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# Workshop Agenda

## Day 1 – Monday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16.00 – 18.00 | Opening and Welcome  
Presentation of the workshop contents and objectives – Prof. Dr. Hoda Soussa and Dr. Fareed Aboul-ela |

## Day 2 – Tuesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30 – 10.30</td>
<td>Introduction and overview of workshop activities and presentation by Egyptian students of projects involving transitions, renewable energy, and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 11.00</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11.00 – 13.00 | Egypt presentation: Managing the transition from fossil fuel to renewable technologies in a manner that is technically, economically, and environmentally sustainable – ASU – Dr. Walid El-Khatam  
Countries’ 30-minute presentations concerning “Managing Transitions For sustainability” including the presentation of one significant case study/example per country – (Use of CMPA is welcome, at least a slide)  
Speech by the respective Deans From ASU and ZC |
| 13.00 – 14.00 | Lunch Break                                                              |
| 14.00 – 17.00 | Partners’ presentation (continuation) – ALL PARTNERS                      |

## Day 3 – Wednesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30 – 11.30</td>
<td>Finalizing CMAP2.0 integrating concepts related to the management of the transition to sustainable energy (group work) – Moderated by ASU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 11.45</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Plenary discussion on the lesson learnt by the students’ workshop – Particular contribution is kindly asked to the coordinators/tutors of students’ groups in Amman-moderated by Zewail City and ROMA 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 – 14.30</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30 – 17.30</td>
<td>Finalizing CMAP2.1 based on the results of the AMMAN training workshop: adding external resources, annotations and links to enrich the teaching/learning experience (group work divided by disciplines) – Moderated by ROMA 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Day 4 – Thursday
9.30 – 11.15
• Steering committee meeting: finalizing outputs, Technical and Financial review; Next workshop in Lebanon and final report and deliverables, role and responsibilities of partners – Moderated by ROMA 3

11.15 – 11.30  
Coffee break

11.30 – 13.00
• Quality board meeting – Moderated by JUST

13.00 – 15.00
Lunch break, 
Poster exhibition of the students work

15.00 – 18.00
• Exchange of experiences on the educational activities implemented so far, with a focus on any problem encountered by the partners: how many students did they involve in their local activities, which course/year, how many hours, if the students received credits for their participation, how was student performance assessed, what if any, elements are to be permanently incorporated into the curriculum, etc. Moderated by ROMA 3, with the input from ALL PARTNERS

• Discussion on how to ensure project outputs sustainability and opportunities to make use of ENEPLAN Open Educational Resources to improve the teaching/learning experience

Day 5 – Friday

9.30 – 11.00
• Visit to Zewail City Campus (at 6th October City)
Steering Committee and quality board meeting - Summary

Federica Benelli from Roma Tre shows advancement of outputs. First outputs are ready and available on the website. In particular, the Amman workshop report is being prepared. FB asks Petra University to prepare a synthesis on the persons participating.

FB reminds partners that some thematic concept maps envisaged by the application form are still missing and will be prepared by MIEMA (technologies) and UAlg (involvement of SMEs, private sector and third sector). She also asks all partners to (1) propose their modifications of Cmap 2.1 and upload them on their own sub-folders in the Cloud, and (2) to upload at least two of the concept maps that they have elaborated with students by May 15. Federica Di Pietrantonio from MIEMA asks partners to name their maps’ files with meaningful names.

FB explains also that all ENEPLAN’s maps will be moved from the private ENEPLAN’s Cloud folder to the public IHMC repository at the end of the project, in order to be available for any user in line with the purposes of the project.

Quality reports: FB asks JUST a formal quality report besides the statistics of the questionnaires.

FB asks partner to send information to be published on the next newsletter, due in May.

Next yearly report has to be drafted.

The webGIS has been delayed but has recently been renovated. It still needs some adjustments. FB shows functionalities of webGIS. Uploaded layers are: background map, ENEPLAN case studies (which can be downloaded individually as data sheets), and a number of open datasets; for those datasets that were too heavy, a raster image has been uploaded; there are also links to external dataset resources. FB asks partners to provide other datasets if possible, or to provide links to further external resources. Hoda Soussa asks if it is possible to purchase data; FB warns to check about the usage rights in that case.

FB asks partners to keep their internal reporting folders in the Dropbox tidy and updated with all the relevant materials. She also asks not to delete any file from the Dropbox, since this would mean deleting it for everybody.

