

## Evaluation ICAAP10 Report 26-30 August 2011, BEXCO Busan, Republic of Korea

### I. Participant Evaluation

#### Section 1: Personal data

##### 1. Gender

	Frequency	Percent
Unknown	2	1.0
Male	90	45.0
Female	106	53.0
Transgender	2	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>

##### 2. Age group

	Frequency	Percent
Unknown	1	.5
Under 21	2	1.0
21-30	43	21.5
31-40	64	32.0
41-50	55	27.5
51-60	28	14.0
Over 60	7	3.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>

All together there were 200 respondents participated in this evaluation, 106 (53%) of them were female and 90 (45%) male. There were 2 cases certified that they were transgender, one from American and one Australia. Most of the participants were between the ages of 31-50 account for about 60 percent. 20% were between 21-30 years old, 14% were between 51-60 years. And there were only 2 cases under 21 and 7 cases over 60.

### 3. Nationality

Nationality	Frequency	Percent
Unknown	29	14.5
American	4	2.0
Australian	3	1.5
Bangladesh	3	1.5
Bhutanese	1	.5
Burmese	5	2.5
Cambodian	12	6.0
Chinese	8	4.0
Fijian	3	1.5
Indian	24	12.0
Indonesian	11	5.5
Japanese	2	1.0
Korean	8	4.0
Loa	4	2.0
Malaysian	6	3.0
Mongolian	3	1.5
Nepali	8	4.0
Papua New Guinea	8	4.0
Philippine	2	1.0
Romanian	1	.5
Singapore	2	1.0
Srilankan	4	2.0
Taiwanese	3	1.5
Thai	38	19.0
Vietnamese	8	4.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The respondents who participated in this evaluation were from 25 different countries. The respondents from Thailand has the highest number of 38 cases, follow by 24 Indian, 12 Cambodian and the other countries.

#### 4. Occupation

Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Unknown	2	1.0
Clinician/Physician	35	17.5
Student	9	4.5
Media representative	7	3.5
Researcher-others	26	13.0
Policy/ administrator	32	16.0
Researcher-clinical science	10	5.0
Researcher-biology & pathogenesis	4	2.0
Pharmaceutical rep/manufacturer	2	1.0
Researcher-biomedical science	4	2.0
other health care workers	22	11.0
Other (please specify)	47	23.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The data shows that 35 (17.5%) of them were clinicians/physicians, 32 (16%) policy/administrator, 26 (13%) researchers work other than the clinical science, 22(11%) were health care workers, 10 (5%) clinical science researcher, 9 (4.5%) students. The rest were media representative, pharmaceutical representative, researcher in biology and pathogenesis.

#### 5. Source of information about ICAAP10 (N=200) (Can select more than one)

Source of information about ICAAP10	Frequency	Percent
Recommended by colleagues/friends	75	37.5
ICAAP website	88	44.0
Other ICAAP communication	18	9.0
Media coverage	11	5.5
Advertisement in journal	2	1.0
Attended previous conference/aware of the schedule	47	23.5
ASAP website/other correspondence	21	10.5
Conference invitation program	23	11.5
Not sure	1	0.5
Other	1	0.5

About 45% of the participants responded that they got the information about the conference from ICAAP 10 web page, 40% answered that they were recommended by their



colleagues/friends. There were 25% of respondents attended the previous conference and aware of the schedule for ICAAP 10. 11.5% were invited to join the conference. 10% of them obtained the information from ASAP website or other correspondence.

### 6. Reasons for attending ICAAP10 (N=200) (Can select more than one)

Reasons for attending ICAAP10	Frequency	Percent
Scientific program	50	25.0
Geographic location	16	8.0
Global focus	27	13.5
Opportunities for networking or collaboration	98	49.0
Presenting paper or poster	88	44.0
Recipient of Scholarship or Grants	22	11.0
Other	1	0.5

50% of the participants joined the conference for the reasons of seeking opportunities for collaboration and networking, 45% come to share their researches by presenting paper or poster, 25% of willing to attend the scientific program and about 15% come for a global focus on HIV/AIDS. There were only 22 cases (11%) of participants joined ICAAP 10 as he/she received a scholarship or grants to attend.

