2017 IPPC Regional Workshop Thank you for participating in the IPPC Regional Workshops.

This survey is estimated to take less than ten minutes to complete.

We appreciate your feedback as it helps us understand how future IPPC regional workshops can be adjusted to best respond to participants' needs.

*1. Which regional works	shop did you attend?					
Africa						
Asia						
Caribbean						
Central Asia and Easter	rn Europe					
Latin America						
Near East						
Southwest Pacific						
2. Participant name						
2 Country						
3. Country						
4. Job title						
1. 900 title		_				
		⊽				
I I■	Þ					
5. Please select the most a	ppropriate answer base	d on your e	experience at th	ne workshop session:		
The content was:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Relevant						
Thorough						
Easy to understand						
Additional comments:			Þ			
6. I was well informed abo	out the objectives of this	workshop				
Strongly agree						
Agree						
Neither agree nor disag						
Neither agree nor disag	ree					

0	Strongly disagree N/A					
7. V	Who did you consult with prior to participating in	the work	sshop?			
	was well prepared for this workshop (e.g. analyze ilable before attending this workshop)	d the dra	aft stand	ards and	other docu	iments
000000	Strongly agree Agree Neither agree or disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree N/A					
	How would you describe your understanding of thing?	he follow	ing BEF	ORE att	ending this	
		Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A (the topic was not included into the agenda)
Ob	jectives of the workshop					
_	dates from CPM-12 (2017) and Secretariat ivities					
Sus	stainable funding					
	line Comment System (OCS) and the latest velopments					
Ov	erview of the Standard Setting process					
	17 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of vtosanitary terms) (1994-001)					
	quirements for the use of fumigation as a ytosanitary measure (2014-004)					
	ernational movement of cut flowers and foliage 008-005)					
app	PM 14 The use of integrated measures in a systems broach for pest risk management, and the beyond impliance tool					
En	nerging issues in plant health					
Th						
	e Secretariat Call for Phytosanitary Treatments					

N/A (the topic was not included into the Excellent agenda)

2020 International Year of Plant Health: updates and latest achievements and follow up from last year

Regional Workshop from countries

Demonstration of the IPP and of the phytosanitary.info webpage and surveys on IPPC **Contact Points**

IPPC implementation pilot programme on surveillance

10. How would you describe your understanding of these issues AFTER attending this workshop?

Poor

Fair

Good

N/A (the topic was not included into the Poor Fair Good Excellent agenda)

Objectives of the workshop

Updates from CPM-12 (2017) and Secretariat activities

Sustainable funding

Online Comment System (OCS) and the latest developments

Overview of the Standard Setting process

2017 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)

Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure (2014-004)

International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005)

ISPM 14 The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management, and the beyond compliance tool

Emerging issues in plant health

The Secretariat Call for Phytosanitary Treatments

Understanding what is the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)

2020 International Year of Plant Health: updates and latest achievements and follow up from last year Regional Workshop from countries

Demonstration of the IPP and of the phytosanitary.info webpage and surveys on IPPC **Contact Points**

N/A (the topic was not included into the agenda)

IPPC implementation pilot programme on

Poor

Fair

Good

Excellent

surveillance
11. The pace of this workshop was appropriate
Too slow
Appropriate
Too fast
^ℂ _{N/A}
12. How could these training sessions be improved?
▼ ▼
13. What was valuable about the workshop?
14. What was the least valuable part of the workshop?
15. What further training or support would help you to become more involved in IPPC activities?
*16. To what extent is the online information provided through the IPP meeting the needs of contracting parties in a user-friendly way? Please rate your answer on a scale of 1-5.
5 - very high
4 - high
3 - moderate
© 2-low
1 - very low
N/A
Comments

*17. To what ext answer on a scale		s and anno	uncements mee	ting your exp	ectations? Pleas	e rate your
5 - very high						
[©] 4 - high						
○ 3 - moderate						
2 - low						
1 - very low						
° _{N/A}						
Comments						
*18. To what ext a scale of 1-5.	ent are IPPC pu	ıblications (other than stand	dards useful?	Please rate you	r answer on
	5 - very high	4 - high	3 - moderate	2 - low	1 - very low	N/A
IPPC Annual						
Report						
IPPC factsheets						
IPPC brochures						
IPPC guides and						
manuals						
Comments						
*19. Do you use					(e.g. Facebook,	Twitter,
LinkedIn, YouTu		-			1	NI/A
5 - Ve	ry high 4 - 1	nigh 3	- moderate	2 - low	1 - very low	N/A
Facebook						
Twitter						
LinkedIn						
YouTube						
Weibo						
Can you indicate l	now and quote ex	amples?				
*20. To what ext	ent is the new O	CS user-fri	endly? Please r	ate your ans	wer on a scale of	1-5.
5 - very high						
4 - high						
3 - moderate						
[©] 2 - low						

0	1 – very low	
0	N/A	
Do	you have suggestions for further improvement?	

Thank you very much for your participation and your feedback.