As regards the financial audit, FB reminds partners that Roma Tre needs certifications of expenditure from every partner, which is necessary for the overall audit procedure that will be carried out by the central auditor contracted by Roma Tre. FB reminds partners that they can refer to EACEA’s guidance notes for further details. She specifies that the financial audit is mandatory only for the coordinator, however the financial department of Roma Tre has required first-level audits for all partners and this has been written in the project’s application form.

The final deadline for the submission of the final report is 14 December 2018. Collection of partners’ contributions for the narrative sections is 15 October. It is not the same format as the intermediate report, and probably it will have to be send as a paper copy. Partners’ contributions to the narrative sections are very important because they will contain descriptions of activities carried out locally and of future local benefits.

FB finally invites partners to apply for a call for abstracts for a monographic issue (Energy planning in the Mediterranean: innovation paths in practices and careers) of Roma Tre’s journal (I Quaderni di UrbanisticaTre), to be published in March 2019. Abstracts to be sent by 15 of June 2018.
Yaser Abunasr from AUB reports about advancements of the organisation of the Beirut conference. The conference will be held on September 10-14 as agreed in Faro. He shows provisional agenda and intended settings for the proceedings. AUB will ask to send an extended abstract of 1000 words to be published in the proceedings. The deadline for submitting the proceedings will be around July.

**QB meeting**

JUST reminds that questionnaires have been distributed to students of Amman workshop, and shows results. He also asks partners to fill in questionnaire regarding the current workshop.

FB asks JUST to send a formal quality report containing the results of the quality assessment. Especially for the Amman workshop, it is very important to provide a written report interpreting and explaining the numbers resulting from the questionnaire, and including the suggestions made by the students. Rita Najjar suggests taking into consideration also what has been written in the Amman tutors’ reports. JUST asks to receive the reports in order to integrate these findings into the quality report.

FB asks again partners to report about any local educational activities through the relevant form.
Presentations Summary

Egypt

**ENEPLAN ACTIVITIES till Cairo 2018**
Prof. Dr. Hoda Soussa, Dr. Fareed Abuela

- Introduction, objectives and outputs of ENEPlan.
- An overview on C-map.
- Workshop theme and agenda.

**Managing the transition from fossil fuel to renewable technologies in a manner that is technically, economically, and environmentally sustainable**
Dr. Walid El-Khattam – Ain Shams University

- Discussing the enabling environment (environmental, technical and economical) for the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energies.
- A closer at each aspect (environmental, technical and economical) and what has already been implemented in Egypt to encourage a sustainable transition to renewable energy.

Malta

**From energy planning to RES projects: the case of Gozo**
Federica Di Pietrantonio - Malta Intelligent Energy Management Agency (MIEMA)

- Introducing EcoGozo and the purpose for its initiation.
- C-map showing how EcoGozo is being implemented and managed.
- How EcoGozo could be of great support to energy-related projects and what could be done for further improvements

Spain

**The emergence of cycling in Seville**
Manu Calvo - University “Pablo de Olavide” (UPO)

- What are the strategies for cycling development.
- Planning the cycling infrastructure.
- Showing how the system has been applied in Seville.
- Description of the objectives yet to be achieved.

Jordan

**From Students to Professional Engineer mEQUITY Vocational Training on Renewable energy**
Jordan University of Science and Technology

1st Presentation:

- Training document evaluation, main results and suggested improvement.
- Overall assessment of organization of the project meeting.
- Overall assessment of organization of the training session.
2nd Presentation:

- Introducing mEQUITY and its benefit for students seeking professional opportunities
- Explaining why the training has been implemented in Gaza Strip and why it has been on renewable energy.
- The mission of mEQUITY team and the scope and aims of the training.
- Identifying three target groups.
- Going through the SWOT analysis that has been prepared for the training.
- Identifying three educational objectives; basic knowledge, practical skills and business skills.

Italy

Managing sustainable energy transition from fossil fuel to RES in time of crisis: the case study of the Italian biofuel niche
Federico Maria Tardella - UNICAM University of Camerino

- An overview on biofuel and European energy policy.
- A closer look at the Italian biofuel niche.

