End-of-event Participant Evaluation

Number of completed forms:

- 44

Main Coding Criteria:

1. Event
2. Materials
3. Event Delivery
   - Plenary
   - Group Discussion
   - Presentation
   - Panel Discussion
4. Facilities
   - Auditorium, furniture, communication aid
   - Accommodation
   - Food/beverages during the event

1. Event

1.1 What are your views of the event overall?

Useful	Not Useful
43 (97.70%)	1 (2.30%)

Some individuals mentioned more than one of the reasons below:

-Timely/Relevant: 6
-Awareness: 7
-Well organized: 14
-Informative: 10
-No specific reason given (other): 8

1.2 Were the objectives of the seminar achieved? If no, please specify

Yes		No	
41	(93.20%)	3	(6.80%)

1.3 Has this event been relevant to your work? If yes, in what way?

Yes		No	
44	(100%)	0	(0%)

-Ideas on combating fraud

-Share experiences, best practices and map a way forward

-Network

-in verifying qualifications

1.4 What did you find the most interesting and the least interesting part of the event?

| Interesting		Least Interesting	
Challenges & experiences from other countries	10 (22.70%)	Time management	2 (4.50%)
Presentations	11 (25%)	Lack of wifi	1 (2.30%)
Panel/ Group Discussion	16 (36.40%)	Some countries absent	2 (4.50%)
Everything	5 (11.40%)	Group discussion needed more participation	1 (2.30%)
		Noise in the group discussions	1 (2.30%)

Least Interesting

2. Materials

2.1 The Declaration is a key document shared with you in the seminar. How will your organization put this into action?

• Have to consult with the relevant authorities at home country before adoption of Declaration	19 (48.70%)
• Develop partnerships, collaboration interactions to ensure effective verifications	12 (30.80%)
• Advocacy, raise awareness	8 (20.50%)

(5 candidates did not respond to this section.)

Materials

(bar chart)

	Materials
Consult with home country authorities	19
Develop partnerships	12
Advocacy	8

3. Event Delivery

What was the quality of?

3.1 Plenary

Average	Good	Very Good
2 (4.80%)	15 (35.70%)	25 (59.50%)

(2 candidates did not respond to this section)

Plenary

(bar chart)

	Plenary
Average	2
Good	15
Very Good	25

3.2 Group Discussion

Average	Good	Very Good
4 (9.30%)	12 (27.90%)	27 (62.80%)

(1 candidate did not respond to this section)

3.3 Presentations

Average	Good	Very Good
3 (7%)	22 (51.20%)	18 (41.90%)

(1 candidate did not respond to this section)

3.4 Panel Discussion

Average	Good	Very Good
4 (9.80%)	13 (31.70%)	24 (58.60%)

(3 candidates did not respond to this section)

4. Facilities

What was the quality of?

4.1 Auditorium, furniture, communication aid

| Average	Good	Very Good
3 (6.80%)	19 (43.20%)	22 (50%)

-Wifi was needed –Noisy hall (group discussion)

4.2 Accommodation (if relevant)

Average	Good	Very Good
6 (27.30%)	13 (59.10%)	4 (18.20%)

(22 did not respond to this section.)

4.3 Food/beverages during the event

Average	Good	Very Good
5 (11.40%)	20 (45.50%)	19 (43.20%)

-More savory snacks for tea breaks.

-Consider diabetic health needs.

-Halaal standards should be considered.