



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM - 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Helmy Sayed
Your Organization (Optional)	HU
Date of Assessment	06-10-2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X



SGT-MEF(v0.2) Meeting Evaluation Form

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....

Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM - 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Dr. Karim Hassan Youssef
Your Organization (Optional)	Alexandria University
Date of Assessment	4/10/2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making				X	
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.			X		
The meeting started on time.				X	
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.				X	
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.				X	
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.				X	
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?				X	
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.			X		



SGT-MEF(v0.2) Meeting Evaluation Form

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....

Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM - 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Nabil Abbasy
Your Organization (Optional)	Alexandria University
Date of Assessment	6-10-2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.				X	
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making				X	
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.				X	
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.			X		
There was a person assigned to document minutes.			X		
The meeting started on time.				X	
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.			X		
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.			X		
Action items were assigned where appropriate.			X		
There was a general agreement for raised points.			X		
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?				X	
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.			X		



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

- More strict commitment to the agenda timings may be needed.
- The process (ground rules) for running needs to be more explained.
- Minuets of the meetings, not only the "meetings outcomes", should be distributed and properly matched with the "meeting outcomes".



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	Progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017 - Full Day
Place of Meeting	Klagenfurt - Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Yehia Mohamed Youssef
Your Organization (Optional)	AAST
Date of Assessment	12 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

Comments (Constructive suggestions):

.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First Progress Meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017
Place of Meeting	Klagenfurt - Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Mahmoud Mohamed Elmesalawy
Your Organization (Optional)	HU
Date of Assessment	12 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.				X	
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

Comments (Constructive suggestions):

.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	Progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017
Place of Meeting	Klagenfurt - Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Mostafa Saad Hamad
Your Organization (Optional)	AAST
Date of Assessment	12 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

Comments (Constructive suggestions):

.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM - 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Mohamed Ali
Your Organization (Optional)	Aswan uni.
Date of Assessment	4-10-2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.				X	
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making				X	
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.				X	
There was a person assigned to document minutes.				X	
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.				X	
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.				X	
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.				X	



SGT-MEF(v0.2) Meeting Evaluation Form

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology – A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM – 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	
Your Organization (Optional)	
Date of Assessment	18 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making				X	
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.				X	
There was a person assigned to document minutes.				X	
The meeting started on time.					
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					
There was a general agreement for raised points.				X	
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?				X	
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.				X	



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology – A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM – 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	
Your Organization (Optional)	
Date of Assessment	18 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X



**SGT-MEF(v0.2)
Meeting Evaluation Form**

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology – A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM – 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Davide Righini
Your Organization (Optional)	UNI-KLU
Date of Assessment	18 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X



**SGT-MEF(v0.2)
Meeting Evaluation Form**

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology – A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM – 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Francesco Marcuzzi
Your Organization (Optional)	UNI-KLU
Date of Assessment	18 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X



**SGT-MEF(v0.2)
Meeting Evaluation Form**

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology – A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM – 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Andrea Tonello
Your Organization (Optional)	University of Klagenfurt
Date of Assessment	18 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X



**SGT-MEF(v0.2)
Meeting Evaluation Form**

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM - 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Ramon Portillo
Your Organization (Optional)	Universidad de Sevilla
Date of Assessment	4/October/2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making				X	
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.			X		
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.				X	
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.				X	
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.	X				



SGT-MEF(v0.2) Meeting Evaluation Form

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

Minutes document should be available in the website and/or the file repository in 7 to 10 days as much.



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM - 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Sergio Vazquez
Your Organization (Optional)	Universidad de Sevilla
Date of Assessment	4/October/2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making			X		
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.			X		
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.			X		
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.				X	
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.			X		
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.				X	
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?				X	
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.	X				



SGT-MEF(v0.2) Meeting Evaluation Form

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

Minutes document should be available in the website and/or the file repository in 7 to 10 days as much.



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM - 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Dr Khaled Ahmed
Your Organization (Optional)	University of Aberdeen
Date of Assessment	18 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					<input type="checkbox"/>
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					<input type="checkbox"/>
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					<input type="checkbox"/>
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					<input type="checkbox"/>
The meeting started on time.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					<input type="checkbox"/>
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					<input type="checkbox"/>
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a general agreement for raised points.					<input type="checkbox"/>
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					<input type="checkbox"/>
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					<input type="checkbox"/>



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....

Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM - 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Dr David Vega-Maza
Your Organization (Optional)	University of Aberdeen
Date of Assessment	18 September 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					<input type="checkbox"/>
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					<input type="checkbox"/>
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					<input type="checkbox"/>
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					<input type="checkbox"/>
The meeting started on time.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					<input type="checkbox"/>
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					<input type="checkbox"/>
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					<input type="checkbox"/>
There was a general agreement for raised points.					<input type="checkbox"/>
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					<input type="checkbox"/>
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					<input type="checkbox"/>



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....



Project Name	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
Meeting Name	First progress meeting
Date and Time	12 September 2017, 8:30AM - 6:00PM
Place of Meeting	Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria
Your Name (Optional)	Mohamed Orabi
Your Organization (Optional)	Aswan uni.
Date of Assessment	

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.				X	
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.				X	
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.				X	



SGT-MEF(v0.2) Meeting Evaluation Form

Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Comments (Constructive Suggestions):

.....
.....
.....