Lebanon

Renewable Energy Plan for Lebanon

The concept map for planning renewable energy in Lebanon branches into three main ideas, which are; Electric Supply, Stakeholders and Integrated Sustainable energy plan. The branch of electric supply discusses the issues facing that line and their causing factors. The stakeholders branch considers the responsible party and their function. The integrated sustainable energy plan explains the energy production technologies and what they are being used for. In addition, this branch discusses how the implementation strategy is connected to the governing policies that are adopted by the responsible stakeholders.
Discussion of Amman Training

**Group 1**

**TUTORS:**
Ms. Federica Di Pietrantonio (MIEMA)
Mr. Francis Mohasseb (LU)
Mr. Ziad Abi Khattar (LU)
Mr. Frédéric Harb (LU)
Mr. Riccardo Pulselli (UNISI)

**EXERCISE 1: MAPPING STUDENTS’ PREVIOUS KNOWLEDGE**

**Comments:**
Due to delays in starting the exercise, it was decided to make students work directly in groups after the individual identification of concepts; therefore the exercise has been carried out as follows:

1) Students made individual lists of 15-20 meaningful concepts concerning the focus question

2) Tutors chose about 10 lists and students presented and discussed them

3) Students formed small sub-groups of 4-5 people from different universities; each sub-group was assigned one of the selected concepts lists (making sure that no one worked on its own list) and worked together to build a c-map out of the concepts therein contained, also by removing/adding/modifying concepts

4) C-maps resulting from step 3 were presented by sub-groups and discussed, and 2 were chosen to be presented in the plenary.

All students showed high motivation and ability, and many of them succeeded in including in the c-maps concepts related to their own specific area of study, thus enriching the maps’ multidisciplinarity. Group work and interaction among students was smooth. A technical problem occurred in the use of the Cloud, as the desktop version of the C-Map Tools software was not able to access the Cloud folder, therefore the maps uploaded on the Cloud were shown on screen as images to quickly bypass the problem. This problem – probably due to a malfunctioning of the platform - could not be solved throughout the workshop.

**EXERCISE 2: MAPPING ONE ENEPLAN CASE STUDY**

**Comments:**
The exercise was carried out as suggested in the guidelines. Results were satisfying, though students experienced difficulties regarding:

a) The uneven length and complexity of the case studies, which made some groups’ work longer and more difficult

b) The identification of cross-links (mainly due to lack of time)

c) The formulation of meaningful linking phrases (often the verb was replaced by nouns or propositions, jeopardizing sometimes the “readability” of the map)
EXERCISE 3: MAPPING A SCIENTIFIC PAPER

Comments:

The exercise was carried out as suggested in the guidelines. The main difficulty experienced by the students was the length and complexity of the papers: most of the groups (even against the tutors’ advice) assigned each part of the paper to a member of the group, who analysed and mapped it separately; the group then worked together to merge the separate c-maps. This procedure had as main consequences: a) a difficult time-management of the exercise – too much time dedicated to analysing the papers, to the detriment of concept-mapping process and group interaction; b) an evident inhomogeneity of most of the resulting maps (repetitions, lack of cross-links, lack of an overall “design” of the map...).

However, given the complexity of the exercise, the results were encouraging.

EXERCISE 4: DESCRIBE AN ENERGY PLANNING PROCESS

Comments:

The last exercise concerned the choice of a specific case study for each group and the description of the energy planning process referred to that, and was mainly assigned to put together the knowledge gained during the previous exercise as well as the lectures to which student attended.

The start-up was blocked first by a lack of internet connexion in the assigned room, but after 15 min, the IT department managed to displace all the group member into an IT lab, where everything was available. Once relocated, the students were grouped with their same colleagues, in order to facilitate communication, and take advantage of each other’s skills gained during previous exercises, but in a multidisciplinary way as suggested. During the first half hour, students determined their hypothetical context. The four sub-groups selected very interesting and challenging case studies with four different reference scales and context: a) the Lebanese country; b) the Harbour of Aqaba; c) Sharm el Sheikh; d) the Airport street in Amman. Once the context was fixed, sub-groups started building the main elements of the energy plan they imagined with the different ways to be implemented in reality.

Students were suggested to refer to the 1.0 c-map in the Cloud: three of them decided to freely develop their own c-map taking some inspiration from the 1.0 c-map; one group decided to start from the 1.0 c-map to adapt it to its case study. The work needed was more than the fixed schedule. For this reason, the tutors were discussing the groups’ c-maps contents every hour, in order to lead them. A final deep review was conducted at the end of the day, sub-group by sub-group, in order to suggest the last improvements before the presentation on Monday’s plenary. Students defined clear schemes of their c-maps with some domains that were described more in depth and further designed through nested c-maps.