### Section 2: before the conference

	Relevance and usefulness				Average score	Suggestion
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		
Access to the Website	52 (26.0)	115 (57.5)	27 (13.5)	5 (2.5)	3.1	-Sometime can't access - Info was lacking
Registration process	38 (19.0)	112 (56.0)	44 (22.0)	6 (3.0)	2.9	-Registration process for scholarship recipients unclear -Accept all credit card
Information available	37 (18.5)	103 (51.5)	54 (27.0)	6 (3.0)	2.9	-
Abstract submission	37 (18.5)	116 (58.0)	35 (17.5)	4 (2.0)	3.0	-Not submit -Allow saving before submitting
Accommodation Reservation	26 (13.0)	114 (57.0)	42 (21.0)	16 (8.0)	2.8	-Very complicated -Should be proper by (single/double room)

	Relevance and usefulness				Average score	Suggestion
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		
						-Not available
Public Relation (PR)	27 (13.5)	101 (50.5)	53 (26.5)	16 (8.0)	2.7	-Very bad for communication

**Total number n=200**

(The assessments were given four categories in the answers. The scores for “Excellent” is 4, “Good” =3, “Fair”=2 and “Poor”=1. And the average score for each assessment is calculated at the end)

The assessments include 1) access to the website, 2) registration process, 3) information available, 4) abstract submission, 5) accommodation reservation and 6) public relation. The result shows most of the participants were satisfied for the assessments before the conference. The average scores for each assessment before the conference were about 3. Most of the people ticked “Good” or “Excellent” to these assessments. 10-25% replied as “Fair”. There were few people (<10%) gave the score “Poor” to the assessments. The reasons include,

- sometimes it is unable to access the ICAAP 10 and lack of enough information on the page
- there was no clear information about the registration process for scholarship recipients
- accommodation reservation was very complicated/not available
- the communication was very bad regarding the public relation

### Section 3: during the conference

Assessment on the event organization						
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Average score	Suggestion
<b>Registration</b>	67 (33.5)	94 (47.0)	36 (18.0)	3 (1.5)	3.1	- Not well prepared during the start of registration - My name was not register - Accompanying confusion
<b>Reception/Welcome</b>	41 (20.5)	116 (58.0)	36 (18.0)	4 (2.0)	3.0	-Too long - Speech too long, art good - It's has too long
<b>Ambience</b>	31 (15.5)	116 (58.0)	40 (20.0)	2 (1.0)	2.9	-
Location/access	56 (28.0)	111 (55.5)	28 (14.0)	3 (1.5)	3.1	-
Plenary session	38 (19.0)	137 (68.5)	20 (10.0)	2 (1.0)	3.1	-
Exhibition (stands)	25 (12.5)	111 (55.5)	52 (26.0)	7 (3.5)	2.8	-

<b>Assessment on the event organization</b>						
	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Suggestion</b>
Skill building and workshop	20 (10.0)	105 (52.5)	53 (26.5)	3 (1.5)	2.8	- Information lacking skill building
Oral presentation	20 (10.0)	125 (62.5)	52 (26.0)	2 (1.0)	2.6	- There was not time to discussion - Lots of speaker did not show up
Poster presentation	17 (8.5)	102 (51.0)	64 (32.0)	15 (7.5)	2.9	-Too numerous - Not many representative to talk to -Not is strategic location
Symposium	25 (12.5)	118 (59.0)	46 (23.0)	3 (1.5)	2.7	-
Satellite meeting	28 (14.0)	126 (63.0)	34 (17.0)	3 (1.5)	2.9	-
Asian Pacific Village (APV)	18 (9.0)	96 (48.0)	57 (28.5)	10 (5.0)	2.7	- Too few, too expensive
Accommodation	32 (16.0)	118 (59.0)	41 (20.5)	6 (3.0)	2.9	- Should be chapter
Transportation	40 (20.0)	109 (54.5)	35 (17.5)	11 (5.5)	2.9	-
<b>Catering</b>						
Service	29 (14.5)	108 (54.0)	48 (24.0)	10 (5.0)	2.8	- Improved English
Food	16 (8.0)	85 (42.5)	64 (32.0)	24 (12.0)	2.5	- No food provide - Expensive! Why they not have catered food?
Beverages	20 (10.0)	93 (46.5)	59 (29.5)	20 (10.0)	2.6	- At least need to provide coffee in between - Water Water Water - Please make tea/coffee
Hygiene Standards	53 (26.5)	105 (52.5)	34 (17.0)	2 (1.0)	3.1	-
On-Site Health Care Facilities	29 (14.5)	99 (49.5)	45 (22.5)	5 (2.5)	2.9	-
Ease of Access	36 (18.0)	116 (58.0)	37 (18.5)	4 (2.0)	3.0	-
Medical Equipment	15 (7.5)	107 (53.5)	45 (22.5)	6 (3.0)	2.8	-
Support from Health Care Provider	14 (7.0)	104 (52.0)	48 (24.0)	5 (2.5)	2.7	-
Availability of Required Medication	15 (7.5)	102 (51.0)	44 (22.0)	6 (3.0)	2.8	-No methadone provision
<b>Conference rooms</b>						
Lighting	61 (30.5)	120 (60.0)	17 (8.5)	1 (0.5)	3.2	-

