

# Evaluation of the Environment Agency's workshop programme on Water Protection Zones

---

Final report annexes

Diane Warburton  
April 2009

Appendix 1. Analysis of questionnaires from all internal workshops  
Appendix 2. Questions for interviews



Shared Practice  
11 Clifton Street, Brighton BN1 3PH  
01273 774557  
[www.sharedpractice.org.uk](http://www.sharedpractice.org.uk)

## APPENDIX 1. Evaluation questionnaire analysis

### Environment Agency WPZ internal workshops, March 2009

West Malling (Thanet), 17 March: 29 participants, 28 questionnaires returned (97%)  
 Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading), 18 March: 21 participants, 18 questionnaires returned (86%)  
 Cropston (Birmingham), 19 March: 27 participants, 20 questionnaires returned (74%)  
 Bow Lake (Southampton), 25 March: 20 participants, 17 questionnaires returned (85%)  
 Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading), 26 March: 16 participants, 13 questionnaires returned (81%)

Total 113 participants; total 96 questionnaires returned = 85% return rate

#### 1 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<b>There was enough time to fully discuss the issues properly</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	3 (12%)	17 (65%)	2 (8%)	4 (15%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	5 (29%)	12 (71%)	0	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	1 (5%)	11 (55%)	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	4 (24%)	12 (71%)	0	1 (6%)	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	1 (8%)	8 (62%)	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>14 (15%)</b>	<b>60 (63%)</b>	<b>7 (7%)</b>	<b>12 (13%)</b>	<b>0</b>

#### Comments:

<p><b>West Malling</b> (Thanet)            ID 10) Some topics could not be fully aired            (ID 12) As a starting discussion, not to go into detail            (ID ANON4) Occasionally some discussions would have been good to continue on, but were time restricted            (ID ANON 09) Need longer after Jan's presentation</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading)            (ID 06) Difficult to equate urban and agricultural approaches            (ID 10) More information prior to workshop</p>
<p><b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham)            (ID 03) Needed a bit longer for some sections            (ID 10) 10 mins more per session would be ideal            (ID 13) Could have started at 10.00 to give more time            (ID 14) Possibly</p>
<p><b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton)            (ID10) More time to get into the specifics of all the pollution sources</p>
<p><b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading)            (ID 07) On the 3 sites we discussed - the remaining 2 were rushed            (ID ANON 01) Getting such useful people together should have been given more time</p>

<b>There was sufficient relevant information</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	5 (19%)	17 (26%)	4 (15%)	1 (4%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	1 (6%)	9 (53%)	5 (29%)	2 (12%)	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	1 (5%)	11 (55%)	4 (20%)	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	2 (12%)	7 (41%)	5 (29%)	3 (18%)	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	1 (8%)	7 (58%)	4 (33%)	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>10 (10%)</b>	<b>51 (53%)</b>	<b>22 (23%)</b>	<b>6 (6%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<p><b>West Malling (Thanet)</b>            (ID 05) Very good presentation from Jan!!            (ID 12) Lots of information to take in            (ID 15) Big subject - would take a long time to go through...            (ID ANON 04) Some of the workshop tasks were slow to move with, it wasn't quick to understand what was being asked            (ID ANON 13) More on links to other environmental aspects such as surface WQ, coastal WQ, quantity would be useful</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b>            (ID 06) Lack of clarity from HO on mechanisms            (ID ANON 02) Local info, but unsure if all the process and background adequate            (ID ANON 03) Although a lack of evidence for the Cherwell designation made decision making all hypothetical            (ID ANON 04) Difficult as WPZ concept still in infancy            (ID ANON 06) Would have preferred a bit more information on what the project is doing and how</p>
<p><b>Cropston (Birmingham)</b>            (ID 01) Information on the process following workshop not clear and conflict between choice of candidate prior to workshop and demonstrating evidence of failure of all other options            (ID 15) In terms of other potential WPZ in Midlands</p>
<p><b>Bow Lake (Southampton)</b>            (ID1) More background information for participants unfamiliar with catchment (issues)            (ID10) Need more info e.g. photos, tour of site, maps            (ANON01) Good background on WPZ's but not much on Bow Lake itself - my knowledge of it is limited            (ANON04) Geology map showing clay boundary would be useful, more information and examples on the types of measure we can implement in a WPZ            (ANON05) Need copies of presentation handouts            (ANON07) I think more information on the flow and rainfall and WQ data should have been available to read through.</p>
<p><b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)</b>            (ID 07) As this is a new subject to me this was a learning exercise for me            (ID ANON 02) Could have used rain data</p>

<b>The purpose of the workshop, and how the results would be used was clear</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	5 (18%)	16 (57%)	3 (11%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	0	9 (60%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	1 (5%)	15 (79%)	3 (16%)	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	2 (12%)	13 (76%)	2 (12%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	1 (8%)	9 (75%)	2 (17%)	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>9 (9%)</b>	<b>62 (65%)</b>	<b>13 (14%)</b>	<b>6 (6%)</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>

