

2nd INTERIM REPORT

An independent assessment of the European Marine Energy Centre Limited (EMEC) stakeholder engagement within the marine energy standards project

Produced by The Environment Council

11th July 2008

Contact: Eva Beresford, External Relations
evab@envcouncil.org.uk
tel: 020 7632 0145

The Environment Council
212 High Holborn
London WC1B 7BF

212 High Holborn
London WC1V 7BF

tel 020 7836 2626

fax 020 7242 1180

email info@envcouncil.org.uk

www.the-environment-council.org.uk

Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary.....	3
2.	Introduction	4
3.	Evaluation methodology.....	5
3.1.	Key aspects of the evaluation methodology to date	5
4.	Analysis	6
4.1.	Participation rates	6
4.2.	Respondent's sectoral breakdown.....	7
4.3.	The credibility of the standards	8
4.4.	The quality of the standards	9
4.5.	Wider Impact of the standards	11
4.6.	Stakeholder engagement and communications.....	12
4.7.	Evaluator observations.....	16
	Appendix 1: full questionnaire.....	17
	Appendix 2: Response Data (non-attributed)	21
	Appendix 3: Stakeholder engagement and evaluation timeline	22

1. Executive Summary

The European Marine Energy Centre (EMEC) is actively involving stakeholders in the development of 13 sets of standards for the marine renewable energy technology industry (the Standards Project).

EMEC has commissioned The Environment Council to conduct an independent evaluation of this stakeholder engagement programme. This document is the second interim report, providing analysis on stakeholder feedback from the third and fourth standards workshops held in April and May 2008. A combined total of 56 stakeholders completed questionnaires at the events.

The aims of the evaluation overall are to integrate learning into the ongoing engagement as well as measure success in terms of the development of robust and widely used standards. Stakeholders were given surveys to complete at each of the workshops. Questions aimed to provide interim feedback on the engagement process as well as measure current stakeholder support for the draft standards. Section 2 provides detailed evaluation objectives, and Appendix 1 contains a blank sample survey.

Key messages from the evaluation relate predominantly to a comparison with the feedback gained at the 2007 standards workshops, illustrating that on the whole, there have been large shifts in a positive direction. In particular:

- the process continues to attract new participants whilst encouraging a majority of stakeholders to continue participating.
- there continues to be a wide sectoral representation, with almost all identified sectors represented.
- fewer stakeholders feel that there is anyone missing from the process now, however some still identify gaps, particularly device developers, insurers and regulators.
- there has been a significant positive increase in the perceived credibility and quality of the standards, and stakeholders are increasingly sure they will use the standards once published.
- the numbers of stakeholders who identified gaps in the standards has reduced considerably.
- satisfaction with the standards workshops remains high.
- a less positive message emerges from feedback about stakeholder communication, both in terms of interim updates from document leaders and issuing draft standards in advance of workshops.
- use of the EMEC website to review and comment on the standards is very high and feedback is generally positive, although some standards were felt to be out of date at certain times.

Please note: This report refers to 'standards' throughout, for simplification purposes, rather than 'guidelines/draft standards'.

2. Introduction

The aim of the Standards Project is to develop 13 sets of standards for the marine renewable energy industry, specifically around tidal and wave technologies. It is intended that they will be iterative and able to be revised. Ideally these standards will become nationally approved standards, with support from the British Standards Institute (BSI).

The objectives of the **stakeholder engagement programme** are to engage relevant industry and academic stakeholders in the development of 13 sets of standards on marine technologies in order to:

- Produce a better, more informed and more credible product
- Engender a sense of ownership from stakeholders and gain their buy-in for the standards
- Increase the profile and therefore use of the standards.

Evaluating the engagement process used to inform and develop the standards will provide evidence to inform future engagement and to measure success as objectively as possible. It also provides an additional opportunity for stakeholders to identify areas for improvement in the standards and generally support their development.