<b>Assessment on the event organization</b>						
	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Suggestion</b>
Ventilation	55 (27.5)	115 (57.5)	27 (13.5)	3 (1.5)	3.1	-So hot -Air condition cannot turn on
Equipment	57 (28.5)	118 (59.0)	24 (12.0)	1 (0.5)	3.2	-Microphone often not ready prepare
<b>Space</b>						
<b>Conference assistants (Host)</b>	44 (22.0)	108 (54.0)	40 (20.0)	4 (2.0)	3.0	-
<b>Support from ICAAP Staff</b>	49 (24.5)	95 (47.5)	48 (24.0)	6 (3.0)	2.9	-Nice
<b>Volunteer Staff</b>	56 (28.0)	92 (46.0)	40 (20.0)	12 (6.0)	3.0	- So friendly and helpful - Nice - Low knowledge of English - Cannot speak English
<b>Participants kit</b>	29 (14.5)	88 (44.0)	61 (30.5)	16 (8.0)	2.7	-
<b>Timing/schedule</b>	29 (14.5)	108 (54.0)	56 (28.0)	7 (3.5)	2.8	- Should do nothing at noon - Presenter not come, some due to other (commitment in ICAAP) - Disappointed that key symposium overlapped with poster display
<b>IT facilities</b>	32 (16.0)	101 (50.5)	56 (28.0)	9 (4.5)	2.8	-Lack of Wi-Fi -Expensive
<b>Media</b>	26 (13.0)	108 (54.0)	53 (26.5)	7 (3.5)	2.8	-I do not know where to access first AIDS -Did not see news coverage
<b>Security</b>	27 (13.5)	86 (43.0)	53 (26.5)	30 (15.0)	2.6	-Police worse! - Non register can access - Bad
<b>Closing ceremony</b>	22 (11.0)	123 (61.5)	39 (19.5)	2 (1.0)	2.9	-
<b>Reception/farewell</b>	19 (9.5)	120 (60.0)	41 (20.5)	3 (1.5)	2.8	-
<b>Others (Please specify)</b>	5 (2.5)	62 (31.0)	18 (9.0)	3 (1.5)	2.8	- Fee to expensive

**Total number n=200**

(The assessments were given four categories in the answers. The scores for “Excellent” is 4, “Good” =3, “Fair”=2 and “Poor”=1. And the average score for each assessment is calculated at the end)



## 1. Sessions and display

The average score for “Open ceremony” =3.0, “Plenary session” = 3.1, “Exhibition (stands)” =2.8, “Skill building and workshop”=2.8, “Oral presentation”=2.6, “Poster presentation”=2.9, “Symposium”=2.7, “Satellite meeting” =2.9, “Asian Pacific Village (APV)”=2.7 and “Closing ceremony= 2.9”.

The results show that most the respondent thought the sessions organized during the conference were good and excellent. The average score for open ceremony (3.0) was the highest and the oral presentation the lowest (2.6). Some of the valuable comments from the participants include,

- There was not time for discussion and absent of speakers during the oral presentation
- There were too much poster presentation but not many representative to talk to and the location of for the presentation is not strategic place
- The AP village were only few and expensive

## 2. Service and facilities

The average score for “Registration”, “Location” of the conference, “accommodation” and “Transportation” were 3.1, 3.1, 2.9 and 2.9 respectively. Most were satisfied for these assessments, however, some claimed that there were some mistake for the registration and the name of the participant was not registered.

The average score for the assessment of “Food” and “Beverages” were 2.5 and 2.6 which were the lowest score of all the assessments. The respondents claimed there was no enough food provided to the delegates even the registration fee was expensive. The respondents also pointed to provide tea/coffee during the break as well as enough water.

