

IBO

Internationale Bouworde

IBO-Netherlands Activity Report 2009

Table of contents

Introduction -3-

Dutch subscriptions / volunteers IBO-projects 2009 -4-

Questionnaire -5-

Projects organized by Austria – 6-

Projects organized by Belgium -8-

Projects organized by Bulgaria -12-

Projects organized by Czech Republic -14-

Projects organized by Germany -16-

Projects organized by Italy -21-

Projects organized by Poland -24-

Projects organized by The Netherlands -27-

Introduction

The report you are about to read, contains statistics and explanations about the International IBO-projects in which the Dutch volunteers took part, in 2009.

Responds

225 Evaluation forms were sent in order to get an overview of the volunteers' experience of the project that they went to. Of these 225 forms, 168 were filled in and sent back by the Dutch volunteers. This means that 75% reacted positively on our request to fill out a questionnaire. 17 volunteers are not included in the evaluations; these are the volunteers that went to Mikoszw, Poland and to Dacia, Romania in October.

The report contains a chapter per organizing IBO-country

We have chosen for this way of presenting the report, so that you do not need to search for your projects. The questions that were asked had to be answered with a mark (for questionnaire, see page 5). The most positive mark is a 5 - 'I totally agree', the worse mark is a 1 - 'I totally disagree'. Apart from that, some marks could be explained with comments. The volunteers were also asked to give a general mark, based on their total IBO-experience, on a scale from 1 to 10. The average of this was a **8,0**. A mark to be proud of.

Report is based on impressions of volunteers

We consider the report as a good way to get an impression of the volunteers' view and opinion of the projects organized by our self and our international partners. But it expresses the volunteers' side of the story and therefore it is not the ultimate truth. The opinion of the project-responsible and views of the reader are very welcome, as the main goal of the evaluation is to learn from it. Therefore we would be very happy with your view and comments about the Dutch groups, their behavior and performance.

Thank you for your feedback and might you have any questions, we are happy to answer them.

IBO – Netherlands,
Nijmegen, October 2009


Jantien Beuman, director & Riekje Weijman, coördinator volunteers

Dutch subscriptions / volunteers IBO-projects 2009

In total 241 Dutch volunteers took part in an IBO-project. The Dutch volunteers took part in 62 projects, organized by different European IBO-organizations. The Netherlands organized 22 projects. Of these 22 projects 6 had to be cancelled because of a lack of subscriptions.

Male / Female volunteers

When we look at the Dutch volunteers, we find a division between male and female:



Groups


In total 5 Dutch groups took part in 'group projects'. In total they were with 54 volunteers.

Age of the Dutch volunteers

Volunteers' age	Number
30 yrs and older	52
Younger than 30	189
Total	241

Social projects and building projects

Most Dutch volunteers took part in a building project. A few took part in a social project, which were organized in: Troyan (Bulgaria), Luxor (Egypt), Agadir, Taroudant (Morocco), Brezovica, Oborovo (Croatia), Capresti (Moldova) and L'viv (Ukraine).



Questionnaire

In order to evaluate the projects, all volunteers received an evaluation form with questions about the project, accommodation, meals, group, journey and project information. These questions could be answered with marks from 1- 5.

In your evaluation, the bold numbers are the mean of the (more than one) volunteers evaluation report.

Marks:

5= very positive/ totally agree

4= positive / agree

3= blank / no opinion

2= negative / disagree

1= very negative/ totally disagree

Questions:

1. I support the goal of the project.
2. The work of the volunteers is useful.
3. IBO-support on this project is necessary.
4. There was enough contact with the target group (children, elderly, handicapped people etc).
5. There was enough work to do.
6. There were enough materials and tools to work with.
7. There was enough technical guidance
8. The work was done safely.
9. The work was practicable.
10. We were received hospitable.
11. The accommodation was good.
12. We were informed well about the local situation (culture, safety, etc).
13. The meals were good.
14. There was enough contact with the local population.
15. The information that I received from IBO was clear.
16. My expectation fit reality.
17. Overall mark about participation on an IBO-project **(1 – 10)**.