The main problem encountered by students was the lack of a specific context: their c-maps did not really focus on the case study they have chosen but, once described the context, c-maps look to refer to general energy planning process not clearly related to specific case studies except for some elements. This lack would probably suggest to change the exercise for next replication and make it clear that c-maps should be more contextualised and focussed on the case study. However, it is important to note that the quality of the C-maps produced was better than the previous ones, with regards to the overall design and to the cross links, which means that the exercises target was reached by the students.

At the end of the exercise some C-maps were uploaded online, others the next day due to connexion problems.
Group 2

Coordinator Hoda Soussa (ASU)

TUTORS Anna Laura Palazzo, Federica Benelli, Romina D’Ascanio, (ROMA3); Nicoletta Patrizi (UNISI); Federico Maria Tardella (UNICAM); Antonio Carlo Razzouk (MEDGreen)

Work organization

Did you ask students to keep working with the same sub-groups, or did you change the sub-groups from day to day? Please explain pros and cons of your choice.

➢ Except for the first exercise, students worked in the same subgroups. The guideline was to form groups as much as possible heterogeneous in expertise and home country (more fields of expertise allow to deal with more heterogeneous topics; tendency to divide the work and to work individually).

Did you set intermediate milestones for the exercises in order to better direct/control the students’ works? Did you guide the students with additional suggestions?

➢ Intermediate steps set, but in a very flexible way to allow all subgroups to take the time needed to do the exercises.
➢ Continuous monitoring of students’ work by tutors and feedbacks with students.

Was the given time appropriate for the exercises?

➢ Apart from the time needed at the beginning of the activities to organize the groups and subgroups and to allow all students to download and familiarize themselves with the use of software (C-Map Tools - C-Map Cloud), the time was appropriate for exercises 1 and 2, but was not enough for exercises 3 and 4. Exercise 3 required the understanding of the whole article before starting the list of concepts and connections between them. With regard to exercise 4, some sub-groups asked to finish the exercise in the following day.

Did you follow the suggested steps? If not, please illustrate how you personalised the proposed exercises.

➢ In the first exercise “Mapping students’ previous knowledge”, the coordinator and tutors decided, for reasons of time, to change some steps indicated in the “Quick manual for the concept mapping exercises”. Thus, students were invited since the beginning to divide into small groups of two students. First, students made a list of meaningful concepts about energy planning (one per sub-group) and then, after a discussion with the class and tutors, groups of 4 students were formed in order to connect concepts through linking phrases to build a C-Map.
➢ For the exercises 2 and 3 “Mapping one ENEPLAN case study” and “Mapping a scientific article”, students were invited to work following the steps suggested in the manual.
➢ With regard to exercise 4, because of the difficulty to articulate the final C-Map in time, the presentation of the C-Maps in progress within the group was skipped and students were left free to use extra time to amend and integrate their works in view of the presentation of the following day.

To what degree were students able to cooperate? For example, did they work individually at the beginning of the exercises and then merged their single works into a single one, or did they discuss and cooperate since the beginning of the exercise?
➢ Given the complexity of mapping a scientific article, in the 3rd exercise all the sub-groups showed the tendency to split the article into parts, corresponding to the different sections of a scientific paper (i.e. aims, methods, results, discussion, conclusions), working individually or in pairs. They merged their works, discussing and cooperating mostly in the second part of the exercise. Students were advised by tutors to consider each scientific article as a whole, making connections among aims, methods and results.
➢ Also, in the final exercise, probably for reasons of time, there was the tendency of students of each sub-group, at least at the beginning, to work individually or in groups of two, each dealing with a specific theme/energy sector, according to students’ field of expertise. Students were encouraged by tutors to discuss on the whole development of the energy plan and integrate the different knowledge sectors.
Results

Exercise 1
➢ Students proved in this phase to be factually involved in the exercise and to have understood the meaning and the use of C-Maps. Students’ works were in general logically sound, although sometimes with some mistakes in the use of linking phrases (repetitions of linking phrases, nouns instead of linking phrases, tree-structure of the map).

Exercise 2
➢ Fewer mistakes were found in the use of linking phrases, in favour of complex but easily readable C-maps. In some cases (1 subgroup out of 4) the tree-structure of the map has remained.