For the assessment of conference room facilities, the average score for lighting, ventilation and equipment were high 3.2, 3.1 and 3.2 respectively. However, there were participants claimed that the temperature was high and inside the conference room and not





comfortable. On the other hands, the score for the “Support for conference assistant”, “ICAAP staff” and “Volunteer staff” were 3.0, 2.9 and 3.0 respective. The participants recommended that the volunteer were friendly and helpful but as they are limited in using English which lead to some communication barrier.

The score for other assessments were as follow, “Participant kit”= 2.7, “Timing/schedule”= 2.7, “IT facilities”=2.8, “Media”=2.8, “Security”=2.6. There were a small position of the participants did not satisfy to these assessments. They expressed that the noon time should be a break time without any sessions, some claimed that they could not access to the session as they couldn’t find where it was, some said the key symposium were overlapped with poster display, there was no Wi-Fi available and the security was bad and non-register could also access.

**Section 4: “After the conference**

**1. What are main benefits gained from ICAAP 10? (N=200) (Can select more than one)**

Main benefits gained from ICAAP 10	Frequency	Percent
New insights into HIV treatment & care	85	42.5
New connections/opportunities for collaboration	98	49.0
Affirmation of current research/practice	38	19.0
Did not gain anything	3	1.5
A global perspective on HIV science	66	33.0
Renewed sense of purpose	45	22.5
Opportunities for career advancement	34	17.0
Other	8	4.0

98 (49%) participants replied that the main benefits that they gained from ICAAP 10 were “New connection and opportunities for collaboration”. About 43% said they received new insights into HIV treatment & care, 33% have learned a global perspective on HIV from the conference, 22.5% renewed the sense of purpose and other 17% got the opportunities for career advancement. There were 3 participants answered that they didn’t gain anything for the joining the conference.

**2. How would you apply the benefits that you gained from ICAAP10? (N=200) (Can select more than one)**

	Frequency	Percent
Share information with colleagues	146	73.0
Strengthen advocacy or policy work	78	39.0
Undertake new research	32	16.0
Refine existing research	27	13.5
I will not do anything differently	8	4.0
Apply new insights to prevention programs	53	26.5
Other	6	3.0

When asking the participants for how they would apply the benefits and knowledge that they gained from ICAAP 10, 146 (73%) of them replied that they would like to share the information with their colleagues, 78 (39%) cases would use to strengthen advocacy or policy work in the field of fight against HIV/AIDS, about 27% would apply the new insights for the prevention programs and some other 16 and 13.5 % would undertake new research and refine existing research. 4% replied that they would not do anything differently.

### **3. Are you willing to attend the next ICAAP in Bangkok? Please give the reason**

#### **8 people want share information and experiences**

- 1) It is a good opportunity to learn and shared
- 2) To share the program of learn by this ICAAP
- 3) Shared information
- 4) Share my long term experience on AIDS
- 5) It's good news for sharing experience for HIV prevention
- 6) To shared/gain more experience/ exchange experience in new treatment and prevention
- 7) Because, able to share to learn good experience on HIV/AIDS from other countries.
- 8) For father knowledge and share what will be done after this conference in my own country at next level

#### **20 people want gain new information and knowledge**

- 1) To update HIV knowledge science
- 2) To know the current work of region
- 3) To learn more on treatment
- 4) To learn more about development on HIV/AIDS
- 5) Wish to get more insights from Bangkok

- 6) There is so much richness in sharing and also advancing in new methods + update ourselves in HIV work together to fight HIV/AIDS
- 7) Networking and gain new insight
- 8) Need to ICAAP information
- 9) I would like to learn more new strategize
- 10) I would like to get new sight in to treatment care and prevention
- 11) I would like to have more HIV information
- 12) I would like to know more about other research in the area
- 13) I want to update of HIV treatment and case
- 14) I want to know the local update on HIV/AIDS
- 15) Hope to join more opportunity to learn more and would like participate in workshop
- 16) For more information and communications
- 17) Bangkok ICAAP is important for our new colleague that they can have opportunity to attend and learn more about ICAAP
- 18) Continuing the knowledge updates on HIV/AIDS
- 19) It's a good change to update new knowledge in AIDS
- 20) Responsibility, Partnership, Study new Innovation

#### **5 people want new collaboration**

- 1) We have collaborate
- 2) To follow up the recommend and action from ICAAP10 and present new result and rising collaboration
- 3) To be able to review the program mode and to sustain the collaboration
- 4) It's good opportunity to network with people who are doing research in the area of prevention
- 5) In ICAAP10 there was only one (participant) woman living with HIV/AIDS , so I want to attend next ICAAP in Bangkok for new collaboration