The objectives for the **evaluation** of this engagement programme are to:

1. measure the breadth and number of stakeholders and stakeholder organisations involved in the development of the standards, as an indication of a balanced and robust product
2. measure stakeholder support for the standards as an indication of their credibility, usefulness and quality
3. once the standards are published, measure broader stakeholder awareness and buy-in of the standards as an indication of their credibility, usefulness and quality
4. In addition the evaluation aims to provide EMEC with interim feedback to enable the remaining stakeholder engagement to benefit from any learning.

The evaluation will assess and report on the following measurables:

- Indication of stakeholder buy-in through the number that indicate intent to using the standards.
- A measure of the quality of the standards including:
 - Identification of any gaps or excessive information
 - Analysis of whether or not they are adopted as standards either nationally or internationally by recognised bodies.
- Time-delayed measurement after the standards' publication of how many stakeholders have actually used the guidelines since indicating their intent of doing so.

3. Evaluation methodology

The evaluation programme consists of five sets of questionnaires following on from each of the 4 stakeholder workshops plus a final survey at the end of the process. As with the 2007 workshops, identical questionnaires were used to survey stakeholders who attended the two stakeholder workshops in April and May 2008. This report provides an interim assessment of the evaluation on the basis of data gathered at the 2008 workshops. A final report will be produced after the fifth questionnaire has been carried out, towards the end of 2008. The timing of the final questionnaire depends on the completion of the standards.

3.1. Key aspects of the evaluation methodology to date

- An observer from the evaluation team was present at three of the four stakeholder workshops, making notes on stakeholder participation and gaining informal feedback during breaks. This information was used as a means to reinforce data gained from stakeholder feedback and where relevant, to position feedback in a wider perspective.
- Interim feedback gained is regularly fed back to EMEC to enable changes to the stakeholder engagement process to be put in place.
- Appendix 1 lists the questions asked. *Three new questions were included in the 2008 workshop questionnaire: the first to filter responses to the question about next steps by asking whether the respondent was aware of the next steps before asking for an opinion on them; the second to ensure that returning participants did not state a different sector to previously; the third to enable EMEC to monitor use of their website where the draft standards are posted for feedback.*
- Appendix 2 provides the full response data from the two events (see separate spreadsheet), with names and organisational data removed.
- Analysis of the responses received:

In order to make the analysis easier to read and to better gauge whether the objectives are being met, we have grouped questions into themes as follows:

1. Sectoral Analysis
2. Credibility of the Standards
3. Quality of the Standards
4. Wider impact of the Standards
5. Stakeholder Engagement and Communications

This second interim report differs in this regard from the first interim report, which looked at each question in order and did not explicitly consider themes in the analysis.

The questions are made up of quantitative and qualitative elements. This was done to allow grouping of responses according to numerical scores

whilst allowing for specific and detailed feedback, which will benefit the ongoing engagement process and development of the standards.

- Quantitative questions:

In analysing the quantitative questions, we generated tables showing the numbers of responses for each score at each of the two events. We have also given totals and averages over both events.

Responses to questions 3d, 3e and 3f have been grouped to reflect where people indicated no, yes or possibly. As these questions were not tick boxes, a level of interpretation was applied in some cases where respondents did not clearly state a yes or no.

- Qualitative questions:

Qualitative questions have been used to provide further detail and a deeper understanding of stakeholder views. A summary illustrating the range of comments is given in the analysis. Comments are not quoted verbatim, rather are abbreviated or where similar comments were made, combined.

As with the 2007 workshops, in general our analysis shows there were many similarities and few obvious distinctions between the 2008 events. Where there were differences, we have highlighted them in our analysis.

In analysing the qualitative questions we did not apply a strict key word system or other more systematic analysis. Instead we assessed the full range of responses and grouped them in the most logical way to reflect the range of views expressed. This was done as all feedback can be considered relevant at this stage even if not directly relevant to the evaluation objectives. It is worth noting that some of the document leaders gave relatively low scores to some questions and with others, felt unable to comment. This is partly due to the fact that they feel they are not strictly participants, being part of the facilitation / process team.