Projects organized by ***Austria***

Austria, Greece and Romania

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Austria																	
Graz	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	5	3	3	4	4	4	3	9
Maria Langeegg	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	8
Maria Langeegg	3	2	2	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	2	3	7
Mean	4	3,5	3,5	5	5	4,5	3	4,5	4,5	5	5	3,5	4,5	5	3	4	7,5
Greece																	
Larissis	4	4	4	5	5	4	3	3	4	5	5	2	5	5	3	5	9
Larissis	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	9
Mean	4,5	4,5	4,5	5	5	4,5	3,5	3,5	4	5	5	3,5	5	5	3	5	9
Romania																	
Stejarisu	4	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	9

Graz

Positive evaluation about the goal and usefulness of the project.

Maria Langeegg

The volunteers did not write down any special remarks.

Larissis

Positive evaluation reports. The female volunteers remark that they were surprised by the rule about wearing skirts. If they knew that they had to wear skirts, they could have brought these with them. The volunteers are very positive about the meals, accommodation and hospitality.

Stejarisu

Very good technical guidance. Postive evaluation.

Projects organized by **Belgium**

Belgium and France

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO information	16. Expectations/ Reality	17. Overall mark (1-10)
Belgium & France																	
Ronse	4	4	5	5	4	3	3	3	4	5	3	3	3	4	5	5	9,0
Ronse	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	4	9,0
Ronse	4	4	4	4	5	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	8,0
Ronse	5	2	2	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	3	2	3	4	9,0
Ronse	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	8,0
Mean	4,6	4	3,8	4,4	4,8	3,8	3,6	3,6	4,2	4,8	4,4	3,6	3,6	3,4	3,6	4,2	8,6
Gits	5	5	4	3	5	3	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	4	2	5	9,0
Gits	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	10,0
Gits	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	10,0
Gits	3	5	4	4	5	4	5	3	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	9,0
Mean	4,5	5,0	4,5	4,3	5,0	4,0	4,8	3,8	4,5	5,0	4,8	4,8	5,0	4,5	4,0	5,0	9,5
Montavoix	4	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	8,0
Montavoix	5	4	2	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	2	4	5	9,0
Montavoix	4	5	5	3	4	4	3	2	4	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	9,0
Montavoix	4	5	5	2	5	4	4	3	4	5	3	3	4	3	1	5	9,0
Mean	4,3	4,5	4,0	3,0	4,8	4,5	4,3	3,8	4,5	5,0	4,5	4,3	4,8	2,8	3,3	4,5	8,8

Ronse

No special remarks, in general a satisfied group with positive evaluation reports.

Gits

The volunteers were very positive and satisfied about this project, but they have a few remarks about the safety when working on the roof. Also they would like to receive a more detailed project description in advance.

Montavoix

Very positive evaluation reports.

Morocco

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Morocco																	
Elbourra	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	8
Elbourra	5	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	2	3	8
Elbourra	5	4	3	5	5	4	5	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	9
Elbourra	5	5	4	3	2	2	4	4	4	5	5	3	5	5	5	4	8
Mean	4,8	4,3	3,5	3,8	3,5	3,5	4,3	3,5	4,0	5,0	5,0	4,5	5,0	5,0	3,5	4,0	8,3
Agadir	5	5	4	5	4	3	5	3	3	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	9
Agadir	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	3	5	10
Agadir	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	9
Agadir	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	1	3	7
Mean	5,0	5,0	4,3	5,0	4,3	3,5	4,3	4,3	4,3	5,0	4,8	4,5	4,8	4,8	2,8	4,0	8,8
Taroudant	4	4	4	5	2	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	9
Tamri	5	3	5	5	2	2	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	8
Tamri	5	3	4	5	3	2	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	2	3	8
Tamri	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	5	4	3	5	4	2	4	8
Mean	4,7	3,0	4,3	4,7	2,7	2,3	4,3	4,0	3,7	5,0	4,3	4,0	5,0	4,7	3,0	3,7	8,0

Elbourra

In general positive report. The project was not so primitive as was told to the volunteers on the information day in Leuven.

Very positive remarks about project-coordinator Hlimou.

Agadir

Positive evaluation reports. Also positive remarks about Hlimou.