#### **2 people want to present research work**

- 1) I want to present work we are doing
- 2) I want to present paper and also conduct skill building workshop for youths

#### **Other reason for attend the next ICAAP in Bangkok**

- 1) Yes. I do it. I like it
- 2) Would like to but depend on many factors
- 3) Worth it many information
- 4) To continue my journey with HIV prevention work
- 5) Thailand is a country good program about conference use 100% in sex worker
- 6) So interesting place at first sign
- 7) Part of co-sponsor

- 8) Nice country with un-registration on PLWHA
- 9) Maybe, I have to do something which can be shared before thinking about BKK.
- 10) Location, Bangkok will support
- 11) I would like Bangkok, but I worry about the security in there
- 12) I love Thailand
- 13) I have worry that ICAAP and other conference are too many on this time, I have a little bit disappoint of the all of oral presentation
- 14) Have evidence based to showcase
- 15) Easy to access
- 16) Depends on financing as I live in Korea this was reasonable for me.
- 17) Because, working with police to understand the right of sexual minority, we need new information
- 18) Because there's local support in Bangkok
- 19) Bangkok so beautiful places

**4. In your personal experience, do you find the ICAAPs motivating, inspiring, or re-energizing?**

**a. Have you been personally empowered by ICAAP participation? If so, how?**

- 1) Yes, Will do more activity in my own working place
- 2) Yes, they are very helpful in brief unique ideas diverse perspectives visions together. They are helpful to see how CSO are doing great works.
- 3) Yes, So many NGOs are making movement
- 4) Yes, room for powerful voice of PLHIV to be heard
- 5) Yes, New information new trend on getting to zero
- 6) Yes, I have presented my program, then received some feedback which can be improving
- 7) Yes, because only 4 countries working with police to address HIV/AIDS affecting MSM, FSW and PLHIV with new knowledge
- 8) to have/update HIV in terms of care treatment prevention and research
- 9) Through gaining knowledge
- 10) This is my first international ICAAP meeting, so I feel many things are new for me.
- 11) the skill building workshop, but the time of workshop has too short, not enough
- 12) Technically + Organization - wise - not development lacking
- 13) New learning
- 14) moderately useful
- 15) last session plenary is great
- 16) It's was a good opportunity to learn experience of difference country programs.

- 17) Inspired by a few speakers in opening community speaker or some other in session + private sector final plenary + new generation sessions
- 18) ICAAP provides opportunities to learn and share my research and experience.
- 19) I meet with many people from many countries and we shared programmed
- 20) I learned a lot from it
- 21) I have, it's my first time. Leaving from other Asian countries helps me to improve myself to my work.
- 22) I have a renewed purpose and energy. I want to review our approach in MSM youth.
- 23) I get a new idea from ICAAP to have a personality empowered
- 24) I found so many people are working at the AIDS area and they all done a good job. We will co-operate each other and make a large change.
- 25) I found many new global findings.
- 26) I can gain more knowledge
- 27) Hearing talks by eminent people, seeing the plight and voices of PLHIV of world and skill building workshop
- 28) Have been totally energized
- 29) Has give the local and the global perspective
- 30) Good sharing on the issue of migration and HIV
- 31) Gain some new information
- 32) Gain more knowledge on HIV/AIDS
- 33) Feel more confidence and clear from data presentation
- 34) Distribute information
- 35) By this one, venally but converge of local LOBT community activists was inspiration
- 36) By gain new knowledge
- 37) By attending the plenary session, I have been motivation to the fight against HIV
- 38) Because there is the commitment
- 39) A little, but I had higher expectation for result. I was less motivated empowered

**b. If not, why not? What would you need to feel that way?**

- 1) There is still a lot to do smaller venue it was too large for people
- 2) No, Nothing really new was said
- 3) Need better organize the topic to be presented
- 4) Motivation
- 5) Lack of any management by LOC leadership appalling ASAP president must resign
- 6) Been to many ICAAP

**5. Do ICAAPs contribute to the accountability of decision-makers in the government, international agencies and/or NGOs?**

a. If so, how?

- 1) Yes. You're a legal body and you are the best advocate in positive HIV living for our HIV friends.
- 2) Yes. Impact from messier amount of attendants
- 3) Yes. Evidence based program

b. How could that ICAAP outcome be improved?