4. Analysis

4.1. Participation rates

In total, 56 stakeholders completed an evaluation questionnaire, of whom 26 stakeholders attended the April workshop and 30 attended the May workshop. Of these, 24 were new participants to the process. Note that actual participation was 27 and 46 respectively (total 73), but not all participants completed a questionnaire. This compares to a total of 86 participants at the first two standards workshops, showing a small decline in overall participation.

The data shows that the process has attracted a good number of new participants and encouraged a majority of stakeholders to continue participating, whilst overall seeing a slight reduction in numbers. As can be seen in the following sections, the feedback is generally very positive, so a reduction in numbers may be due to the EMEC website providing an alternative feedback mechanism, as well as

stakeholders feeling generally confident that their needs are being met and so not investing further time in attending events. However, it may be useful to contact non returners as part of the final evaluation exercise to better understand their reasons.

4.2. Respondent's sectoral breakdown

Respondents were asked to indicate the sector(s) they represent, with the exception of returning stakeholders who have already answered this question in a previous workshop (to ensure consistency we have returned to their original self-classification). As with the 2007 workshops, many stakeholders belong to several sectors or do not fit neatly into the sectoral breakdown provided. The list below gives some indication of the range of sectors, however please note that where multiple representation was indicated, only the first sector ticked has been given here. Equally, a few stakeholders ticked 'other' and provided their own categorisation.

<u>Sector</u>	<u>Number of responses</u>		
	2 nd April 2008	20 th May 2008	2007 workshops combined
➤ Academic	1	4	6
➤ Research	2	2	16
➤ Generation	1	2	3
➤ Construction and manufacture	2	2	14
➤ Maintenance			
➤ Non-Government Organisation	1	1	4
➤ Grid connection			1
➤ Sub-sea cabling and transition components	1		1
➤ Consultants	11	12	19
➤ Utilities	3	1	6
➤ Contractors			
➤ Service companies			
➤ Trade Association		2	3
➤ Certification & warranty	1		5
➤ Standards body			1
➤ Government			3
➤ Other:			
➤ Device developer (wave power)	1		
➤ Accreditation/testing	1		
➤ Wave measurement	1		
➤ Testing, engineering & development		3	
➤ Wave energy system development		1	
Total	26	30	82

In terms of assessing evaluation objective 1, a sectoral analysis reveals that there is a wide spread of participation from relevant sectors. Maintenance, contractors and service companies are the only sectors with no representation at all.

At this interim stage it is also useful to consider participants' feedback on where there may be gaps in expertise, detailed in 'the quality of the standards' (Section 4.4). Further analysis of sectors participating in this engagement process will be provided as part of the final report, when an overall assessment of participating organisations can be made.

4.3. The credibility of the standards

- ◆ How credible do you think the marine energy guidelines are?

(Question 3a)

Scale from 1: *Not very credible* to 5: *Highly credible*.

Event	Number of responses for each score					
	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	No score
2 nd April 2008	0	0	5	20	1	0
20 th May 2008	0	2	9	16	2	1
Average	0	1	7	18	1.5	0.5
Total	0	2	14	36	3	1

70% of respondents scored the credibility of the standards highly, giving a 4 or 5. This represents an increase of more than double the score given at the first two workshops (31%), indicating a healthy increase in perception of credibility. Some respondents scored the credibility of the standards at the lower-end of the scale, reasons for which include concerns regarding overlap and repetition in the standards, as well as the standards still being a bit too broad and generalised, and in need of further clarity.

Some of the specific comments include:

- Credibility increasing with drafts being produced, also independent comments on some documents.
 - Getting there but still difficult to say before projects go in.
 - As before final product will determine credibility but based on progress to-date most look good.
 - Still some narrowing down needed.
 - The duplication/cross-referencing is becoming essential as documents mature, although some concern about too much overlap.
- ◆ Will you use the standards once they are finalised? If so, how? If not, why not? (Question 3d)

Number of responses for each answer				
Event	No	Possibly	Yes	No response
2 nd April 2008	0	3	23	0
20 th May 2008	2	1	23	4
Total	2	4	46	4
Average	1	2	23	2

82% of respondents said they will use the standards once they are finalised, representing a small increase since the 2007 workshops (76%). The way in which they will use them include: for testing and resource assessment, for QA of testing, in assisting with design and testing of devices, for the development of grid connectors, and for reference and to help policy and lobbying.

