The first training of trainers, which is part of the WP3, took place in the Department of Sanitary and Environmental Engineering of the Faculty of Civil Engineering of the Budapest University of Technologic and Economics in Budapest. The training was organized on 18-23 January 2010.

On 18 of January, 2010 the software was installed to the computers as the agreement contain.

The course's instructor was Daniel Moran.
The participants of the course were:

| | Participant(s) | Company/Institution |
|---|---|---|
| **1** | Silvia Kirilova | University of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy (UACEG) – Sofia, Bulgaria |
| **2** | Vladimir Kukurin | UACEG – Sofia, Bulgaria |
| **3** | Péter Darabos | Budapest University of Technologic and Economics (BME) |
| **4** | Marcell Knolmár | BME |
| **5** | Zsolt Jolánkai | BME |
| **6** | Tamás Karches | BME |
| **7** | Dániel Sándor | BME |
| **8** | Gábor Bódi | BME |
| **9** | Roland Fülöp | BME |
| **10** | László Raum | BME |
| **11** | Kálmán Buzás | BME |
| **12** | Adrienne Clement | BME |
| **13** | Adrienn Horváth | BME |

Before the training course nobody used the MIKE Urban software.

The training course started with an introduction by Evzen Zeman.

The course is focused on the understanding basic of modelling, model applications and use basic principles and functionality of MIKE Urban – Collection system. On the first training day were presented the MIKE Urban software. During this introduction the inspector talked about the overview, architecture, modules, collection system, water distribution, assets management, tools, interface, geodatabase and database of project. We got acquainted with the data input and horizontal plan graphics (delete elements, horizontal plan options, zoom facilities, editing facilities, query and sort functions).

On the next days we had hands-on exercises on a project existent yet, and we had to create a new project as well. By the end of the course has already running simulation after we give the necessary model parameters (rain intensity and duration, catchments, links and nodes properties).

During the course many question were raised about the operational, using and parameters of the software.

At the end of the course every participant filled the evaluation form of the training. The results, represented in per cent, are the following:

| To what extent do you agree with the following statements? | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. The course fulfilled my expectations** | 25,0 | 66,7 | 8,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **2. The technical contents of the course was satisfactory** | 70,0 | 10,0 | 10,0 | 10,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **3. The material was presented clearly and comprehensively** | 41,7 | 50,0 | 8,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **4. The instructor's technical knowledge was adequate** | 58,3 | 41,7 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **5. The presentation covered the subjects well** | 25,0 | 75,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **6. I know where to find additional related information** | 27,3 | 54,5 | 18,2 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **7. The length of the course was suitable** | 41,7 | 8,3 | 41,7 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **8. There was enough time for discussions** | 58,3 | 25,0 | 16,7 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **9. There was enough time for the hands-on exercises** | 45,5 | 27,3 | 18,2 | 9,1 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **10. The hands-on exercises were relevant and instructive** | 33,3 | 58,3 | 8,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **11. The information provided beforehand was adequate** | 25,0 | 50,0 | 16,7 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 8,3 |
| **12. The classroom facilities were satisfactory** | 41,7 | 41,7 | 16,7 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **13. The course was well organised** | 50,0 | 50,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **14. I would be interested in additional courses** | 66,7 | 33,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| **15. I will recommend this course to others** | 66,7 | 25,0 | 8,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |

*(1 – Not relevant; 2 – Strongly disagree; 3 – Disagree; 4 - Neither/nor; 5 – Agree, 6 – Strongly agree)*

| | Excellent | Good | Acceptable | Blow expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **What was your overall impression of the course?** | 33,3 | 58,3 | 8,3 | 0,0 |

About the results seems that the participants were satisfied with the course.