CAPonLITTER
Interreg Europe

Regional Stakeholders Workshop #3 (Portugal) – English Summary and Results

May 2021

Title: Regional Stakeholders Workshop #3 (Portugal) – English Summary and Results

Version: 1

Authors:

José Carlos Ferreira (LP1 – FCT-NOVA)

Cláudio Duarte (LP1 – FCT-NOVA)

Lia Vasconcelos (LP1 – FCT-NOVA)

Filipa Ferreira (LP1 – FCT-NOVA)

Margarida Nunes (PP2 – APA)

Isabel Moura (PP2 – APA)

Renato Monteiro (LP1 – FCT-NOVA)

Catarina Jóia Santos (LP1 – FCT-NOVA)

Date: May 2021

Location: FCT-NOVA, Campus de Caparica, Almada (Portugal)

1. Planning and logistics

1.1. Introduction

The Portuguese 3rd Regional Stakeholders Workshop, of the CAPonLITTER project, was co-organized by PP2 – Portuguese Environment Agency (APA) and by LP1 – NOVA School of Science and Technology (FCT-NOVA).

With the title "The best that is done around here! - evaluation and co-construction of the Good Practices of the CAPonLITTER project", this event focused on the evaluation of Good Practices submitted by the stakeholders, prior to the workshop.

The event took place online on 22 April 2021, using Zoom software. The workshop started at 9:30 and ended at 13:00.

1.2. Communication

As this event focused on the evaluation and co-construction of Good Practices (GP), three weeks prior to the workshop, the staff sent a form to all the stakeholders, so they could submit GP implemented by their organization and/or other organizations. They were encouraged to share this initiative with other organizations as well.

Closer to the date of the event, the staff from both partners sent the invitation for the 3rd Regional Stakeholders Workshop by email. The invitation was sent by email to all the stakeholders previously identified and to potential new ones, and it included all the information about the workshop: programme and registration form, created using Google Forms.

The invitation email had all the basic information, the programme and the registration form, created with Google Forms. This form collected the participants email, name, institution, and agreement with the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

The Zoom room link was sent to the registered participants two days before the workshop.

1.3. Online venue

Due to the COVID-19 crisis, the event took place online, using the Zoom software, on a session licenced by the FCT-NOVA services. The Zoom software allowed for the work to take place in breakout rooms, splitting the participants in smaller rooms for the group activities.

1.4. Registration and participation

As stated above, the registration was carried out using a Google Form. While 31 participants registered for this workshop, only 20 of them participated in the workshop. The remaining were either staff or experts which were contacted to evaluate the submitted Good Practices. Their profile is shown on Table 1.

Table 1 - Profile of the participating stakeholders.

Category	Number of participants
Distributors and retailers	2
Waste Management Services	1
Political and Coastal Management Authorities	12
Civic and Non-Governmental Organizations	3
Academia and Research	2
Total of Stakeholders	**20**
Staff	9
Experts	2

2.   Workshop activities

2.1.   Welcome session

At the Welcome Session, the LP1 Project Coordinator, José Carlos Ferreira, and the PP2 member, Margarida Nunes, welcomed the participants to the workshop. José Carlos made a short presentation about the CAPonLITTER project, namely its objectives, its project partners and the staff members of the two Portuguese partners.

After that, Lia Vasconcelos, Project Co-coordinator from LP1 and responsible for the participatory process, briefly explained the methodology for the participatory dynamic of the workshop.

2.2.   Breakout room sessions

The participants were split into four breakout rooms, each with no more than six stakeholders. In each room, a staff member acted as facilitator, helping the participants with the work, controlling the time, and encouraging everyone to contribute to the activities.

The distribution of the participants into breakout rooms was done prior to the date of the workshop, so the groups could be as diverse as possible. Additionally, this distribution in advance was essential to avoid potential conflicts of interest (e.g.: a stakeholder evaluating the Good Practice they submitted).

A fifth room was created for the rest of the staff members. Here, they could talk and discuss the work progress. These members also visited the different rooms to oversee the participants' interactions.

Each breakout room needed to evaluate three Good Practices. The distribution of the 12 GP, submitted prior to the event and to be evaluated during the workshop, for each breakout room is represented in Table 2.