**Comments:**

<p><b>West Malling (Thanet)</b>            (ID 03) Wasn't clear how the results will be used until asked at the end            (ID 12) Did not try to go too far            (ID ANON 01) Not clear that the results were being collected or where they were going            (ID ANON 03) Clarify at start            (ID ANON 09) Needed to clarify outputs of meeting - what would happen to suggestions            (ID ANON 11) Purpose of workshop - agree. Results used - disagree</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b>            (ID 07) Not clear on how results will be used. Clear on purpose            (ID 11) Not sure how results will be used</p>
<p><b>Cropston (Birmingham)</b>            None</p>
<p><b>Bow Lake (Southampton)</b>            None</p>

**Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)**  
None

<b>There were enough opportunities for participants to raise issues / questions</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	7 (26%)	19 (70%)	0	1 (4%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	4 (24%)	13 (76%)	0	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	6 (30%)	11 (55%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	8 (47%)	9 (53%)	0	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	2 (15%)	11 (85%)	0	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>27 (28%)</b>	<b>63 (66%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling (Thanet)</b> (ID 12) Good opportunity but some voices may have been lost (ID ANON 11) Not enough question time. People being cut short
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b> (ID 06) Obvious lack of understanding of some issues
<b>Cropston (Birmingham)</b> (ID 10) Nearly!
<b>Bow Lake (Southampton)</b> None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)</b> None

<b>What participants were expected to do and contribute was clear</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	1 (4%)	18 (67%)	3 (11%)	5 (19%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	2 (12%)	14 (82%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	4 (20%)	14 (70%)	2 (10%)	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	5 (29%)	10 (59%)	2 (12%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	2 (15%)	10 (77%)	0	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>14 (15%)</b>	<b>66 (69%)</b>	<b>8 (8%)</b>	<b>5 (5%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling (Thanet)</b> (ID 13) There was concern in the mapping session and good practice session - needs to be ironed out (ID ANON 04) Workshops > explained in 2nd comment (ID ANON 09) Group working not very clear
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b> (ID ANON 02) Not completely sure why I was here in my capacity
<b>Cropston (Birmingham)</b> None
<b>Bow Lake (Southampton)</b> None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)</b> None

<b>All participants were treated equally and respectfully</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	16 (62%)	10 (38%)	0	0	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	5 (29%)	12 (71%)	0	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	9 (50%)	9 (50%)	0	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	9 (53%)	8 (47%)	0	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	3 (23%)	10 (77%)	0	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>42 (44%)</b>	<b>49 (51%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling</b> (Thanet) (ID 04) Yes, very open and up-front
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading) None
<b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham) None
<b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton) None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading) None

<b>The facilitation and design of the workshop ensured fair and full discussions</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	10 (38%)	14 (54%)	2 (8%)	0	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	6 (35%)	10 (59%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	9 (45%)	8 (40%)	3 (15%)	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	8 (47%)	9 (53%)	0	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	3 (23%)	10 (77%)	0	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>36 (38%)</b>	<b>51 (53%)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling</b> (Thanet) (ID 04) Clear and encouraging (ID ANON 04) Discussions > explained in 1st comment (ID ANON 09) Mostly - but rushed at times. Q&A as a room most useful
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading) (ID 06) Could have done with better maps (ID ANON 02) Discussions were already set, so difficult to be open up to something else, but kept to subject.
<b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham) (ID 03) Needed longer in places
<b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton) None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading) None

<b>There were opportunities for participants to influence EA decisions on WPZs</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	5 (19%)	18 (67%)	3 (11%)	0	1 (4%)
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	0	7 (44%)	5 (31%)	4 (25%)	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	2 (11%)	10 (56%)	3 (17%)	3 (17%)	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	2 (12%)	10 (59%)	5 (29%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	2 (15%)	8 (62%)	3 (23%)	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>11 (11%)</b>	<b>53 (55%)</b>	<b>19 (20%)</b>	<b>7 (7%)</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>

#### Comments:

<p><b>West Malling (Thanet)</b>  (ID 03) Opportunities to talk yes, but have we influenced national design in reality?  (ID 12) This may not have come across but we are in listening mode  (ID ANON 03) Needs to be clarified  (ID ANON 04) This is dependent upon how the information from today is processed</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b>  (ID 04) Would like Dave Tobias to have stayed in the afternoon to answer questions  (ID 06) To early to say  (ID 08) No national presence in on Cherwell Discussion group  (ID 11) Hope so!  (ID 12) Unsure how much influence this workshop has on National decisions  (ID ANON 02) Not too sure if we had a platform to do this  (ID ANON 03) To early to tell</p>
<p><b>Cropston (Birmingham)</b>  (ID 03) Needed more evidence on hand to avoid 'finger in the air' decisions  (ID 12) As long as feedback taken back to decision makers at EA and Defra</p>
<p><b>Bow Lake (Southampton)</b>  (ID9) Remains to be seen</p>
<p><b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)</b>  None</p>

<b>I understand the EA thinking on WPZs better as a result of attending this workshop</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	8 (32%)	12 (48%)	5 (20%)	0	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	0	10 (59%)	5 (29%)	2 (12%)	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	4 (20%)	15 (75%)	0	1 (5%)	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	5 (29%)	9 (53%)	2 (12%)	1 (6%)	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	3 (25%)	8 (67%)	1 (8%)	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>20 (21%)</b>	<b>54 (56%)</b>	<b>13 (14%)</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>	<b>0</b>