- 1) to promote and motivate group
- 2) There was too much emphasis on research a little about the work being done, demonstration or discriminations of projects and health promotion.
- 3) The result/key outcome to be show in ICAAP website.
- 4) Strengthen PACIFIC component at plenary
- 5) should give more opportunity for people in community to attend through scholarship
- 6) should be proving better scholarship to the scholarship participant
- 7) Security
- 8) Rights of PLWHA protection
- 9) Promoting for ICAAP
- 10) Promoting and safe more paper
- 11) prepare well
- 12) Please ensure that the flag of all delegate are shown at the entrance
- 13) Move involvement of community member
- 14) motivation
- 15) more productive discussion, follow up interventions
- 16) More focus
- 17) Maximum participant from woman living with HIV and give opportunity to share their feeling from the ground level.
- 18) Make all of them report on result and impact at next ICAAP
- 19) Less session on the presentation
- 20) Leaders should do more than just making speeches.
- 21) It's very important that staff/organizer reply e-mail enquiries. This time e-mail communication with organizer is extremely poor. E-mail were not answer, information provided was wrong!
- 22) ICAAP outcome be improved my knowledge more than don't come
- 23) Honestly that many poster presentations represented more original scholarship then oral presentations



The 10<sup>th</sup> International Congress on **AIDS** in Asia and the Pacific  
26–30 August, 2011 BEXCO, Busan, Republic of Korea

- 24) Hold the participant to be accountable to produce result. It should not be another trip.
- 25) go ahead with new ideas and insights
- 26) For supportive PWHL (Key populations)
- 27) Follow up with government and policy maker. Advocate for outcome oriented  
Give priority to beneficiaries through all acting than research on HIV/AIDS
- 28) Do something very difference
- 29) Chapter accommodations should be made available to participation. More involvement of scientists in academic discussions not just CSO members in symposiums.
- 30) As best as it is
- 31) The next ICAAP need more relevant works, need more time to get well prepared !!
- 32) Running the ICAAP every two years is needed to reconsider, why not every 3 years
- 33) too many conferences these days
- 34) Think about quality and more application
- 35) Should have a community perspective on what is needed/wanted at ICAAPs
- 36) Improve ASAP role as custodian

## II. Session Evaluation

Session	Response	
	No.	Percentage
Plenary Session	724	33.6
Oral Session	622	28.9
Symposium Session	515	23.9
Satellite meeting	180	8.4
Skill building	111	5.2
	n=2152	100%

2,152 session evaluation forms were collected after the conference. The respondents gave their opinions on the sessions that they have attended. The data shows that plenary session and oral session contributed most of the responses from the participants. There were 724 (33.6%) participants responded to “Plenary Session” and 622 (28.9%) oral session, 515 (23.9%) symposium session, 180(8.4%) satellite meeting and 111(5.2%) skill building.

### Plenary Session

Plenary Session	No.	Percentage
27 Aug session 1	188	26.0
27 Aug session 2	137	18.9
28 Aug session 3	175	24.2
29 Aug session 4	120	16.6
30 Aug session 5	104	14.4
	n=724	

Total number of participants on Plenary presentation n=724

There were 5 plenary sessions organized during the ICAAP 10. The numbers of participants who participated in “Session 1” were 188, “Session 2” 137, “Session 3” 175, “Session 4” 120 and “Session 5” 104. Each of the evaluation form contained 8 assessments and the answers were given four categories. If a participant responded to the assessment “Poor”, the scores will be count as 1. Similarly, who responded as “Fair” will be count as 2 scores, “Good” 3





scores and “Excellent” count as 4 scores. Finally the average score is calculated for each assessment.

### Evaluation on 27 Aug Session 1

Assessment Score	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1		2		3		4		
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	21	11.2	124	67.2	43	23.1	3.12
Quality of speakers	2	1.1	28	14.9	119	63.3	39	20.7	3.04
Quality of discussion & debate	8	4.3	57	30.3	101	53.7	22	11.7	2.73
Coverage of topic issues	2	1.1	38	20.2	115	61.2	33	17.6	2.95
Usefulness of information	3	1.6	30	16.0	118	62.8	37	19.7	3.01
Time for discussion	28	14.9	66	35.1	70	37.2	24	12.8	2.48
Time for question	30	16.0	67	35.6	72	38.3	19	10.1	2.43
Lessons learned	2	1.1	40	21.3	111	59.0	35	18.6	2.95