The results of the evaluation and co-construction performed by the stakeholders, alongside the evaluation of the team of Experts, will be fundamental to improve the quality of the GP submitted. The comments provided both by the stakeholders and the Experts will be shared with the entity responsible for the Good Practice, so they can improve it and, consequently, submit it to the Interreg Europe website.

Table 2 - Distribution of the submitted Good Practices for evaluation and co-construction by each of the Breakout Rooms

	Good Practice
Room 1	▪ GP05: *Plástico à vista* (Plastic in sight) by EDA (Ensaios e Diálogos Associação) ▪ GP07: *Quero a minha praia limpa!* (I want my beach clean) by Associação Litoral Aventura ▪ GP08: *Jovens em Movimento* (Young people on the move) by Oeiras Municipality
Room 2	▪ GP01: *Amarsul Eco-Praias* (Amarsul Eco-Beaches) by Amarsul ▪ GP09: *Certificação 3R6* (3R6 Certification) by Ponto Verde Serviços ▪ GP13: *Waste4Coffee #2MinuteBeachCleanup* by Waste4Coffee
Room 3	▪ GP02: *(R)educar - Responsabilidade Social e Ambiental* (Re-educate - Social and Environmental Responsability) by Torres Vedras Municipality ▪ GP03: *Ocean Spirit - Zero Plástico Descartável* (Ocean Spirit - Zero Disposable Plastic) ▪ GP11: *Limpeza de Praia* (Beach cleanup) by Vila Galé S.A.
Room 4	▪ GP04: *Zero Beatas no Chão* (Zero cigarette butts on the floor) by Torres Vedras Municipality ▪ GP06: *TransforMAR* (To transform the sea) by LIDL Portugal ▪ GP12: *Projeto CARE* (CARE Project) by Vitrus Ambiente E.M.

2.3. Evaluation and Co-construction of Good Practices

The following tables represent the work developed by the different groups of stakeholders during the participatory process.

2.3.1. Room 1 – Good Practice 05: "Plástico à Vista"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	5	It is important to more initiatives aimed at increasing proximity to users of a given space, considering having greater incidences to be corrected, and focusing on environmental awareness and good practices
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	4	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	4	-
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	Due to the mobility of the project
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	3	It was not possible to reach general public
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	2	There was no replicability because there were no partners
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	3	Objectives are not clear, can lead to confusion. Specific objectives need to be clearer
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	4	With the comparative numbers presented by the project, it reached higher numbers
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	4	-
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	2	Equipment is described, but the value for analysing replicability is unclear.
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	4	-

How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	4	-

1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent

A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)	The mobility of the project guarantees the objective of reaching the greatest number of people aware. Need to clarify actions to achieve objectives. The real impact is not clear, as the success indicators only showed the number of itineraries.

2.3.2. Room 1 - Good Practice 07: "Quero a minha praia limpa!"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	3	-
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	2	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	2	-
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	2	-
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	1	There is no data to perform the assessment
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	1	There is no data to perform the assessment
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	2	There are no defined goals
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	1	There is no data or methodology on how the evaluation of results will be carried out
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	1	There is no data or methodology on how the evaluation of results will be carried out
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	1	There is no information on how companies can contribute
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	1	There is an omission of objectives and data, which makes it difficult to justify the allocation of funding
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	2	It is a project that can be financed, but as it is written it does not make it possible
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)	The Good Practice has potential, its description and presentation makes its implementation unattractive.	

2.3.3. Room 1 - Good Practice 08: "Jovens em Movimento"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	5	The longevity of the initiative
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	5	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	5	Young people description and selection process
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	-
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	5	Due to the number of young people joining
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	5	As long as there are human resources allocated to the initiative
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	4	There is no comparative history. It is not clear whether the aim is just to raise awareness among young people or to keep them busy.
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	4	Although the practice contains the number of young participants, it does not have numbers relating to the amount of waste collected.
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	4	The analysis of qualitative data on collected waste is lacking.
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	4	It omits the logistics part (equipment, transport) and the financial part
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	5	-
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	5	-
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)	Raise awareness and make young people responsible, since this activity brings benefits to the community. The Good Practice could highlight the benefit that this activity brings to future generations. Suggestion for improvement: development of materials so that young people can raise awareness in their families.	