#### Comments:

<p><b>West Malling (Thanet)</b>  (ID ANON 07) Too well</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b>  (ID 01) Insufficient clarity on what EA thinking is – i.e. what is actually new with WPZ's?  (ID 04) But the issue lacks clarity  (ID 06) More confused i.e. no additional resources  (ID 07) Probably had more prior knowledge than others  (ID 08) But still early days anyway – not clear what a WPZ will be / work.  (ID 11) Not clear on Head Office thinking on decision making re catchments  (ID ANON 02) I can see why we may do this but did so before, hasn't added much more  (ID ANON 03) I knew the reasoning beforehand</p>

<b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham) (ID 12) Some points of clarification made
<b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton) (ID6) Still a bit confused but that's because early stages in WPZ process
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading) None

<b>I am more enthusiastic and committed to the WPZ concept after the workshop</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	7 (26%)	11 (41%)	6 (22%)	3 (11%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	0	4 (24%)	12 (71%)	1 (6%)	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	0	13 (65%)	6 (30%)	1 (5%)	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	3 (18%)	10 (59%)	4 (24%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	0	4 (31%)	8 (62%)	1 (8%)	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>10 (10%)</b>	<b>42 (44%)</b>	<b>36 (38%)</b>	<b>6 (6%)</b>	<b>0</b>

### Comments:

<p><b>West Malling</b> (Thanet) (ID 12) Not sure about this as an advocacy (ID 15) Depends! In theory good idea but more legislation - more complication and tight timescale (ID ANON 01) Did not come across as something in line with Hampton (ID ANON 04) As the detailed direction for WPZ is still unclear (ID ANON 11) More and more doubts and gaps the more discussion there is, not enough answers</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading) (ID 06) Difficult to see how WPZ will operate in urban setting (ID 07) Unsure about concept due to uncertainty about ability to enforce measures (ID 08) Depends on whether the evidence base enables this (ID 11) I think more evidence needed – perhaps in 5 years (ID ANON 02) Really need to sit down in the area to thrash this out (ID ANON 03) I need to see one in action first</p>
<p><b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham) (ID 03) But see some issues / problems with this concept too (ID 10) But still many issues to be resolved (ID 12) Think it's too early. In 5 years time we will be in a better position (ID 13) I think co-operative approaches need more time (ID 15) Need to address decision making process</p>
<p><b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton) None</p>
<p><b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading) None</p>

<b>Facilitated workshops like this are a useful way of learning and developing understanding</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	13 (48%)	12 (44%)	2 (7%)	0	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	5 (29%)	8 (47%)	3 (18%)	0	1 (6%)
Cropston (Birmingham)	6 (30%)	13 (65%)	1 (5%)	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	6 (35%)	10 (59%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	2 (15%)	10 (77%)	1 (8%)	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>32 (33%)</b>	<b>53 (55%)</b>	<b>8 (8%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling</b> (Thanet) (ID 04) Yes, very direct (ID 12) Necessary development of the concept (ID ANON 04) Workshops good for brainstorming, not necessarily develop understanding (ID ANON 09) Unsure about value of 'facilitation'
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading) None
<b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham) (ID 01) Didn't need to be facilitated (ID 08) Could be facilitated by EA staff
<b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton) None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading) None

<b>The venue contributed to a comfortable and productive working atmosphere</b>	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West Malling (Thanet)	7 (26%)	18 (59%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	5 (29%)	12 (71%)	0	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	7 (35%)	9 (45%)	4 (20%)	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	5 (29%)	11 (65%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	3 (23%)	7 (54%)	1 (8%)	2 (15%)	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>27 (28%)</b>	<b>47 (49%)</b>	<b>9 (9%)</b>	<b>3 (3%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling</b> (Thanet) (ID 02) Had some good background knowledge before the workshop (ID 12) Venue was fine (ID 15) Not bad, but not the best... (ID ANON 09) Tables better for group working vs. discussion
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading) (ID 09) Chairs a bit uncomfortable to sit on for a long time.
<b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham) (ID 13) The venue was too hot and stuffy
<b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton) (ID9) Good space, but poorly lit.
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading) (ID 01) Air con noise made hearing difficult (ID 05) Noise from air conditioning (ID ANON 01) Noise from air conditioning made it difficult to hear

**General comments:**

<b>West Malling</b> (Thanet) (ID 09) Good pitch considering not everyone has a full understanding of the problem
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading) None
<b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham) None
<b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton) None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading) (ID 02) High level of background noise in the room from equipment e.g. projector

## 2

## How satisfied were you with the workshop overall

	Very satisfied	Quite satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied	Don't know
West Malling (Thanet)	10 (37%)	15 (56%)	1 (4%)	0	1 (4%)
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	2 (11%)	14 (78%)	2 (11%)	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	7 (37%)	12 (63%)	0	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	4 (27%)	11 (73%)	0	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	4 (31%)	9 (69%)	0	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>27 (28%)</b>	<b>61 (64%)</b>	<b>3 (3%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>