Taroudant

There were 2 IBO-groups, which resulted in quite a lot of volunteers at the project.

Very positive remarks about coordinator Hlimou.

Tamri

The volunteers had a nice experience. The volunteers remark that there was not always enough (useful) work/materials to work with for everyone.

Egypt and Senegal

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local populatio	15. IBO information	16. Expectations/ Reality	17. Overall mark (1-10)
Egypt & Senegal																	
Luxor	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	10,0
Luxor	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	2	5	5	4	5	5	5	3	4	8,0
Luxor	4	4	4	5	3	4	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	2	4	9,0
Mean	4,3	4,3	4,0	4,7	3,7	4,0	3,7	3,3	4,3	5,0	4,7	5,0	5,0	5,0	3,3	4,3	9,0
Kaolack	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	8,0
Kaolack	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	10,0
Mean	5	5	4,5	4,5	5	4	4,5	4,5	5	5	5	4	5	4,5	4,5	4,5	9

Egypt

No special remarks, the volunteers were satisfied about this project.

Senegal

Very positive evaluation reports.

Projects organized by **Bulgaria**

Bulgaria

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO information	16. Expectations/ Reality	17. Overall mark (1-10)
Bulgaria																	
Balgaravo	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	9,0
Balgaravo	4	4	4	4	5	2	2	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	10,0
Mean	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4,5	5	5	5	5	5	3,5	5	9,5

Balgaravo

The volunteers are very enthusiastic about the housing, friendly local people, hospitality. They were impressed about the project.

Projects organized by ***Czech Republic***

Czech Republic

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO information	16. Expectations/ Reality	17. Overall mark (1-10)
Czech Republic																	
Safov-Langau	5	5	4	2	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	9,0
Safov-Langau	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	9,0
Safov-Langau	5	4	4	2	3	5	3	4	3	5	5	4	3	3	4	3	7,0
Safov-Langau	1	1	1	1	4	2	1	1	2	5	5	5	3	4	4	3	5,0
Safov-Langau	3	3	5	1	5	1	1	2	1	4	4	3	4	2	4	3	5,0
Safov-Langau	3	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	2	3	1	1	5,0
Safov-Langau	2	2	2	1	5	2	1	1	2	5	5	3	5	1	2	2	2,0
Safov-Langau	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	4	5	2	4	1	2	1	3,0
Mean	3,3	2,8	3,0	1,5	4,3	2,8	2,0	2,1	2,4	4,8	4,9	3,9	3,8	2,5	3,3	2,8	5,6
Marianski Radcice	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	10,0
Marianski Radcice	4	3	3	2	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	3	5	2	8,0
Marianski Radcice	3	3	3	2	3	4	2	2	4	2	4	2	3	1	5	3	7,0
Marianski Radcice	5	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	4	2	3	1	3	1	3	1	3,0
Marianski Radcice	2	2	1	2	2	4	2	4	4	2	4	2	4	2	2	1	3,0
Marianski Radcice	2	2	1	3	2	3	3	4	4	1	5	1	4	1	2	3	8,0
Mean	3,5	2,7	2,3	2,5	2,8	3,7	3,2	4,0	4,3	2,7	4,3	2,7	4,0	2,2	3,7	2,5	6,5

Safov-Langau

The first group is quite satisfied about the project, but the second group had some remarks about the local organization. They did not quite understand the goal of the project.

Marianski Radcice

The first group remarks that they were not allowed to do some men-jobs, but they had a nice time. The second group felt that they were not necessarily needed (a lot of small jobs). The meals were good.

Projects organized by ***Germany***

Bulgaria and Germany

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Bulgaria																	
Kashina	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	4	5	3	3	5	2	5	4	7
Kashina	5	4	4	5	2	2	1	2	2	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	8
Kashina	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	8
Kashina	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	9
Kashina	5	4	4	4	3	2	2	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	8
Kashina	5	5	4	5	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	10
Mean	4,8	4,3	4,0	4,3	3,7	3,0	2,7	3,8	4,0	5,0	4,3	4,2	4,7	4,2	4,3	4,3	8,3

Kashina

The volunteers are positive about the project and the hospitality.

