

This questionnaire was filled in by 26 of the 28 participants between the 23rd and 29th of August (in addition one of the participating organizers gave general comments presented here under questions 8-11). Not all participants gave answers to all questions. The number of persons with a certain opinion is given within [brackets].

1. What is your opinion about the meeting?

Waste of time [0] OK [0] Good [16] Excellent [10]

2. If you are positive to the meeting, how often do you think we should arrange similar meetings?

Once a year [20] Every 18 months [5] Every second year [1] Every third year or More seldom [0]

3. What is the relevance to your research of the topics (risk and uncertainty) in focus at the meeting?

Fits very well. Of high relevance for my research. Good general information – now I know what kind of risk assessment I want to know more about, I would not have read the general papers without being forced for this meeting. It is very important to be able to communicate/evaluate uncertainties and which risks are associated with uncertain results. Very high relevance. Uncertainty or risk related to my research work can be represented in three stages. First: Natural soil, changing in soil characterization represents one of the important factors effecting on the uncertainty. Second: Mixing natural soil with binders uncertainty can be represented by different factors like: Binder content, Adequate mixing time and Spreading binders around the soil particles. Third: Curing conditions. Walker paper which is about how to find the uncertainty type that I face in my research work, and the definition of the risk from Aven paper. It is directly related with my work. Tricky, maybe, to find subjects relevant for all in future meetings. Ethical breach, data manipulation, measurement error, epistemic uncertainty etcetera. Those topics showed from a different perspective, made me reflect on my research and how the analysis of the risks and uncertainties propose a more organized way to sort and eventually solve them. I'm not using risk and uncertainty in my everyday research, but it can definitely be applied regarding e.g. modeling, so I would say that it is pretty relevant. The topic is a quite general subject, so I guess it will apply to many different scientific topics.

Mainly uncertainties rather than risks. Uncertainties are relevant to my project, for instance in the chosen model, in the geometry or in the chosen values for the parameters. Uncertainty! The uncertainty focus is directly relevant to my research in terms of model uncertainties while I find the risk focus to be less relevant. Risk is not a main topic in my research – however, the project is very focused on lowering the uncertainties. I would say that minimizing the uncertainties is one of the main tasks of my PhD project.

The tools I am researching will be used as input in risk models. Risk was relevant for most of us, I think. The papers allow me realize the risks present in my research and how to describe/interpret and face them considering the different definitions of risk.

Not so much. Not the most relevant topic, but certain relevance. Not really related to my work, but uncertainty exists in my research. In my case, I realized that for example quantitative estimations of uncertainties in results are something that is not included in presented results.



4. What do you think of the format of the meeting as regards...
- a. ...the four articles you were supposed to read before the meeting?
 Waste of time [0] OK [5] Good [14] Excellent [7]
- b. ...writing one page on how your own studies relates to the concepts and ideas of the papers?
 Waste of time [0] OK [4] Good [12] Excellent [10]
It would be nice if all pages were distributed. We were told the texts would be used during the meeting – they were not (see also comments at Question 9!).
- c. ...the possibility to get credits within your doctoral program?
 Without importance [1] OK [0] Good [8] Excellent [17]

5. What do you think of the day with group work and presentations? Mark the alternatives that you agree with. Feel free to add comments.

- There should have been more time for each presentation (and discussion) [3]
- The presentations should have been shorter [1]
- There should have been more introductory lectures for us who are less familiar with the risk concepts. [4]
- The meeting should be divided into sub-themes (soil mech. / rock mech. / hydrogeology / road eng. / geophysical methods / numerical modeling etc.) [9]
- Risk and uncertainty was a perfect topic! [11]
- Other ideas?
The “assignment” could have been clearer. Be clear on and communicate the purpose of the workshop and be very clear regarding the expected output. The text in the description was good but in terms of the above mentioned it could have been better.
The written assignment may be distributed among the participants before the meeting. Would have been good with more time to discuss with Lars after the presentations.
A good balance as it was. The program was very well fitted to time and audience.
More lectures would have been nice, but I understand that the time is limited. Nice with a common subject that everyone can relate to somehow.
The groups were heterogeneous and each participant had different opinions of the topics applied on their research. However, groups with similar backgrounds and researches could improve a deeper analysis and applicability of concepts (in this case risk & uncertainty) on specific subjects. People in similar research area can be in one group to have more discussion and ideas.



6. What do you think of the study visits?

d. Gothenburg drinking water supply

Waste of time [0] OK [5] Good [11,5] Excellent [8,5]

It would have been nice to see the inside of the Water facility and discuss cleaning processes - might not fit the theme perfectly though.

The two study visits didn't seem necessary for the theme of the workshop. Too much details on general information about the sites.

e. Marieholmstunneln

Waste of time [1,5] OK [13,5] Good [6] Excellent [3]

It seems like a very interesting project! However, it was a bit disappointing that we could not see anything or very little on the actual visit. Difficult to see anything, but the presentation before the visit was interesting.

Presentation was good, but the visit superficial. Too bad we couldn't go inside and see more details. Difficult to make a discussion out there on site – interesting project though. The presentation prior to the visit was good, but it was a pity that we couldn't enter the site.

7. What do you think of the location/accommodation/meals/social activities?

Hönö

Meals / Food

- Never again Hönö! [0]
- Nice environment, but unnecessary isolated for a meeting like this [4]
- Perfect conditions [21]

Restaurant

Bad [0] OK [0] Good [12] Perfect [14]

What is your opinion about the social activity "watching the sunset and chat by the cliffs"?

