generally high marks from the participants. Ring bound training materials were prepared and distributed at registration, and the trainers' powerpoint presentations tracked the training materials.

4. Evaluation of Individual Presenters.

Scale: 5=excellent
4=very good
3=good
2=poor
1=very poor

	<u>Average Score</u>
N. Benabbes Taarji	
Quality of Presentation	4.57
Grasp of Topics	4.71
Experience and Expertise	4.57
K. Adachi	
Quality of Presentation	4.71
Grasp of Topics	4.71
Experience and Expertise	4.57

Analysis: The participants appear to have been very satisfied with the trainers selected for the workshop. The average score for all of the trainers for all aspects (quality of presentation, grasp of topics, experience and expertise) were rated 4.5 or above.

5. Evaluation of Topics Covered in the Workshop.

<u>Module</u>	<i>Most Useful</i>	<i>Least Useful</i>
What is policy advocacy for IPAs?	5	1
Understanding policy and decision making	7	0
Investors' Roundtable	7	0
Identifying the policy issues that matter for investors	6	0
Developing a policy advocacy strategy	7	0
Organizing the IPA for policy advocacy	7	0
Wrap-up exercise	5	1

<u>Module</u>	<i>Time Allocated</i>		
	<i>Too Much</i>	<i>Sufficient</i>	<i>Too Little</i>
What is policy advocacy for IPAs?	0	5	0
Understanding policy and decision making	0	5	1
Investors' Roundtable	0	5	1
Identifying the policy issues that matter for investors	0	5	1
Developing a policy advocacy strategy	0	3	2
Organizing the IPA for policy advocacy	0	4	1
Wrap-up exercise	0	2	3

Analysis: The participants felt that all of the modules were useful, and that generally sufficient time was allocated for covering the substance in each module. The workshop was originally designed as a two and a half day event with the last half day dedicated to the wrap-up exercise. If run in two days, more time would need to be given to modules 4 and 6.

6. Topics that Participants would have liked to see Covered in this Workshop.

7. Objective of the Workshop.

In response to the question as to whether the workshop met its objective, the responses were as follows:

Yes: 6
No: 1

Analysis: According those who answered this question on the evaluation questionnaire, the participants felt that the workshop achieved its objectives. The single respondent who answered "no" indicated that s/he felt that the workshop was too short.

8. Benefits for Participant of the Workshop.

	<i>substantially</i>	<i>sufficiently</i>	<i>insufficiently</i>
Introduction of New Topics to you	2	4	0
Understanding of problems and issues	3	3	0
Introduction of new concepts	5	1	0
Exchange of experience	6	0	0
Transfer of skills	4	1	1

Analysis: The workshop appears to have succeeded in providing benefits to the participants in all of the above criteria (introduction of new topics, understanding problems and issues, introduction of new concepts, exchange of experience and transfer of skills). The workshop was particularly strong at facilitating the exchange of experience and introducing new concepts.