The two respondents who said they will not use the standards explained that the standards are not directly relevant to their activity. Overall, therefore, respondents continue to have a high level of expected use which has increased slightly since the 2007 workshops.

4.4. The quality of the standards

- ◆ How would you rate the quality of the marine energy standards?_(Question 3b)
Scale from 1: *Very poor* to 5: *Excellent*.

Event	Number of responses for each score					
	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	No score
2 nd April 2008	0	0	4	21	1	0
20 th May 2008	0	1	11	15	2	1
Total	0	1	15	36	3	1
Average	0	0.5	7.5	18	1.5	0.5

At the 2007 workshops 25% of participants scored a 4 or 5, which has now increased to 69%. This demonstrates stakeholder opinion on the quality of the standards has improved considerably in the interim.

Some of the comments stakeholders made include:

- Wider industry input is reaping benefits.
- Good quality which will no doubt improve towards final versions.
- Must be clearly aligned to deliver useable products for end users (finance etc).
- Sometimes ambitious, and a bit early as some points are still at early research stage.

- ◆ From what you know of the scopes of the documents, do you feel there are any gaps in the standards? (*Question 3f*)

Number of responses for each answer				
Event	No	Possibly	Yes	No response
2 nd April 2008	11	4	4	7
20 th May 2008	5	4	6	15
Total	16	8	10	22
Average	8	4	5	11

At the 2007 workshops 40% respondents identified gaps in the standards, which has now been reduced to 18%. This reduction is an expected trend as the standards are becoming more complete over time. However, looking at the April and May workshops separately this is one of the few questions where a notable difference has occurred between them, in that half of all respondents at the May workshop did not give an answer to this question. Looking at the other answers given by this group of respondents, we assume that they do not feel there are any gaps and so did not answer the question at all, as they scored an average of 3 on credibility and quality, and most said they would use the standards.

A summary of the gaps still identified at this stage:

- Environmental assessment.
 - Measurement systems.
 - Gap between tank testing and full-scale testing of wave devices – including intermediate performance, wave measurement standard.
- ◆ If (you answered) yes to question 4b, are you confident that the next steps will deliver the best outcome for the standards? (*Question 4c*)

Number of responses for each answer				
Deliver best outcome				
Event	No	Possibly	Yes	No response
2 nd April 2008	0	0	23	3
20 th May 2008	2	0	14	14
Total	2	0	37	17
Average	1	0	18.5	8.5

Of the respondents who answered 'yes' to the previous question (see Section 4.6), 66% of respondents believe the next steps will deliver the best outcome for the standards. Two respondents at the May workshop answered 'no', one of whom qualified their response by saying that more work was needed to pull all standards together, whilst some need converting to better relate to BSO2.

There was a particularly high proportion of respondents (46%) at the May workshop who did not give a response to this question. The main reason for this is because respondents were only asked to complete this question following a positive response to the prior question about awareness of the next steps and opportunities for involvement (4b). One third (33%) of respondents at the May workshop weren't aware of the next steps or opportunities for their involvement and therefore didn't answer this question. (Question 4b is covered in the 'stakeholder engagement and communications' section 4.6 of this report).

Other comments made include:

- Clarity on how engagement with the IEC and their view on progress is important to the progress of the sector.
- An essential development for a strong industry.
- Early days, but we are setting some standards for continual update.
- Excellent to see such progress. Keep up the good work.
- This is possible with continued engagement.

