

This questionnaire was filled in by all of the 22 participants between the 16th and 25th of March. However, 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 [11] Excellent [11]

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

Once a year [9.5] Every second year [12.5] Every third year [0] More seldom [0]

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

- There should have been more time for each presentation (and discussion) [2]
- The presentations should have been shorter [3]
- ~ 15 minutes are OK [17]
- Only PhD-students should present their work (no info on university level) [1]
- There should have been more info. about the different universities (from professors, supervisors etc.) [5]

- The meeting should be divided into sub-themes (soil mech. / rock mech. / hydrogeology / road eng. / geophysical methods / numerical modeling etc.) [9]
- Other ideas?

It is also good to listen to other research groups to broaden the knowledge. Maybe 1.5 days for presentations would be better (more room for discussions). Maybe a bit more discussion, but that's always difficult – at least, we got time for questions. Force presenters to keep the time limit or allocate two days for presentations. Maybe there should be two days presentations and more activities in between like workshops, round table discussions of different subjects etcetera. Maybe some kind of workshop connected to each sub-theme. Divide into sub-themes if more people are attending or longer presentations are given. The presentations of individual research can be divided into subthemes, but the meeting and study trip in general can be held together.

4. What do you think of the study visits?

a. Presentation of the Kiruna City Transformation

Waste of time [0] OK [8] Good [12] Excellent [2]

b. Visit in the mine

Waste of time [0] OK [2] Good [4.5] Excellent [15.5]

5. What do you think of the location/accommodation/meals?

Abisko

- Never again Abisko! [2]
- Nice environment, but unnecessary far out for a meeting like this [3]
- Perfect conditions [14]

Accommodation

Bad [0] OK [4] Good [16]

Meals / Food

Restaurant

Bad [0] OK [0] Good [10] Perfect [9]

Self-catered

Bad [0] OK [0] Good [8] Perfect [14]

*What is your opinion about the "dinner-activity"
(cooking together)*

Waste of time [0] OK [0] Good [5.5]
Perfect way to talk [16.5]

• Other ideas?

Perhaps not enough cooking tasks when such a number of people are participating. Self-cooking is perfect! Cooking together would have been better with groups organized before (now not all participate).

Perfect place to be – but use it!
Quite long trip and we did not see so much of the beautiful environment.
Since the weather was good maybe some workshop outside might be good to see and feel the nice weather.



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

To meet other PhD students in our field. The presentations that were relevant for my own research and the study visit to the mine. Everything was great, some nice presentations (added much knowledge), get together, and making food (I liked this most, we felt like a family). The interaction. Getting an insight about activities in other universities on related topics. Getting to know other PhD-students, as well as learn about the work they are doing. It was very interesting to get an idea about what is dealt with at other universities. In addition, it is good to meet people working on topics being related to one's own: important and nice at the same time. The friendly environment and the possibility to exchange ideas and discuss collaborations. Knowing some other people working with the same topic as mine and have some time to discuss the subject. Moreover, we had some fun and enjoyable time and talk together during preparing the dinner, study visit, sauna etc.

Meeting people. The study visit and to listen to what other PhD students are working with. The discussions and the dinner-activity. Know the different areas and types of researches. Communication with PhD students from different places. The location, the relaxed atmosphere, interesting presentations and very interesting visit to Kiruna mine. The variation in the research topics of the participants – in spite of the variation it was very fun to listen to the presentations and the projects have in fact many common parts. Visiting a cool location and meeting interesting people.

To talk to people and discuss their and my research. Meeting the other PhD-students.

Good to know what different research areas different universities have. Good to start knowing each other, maybe PhDs can work more together between different universities. The walks to the restaurant – magnificent surrounding nature and weather.

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

I think it would have been better to start with the study visits in Kiruna and then go to Abisko. Less time travelling in that case for the persons who would like to ski during the weekend. I would have liked to have some group activity outside in the beautiful nature around Abisko. I also think it would have been nice with some type of presentation connected to the research that is going on at the station in Abisko. Some more time for group activities. It would be good to organize the presentations to have a more detailed program with titles and presenter's name. It will also be useful to have a list of participants with their contacts.

If possible, it would be better with half day presentations and half day study visit instead of one whole long day of presentations. Putting all presentations on one day was a bit too much and could tire the audience and avoid their active participation in discussions after each presentation. Scheduling the presentation: In the morning session the presentations were long, therefore in the afternoon session we ended up to very short presentations. As a result I had to skip some of the slides and the audiences were exhausted. The Thursday was very long but I guess that's the way it is when the conference part is only one day. Stricter time control of the presentations. The day of presentations was too long and



exhaustive! Too long Thursday with presentations. The presentations time should be in control – 30 min. is too long! The presentation day was quite long and tiring. It should have been better communicated what the presentations should cover and the limit of 15 minutes should have been enforced more. Be harder on times to avoid delays of presentations.

Level of information during study visits should be raised (too basic/commercial).

Maybe the study visit was a little bit too short in order to get through everything for those that never had been in contact with mines before.

No [3]! Overall good and meaningful!

8. 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.

Arrange PhD-courses. Joint doctoral courses. Organize seminars or short PhD courses (½ days) on specific themes. PhD courses in a structured way. Doctoral course exchange between universities.

Organize PhD courses like Applied Statistics, Geostatistics.... Topical days/workshops. Maybe some workshop to get the PhDs to interact more with each other.

Similar activities like the ones in Abisko this time. Another meeting like this one. Some sort of general session where everybody presents his/her research briefly and after that people should form sub-groups and discuss the issues in detail. For example it can be divided into the following groups: road – environments – dams and tailing dams – numeric etc. Maybe every certain period, this mini conference can be addressed like a national conference where the most outstanding projects can be presented to a wide audience (e.g. students, companies, academics etc.). Keep doing this kind of relaxed and nice conferences. Not sure, but I think more meetings like this should be organized – fun, interesting and beneficial. Organize meetings like this. It would be good to add group discussions, to discuss the presentations at meetings like this one. A small annual meeting to discuss research and for social activities. Another meeting like this in two years.

It would be good with a quarterly newsletter with mixed information regarding on-going research in Geotechnology at our universities. With such information it would be easier to follow up meetings like this one. Forum where doctoral students may upload presentations they have done in order to share their research with each other. Such a forum does not necessarily create more work for the PhDs.

Another study visit – see the frozen ground? Study site visits. Organize study visits.

Road construction and pavement analysis seemed to be a “hot topic”.



Some research projects are closely related, co-operation within those.

Meet the industry to better understand their needs and possible research directions.

On a more general plane numerical modeling of any kind is unquestionably what is increasingly focused. Maybe what is important is to show on applicability and reliability of results, and to convince consultants to aim for optimization and see the strengths of improved modeling approaches.

9. Any other comments?

It would be nice to follow the progress of the other PhD-students' research – maybe a shared web page can be of interest.

Thanks for a well arranged event! Thank you for organizing this meeting! Good!

Very good activity!

The event was well organized, but there should be some sort of record-keeping for the past members of the events.

The location of the events should be changed and for the next meeting another university takes the responsibility. Next time another university may book and plan.

It's important to have meetings every year so that a PhD student can participate at least twice during the studies (assuming 50% of the meetings do not fit the schedule).

Another time everybody should be asked in an open e-mail if they are interested in travelling together to the meeting or to plan common activities after the meeting. Now it was difficult to contact other participants in beforehand and thus many small groups travelled to different places after the study visit in Kiruna. And it was difficult to plan for a shared taxi from the late flight to Kiruna.