Accommodation

Bad [0,5] OK [13,5] Good [11]

Waste of time [0] OK [1,5] Good [8,5] Perfect way to talk [15]

Good because I stayed at the hotel. The hostel was good enough ☺. OK hostel.

Maybe we could have done something more organized one of the nights. OK but cold! Maybe the social activity could be a little bit more organized. For instance "team-building" activities where a problem is supposed to be solved by a group may be fun and also a good way to mix and meet other people that you do not already know?

8. What did you enjoy the most from the meeting?

Meeting, talking and discussing research with other PhDs [6]. The very positive atmosphere at the meeting, where all participants were active and wanted to contribute to make the meeting successful. Meeting other young scientists to discuss, exchange experiences and get inspired by each other [2]. The possibility to meet people from other universities, to get a broader perspective and to get some more insights into something that I would not have encountered otherwise. Interacting with other PhD students. To meet other PhD students working in the same (or close by) field [2]. Socializing. Meeting the other PhD students; both from the last meeting to get an update on what they are doing as well as meeting new ones. The social parts [2]. Meeting new people, networking. Chatting by the cliffs. Sharing opinions of different areas of study/investigation. Nice groups and interesting people. Getting to know fellow PhD students' work.

To notice how all research topics relate to uncertainties and the framework given by some of the articles is useful to structure different types of uncertainties. Some of the lectures were interesting. Discussions/lectures related to the uncertainty topic. Presentation of Marieholmstunneln before visiting the site. The visit at Gothenburg drinking water system and how the concepts, sometimes abstract, are applied on this case [3]. The two study visits and the time on the island. The stay at Hönö, very nice to have technical discussions in a sofa outside with sun shining.



9. Was there something that was bad, and should have been performed differently?

The purpose and outcome of the workshop was not specified clearly enough, a common problem with workshops. No feedback on the home assignment. The pre-meeting assignment was not at all used in the workshop, please give relevant assignments instead (even though the reflection part of the assignment is never lost). Too much time spent on examples of applications (i.e. water supply research) – interesting, but not applicable for all. The group work was not interesting – could have been more interesting if we could discuss and connect more to our own research (groups with sub-themes perhaps). It would have been good if some of the papers that were sent to us were more relevant with our work (some of them seem to be written for a general audience and not for the Geotechnology group in particular). The presentation by the groups seems unnecessary; more presentations from experts about risk and uncertainty in industry and its effects would have been better.

Not exactly, but I hoped to focus more on soil and road projects. Maybe organize the participants according to their investigations, more possibilities to create contacts within common subjects. Each university as a group could say something about their strength/research focus.

The Marieholm tunnel study visit should have been planned better to get access to the site [3]. The visit at Marieholmstunneln felt somewhat unstructured. The information prior to the visit was good, but it would have been nice to see the actual work from a closer point of view. More time and explanation about the Marieholmstunneln site. Even if the site visits were good, it would have been better if access to any of the installations had been part of the visit.

Inform before what kind of accommodation (shared rooms: who to share with and how many) and what to bring (here it was the possibility for bathing). Some heads-up about the shared accommodations would have been nice. The information said “hotel” not “hostel” – I might have packed differently. OK with budget accommodation.

10. What do you think should be the main activities of the theme group Geotechnology within the SBU the coming two-three years? All ideas are welcome, but please try to put them in your priority order.

It is most important to meet each other. To organize new meetings like this, using the same concept with a workshop theme and resulting in doctoral credits [3]. Small courses and seminars is a good idea, it is difficult to find useful PhD courses within theme Geo. It is difficult to find a good theme for the next meeting – maybe “borrow” a two-day course from SGF? Workshops/networking. Use the same topic again but with different examples of application. Maybe to analyze the study visit sites as a part of the group tasks would be a good idea. It would also be good to have something to read about the visited sites in advance.

Better coordinate the possibilities for PhD courses at other universities and inform about possibilities of exchanges between universities. Collaboration between the different universities considering research; focusing on PhD courses – what we have to offer each other. Exchange experience/ share expertise. Something about how to collaborate more between the universities but also within your own university. Relevant joint course in “compressed version”.

More study visits at ongoing projects around the country. Presentations and workshops on ongoing projects related to geotechnology in any city in Sweden[2]. Hoping to visit more project sites in Malmö and Stockholm [2]. More information about the Swedish situation and global market of geotechnology. Introduce more about different universities and industrial companies. Discussions about real cases of geotechnical structures in Sweden and how our research can be linked with this, in order to provide solutions and/or optimize future similar projects.

11. Any other comments?

Thank you for the nice meeting [2]! Well arranged [2]! Very well organized, keep up the good work! Good opportunity to meet colleagues and to initiate collaborations. Very good workshop. Nice to swim in the sea and very nice setting for the meeting.

The project topics of the students are very diverse, this is a challenge for the intended outcome of collaboration. With a meeting of all SBU theme groups it would be easier to find relevant collaboration possibilities. Meeting where all SBU theme groups meet. Some time allocated for collaboration brainstorming.

Suggestions of themes for next meeting: theory and methodology of science; ethics in science. Non destructive testing, novel materials and probabilistic approach. Latest innovations in field and laboratory testing, modelling [2] etcetera.