4.5. Wider Impact of the standards

- ◆ Do you think the standards will deliver better quality, more competitive marine energy solutions for the wider UK energy sector?
If so, how? If not, why not? (*Question 3e*)

Number of responses for each answer				
Event	No	Possibly	Yes	No response
2 nd April 2008	0	3	22	1
20 th May 2008	0	1	26	3
Total	0	4	48	4
Average	0	2	24	2

It is very encouraging that there were no negative responses to this question. Only 7% of respondent felt unsure, whilst 86% answered with a 'yes'. This represents a small positive shift from the 2007 workshops where 72% answered 'yes' and 18% felt unsure.

Some of the ways in which stakeholders think the standards will deliver better quality, more competitive marine energy solutions are:

- By opening up markets - giving guidance to subcontractors for design and construction etc.

- Traceability & consistency.
- More comparability and a higher 'bottom level'.
- Encourage good practice, reduce mistakes.
- Attention drawn early to key issues/regulations to follow/be aware of.
- They should aim to deliver a competitive and integrated supply chain, including devices.
- Establish UK at centre of standards production will aid convergence on design consensus.
- Well-developed standards should raise the (levels of) quality in the sector.
- Standard developed projects should be easier to finance helping to consolidate & develop UK as market leader.

4.6. Stakeholder engagement and communications

- ◆ Do you feel you've been able to fully participate in today's event?
(Question 4a)
Scale from 1: *Not at all* to 5: *Fully*.

Event	Number of responses for each score					
	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	No score
2 nd April 2008	0	0	2	10	14	0
20 th May 2008	2	1	4	12	9	2
Total	2	1	6	22	23	2

80% of respondents gave a score of 4 or above in terms of their ability to fully participate in the workshops. It is worth noting that one of the scores of 1 given at the May event were said to be a reflection of the respondent's "technical inability and not a reflection on the event". The other score of 1 was given by an author of one of the standards, which might indicate that they felt they weren't really able to fully participate in the event due to having that specific role.

The respondents were asked to supplement their answers with details of what would have made it easier for them to participate or what they found particularly useful. Some of the responses are summarised below:

Improvements for easier participation:

- Earlier distribution of revised standards (but I understand why an evolving product is hard to pin down!)
- More of the required skills & experience to contribute is required.
- It would be useful to discuss the 'fine detail' with others working in the field.
- Suggest emailing documents along with the booking form to ensure receipt.

Found particularly useful:

- Small groups, enabling more animated discussion over time.
- Combined with the All Energy event made attendance easier.
- The documents for review were already to a high standard, which made the work easier.

- Good to have The Environment Council involved.

There were a number of respondents who would have liked to have the draft standards emailed to them earlier. The standards were made available to all participants a minimum of 3 working days prior to the workshop, and as such it is possible the feedback is due in part to respondents not having noticed the email. It may be useful to factor in absences and other work commitments that may require drafts to be sent out further in advance of any future workshop.

- ◆ Are you aware of the next steps for the standards and opportunities for your involvement? (*Question 4b*)

<u>Number of responses for each answer</u>			
Event	No	Yes	<i>No response</i>
2 nd April 2008	1	25	0
20 th May 2008	10	19	1
Total	11	44	1
Average	5.5	22	0.5

This was a new question included for these workshops due to the fact that respondents from the 2007 workshops did not always appear to understand the subsequent question on meeting needs and delivering best outcomes (4c). We felt therefore that it was necessary to ensure that only those who knew what the next steps were would answer this question.

All but one of the respondents at the April workshop feel they understand the next steps and opportunities for their involvement, whereas 33% of respondents at the May workshop responded 'no' to this. These responses show that although in some cases communication with stakeholders has been good, this isn't the case for everyone. Some informal feedback gained at the May workshop was that no follow-up communications were made to some stakeholders in the period between the 2007 and 2008 workshops. As part of the evaluation process, earlier this year we contacted document leaders to find out what communications had been made to clarify the next steps to stakeholders. Not all the document leaders replied, but the responses we did receive show a wide variance in communication, which could answer the above.