They remark that the project can use more and better materials and an experienced technical guide.

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Germany																	
Lichtenow	4	4	4	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	4	8
Lichtenow	5	4	4	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	9
Lichtenow	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	8
Mean	4,3	4,0	4,0	2,3	4,7	4,3	4,3	4,7	5,0	5,0	4,7	4,7	5,0	4,0	4,0	4,3	8,3
Neustadt	4	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	3	4	4	3	5	5	4	4	7
Tantow	3	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	4	3	4	3	8
Tantow	5	3	4	2	3	4	2	3	4	5	5	3	2	5	3	2	8
Tantow	3	4	3	1	3	5	4	3	4	4	4	2	3	5	2	3	8
Mean	3,7	3,7	3,7	2,0	3,3	4,7	3,7	3,7	4,3	4,3	4,7	2,7	3,0	4,3	3,0	2,7	8,0

Lichtenow

Very positive evaluation reports, nice, warm welcome.

Neustadt

Only one Dutch volunteer went to this project, in her opinion it maybe would have been better to start working there (as an IBO-volunteer), after finishing the roof.

Tantow

The volunteers ask for a more detailed project description. They also would have liked to have some contact with the target group: the children.

The volunteers like the place Tantow and the local population (project-coordinators) were very friendly. From the project description the volunteers thought it would be a very religious (and because of that difficult) project, but it was very nice.

Estonia & Latvia and Romania & Ukraine

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Estonia & Latvia																	
Padise	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	4	3	3	5	3	7
Padise	4	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	3	4	8
Mean	4,5	4,5	3,5	3,5	5	5	5	5	3,5	5	5	4,5	3,5	3	4	3,5	7,5
Tammiste	2	2	1	2	1	5	1	5	5	2	5	3	2	1	1	3	2
Tammiste	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	1	4	1	2
Mean	2	2	1,5	1,5	1,5	3,5	1	3	3,5	2,5	3,5	2	2	1	2,5	2	2
Latvia																	
Vilnius	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	2	4	3	5	4	4	3	4	3	6
Vilnius	3	2	1	1	3	3	2	1	3	5	5	5	5	3	5	3	5
Mean	2	1,5	2	1	2	2,5	2	1,5	3,5	4	5	4,5	4,5	3	4,5	3	5,5

Padise

The volunteers had a nice time, but from the project description they expected to work on the monastery. This was not the case.

Tammiste

The volunteers did not feel satisfied about the project, because they felt that it was not for the 'public' but for an art project, and not necessary (especially the dog houses and the painting of the waste containers the second week). In the second week the accommodation was according to the volunteers not good organized.

Vilnius

The people on the project told the volunteers that the school will close its doors within a year. Therefore, the volunteers ask if the project is necessary. The meals and hospitality were good/nice.

Romania and Ukraine

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Romania																	
Aiud	5	3	3	4	5	3	2	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	3	7
Aiud	3	3	2	5	3	2	2	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	3	7
Aiud	3	4	1	5	4	3	3	3	4	4	5	4	5	5	2	5	
Aiud	3	2	2	4	4	2	3	3	4	1	4	1	4	4	4	3	5
Mean	3,5	3,0	2,0	4,5	4,0	2,5	2,5	3,3	3,8	3,0	4,3	3,0	4,3	4,3	4,8	2,8	6,0
Ukraine																	
Simferopol	4	2	4	3	2	1	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	3	3	7

Aiud

The volunteers mention that the goal of the project is good. The meals and the accommodation were well organized as well.

But because of the communication and coordination by the project coordinator, the volunteers did not feel appreciated by their jobs. The volunteers mentioned that it is necessary to change the atmosphere in the house, and then it is a nice project.

Simferopol

Only one volunteer responded with an evaluation report.

She mentions that the school project was better organized than the elderly project. The meals and accommodation were okay, but in the school it was not so good.

The volunteer said that she thinks that the coordinators are not really used to volunteers, but she thinks that if they learn from this year, they can organize it a little bit better next year.