Exercise 3
➢ The outcomes of this session can be considered very satisfactory in terms of students’ involvement, compliance with the content of case studies, and capacity to build a C-Map. Fewer mistakes were found in the use of linking phrases, in favour of complex but easily readable C-maps; in some cases, the tree-structure of the map remained and nested nodes used to include lists of concepts lacking connections.
➢ In general, students showed a good capacity to use different tools of the C-Map Tools software to modify graphical aspects of the maps, to insert links to images and tables, and to master the use of nested nodes.
➢ In particular, the best work selected by the tutors showed an excellent capacity of students to understand the contents of the article and translating them into a clear and consequential arrangement of concepts with regard to both meaningfulness and readability, witnessed also by the use of cross-links.

Exercise 4
The last exercise proved to be much more difficult for the students compared with the previous ones.
➢ General difficulties
   - Defining specific planning objectives based on strength/weakness points, which not always were made explicit
   - No group planned a completely invented context, preferring wide-scale and country-specific cases (even when described as imaginary town), it means the potentialities of imaginary “extreme” or very characterized contexts were not explored.
   - Even if in some cases the effort to focus on certain sectors could be appreciated (highlighting the links problem-objective-solution), most groups tended to reproduce the lesson learnt and to deal with all the energy related problems/issues rather than start from the peculiarities of the defined case study (on one hand imitating the Eneplan C-Map and willing to take
advantages from connections with previous exercises, on the other revealing a not completely sound analysis of strength and weaknesses)

- Most groups developed very complex maps with several links - including crossing ones - at the expenses of the legibility, the use of nested nodes or external linked maps helped, as well as the use of different fonts and colours but did not solve the issue.

➢ Some C-maps still show to be developed per parts by single or couple of students lacking to be perfectly integrated.
➢ Some C-maps still suffer in some parts for some methodological mistakes such as poor linking phrases, repeated concepts, nested nodes with list of concepts or tree-like structure (this occurs mainly with groups composed by students that missed one or two of the previous exercises).
Group 3

TUTORS
Flávio Martins
Mahmoud Nady
Daniel Ayala

Scope
This section summarizes the activities carried out by the students and tutors of group 3 during the ENEPLAN workshop in Amman (18-29, February, 2018). Additionally, the section produces a self-evaluation of the sessions as seen by the tutors. The group was constituted by the tutors Mahmoud Nady (ZEWAIL); Flavio Martins (UAig); Daniel Ayala (UPO); Abdulsalam Shboul, Fedaa Al-Qasem and Rasha Al-Baik (UJ) and by the students. The self-evaluation is analysed in three different aspects: Suitability of the sessions; Background and performance of the students and Self-evaluation of the tutors.

Suitability of the sessions
The workshop was composed by four different sessions: a first session dedicated to create a Concept map to map students’ previous knowledge; a second session to develop a Concept map to map one ENEPLAN case studies; a third session create a Concept map of a specific scientific paper related to RE and landscape planning and finally a fourth session to create a Concept map of a real or hypothetical situation describing all aspects of integrated energy planning for that area.

The workout example was suitable, focused in the thematic and easy to understand by the students. The level and duration of the sessions are considered adequate for the purpose of the workshop since they started from simpler more basic exercises and evolved to a final more elaborated and complex exercise. The level of the work asked is also considered appropriate for the level of knowledge of the students as they all understand the objectives and were able to elaborate on the subjects. The duration of the sessions was adequate as all the groups were able to finalize the exercises on time.

Background and performance of the students
The students came from different countries, different universities and different fields of expertise. Additionally, students of different levels were present, spanning from undergraduate to PhD. The background was thus very diverse. The methodology chosen was to mix as much the students as possible, creating diverse groups. This methodology proved to be correct as the students contributed with their own expertise levelling the knowledge in the groups. The students were highly committed in solving the exercises, creating a positive dynamic inside the group, without any tensions or other issues. This mixing approach was also considered very useful from the social and cultural point of view as allowed the students from different origins to interact and get to know each other in a very inclusive way.

Self-evaluation of the tutors
The tutors promoted the creation of the groups in the beginning of each session and introduced the exercises. After that, personal assistance was given to each of the group, either upon demand from the group or as a controlled supervision along the work. Different time milestones were also proposed to control the development of the work. Special care was taken to avoid the actions of the tutors to be too intrusive, and also to prevent it to be too “loose”. The relationship between the students and the tutors was also considered positive with many fruitful discussions arising from the interactions. The students actively asked for help and aid was always given.

**Final Comments and Suggestions**

These sessions would benefit from the inclusion of European students, in several different aspects: exchange of technical knowledge, sharing of different realities regarding the needs and the possibilities for implementation of RE planning and sharing of cultural experiences. We would thus suggest the inclusion of students from the two sides of the Mediterranean in future events.
Group 4

Presentation on parallel sessions – Indicative questions to be answered

Did you follow the suggested steps? If not, please illustrate how you personalised the proposed exercises.