2.3.4. Room 2 - Good Practice 01: "Amarsul Eco-Praias"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	3	Lack of data to clearly assess the achievement of objectives.
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	5	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	5	We don't know how the management and implementation is done.
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	-
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	5	-
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	4	We know it was replicated because it is referred to but there is no evidence
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	3	The objectives are clear but do not refer to targets or indicators
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	1	There is no quantitative date
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	2	The only result mentioned the 3rd edition
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	4	It is mentioned who finances the project and where the resources will be allocated to; however, these are not quantified.
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	5	-
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	5	-
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)		It is a good practice with potential for success, but it lacks information in terms of results.

2.3.5. Room 2 - Good Practice 09: "Certificação 3R6"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	3	Although some information on the good execution of the measure is provided, this is not reflected in the document
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	2	It does not state the problem clearly
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	5	-
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	-
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	5	-
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	4	It is reported that it has been applied in various contexts but does not present evidence
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	3	The objective is clear but does not present data
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	1	No data is presented
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	2	They refer to the certification of various events/entities but do not refer to evidence
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	1	There is no mention of the necessary financial and human resources
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	5	-
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	5	-
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)	We are aware that the results of this Good Practice are good, but through the submitted information this is not evident.	

2.3.6. Room 2 - Good Practice 13: "Waste4Coffee / #2MinuteBeachCleanup"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	5	-
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	5	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	5	-
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	-
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	5	-
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	5	-
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	4	Quantitative goals are missing
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	4	They could quantify and characterize what is collected
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	4	Do not show results of the action itself
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	5	
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	5	
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	5	
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)	It is a good measure. Nonetheless, we suggest the inclusion of people who do not drink coffee and the use of standard buckets provided by Waste4Coffee	

2.3.7.   Room 3 - Good Practice 02: "(R)educar - Responsabilização Social e Ambiental"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	4	-
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	4	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	3	Activity partners were not identified
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	-
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	4	-
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	3	-
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	2	There is a need to quantify the reduction of waste on beaches or the evolution of behaviour of the sensitized population.
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	3	There is a need to quantify the reduction of waste on beaches
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	1	No quality results were presented
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	5	-
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	5	Assuming that the municipal budget is public funding
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	5	-
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)	Very interesting environmental education initiative with high replicability. However, it needs metrics to monitor the population behaviour change (e.g.: follow-up).	

2.3.8. Room 3 - Good Practice 03: "Ocean Spirit: Zero Plástico Descartável"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	4	-
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	5	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	5	-
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	-
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	4	It is not clear whether the measures were applied only to participants or also to other beach users.
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	5	Although it seems easily replicable, there is no evidence that this has happened (due to the current pandemic)
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	3	No targets are presented
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	3	As there were no defined goals, it is not possible to see if the results achieved were as expected
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	4	Although it seems there was an effective reduction in the single-use plastic usage, no targets were presented
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	5	-
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	5	-
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	5	-
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)	Good initiative, easily replicable, with low cost. Measure that can be considered for reference for future events, on this or other topics.	

2.3.9.   Room 3 - Good Practice 11: "Limpeza de Praia"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	2	According to what was stated, the Good Practice hasn't been implemented yet. Nevertheless, it has clear roles.
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	2	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	3	-
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	-
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	5	-
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	4	-
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	5	-
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	1	Activity not performed yet, so there are no results.
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	1	Activity not performed yet, so there are no results.
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	5	-
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	4	-
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	4	By sticking to Hotel guests
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)		Simple practice with direct effects on the disposal of trash from the beach. However, there are no quantifiable results, as it was not carried out.

2.3.10. Room 4 - Good Practice 04: "Zero Beatas no Chão"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	4	Theme is very pertinent, replicable and with potential for expansion outside festivals.
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	3	Possibility of improving the project description with clearer indication of the equipment's signage. The description of good practice
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	2	It is not clear which stakeholders are involved in the various stages of implementation
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	-
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	5	-
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	2	-
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	2	Absence of an indicator to measure the collected cigarette butts.
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	3	The annual variation since 2018 should be presented (to see how impactful the changed have been)
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	3	Provide an estimate based on cigarette consumption.
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	4	It does not mention the involvement of Human Resources
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	5	
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	4	
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)	It is a great idea - low cost, with high replicability. It needs, however, a description from HR stakeholders and of materials to be used, to highlight the reuse of materials	