## Comments:

<p><b>West Malling</b> (Thanet)            (ID 02) Useful engagement with a number of staff            (ID 12) Lots of questions but excellent to get initial views            (ID ANON 11) No further conclusions made as to where this project will be taken forward, no conclusions made into measures, just more and more questions raised</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading)            (ID 06) No reflection of above on facilitators</p>
<p><b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham)            (ID 03) Filled a knowledge gap for me</p>
<p><b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton)            None</p>
<p><b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading)            None</p>

## 3

## Which parts of the workshop did you find useful?

<b>Presentation by the Project Team introducing WPZs</b>	Very useful	Quite useful	Neither	Not very useful	Not at all useful
West Malling (Thanet)	16 (59%)	11 (41%)	0	0	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	4 (24%)	11 (65%)	2 (12%)	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	10 (50%)	10 (50%)	0	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	13 (76%)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	9 (69%)	4 (31%)	0	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>52 (54%)</b>	<b>39 (41%)</b>	<b>3 (3%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Comments:

<p><b>West Malling</b> (Thanet)            None</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading)            None</p>
<p><b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham)            None</p>
<p><b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton)            (ANON04) More information / examples on actual measures we can use</p>
<p><b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading)            None</p>

<b>Presentation by the Regional lead on the WPZ(s) in your area</b>	Very useful	Quite useful	Neither	Not very useful	Not at all useful
West Malling (Thanet)	18 (66%)	9 (33%)	0	0	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	6 (38%)	10 (62%)	0	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	13 (68%)	6 (32%)	0	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	9 (53%)	8 (47%)	0	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	7 (58%)	5 (42%)	0	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>53 (55%)</b>	<b>38 (40%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling</b> (Thanet) (ID 05) Very good!!
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading) (ID 05) N/A
<b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham) (ID 07) Couldn't comment!
<b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton) (ID9) Too technical for my level of understanding, probably fine for most! (ANON04) Need to explain graphs more / better
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading) None

<b>Q &amp;A sessions on presentations</b>	Very useful	Quite useful	Neither	Not very useful	Not at all useful
West Malling (Thanet)	10 (38%)	14 (54%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	6 (35%)	10 (59%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	10 (50%)	10 (50%)	0	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	10 (59%)	7 (41%)	0	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	6 (46%)	7 (54%)	0	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>42 (44%)</b>	<b>48 (50%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling</b> (Thanet) (ID ANON 09) Needed more time
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading) (ID ANON 02) Don't think we really got a consensus of opinion, confused issue more
<b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham) None
<b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton) None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading) None

<b>Discussion of data about the WPZ and its potential boundaries</b>	Very useful	Quite useful	Neither	Not very useful	Not at all useful
West Malling (Thanet)	8 (32%)	12 (48%)	4 (16%)	1 (4%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	4 (25%)	6 (38%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	9 (47%)	9 (47%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	8 (47%)	8 (47%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	4 (33%)	7 (58%)	1 (8%)	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>33 (34%)</b>	<b>42 (44%)</b>	<b>10 (10%)</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<p><b>West Malling</b> (Thanet)  (ID 13) We didn't discuss boundaries  (ID 14) Sat out - sorry!  (ID 15) Not really enough time to discuss fully so question a bit unfair  (ID ANON 03) (N/A) column  (ID ANON 09) Aim unclear</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading)  (ID ANON 03) Hindered by lack of evidence</p>
<p><b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham)  (ID 03) N/A</p>
<p><b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton)  (ID6) More data may have been more useful, but then again may have been too much.  (ANON07) I don't think it was clearly available to all conclusive discussion.</p>
<p><b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading)  (ID 01) Groundwater issues needs clear understanding of geology to impose boundaries especially where agriculture involved</p>

<b>Discussion on potential for regulation</b>	Very useful	Quite useful	Neither	Not very useful	Not at all useful
West Malling (Thanet)	6 (23%)	18 (69%)	2 (8%)	0	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	4 (24%)	6 (35%)	5 (29%)	2 (12%)	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	6 (30%)	9 (45%)	3 (15%)	2 (10%)	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	5 (29%)	9 (53%)	3 (18%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	4 (33%)	7 (58%)	1 (8%)	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>25 (26%)</b>	<b>49 (51%)</b>	<b>14 (15%)</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<p><b>West Malling</b> (Thanet)  (ID 14) Sat out - sorry!  (ID ANON 09) Aim unclear</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee</b> (Reading)  None</p>
<p><b>Cropston</b> (Birmingham)  (ID ANON 05) As the individuals our group didn't have the background knowledge of best practises. Also, groups could have been divided more evenly</p>
<p><b>Bow Lake</b> (Southampton)  None</p>
<p><b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane</b> (Reading)  None</p>

<b>Session to pick up outstanding issues and questions</b>	Very useful	Quite useful	Neither	Not very useful	Not at all useful
West Malling (Thanet)	7 (27%)	16 (62%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	4 (25%)	7 (44%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	5 (28%)	9 (50%)	4 (22%)	0	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	9 (53%)	7 (41%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	3 (23%)	6 (46%)	4 (31%)	0	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>28 (29%)</b>	<b>45 (47%)</b>	<b>15 (16%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling (Thanet)</b> (ID 12) Not present
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b> None
<b>Cropston (Birmingham)</b> None
<b>Bow Lake (Southampton)</b> None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)</b> None