Total number of respondents n=188

**(The assessments were given four categories in the answers. The scores for “Excellent” is 4, “Good” =3, “Fair”=2 and “Poor”=1. And the average score for each assessment is calculated at the end)**

#### 1. Evaluation on Plenary Session 1

There were 188 participants participated in this session and the average score for most of the assessments were about 3. The average score for assessment in “Overall quality of the session” were 3.12, “Quality of speakers” 3.04, “Quality of discussion & debate” 2.73, “Coverage of the topic issues” 2.95, “Usefulness of information” 3.01, and “Lessons learned” 2.95. However, the scores for “Time for discussion” and “Time for question” were under 2.5. There about 15% of the participants replied time available for discussion and question for “Plenary Session 1” were poor. And there were 4.3% of the participants were not satisfied for “Time quality of discussion & debate”

## Evaluation on 27 Aug Session 2

Assessment Score	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	15	10.9	91	66.4	31	22.6	3.12
Quality of speakers	1	0.7	22	16.1	85	62.0	29	21.2	3.04
Quality of discussion & debate	7	5.1	38	27.7	74	54.0	18	13.1	2.75
Coverage of topic issues	2	1.5	27	19.7	85	62.0	23	16.8	2.94
Usefulness of information	0	0	24	17.5	82	59.9	31	22.6	3.05
Time for discussion	14	10.2	52	38.0	57	41.6	14	10.2	2.52
Time for question	17	12.4	51	37.2	57	41.6	12	8.8	2.47
Lessons learned	0	0	33	24.1	77	56.2	27	19.7	2.96

Total number of respondents n=137

### 2. Evaluation on 27 Aug Session 2

Compare to session 1 there were less participants (137) participated in session 2 that run on the date on August 27, 2011. The score of each assessment for this session was about 3. The average of “Overall quality of session” is 3.12, “Quality of Speakers” 3.04, “Quality of discussion & debate” 2.75, “Coverage of topic issues” 2.94, “Usefulness of information” 3.05 and “Lessons learned” 2.96. While most of the people were satisfied, there were about 10% of the people think “Time for discussion” and “Time for question” was poor for this session and the average score were 2.52 and 2.47 respectively.

## Evaluation on 28 Aug session 3

Assessment Score	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	19	10.9	122	69.7	34	19.4	3.09
Quality of speakers	0	0	24	13.7	119	68.0	32	18.3	3.05
Quality of discussion & debate	9	5.1	59	33.7	88	50.3	19	10.9	2.67
Coverage of topic issues	2	1.1	34	19.4	112	64.0	27	15.4	2.94
Usefulness of information	3	1.7	32	18.3	111	63.4	29	16.6	2.95
Time for discussion	20	11.4	61	34.9	77	44.0	17	9.7	2.52

Time for question	23	13.1	67	38.3	66	37.7	19	10.9	2.46
Lessons learned	1	0.6	43	24.6	97	55.4	34	19.4	2.94

Total number of participants=175

### 3. Evaluation on 28 Aug session 3

The total number participants were 175 for session 3. According to the data we can see that most of participants' answers to the assessments of this session were "Good" (40%-70%). There were 10% replied as "Excellent", 10-40% as "Fair" and 1-10% as "Poor". The average of score for each assessment is about 3. Similar to session 1 and session 2, "Time for discussion" and "Time for question" scored the lower point with 2.52 and 2.46 respectively. The score for "Overall quality of the session" is 3.09.

### Evaluation on 29 Aug session 4

Assessment Score	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1	2	3	4					
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	19	15.8	80	66.7	21	17.5	3.02
Quality of speakers	0	0	22	18.3	82	68.3	16	13.3	2.95
Quality of discussion & debate	8	6.7	38	31.7	63	52.5	11	9.2	2.64
Coverage of topic issues	2	1.7	25	20.8	75	62.5	18	15.0	2.91
Usefulness of information	2	1.7	20	16.7	75	62.5	23	19.2	2.99
Time for discussion	15	12.5	39	32.5	54	45.0	12	10.0	2.53
Time for question	18	15.0	45	37.5	46	38.3	11	9.2	2.42
Lessons learned	1	0.8	28	23.3	70	58.3	21	17.5	2.93

Total number of respondents n=120

### 4. Evaluation on 29 Aug session 4

Total number of participants for this session was 120. The scores were about 3; "Overall quality of session"=3.02, "Quality of speakers" = 2.95, "Quality of discussion & debate"=2.64, "Coverage of topic issues"=2.91, "Usefulness of information"=2.99, "Time for discussion"=2.53, "Time for question"=2.42, "Lessons learned"=2.93. Similar to other sessions there were a few portion of the participants were not satisfied the session for the reasons of no time for discussion and question.

