Participants present on the final day of the Seminar were asked to fill in a feedback form and to make comments about their experiences of the workshop. Thirty-three participants filled in their responses.

Feedback About the Seminar
This section of the form asked participants to grade certain aspects of the Seminar. They used a scale ranging one to five, where one = Poor and five = Excellent.

1. How effective were the speakers?

![Efficiency of Speakers chart](chart.png)
2. How would you rate the structure of the seminar?

![Structure Diagram]

3. How useful was the background documentation?

![Background Documentation Diagram]
4. How would you rate the organisation of the event?

![Organisation of Seminar Chart]

5. How well did you feel that the seminar addressed the main topic?

![Seminar Focus Chart]
6. Was the cost acceptable?

[Costs chart]

7. Did this seminar meet your expectations?

[Meet Expectations chart]

Those participants that answered ‘No’ were asked to provide details, and some of the responses included:

- the time planning was too tight
- creating a policy as such is not that difficult, the problem lies in convincing senior management
8. What will you be able to take from this seminar back to your own organisations?
Responses included:
- ability to start building a digital preservation policy with a solid background knowledge
- ideas about risk, liability, evidence
- methodologies and concrete examples
- new contacts,
- and enthusiasm

9. What else would you liked to have seen covered at this seminar?
Responses included:
- a detailed review of policies in place
- more attention to a perspective on a national level
- tools
- what preservation methods are necessary for what kind of data
- more on financial aspects of digital preservation
- also short term recommendations

10. What did you like best about this seminar?
Many responses underlined the variety of the backgrounds of speakers and participants as valuable. Also, the venue and the breaks (i.e. food) were mentioned as excellent.
(When coming down to names, Peter Emmerson and John McDonald gave the best talks in the view of participants.)

11. What did you like least?
Answers focussed on the tight timetable mainly. Aspects of this included the necessity for (a) shorter presentations and/or fewer speakers; (b) buffet lunch or more time for sit-down lunch; (c) more time for practical sessions and more exhaustive reporting after the practical sessions.
Other opinions raised were that the private sector was not represented prominently enough, there were too many speakers from archive sector.
And also that the workgroup questions were too general, and therefore ineffective.
About the Participants
This section was designed to gain insight into the participants themselves, focusing on their profession, affiliations, and reasons for attending the seminar.

12. What type of organisation do you work for?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of participants working in different types of organisations.

- Public Sector: 50%
- Commercial: 20%
- Academic: 15%
- Consultancy: 10%
- Other: 5%

13. What do you work as?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of participants working in different roles.

- Archivist: 50%
- Information Professional: 20%
- Programme Manager: 15%
- Consultant: 10%
- Researcher: 5%
- Other: 5%]
14. How did you hear about this seminar?

- Through Organisation: 40%
- Colleague: 30%
- Listserv: 20%
- ERPANET website: 10%
- Web search: 5%
- Other: 10%

15. What motivated you to attend?

- Preservation Activities: 12%
- ERPANET: 10%
- Location: 2%
- Speakers: 2%
- Topic: 8%

Motivation to come
The Future

16. Are you likely to attend other ERPANET events in the future?

![Bar Chart]

17. Are there any topics that you would like to see ERPANET provide training on?

Suggestions for future seminar topics included:

- DSpace and Asset Management
- archiving of websites and e-mail
- evaluation of costs
- metadata
- retention schedules for electronic documents
- tools and standards