2.3.11. Room 4 - Good Practice 06: "TransforMAR"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	4	There needs to be a reinforcement in awareness raising
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	5	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	5	-
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	Reinforcement of awareness through the overlapping of themes developed by the managing entities
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	5	Many stakeholders involved and high tonnage of waste collected
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	3	It does not demonstrate replicability
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	4	Lack of plastic reduction data in LIDL activities until 2025
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	5	Absence of waste targets to be collected
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	4	Absence of data mentioned above
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	4	Absence of indication of financial resources
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	5	-
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	4	-
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)		Excellent project to raise awareness on the issue of plastic with emphasis on the conversion of waste into material and financial goods (social support)

2.3.12. Room 4 - Good Practice 12: "Projeto CARE"

1 - IMPLEMENTATION	Score	Comments
How do you evaluate the consolidation of the good practice? (Has it been implemented for a long time? Is its execution good? Does it clearly meet the objectives?)	3	Lack of description of execution data and evaluation indicators and number of establishments involved in the action
How is the problem described? (Does it clearly describe the problems it is trying to solve?)	5	-
How is the description of the stakeholders involved and of the processes? (Management, implementation, communication processes, etc.)	2	Lack of description of stakeholders (sends complementary description on links, but the Good Practice itself should include all of this information)
2 - REPLICABILITY AND INSPIRATION		
What is the potential for applicability? (for example, different types of coastal zones, different countries, different activities, etc.)	5	All the consumption locations nationwide (commercial establishments, festivals, among others)
What is the potential for active involvement (engagement) of the population / stakeholders?	5	-
How do you rate the degree of demonstration of replicability? (Does the form indicate whether the good practice has already been replicated? Is there evidence?)	2	Absence of evidence of replicability
3 - SUCCESS		
How have the goals and objectives been defined? (Are they clear? Are they measurable? Does it include indicators?)	2	Lack of goals and miscellaneous data (number of establishments involved, waste collected, reduction of cups, among others)
How are the quantitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	2	-
How are the qualitative results? (Do they show results? Are they in line with the goals and objectives? Are they evident?)	2	-
4 - PUBLIC FUNDING		
How is the demonstration of the necessary resources? (Human and financial)	2	Absence of Human Resources and financial data
How is the suitability of the good practice for public funding? (Is it already being publicly funded? If not, does it have the potential to be?)	5	-
How easily can the good practice apply for public funds? (Would it be easy to apply this good practice to the instruments in force?)	4	-
1 – Very weak / 2 – Weak / 3 – Moderate / 4 – Good / 5 – Excellent		
A Key Idea of the evaluation (in one sentence - criticism, praise, suggestions for improvement…)	Excellent idea, only needs clarification of the points highlighted in the remarks	

2.4. Closing of the event

After each group finished filling the Evaluation of Good Practices sheets, all the participants returned to the Main Room (in Zoom). There, each Rapporteur presented and shared with every participant the key idea of the evaluation they did for each of the three Good Practices analysed. At the end, there was a period for discussion and debate, where some stakeholders gave positive feedback about the event.

2.5. Evaluation of the 3rd Regional Stakeholders Workshop

After the event, an Evaluation Form was sent to all the participants, so they could answer three questions about the 3rd Regional Stakeholders Workshop:

1. What did you like the most about the workshop?
2. What did you like the least about the workshop?
3. Suggestions and additional comments.

Four participants answered the Evaluation Form. However, since the questions were not mandatory, there are not four answers to each of the questions. Nevertheless, the obtained answers for each question were:

1) What did you like the most about the workshop?
   i)   Information on good practices, success and failure factors associated with each initiative.
   ii)   Sharing ideas in the workgroup.
   iii) The dynamic for listening to everyone involved.
   iv) The group dynamic.

2) What did you like the least about the workshop?
   i)   Difficulty in evaluating good practices due to insufficient information associated with each action and not having access to clarifications by the promoting entities.
   ii)   Duration of group work could be longer.

3) Suggestions and additional comments.
   i)   It would be more useful to have access to good practice information before the workshop starts to have more time for analysis and allow for questions and doubts with the proponents.

Overall, despite the low number of answers, the evaluation of the workshop is very posi   tive, with the participants mentioning the participatory exercise as the most positive element of the workshop.