<b>Final session on communication and next steps</b>	Very useful	Quite useful	Neither	Not very useful	Not at all useful
West Malling (Thanet)	8 (32%)	13 (52%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	0
Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)	0	3 (100%)	0	0	0
Cropston (Birmingham)	3 (17%)	11 (61%)	1 (6%)	3 (17%)	0
Bow Lake (Southampton)	3 (23%)	9 (69%)	1 (8%)	0	0
Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)	3 (27%)	4 (36%)	3 (27%)	1 (9%)	0
<b>Combined result</b>	<b>17 (18%)</b>	<b>40 (42%)</b>	<b>7 (7%)</b>	<b>7 (7%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Comments:**

<b>West Malling (Thanet)</b> (ID 03) Didn't recognise us doing this (ID 13) Did not happen! > Short (ID ANON 03) read this - delete (ID ANON 11) No next step made (ID ANON 12) Unclear - but once the scribe's notes have been circulated it will be really helpful to consider all the points discussed afresh
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b> None
<b>Cropston (Birmingham)</b> (ID ANON 01) Not enough time
<b>Bow Lake (Southampton)</b> None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)</b> None

**General comments:**

<b>West Malling (Thanet)</b> None
<b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b> None
<b>Cropston (Birmingham)</b> None
<b>Bow Lake (Southampton)</b> None
<b>Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)</b> None

**4 What were the best aspects of the workshop for you?**

<p><b>West Malling (Thanet)</b>            (ID 01) Points of discussion in small groups on further / enhanced regulation            (ID 02) Feedback and questions from other participants            (ID 04) The science behind Thanet's selection for WPZ status and background            (ID 05) The discussions and Jan's presentation            (ID 06) An ability to offer differing views on the creation of something that is not finalised            (ID 07) Discussions on timing and how it would achieve our overall objectives            (ID 08) Understanding evidence base            (ID 09) Better knowledge developed            (ID 10) Opportunity to hear and discuss different views            (ID 11) Chance to discuss with technical colleagues            (ID 12) Getting feedback from local staff            (ID 13) Presentation by the regions            (ID 14) Hearing the local perspective and local officers concerns            (ID 16) Jan's presentation            (ID ANON 01) Initial presentation            (ID ANON 04) Presentation on Thanet groundwater            (ID ANON 08) Understanding of process            (ID ANON 09) First 2 presentations and Q&amp;A session afterwards            (ID ANON 10) Good opportunity for discussion            (ID ANON 11) Having project management to question            (ID ANON 12) Different specialists views / contributions and discussion            (ID ANON 13) Initial presentations            (ID ANON 14) All good</p>
<p><b>Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)</b>            (ID 01) Dialogue            (ID 02) Learning and understanding about the aims and process of WPZ designation            (ID 03) General presentations            (ID 04) Group discussions and discussions on measures (which showed gaps in the process)            (ID 05) The opportunity to listen/discuss views of others            (ID 06) Opportunity to discuss various issues            (ID 07) Input from colleagues with knowledge of agricultural practices            (ID 08) Discussion groups to exchange ideas from different regional staff → passive monitoring suggestion            (ID 09) Clarification of what a WPZ is            (ID 10) Declaration of problems            (ID 11) Good participation by all            (ID 12) Better understanding how WPZ relates to Cherwell Catchment            (ID ANON 01) Finding out about WPZs            (ID ANON 02) Discussion periods during Q&amp;A            (ID ANON 03) Getting ideas from others and general discussions            (ID ANON 04) Discussion on implementation: opens up greater dialogue between EA departments            (ID ANON 05) Discussing ideas with colleagues and getting new ideas about what could be done to solve the problem            (ID ANON 06) Presentations and Q&amp;A's + WPZ boundary discussions.</p>
<p><b>Cropston (Birmingham)</b>            (ID 01) Explanation of evidence of failure and awareness of WPZ requirements</p>

(ID 02) Cropston  
 (ID 03) Learnt a lot about WPZs - useful discussions with people from different parts of EA  
 (ID 04) Came with no knowledge of WPZ but now I have a good idea  
 (ID 05) The local workshop  
 (ID 07) Q&A discussions  
 (ID 08) Better understanding of where we are for WPZs  
 (ID 09) Increasing WPZ awareness. Know more about Cropston  
 (ID 10) Presentations and discussions  
 (ID 11) Discussion  
 (ID 13) Understanding how WPZ can be used  
 (ID 14) Opportunity to discuss with Area / Regional / National leads  
 (ID 15) Discussion by all delegates on Land Management  
 (ID 16) Discussion of local issues at Cropston with all relevant team members present  
 (ID ANON 01) Meeting other people with same interests  
 (ID ANON 02) Alan Rees' presentation. How are we going to implement  
 (ID ANON 03) Cropston issues  
 (ID ANON 04) Ability to input / discuss. Facilitation helped  
 (ID ANON 05) Better understanding of WPZs through discussions and Q&A sessions

