


Report based on the answers following the survey sent 24 January with follow-up reminder 15 February



- The questionaire was sent to all 100 registered participants
- The maximum number of possible responses was 96, as the 4 coordination group members were not expected to answer
- We received 33 responses meaning a response percentage of 34 (2016: 35 and 2013: 44)




Overall rate of the seminar – 33 responses








Seminar attendance? Did you attend day1 and 2? Day1? / Day 2? – 31 responses






Relevance of seminar theme – risk and uncertainties – 33 responses








Usefulness of information presented – 33 responses








Quality of presentations – 33 responses






Seminar organization: scheduling and timing – 33 responses






Seminar organization: facility / venue – 33 responses






Seminar organization: handouts of books of abstracts – 32 responses






Seminar organization: handouts of pamphlets – 30 responses








Networking possibilities/opportunities: How did you rate these? – 33 responses








Did you visit the poster session? – 33 responses









How likely are you to attend future NKS seminars? – 33 responses







How did you hear about the seminar? – 33 responses





- Survey comments (1):
- Generally very good speakers although some exception. Especially enjoyed Britt-Marie Drottz Sjöberg's presentation: it was refreshing to hear insights outside nuclear field, yet so relevant to us.
- Overall very interesting and well organized



- Survey comments (2):
- The presentations should concentrate on showing the need for the research, what is the essential outcome, and how this affects safety. The details of experimental methods is not important in this kind of seminar. Enough time should be allocated to questions after the presentations.
- Time for questions and discussion after each session.
- Longer and SCHEDULED Q&A & discussion periods.
- More time for Q&A.



- Survey comments (3):
- Seminar proceeding should have been more official and citeable i.e. NKS report number & ISBN. It always takes time and effort to produce scientific abstract and poster/presentation and it's motivating to have some kind of price for that effort i.e. something to cite and something to put in CV etc. Posters should have been more in spotlight i.e. mentioned during the seminar and separate poster session (not only during the coffee, when people want to chat, refresh, drink coffee, go to the toilet etc.



- Survey comments (4):
- Details only, but as a suggestion: Maybe make the handout of books of abstracts in a bigger size, that is for instance in a A4 format? And maybe give space for notes in the handout?
- It would be nice to have more non-Nordic participants taking part in future NKS seminars.
- Keep arranging good seminars of different topics and for different audience



- Survey comments (5):
- It was a little disturbing a few times when there was noise from the kitchen/dishes during presentations. Presenters must understand that they are mostly presenting to an audience that are not very familiar with their field. There were a few who lost the audience.



- Survey comments (6):
- With my own field being mostly related to radioecology, and not nuclear facilites, most of the presentations were of very limited relevance to me personally. Although I see that the information is very relevant to others and the general area of radiation protection.