- ◆ If (you answered) yes to question 4b, are you confident that these next steps will meet your needs?
(Question 4c)

Number of responses for each answer				
	Meet your needs			
Event	No	Possibly	Yes	No response
2 nd April 2008	0	0	24	2
20 th May 2008	2	0	14	14
Total	2	0	38	16
Average	1	0	19	8

Of the respondents who answered 'yes' to the previous question, 69% feel the next steps will meet their needs. Those who responded 'no' to this did not clarify their reasons with a comment.

- ◆ Have you made use of the standards section on the Emec website either for reviewing or downloading draft standards? (Question 5)

Number of responses for each answer			
Event	No	Yes	No response
2 nd April 2008	2	20	4
20 th May 2008	5	23	2
Total	7	43	6
Average	3.5	21	3

As this is a new question there is no comparison of usage rates with the 2007 workshops. A significant majority of respondents (87%) have made use of the availability of the draft documents on Emec's website to date. For some respondents who answered 'no' to this, they are aware of the standards section on the website but hadn't yet made use of it. For those who were not aware of this website section, we anticipate that the question itself is a useful prompt and may encourage further uptake.

This question went on to ask if the respondees found the section of Emec's website user friendly, a summary of the responses is below:

- Quick access and good outlines.
- Not up to date.
- Except that info online was out of date 1 day before the meeting.
- It is very user friendly, but could be advertised more widely perhaps?
- Easy to download.
- Fine, only (unreadable) versions could be improved.

Overall feedback was that although the stakeholders who've used the website function find it useful and easy to use, it could be further improved by being kept up to date and more accurate. It is possible that respondents experienced a wide range in terms of the accuracy of the standards on the website, as each standard is at a different stage of development and each document leader is individually responsible for ensuring the latest draft is made available.

- ◆ Is there anyone else (individuals or organisations) that should be involved in this process for the development of marine energy standards? If so, who and in what capacity? (*Question 3c*)

A summary of suggestions made by respondents is given below:

Who else should be involved in this process?

- Device developers.
- Regulators.
- Financing bodies.
- Certification bodies.
- Wider insurance industry.
- Government.
- Offshore manufacturing.
- Other relevant industries.

It is worth noting that 71% of respondents felt there were no gaps in participation, which has increased considerably from 32% at the 2007 workshops. For the other respondents the range of suggestions made was very broad in terms of sectors. Some of the suggestions are from sectors which are already represented, such as government. The reasons for this may be simply that there was no government representative at their particular workshop or standard discussion. Interestingly, there are no suggestions that the sectors which are not represented in our sectoral breakdown should be involved, ie. maintenance, contractors and service companies – this may be because our description of sectors (see section 4.2) is too generic.

Overall, there is general agreement that the more stakeholders who are involved in this process, the better quality and more credible the standards will become.

- ◆ A summary of the general comments from the stakeholders at the 2008 workshops is below:
 - More interaction between November and now would have been better.
 - Don't give up!
 - We've still a fair bit to go and need some more technology in the water.
 - We would be willing to promote the EMEC standards page on our website (written by a stakeholder from Scottish Renewables).
 - Excellent interfacing.

4.7. Evaluator observations

A member of the evaluation team attended the May 08 workshop as part of the evaluation process, to compare observations and informal feedback with formal responses given in the questionnaires. General observations are also given in this section.

Interim communications / understanding the next steps

One participant gave informal feedback that they did not receive a revised report or response as to the changes made as a result of the first round of stakeholder input. This appears to support the analysis around question 4b (Section 4.6) and the interim research carried out by the evaluation team around communications from individual document leaders, where not all appear to have given a clear update on what changes have been made to date and what the next steps are going to be.

Circulating draft standards in advance of the workshop

Observations at the workshop showed that several people had not brought copies of the standards with them. This appears to support the analysis around question 4a (Section 4.6) in that although participation was maximised for most people, some did not receive the papers in advance. As such these participants were perhaps not able to fully contribute having not read the latest versions of their respective standards.