**Bow Lake (Southampton)**

(ID1) Debating value of WPZ to achieve WQ improvements  
 (ID2) Break out sessions on what WPZ's add was very useful  
 (ID 3) Potential to reverse negative inputs and degradation of catchment and protection of catchment in future  
 (ID 4) Coordinated approach  
 (ID 5) Interactions / sharing of ideas  
 (ID 6) Understanding the catchment better  
 (ID 7) Understanding complexity of issues and why area haven't managed to take forward  
 (ID 9) Understanding how WPZ could be used, and process in getting to point of designating WPZ  
 (ID 10) For everyone to get together and talk about the issues of the bow lake.  
 (ANON 01) Learning more about the WPZ process and potential impacts and focussing on a broad range of specialists on the problems of the Bow Lake  
 (ANON 02) Discussion sessions actually looking at the issues on the ground  
 (ANON 03) Working within groups - discussing issues on Bow Lake. Presentations - very useful  
 (ANON 05) Understanding how WPZs will compliment existing regulation and voluntary initiatives  
 (ANON 06) Context with region re WPZ  
 (ANON 07) Discussion

**Fogham Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)**

(ID 02) Being able to influence WPZ policy. Understanding the process for defining WPZs  
 (ID 03) Discussing local WPZ. Good Head, regional and local office input  
 (ID 05) A better understanding of WPZ  
 (ID 07) Getting a better understanding about WPZ  
 (ID 08) Good maps and data  
 (ID 10) Fogham Down discussion  
 (ID ANON 01) Other people's input - very informative  
 (ID ANON 02) Discussion  
 (ID ANON 03) Discussion sections - bringing up the issues

5

**What were the worst aspects of the workshop for you (e.g. was there anything missing)?**

**West Malling (Thanet)**

(ID 01) No  
 (ID 02) None  
 (ID 04) Looking forward to the next National step / direction  
 (ID 06) None  
 (ID 07) Not linked as closely to meeting WFD compliance as I'd have expected / hoped  
 (ID 08) The break out session introduction could have been clearer  
 (ID 11) Not enough on how to work with others (external stakeholders) e.g. WFD provider model  
 (ID 12) Always do more but no major criticisms, except lack of focus on proportionate risk based needs  
 (ID 13) I think the mapping sessions need more time and we didn't make boundaries  
 (ID ANON 01) Purpose wasn't initially clear, felt a bit standalone  
 (ID ANON 04) The map with dots  
 (ID ANON 09) Group working - not organised and aim unclear

(ID ANON 13) Lack of clarity around what the first breakout (with maps) was supposed to do. No local knowledge in our group was a significant handicap  
(ID ANON 14) None

**Cherwell and Lower Lee** (Reading)

(ID 01) Lack of clarity on new provisions of regs  
(ID 02) Discussing boundaries and sources of pollution without the evidence of where the specific problems are (Lower Lee)  
(ID 03) Group discussions  
(ID 05) Having to sit in either the Lee or Cherwell group  
(ID 06) Lack of clarity. Perhaps its too early  
(ID 08) More national presence to understand the local issues from us  
(ID 09) Still very early days in the development of WPZs so lots of unknowns e.g. regulations, measure we may / able to use, what the difference being designated means... enforcement  
(ID 10) Legislation changes – i.e. bylaws. Councils – important /vital participation  
(ID 11) Unclear as to whether these are pilots. Unclear what is main driver i.e. environmental / drinking water. If not, why other important sites e.g. Lem not put forward?  
(ID 12) Still unsure whether this is pilot project, message conflicts with other information given by National.  
(ID ANON 01) Too long and over analysing feedback form!  
(ID ANON 02) ?  
(ID ANON 03) Process was rushed so we did not have time to properly gather evidence  
(ID ANON 04) Lack of clarity on how 'enforcement' will be delivered  
(ID ANON 05) Not much information on the process of how Head Office consult with area colleagues

**Cropston** (Birmingham)

(ID 01) That WPZ designation may be based on decisions made in 2/3 weeks based on intuition rather than evidence  
(ID 02) No  
(ID 03) Not quite enough time - could have done with data to support the non-Cropston discussion groups  
(ID 05) Nothing missing but showed how essential sampling is for future data  
(ID 07) N/A  
(ID 08) Too little time  
(ID 09) Difficult and complex subject how to implement a WPZ on the ground  
(ID 10) Muffins were too big!  
(ID 11) No  
(ID 13) Venue  
(ID 14) Nothing on potential measures that would suit Cropston and evidence of our work was missing  
(ID 15) N/A  
(ID 16) Lack of clarity re. actions I need to take locally as a result of discussions (if any)  
(ID ANON 01) Too rushed  
(ID ANON 02) Lack of time  
(ID ANON 03) Potential regulation  
(ID ANON 04) Too much information over a very short space of time  
(ID ANON 05) Not enough discussion. Also, I would have been interested in learning more about Cropston

**Bow Lake** (Southampton)

(ID1) Frustration of resource issues  
(ID2) More needed on resources  
(ID 3) No  
(ID 4) Not enough information on steps taken so far  
(ID 5) No  
(ANON 02) Ultimately decisions could be with people higher up (e.g. AMT) needed representation from them to get their point of view  
(ANON 03) Didn't get to discuss all possible issues on Bow Lake. What benefits would a WPZ bring was unclear. Unsure of causes of pollution to Bow Lake.  
(ANON 05) Not sure what happens next  
(ANON 06) Why was Bow Lake selected  
(ANON 07) Finalising of action planning - wasn't clear who was leading on this - especially if WPZ gets rejected

**Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane** (Reading)

(ID 02) Little or no reference to WPZs related to built development  
(ID 03) Still unclear on some head office issues  
(ID 05) At times people's voices masked by air conditioning noise  
(ID 07) Not being fully aware of what I was supposed to do  
(ID 10) From WFD practice to regulation - very difficult identifying measures  
(ID ANON 01) None  
(ID ANON 02) Rushed at times  
(ID ANON 03) More local area views on some of the specific sites - field EA workers

## What was the most important benefit to you of attending the workshop?

### West Malling (Thanet)

- (ID 01) Understanding WPZs and the benefit it may bring to Thanet
- (ID 02) Understanding other people's concerns / views / questions
- (ID 03) The opportunity to talk to the leads about the area, and hopefully, to influence inclusion of communication and influencing benefits being as great as regulatory through a designation. And opportunity to show leadership on how EA adapts Hampton guidelines
- (ID 04) Right people in one room, talking about the future
- (ID 06) An understanding of the intentions of a WPZ
- (ID 07) To keep in touch with the current progress and thinking on this candidate WPZ
- (ID 08) Hearing other views
- (ID 09) Gaining an understanding of WPZ
- (ID 10) Better understanding of WPZ and networking
- (ID 11) Learning more about the issues and perspectives of other colleagues
- (ID 12) Getting area awareness
- (ID 13) Came to know about Thanet issues better
- (ID 14) Seeing the link to wider concerns on tackling diffuse pollution and sensing how we could tap into that
- (ID 15) Greater understanding of WPZ and the issues involved and experiences of those on the ground
- (ID ANON 01) None
- (ID ANON 04) Gives me a bigger picture that my work will contribute to
- (ID ANON 08) Understanding how WPZ can be incorporated into work
- (ID ANON 09) Increased knowledge of Thanet issues
- (ID ANON 10) Greater understanding of WPZ
- (ID ANON 11) Seeing the problems with implementation
- (ID ANON 12) Rounded perspective on the range of issues
- (ID ANON 13) Increased understanding of the potential within the wider environment and regen challenge in Thanet
- (ID ANON 14) Understanding potential benefit / use of WPZ

### Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)

- (ID 01) Dialogue
- (ID 02) I'm in a better position to contribute to WPZ process in the future, especially in terms of evidence gathering
- (ID 03) Improved awareness
- (ID 04) Finding out from Head Office about WPZs. Also finding out other departments views and level of understanding
- (ID 05) To gain a better understanding of the work in progress
- (ID 06) Discuss issues / explore solutions
- (ID 07) Got better understanding of the issues affecting the Cherwell catchment
- (ID 08) Suggestions to assist the project → evidence base, data collection
- (ID 09) Knowing who's dealing with what and what's going on and trying to see if any of my day job / my team can help in delivering better environment outcomes
- (ID 10) United approach to problems.
- (ID 11) Understanding about the Lee catchment
- (ID 12) As question 4
- (ID ANON 01) Discussing diffuse pollution areas on Lower Lee in a wider group
- (ID ANON 02) Knowing that we are probably going to have to have a strong look at resource issues and how we are going to be able to regulate
- (ID ANON 03) Gaining ideas on evidence gaps we need to fill to put the Cherwell forward for a WPZ
- (ID ANON 04) Overview
- (ID ANON 05) Got some ideas on monitoring equipment, which is available. Useful to have chance to just brainstorm the problem and plenty of time for group discussion very important.
- (ID ANON 06) Bit more understanding WPZ, and need to support project to make it happen in the Lower Lee

### Cropston (Birmingham)

- (ID 01) Better understanding
- (ID 02) More overall information
- (ID 03) Good to get Head Office / region-wide perspective on this issue right at the beginning of the WPZ process - not half-way through which is often the way it happens
- (ID 05) The purpose of WPZs and how it will work was further explained
- (ID 07) Better understanding of issues to be addressed before WPZ designation
- (ID 08) Better understanding of where we are for WPZs
- (ID 09) Overall awareness of WPZ issues
- (ID 10) Understand N
- (ID 11) Opportunity to learn and perhaps influence
- (ID 13) Understanding the importance of achieving improvements through a variety of methods
- (ID 15) Tremendous as EM lead in Region on Land Management / Agriculture

(ID 16) Understanding of the scope of WPZ and potential as a regulatory tool  
(ID ANON 03) Awareness  
(ID ANON 04) Understanding WPZs better, ability to input into process or get information from process  
(ID ANON 05) Understanding WPZs