Projects organized by ***Italy***

Albania

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Albania																	
Gorica	4	3	3	5	4	1	1	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	7
Gorica	4	4	2	4	3	1	1	1	3	5	4	3	4	5	2	2	6
Gorica	5	5	4	2	4	3	2	4	4	5	5	4	3	2	4	4	8
Mean	4,3	4,0	3,0	3,7	3,7	1,7	1,3	3,0	3,7	5,0	4,7	4,0	4,0	4,0	3,0	3,3	7,0

Gorica

The volunteers were surprised that they would sleep in the houses of local guest families. (Though, the families were very nice. But the volunteers would have liked it to know it in advance. The project information says that the volunteers will stay in Bed & Breakfast.)

The technical guidance needs to be improved.

Italy

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).	
Italy																		
Cortemilia	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	10
Cortemilia	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	3	5	4	4	5	5	8
Cortemilia	5	4	3	4	5	2	3	1	4	5	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	8
Mean	4,7	4,3	4,0	4,3	5,0	3,7	4,3	2,7	4,0	5,0	5,0	4,0	5,0	4,0	4,7	5,0	5,0	8,7
Nomadelfia	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	8
Nomadelfia	5	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	9
Nomadelfia	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	3	8	8
Nomadelfia	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	5	4	2	4	5	4	8	8
Mean	4,8	4,3	3,8	4,5	4,5	4,8	4,5	4,0	3,8	5,0	5,0	4,3	4,3	4,5	4,8	4,3	8,3	
Libolla / Ostellato	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	2	3	8	8
Libolla / Ostellato	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	3	4	8	8
Mean	4	4	4	4	4,5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	2,5	3,5	8	
Rieti	5	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	1	10	10
Vicchio	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	9
Vicchio	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	4	3	5	5	2	5	8	8
Vicchio	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	10	10
Vicchio	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	9	9
Vicchio	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	3	4	5	4	3	4	3	5	5	9	9
Mean	4,6	4,4	4,4	4,8	4,8	4,4	4,4	3,4	4,4	5	4,2	4	4,8	4,6	3,8	4,4	9	

Cortemilia

The volunteers are positive about the project, the hospitality and the accommodation.

Nomadelfia

The volunteers are very positive about the project, the people and the place.

Libolla / Ostellato

Positive evaluation reports.

Rieti

The volunteer mentions that she had to do a lot of small jobs, but still she wrote down a very positive and enthusiastic evaluation report.

Vicchio

The volunteers are very positive about the project coordinators and the total project.

Projects organized by ***Poland***

Poland

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO information	16. Expectations/ Reality	17. Overall mark (1-10)
Poland																	
Mikoszow	4	4	4	3	4	3	2	2	2	4	4	2	4	3	2	2	8,0
Mikoszow	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	4	3	4	3	8,0
Mikoszow	4	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	8,0
Mikoszow	4	5	4	4	5	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	7,0
Mikoszow	3	5	4	1	4	2	2	3	3	5	4	4	5	4	3	3	9,0
Mikoszow	5	5	4	3	5	2	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	3	2	4	9,0
Mikoszow	4	5	4	3	5	2	2	3	3	4	2	3	2	4	4	4	7,0
Mikoszow	4	2	4	1	5	2	2	2	2	5	2	5	5	3	2	2	7,0
Mikoszow	5	5	5	4	3	2	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	8,0
Mikoszow	5	5	5	4	5	3	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	2	4	8,0
Mikoszow	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	8,0
Mikoszow	5	4	4	2	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	8,0
Mikoszow	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	2	4	4	8,0
Mikoszow	4	2	1	3	3	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	3	3	5,0
Mikoszow	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	9,0
Mikoszow	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	3	4	3	2	4	9,0
Mikoszow	5	4	5	3	5	5	4	2	4	5	3	5	4	3	2	4	8,0
Mikoszow	5	3	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	5	8,0
Mikoszow	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	3	5	9,0
Mikoszow	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	9,0
Mikoszow	5	4	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	1	3	3	8,0
Mean	4,5	4,2	4,2	3,0	4,4	3,7	3,6	3,8	3,9	4,8	4,0	4,1	4,3	3,1	3,2	3,7	8,0

Mikoszow

In general positive evaluation reports, and positive remarks about the coordination of the project. The second + third group volunteers though, (not the school) remark that they would have liked to learn more building/repairing jobs.