Facilitation on the day

Each of the standards had a facilitator allocated, as well as the document leader present. After a brief round of introductions and clarification of the stage of the standard, facilitation was generally light touch, without directing participants to answer specific questions or follow a specific format. This appeared to work well for participants, as it enabled them to give feedback at a range of levels from the strategic / philosophical down to the detail of layout and spelling. Energy levels remained high in all groups throughout the session.

General points

Several participants raised the issue of overlaps between the standards, both for having overlap where the same issues affect different technologies, as well as ensuring no contradictions occur. One participant suggested an overview diagram showing how the standards fit together, which could indicate that the diagram EMEC have already produced may not have been disseminated to all stakeholders. A quick review of the website shows that the diagram is not given there at present.

From informal discussion with one stakeholder a point arose regarding the early stages of the industry and what this means for the standards. They felt that the standards would need to remain generic at this point, and require revising over time to become more specific and detailed as the industry matures. This also relates to feedback in section 4.4 where another respondent commented on the sometimes ambitious nature of the standards project at this point in the industry's development. It may be interesting to consider this feedback in the light of future revisions to the standards, however, it is important to note that to date only a few stakeholders have raised this issue.

Appendix 1: full questionnaire

Evaluating Engagement on Marine Energy Guidelines/Standards evaluation form

Thank you for taking the time to fill in this form. We will be using your views to evaluate the development of the Marine Energy Guidelines/Standards and very much value your feedback

1. Name of the organisation you are representing

.....

2. Have you already filled in an evaluation form at a prior event on the marine standards?

Yes

No

2b. If you answered 'No' to the above, please indicate below which field of marine energy your organisation represents (please tick ONE box only, which best describes your organisation)

- Academic
 - Research
 - Generation
 - Construction and manufacture
 - Maintenance
 - Non-Government Organisation
 - Grid connection
 - Sub-sea cabling and transition components
 - Consultants
 - Utilities
 - Contractors
 - Service companies
 - Trade Association
 - Certification & warranty
 - Standards body
 - Government
 - Other
- (Please specify).....

3. Your views on the marine energy guidelines/standards, as they stand now (please tick the appropriate box)

a. How credible do you think the marine energy guidelines are?

1 2 3 4 5

Not very credible ----- Highly credible

Comments:

b. How would you rate the quality of the marine energy guidelines/standards?

1 2 3 4 5

Very poor ----- Excellent

Comments:

c. Is there anyone else (individuals or organisations) that should be involved in this process for the development of marine energy guidelines/standards? If so, who and in what capacity?

d. Will you use the guidelines/standards once they are finalised?
If so, how? If not, why not?

e. Do you think the guidelines/standards will deliver better quality, more competitive marine energy solutions for the wider UK energy sector? If so, how? If not, why not?

f. From what you know of the scopes or the documents, do you feel there are any gaps in the guidelines/standards?

4. Your views on the stakeholder engagement process

a. Do you feel that you have been able to fully participate in today's event? (please tick the appropriate box)

1
 2
 3
 4
 5

Not at all ----- Fully

Please give details of anything that would have made it easier for you to participate or what you found particularly useful

b. Are you aware of the next steps for the standards and opportunities for your involvement?

Yes
 No

c. If yes, are you confident that these next steps will meet your needs and deliver the best outcome for the standards?

Meet your needs: Yes No

Deliver the best outcome: Yes No

Comments:

5. Have you made use of the standards section on the Emec website either for reviewing or downloading draft standards?

Yes

No

If yes, please give feedback on whether you found it user friendly. If no, please tell us why not

Please feel free to make any further general comments, all feedback is welcome:

Please provide your details if you are happy for The Environment Council to contact you in the future about the marine energy standards

If you have not had time to fill in this form at the workshop and would like to take it with you to complete at another time, please post your completed form to: Eva Beresford, The Environment Council, 212 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BF.

Appendix 2: Response Data (non-attributed)

Please refer to separate spreadsheet.

Appendix 3: Stakeholder engagement and evaluation timeline