**Bow Lake (Southampton)**

(ID1) Working with allies and a joint approach to a long lived problem  
(ID2) Better understanding of Bow Lake  
(ID 3) A much better understanding of WPZ and how potentially beneficial it could be  
(ID 4) Ideas for way forward  
(ID 5) Gaining understanding of WPZ process  
(ID 6) Same as 4  
(ID 7) Application of Effort that will be required to both designate WPZ and investigate failing waterbodies  
(ID 9) To see the range of people involved in this work and making contacts  
(ID 10) To learn others thoughts and issues  
(ANON 01) Greater knowledge about WPZ's and potential benefits  
(ANON 02) Learned more about process involved in large scale discussion groups. Learned more about issues on Bow Lake.  
(ANON 03) Finding out more about what a WPZ would mean. Finding out more about Bow Lake.  
(ANON 04) Better understanding of the process  
(ANON 05) As 4, with respect to engaging with farmers in a voluntary approach  
(ANON 06) Context with region re WPZ  
(ANON 07) Understanding WPZ

**Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane (Reading)**

(ID 02) Being able to contribute to the WPZ process  
(ID 03) Good to communicate between local and head office (Defra)  
(ID 04) Better understanding of WPZ project  
(ID 07) Learning how such workshops work  
(ID 10) Gauging our level of preparedness for taking WPZs forward  
(ID ANON 01) Meeting new people  
(ID ANON 03) Better understanding of what WPZ are trying to achieve

7

**Do you have any other comments?**

**West Malling (Thanet)**

(ID 01) Very useful and informative. Good mixture of people from across Environment Agency  
(ID 02) Since morphology is a consideration, an overview of WPZs may need to be given to those functions within the Environment Agency who affect the morphology of surface water based WPZs (e.g. waterways staff!)  
(ID 06) No  
(ID 07) No, not yet  
(ID 08) No  
(ID 11) Facilitators lost a group during the breakout session? Chance to view each others group notes (carousel) might have been useful?  
(ID ANON 08) At start of the day WPZ considered a good 'stick'. However, after discussions around 'will this make a difference to what we do' the group didn't conclude how far we should push regulation  
(ID ANON 09) Better group discussion re. general WPZ concerns

**Cherwell and Lower Lee (Reading)**

(ID 04) Would have liked longer Head Office involvement  
(ID 05) Very well run workshop  
(ID 06) Need guidance or quality extent of evidence  
(ID 08) Not ready for external workshops → need time to collect data on where exactly and how getting to river to know what measures to put in place  
(ID 10) We need to be clear before external consultation  
(ID ANON 03) No

**Cropston (Birmingham)**

(ID 09) Need to make people aware that unless try to designate WPZ don't bring all issues together and look what extra measure actions could be taken - therefore still lots of benefits even if WPZ is not designated  
(ID 15) N/A

**Bow Lake (Southampton)**

(ID1) What about Pledges for Participants to sign up to  
(ID 3) No

(ID 4) Sometimes not clear why we were doing things in discussions (link to 2)  
(ID 6) Thought it was very useful workshop overall  
(ID 7) Ensuring resource allocation key HO/AMT issue  
(ANON 03) Good to meet other colleagues and discuss all concerns / issues. Concerned this could mean more work for already extremely busy EA team.

**Fognam Down and Boxhalls Lane** (Reading)

(ID 04) How to gather evidence? Who is going to pay for it? Time scale? Is it going to be model base scenario?  
(ID 08) Need clarification of policy i.e. will a WPZ be imposed to manage future risk? - this is not what we've been told before!

## NOTES

- The percentages shown in response to each question are only of the total number who answered that question.
- The overall percentages shown in the total boxes in each case are of the total number of completed questionnaires.

## **APPENDIX 2. QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS**

Interview questions for participants (Environment Agency staff only)

### **Process**

- 1 Why did you attend the workshop? Did it provide what you wanted from it? Please explain.
- 2 How well did the design and delivery of the workshop work (time available, information provided, facilitation, the right people there)?
- 3 What worked best and should be done again if the workshops are repeated around the country?
- 4 What worked less well and should be changed / dropped if the workshops are repeated around the country?
- 5 Is there anything else that would have improved the workshop?
- 6 Do you think that workshops like this are a good way of sharing knowledge and exploring issues, or not? Please explain what is good and not good about this way of working in your view.
- 7 Do you think this workshop was held at the right time in terms of where the Environment Agency thinking has got to on WPZs? Please explain.

### **Impacts**

- 8 How much did you know about WPZs before the workshop? A lot / quite a bit / not much / nothing?
- 9 Do you feel you know and understand more about the Agency's proposals for WPZs as a result of attending the workshop?
- 10 Do you feel you were able to input your views on the nature of WPZs, their potential boundaries, and implications for regulation?
- 11 Do you feel your input will make a difference to the way WPZs are finally designed and implemented by the Agency?
- 12 Do you feel more enthusiastic and committed to WPZs as a result of attending the workshop?
- 13 What were the most important benefits for you of attending the workshop?

### **Lessons for the future**

- 14 Do you think that this workshop was 'money well spent' or not? Please give details. Is there anything that would have made it better value for money in your view?
- 15 Were the right people in the room, presenting etc?
- 16 How does this facilitated workshop approach compare to the usual way the Environment Agency rolls out these sorts of initiatives?

- 17 Environment Agency staff often facilitate these sorts of internal workshops; what did you think of using external facilitators in this case?
- 18 Can you suggest any specific messages that need to be given to those organising workshops like this? Please say what and why.
- 19 Do you have any other comments?

Many thanks for your help.

Diane Warburton  
31 March 2009