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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Workshop Evaluation &amp; Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organized by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scientific secretary:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistants to scientific secretary:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rapporteurs:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of participants:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of countries:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data below was sourced from contributions from 24 workshop participants.
Overall Workshop Rate  
(n = 24)

- Value for money / time  
  - Awful: 4  
  - Poor: 21  
  - Okay: 54  
  - Good: 21  

- Location & Venue  
  - Awful: 4  
  - Poor: 21  
  - Okay: 54  
  - Good: 21  

- Networking  
  - Awful: 8  
  - Poor: 4  
  - Okay: 63  
  - Good: 13  

- Learning  
  - Awful: 8  
  - Poor: 4  
  - Okay: 63  
  - Good: 25  

- Ability to participation  
  - Awful: 25  
  - Poor: 58  
  - Okay: 17  
  - Good: 8  

- Facilitation  
  - Awful: 17  
  - Poor: 75  
  - Okay: 8  
  - Good: 8  

- Presentation  
  - Awful: 29  
  - Poor: 63  
  - Okay: 8  
  - Good: 8  

- Organisation  
  - Awful: 21  
  - Poor: 58  
  - Okay: 21  
  - Good: 4  

- Content  
  - Awful: 4  
  - Poor: 13  
  - Okay: 79  
  - Good: 4
Overall Workshop Rate (n = 24)

Content
- Okay: 4%
- Good: 13%
- Great: 79%

Organisation
- Good: 21%
- Great: 21%
- WOW: 58%

Presentation
- Good: 63%
- Great: 29%
- WOW: 8%

Facilitation
- Good: 8%
- Great: 17%
- WOW: 75%

Ability to participation
- Good: 58%
- Great: 25%
- WOW: 17%

Evaluation criteria:
- Okay: Not satisfied
- Good: Satisfied
- Great: Very satisfied
- WOW: Extremely satisfied
Overall Workshop Rate (n = 24)

Learning

- 63% Okay
- 25% Good
- 8% Great
- 4% WOW

Networking

- 50% Good
- 37% Great
- 13% WOW

Location & Venue

- 54% Okay
- 21% Good
- 21% Great
- 4% WOW

Value for money / time

- 54% Okay
- 21% Good
- 21% Great
- 4% WOW
Evaluation of Sessions (n = 21)

Number of Participants

- Session 2: General overview
  - Least useful: 1
  - Most useful: 1
- Session 3: Regional perspectives
  - Least useful: 2
  - Most useful: 2
- Session 4: Biological pathways
  - Least useful: 1
  - Most useful: 3
- Session 5: Intervention and case studies
  - Least useful: 4
  - Most useful: 3
- Session 6: Tools and current approaches
  - Least useful: 1
  - Most useful: 2
- Session 8: Summary and feedback
  - Least useful: 1
  - Most useful: 3

- Breakout
  - Least useful: 8
  - Most useful: 7

- All
  - Least useful: 1
  - Most useful: 8

Legend:
- Red: Least useful
- Green: Most useful
Meeting Expectations (n = 19)

Number of participants

- Knowledge: 5 participants (2: Okay, 1: Good, 1: Great, 2: Wow)
- Learning: 6 participants (1: Okay, 1: Good, 1: Great, 1: Wow)
- Agenda setting: 1 participant (1: Okay)
- Contribute ideas: 1 participant (1: Okay)
- Networking: 1 participant (1: Okay)
- New host: 1 participant (1: Okay)
- Supervision to do more: 1 participant (1: Okay)
- Research gaps: 1 participant (1: Okay)
- Action plan/framework: 1 participant (1: Okay)
- Sharing experiences: 2 participants (1: Okay, 1: Good)
- Timely: 1 participant (1: Okay)
- Multi-sectoral: 1 participant (1: Okay)
- All: 1 participant (1: Okay)

Legend:
- Okay
- Good
- Great
- Wow
What would you have liked to have seen done differently?

- More specific questions for 1st breakout session would have been better
- Sitting arrangements
- Food at coffee breaks
- More time for discussions
- Better catering
- More focus on technology and technological solutions on DBM
- Networking was not very easy due to the room setup and brief coffee break
- More days (if discussion times are not possible to be longer)
- To come up with some framework
- Make objectives clearer
- Not to involve too many
- To have even presentations and equal relevance

What did we miss/ should we have done MORE of?

- Micronutrient deficiencies focus
- Focus on technology and technological solutions on DBM
- More stakeholders to get a feel at their opinion and how they fit in the nutrition agenda
- More time for breakout sessions

Should we run another workshop like this? Why?

YES (n=14)

- Small workshop: for more in depth discussion, large workshop: to educate
- Certainly needs follow up monitoring action
- Very practical and informative
- Paper writing for a supplemental issue in American Journal of Clinical Nutrition
- Great learning experience and networking opportunity
- To enable sharing experiences with experts that you have no access to
- To build up on what has been learned and add on to what will have been covered by then and move forward – develop further action plans
- More time for discussion to get a conclusion about action prints
- It is a very good momentum to trigger/catalyse things in the field
- Important to convene the many different players interested in the double burden
- Learning was incredible
- If the focus and aims are clear