Poland and Ukraine

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO information	16. Expectations/ Reality	17. Overall mark (1-10)
Poland																	
Lublin	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	9,0
Lublin	5	5	3	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	9,0
Lublin	4	3	2	4	4	4	3	3	3	5	5	3	4	2	4	3	6,0
Mean	4,7	4,0	3,0	4,3	4,3	4,0	3,7	3,7	4,0	5,0	5,0	4,0	4,7	4,0	4,0	4,0	8,0
Olshzyn																	
Olshzyn	5	4	5	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	4	7,0
Olshzyn	4	4	4	4	5	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	9,0
Olshzyn	5	4	3	2	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	8,0
Mean	4,7	4,0	4,0	3,0	4,0	3,3	4,0	4,0	4,3	5,0	5,0	4,7	5,0	4,3	5,0	4,7	8,0

Lublin

Project was nice, hospitable population. Some problems with language/communication, with the result that contact with the local population was a little bit difficult.

Olshzyn

Nice project, we have received positive evaluation forms. The volunteers remark that there were no activities organized with the blind inhabitants of the project. They expected that this was part of the project activities for the volunteers (like it was written on the project information).

Hospitality very good!

Ukraine

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO information	16. Expectations/ Reality	17. Overall mark (1-10)
Ukraine																	
L'viv	4	4	3	5	4	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	9,0
L'viv	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	9,0
L'viv	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	3	8,0
L'viv	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	3	8,0
Mean	4,3	4,3	3,5	4,8	3,5	4,0	4,8	4,3	5,0	5,0	5,0	4,5	5,0	4,8	4,8	3,8	8,5

L'viv

Volunteers expected to do building activities, but it was more a social project (due to a delay with the building-permission).

The volunteers are very enthusiastic about the hospitality of the Ukrainian people/project.

Projects organized by ***The Netherlands***

Bosnia & Herzegovina and Bulgaria

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO information	16. Expectations/ Reality	17. Overall mark (1-10)
Bosnia & Herzegovina																	
Banja Luka	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	3	4	4	8,0
Banja Luka	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	3	4	4	5	5	10,0
Banja Luka	5	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	4	3	5	5	9,0
Banja Luka	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	10,0
Banja Luka	5	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	4	3	5	5	5	9,0
Banja Luka	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	1	3	3	5	2	5	10,0
Banja Luka	5	4	4	5	3	2	5	1	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	4	8,0
Mean	5,0	4,4	4,7	4,3	4,1	3,6	4,6	3,7	4,4	5,0	4,1	3,3	3,4	4,0	4,1	4,7	9,1
Bulgaria																	
Troyan	3	4	4	4	4	3	1	2	4	5	4	3	2	5	2	2	6,0
Troyan	5	3	2	2	5	2	1	1	2	3	4	1	3	1	1	1	3,0
Troyan	4	4	4	5	5	3	2	3	4	4	4	3	3	5	3	4	8,0
Mean	4,0	3,7	3,3	3,7	4,7	2,7	1,3	2,0	3,3	4,0	4,0	2,3	2,7	3,7	2,0	2,3	5,7

Banja Luka

Positive evaluation reports. Only one female volunteer thought it was difficult to do useful jobs which were not too heavy. Sometimes there was not enough work to do for everyone, but in general a good project with satisfied volunteers.

Troyan

Due to communication problems this social try-out project was difficult. The volunteers remark that there was not so much help or guidance from the project, which made it difficult to organize social activities.

Croatia

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Croatia																	
Brezovica	5	5	5	5	5	2	3	4	3	5	5	3	4	4	5	5	
Brezovica	5	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	4	3	5	3	4	3	4	3	9
Brezovica	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	9
Brezovica	5	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	2	2	3	5	5	8
Brezovica	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	5	5	2	4	4	5	5	8
Brezovica	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	2	3	3	2	3	7
Mean	4,7	4,0	3,8	4,7	4,3	2,7	2,8	3,2	3,2	4,2	4,8	2,7	3,5	3,5	4,2	4,2	8,2
Oborovo	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	5	5	10
Oborovo	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	5	3	5	5	9
Oborovo	5	4	5	5	4	3	4	2	3	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	7
Oborovo	5	4	5	4	5	4	3	4	4	2	4	2	3	2	4	4	9
Oborovo	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	9
Oborovo	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	9
Mean	4,8	4,3	4,8	4,5	4,7	3,7	3,7	3,8	4,0	4,0	4,3	3,3	4,2	3,7	4,3	4,7	8,8

Brezovica

Positive evaluation reports.