- We had a presentation during the first session explaining and re-iterating the main concepts with demonstrations

- On daily basis, we devised the schedule for the day and defined objectives explaining what is required including the focus questions, specific tasks, and at what time each task is to be completed. Duration for each task was also provided.
- Discussion and questions followed to be able to start their work.

Did you guide the students with additional suggestions?
The instructors were moving around groups. Asking them about their focus or approach to the subject they wanted to address providing detailed guidance. This was a continuous process allowing instructors to focus each C-map based on the question.

- In some cases, when common problem or issue emerges, then we would stop all groups and have a 5-minute explanation and what needs to be done.

**Did you set intermediate milestones for the exercises in order to better direct/control the students’ works?**

- Yes, we had included that on the board with tasks. For example, we have listed the tasks that they needed with time for each task. See photo above.

**Did you ask students to keep working with the same sub-groups, or did you change the sub-groups from day to day? Please explain pros and cons of your choice.**

- We allocated students to groups to achieve mix of universities, disciplines, and gender allowing for the maximum possible mix.
- The first day, we devised the groups.
- Second and third days, we also devised the groups but changed the mix.
- The fourth day, we gave the students the choice to form their own groups.
- In context where instructors do not know most of students and students do not know each other, changing groups is a good idea in the beginning allowing students to test and mix. Once interests and knowing others is more developed, allowing students to choose their groups allowed more focused and directed
- Article: asked everyone to read the abstract and divide the article into parts where each focused on one piece
- Some challenges: software, coordination and getting used to each other, different disciplines (common language), and different approaches and cultural backgrounds

**To what degree were students able to cooperate? For example, did they work individually at the beginning of the exercises and then merged their single works into a single one, or did they discuss and cooperate since the beginning of the exercise?**

- This was very much dependant on each group. Some groups decided to work together from the beginning and others worked independently then joined the individual results. The results from the continuous group work was more coherent, but in some cases, were not able to go into much depth as there was always discussion and compromise. When worked individually then combining, there was more wealth and detail of ideas, but less coherent. For the last case, if there was more time, I believe that the work could have been more harmonized.

**Was the given time appropriate for the exercises?**

- It would have been enough to conduct the exercises if we had provided one session where the focus was on the technical application of the software. There was much wasted time on trying to figure the different aspects of the software. This improved very much by the fourth session and after practicing for a couple of days.

**Is there any significant feedback by the students that you would like to report?**
- Believe that the students were very happy with the exchange in general. In more specific, they were happy to communicate and work with students from other universities supporting the cultural and education diversity.

- Students also mentioned that it would have been great to try and apply the C-map on analysing real case conditions rather than a hypothetical situation.

- They were very happy with the multi-disciplinary mix of the groups. Seeing what an engineer thinks or architect or a landscape architect was very helpful for them to be able to see different points of view allowing them to be more accepting of others.

Please write any additional comment or suggestion if you wish.

- We had a presentation in Beirut sharing the experience
- Two students used the C-mapping in their master’s thesis
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<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nathalie Khreich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Dgheim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federic Harb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Bassil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ziad Abi Khatar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hassan Makhlouf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Mohasseb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ALMEE</td>
<td>Rita Najjar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Medgreen</td>
<td>Joseph Merhej</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Sokhn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caroline Seaiby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ziad ADEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maya Tueni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie Rose Nasr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Moarbes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ZWC</td>
<td>Fareed Aboul-elA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ibrahim Ashour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ibrahim Ismail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahmoud Nady</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 AIN SHAMS</td>
<td>Hoda Soussa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Hany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walid EL Khattam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 BAU</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Tariq Al Azab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mohannad Al-Khalifat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radwan El Diwery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 JUST</td>
<td>Asma Batainah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>16-Apr</td>
<td>17-Apr</td>
<td>18-Apr</td>
<td>19-Apr</td>
<td>SC del.</td>
<td>20-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hind Al Momany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fahmi Abu Al-Rub</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hikmat Ali</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saeb Khresat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PSUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hussein Almajali</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmed Al Salaymeh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ali Maqosi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tatiana Balikhina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanada Almumani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hadeer Merza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>RSS/NERC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nidal Abdalla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total number of participants from partner organizations | 38 | 40 | 42 | 42 | 42 |
Pictures