We have received a few remarks about the general information when the volunteers arrived. They would have liked a more detailed introduction about the project etc.

Oborovo

Very positive evaluations. No special remarks.

Moldova and Romania

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Moldova																	
Capresti	2	2	1	1	4	2	1	1	3	3	3	2	3	1	3	2	5
Capresti	2	2	2	2	1	5	5	3	3	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	7
Capresti	3	3	2	4	3	2	1	4	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	2	6
Capresti	3	4	3	3	5	1	2	2	2	5	4	2	4	4	2	3	6
Mean	2,5	2,8	2,0	2,5	3,3	2,5	2,3	2,5	2,8	3,5	3,5	2,5	3,5	2,5	2,8	2,3	6,0
Romania																	
Giurcani	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	9
Giurcani	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	9
Giurcani	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	2	3	4	4	4	3	7
Giurcani	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	1	4	3	1	2	5	3	4	2	6
Giurcani	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	2	2	4	4	2	2	6
Giurcani	5	4	5	2	5	2	3	2	4	5	3	3	5	5	5	2	8
Giurcani	4	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	3	4	5	4	4	5	8
Mean	4,4	4,1	4,0	3,6	4,3	3,7	3,7	3,0	4,3	4,1	3,0	3,3	4,6	4,1	4,0	3,1	7,6
Haranglab	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	7
Haranglab	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	5	9
Haranglab	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	9
Haranglab	4,0	3,0	3,0	2,0	5,0	5,0	4,0	4,0	5,0	5,0	3,0	4,0	4,0	4,0	4,0	3,0	8,0
Mean	4,3	3,8	4,3	4,0	4,8	4,8	4,5	4,5	5,0	4,0	3,3	3,3	3,8	4,0	3,5	3,8	8,3

Capresti

The volunteers mention that there were not so much materials to work with. The jobs for the poor people were very useful, but for Casa Max, the communication and the work could have been better co-ordinated, according to the group. This is also the case for the technical guidance. Next year the volunteers prefer to work on the houses in the village, instead of working on the Casa Max house.

Giurcani

The volunteers remark that the accommodation was not so good, partly due to the fire in the house. The project is useful and necessary, but the volunteers remark that the communication with the project co-ordinator could be improved.

Haranglab

The situation in Haranglab is difficult, and has a big impact on the volunteers. They suggest to prepare the volunteers of next year to the local Roma-Romanian situation. They agree that the project is necessary, but they also mention that it is important to have a local coordinator in the village.

Russia

	1. Goal	2. Project is useful	3. Project is necessary	4. Contact with target group	5. Enough work to do	6. Enough materials	7. Technical guidance	8. Safety at work	9. Work was practicable	10. Hospitality	11. Accommodation	12. Info local situation	13. Meals	14. Contact local population	15. IBO-Information	16. Expectations/reality	17. Overall mark (1-10).
Russia																	
Taganrog Children	5	4	5	3	4	2	4	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	9
Taganrog Children	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	10
Taganrog Children	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	7
Mean	5,0	4,7	5,0	4,0	4,7	4,0	4,0	2,7	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	4,0	5,0	8,7
Ryschkowo	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	9
Ryschkowo	4	4	5	3	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	3	4	8
Ryschkowo	3	4	4	2	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	8
Mean	4,0	4,3	4,7	3,3	4,7	4,7	3,3	3,7	4,7	4,7	4,7	3,7	4,3	4,3	3,7	4,3	8,3

Taganrog children

Very positive evaluations, no special remarks received from the volunteers.

Ryschkovo

Very positive evaluation reports, no special remarks. A remark is placed about the technical guidance; the volunteers would have appreciated more feedback about their work (which, they later found out, was very good).