### Evaluation on 30 Aug session 5

Assessment Score	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	16	15.4	69	66.3	19	18.3	3.03
Quality of speakers	1	1.0	18	17.3	72	69.2	13	12.5	2.93
Quality of discussion & debate	9	8.7	30	28.8	58	55.8	7	6.7	2.61
Coverage of topic issues	1	1.0	21	20.2	64	61.5	18	17.3	2.95
Usefulness of information	1	1.0	18	17.3	67	64.0	18	17.3	2.98
Time for discussion	15	14.4	43	41.3	41	39.4	5	4.8	2.35
Time for question	21	20.2	38	36.5	38	36.5	7	6.7	2.30
Lessons learned	1	1.0	27	26.0	62	59.6	14	13.5	2.86

Total number of respondents n=104

#### 5. Evaluation on 30 Aug session 5

Among 5 plenary sessions, the number of participants (104) in session 5 was the lowest. The score for each assessment is similar to the other plenary sessions which are round about 3, except the score of “Time for discussion”; 2.35 and “Time for question”; 2.30 in this session which score the lowest among all other sessions. The average score for “Overall quality of the session” is 3.03.

#### Oral Session

Oral presentation	No.	Percentage
Track A	82	13.2
Track B	70	11.3
Track C	319	51.3
Track D	57	9.2
Track E	63	10.1
Track F	31	5.0
Total	n=622	100.0

Total number of participants on oral presentation n=622

There were 622 participants attended the oral session. About half of them (319 people) have attended Track C. And the number of people participated are for “Track A” 82, “Track B” 70, “Track D” 57, “Track E” 63 and “Track F” 31. The average scores of 8 assessments in all

tracks of the oral presentation shows that most of the participants were satisfy for the oral presentation. Most of the assessments in each track score about 3. And the “Overall quality of session” for each track is above 3. “Time for discussion” and “Time for question” remains to be the assessments with the lowest scores in oral sessions.

### 1. Evaluation on track A

Assessment Score	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	8	9.8	55	67.1	19	23.2	3.13
Quality of speakers	0	0	14	17.1	52	63.4	16	19.5	3.02
Quality of discussion & debate	4	4.9	29	35.4	40	48.8	9	11	2.66
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	18	22	51	62.2	13	15.9	2.94
Usefulness of information	0	0	13	15.9	52	63.4	17	20.7	3.05
Time for discussion	12	14.6	28	34.1	34	41.5	8	9.8	2.46
Time for question	15	18.3	28	34.1	33	40.2	6	7.3	2.37
Lessons learned	0	0	22	26.8	47	57.3	13	15.9	2.89

Total number of respondents n= 82

The total number of respondents was 82. The average score for “Overall quality of the session” is 3.13. The scores are lower in “Quality of discussion & debate”;2.66, “Time for discussion”;2.46 and “Time for question”; 2.37. The rest assessments scored about 3.

### 2. Evaluation track B

Assessment Score	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	6	8.6	51	72.9	13	18.6	3.10
Quality of speakers	1	1.4	12	17.1	43	61.4	14	20	2.94
Quality of discussion & debate	5	7.1	21	30	37	52.9	7	10	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	14	20	45	64.3	11	15.7	3.07
Usefulness of information	1	1.4	9	12.9	41	58.6	19	27.1	3.11

Time for discussion	9	12.9	29	41.4	25	35.7	7	10	2.77
Time for question	12	17.1	29	41.4	24	34.3	5	7.1	2.77
Lessons learned	1	1.4	17	24.3	38	34.3	14	20	2.87

Total number of respondents n= 70

Total of respondents for track B is 70. The average score are nearly 3 in all assessments. The score for “Time for discussion” and “Time for question” remains the lowest which is 2.77. The others are round about 3.

### 3. Evaluation track C

Assessment Score	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1		2		3		4		
	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	33	10.3	220	69	66	20.7	3.10
Quality of speakers	2	0.6	59	18.5	196	61.4	62	19.4	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	19	6	107	33.5	155	48.6	38	11.9	2.66
Coverage of topic issues	1	0.3	66	20.7	187	58.6	65	20.4	2.99
Usefulness of information	2	0.6	55	17.2	191	59.9	71	22.3	3.04
Time for discussion	41	12.9	111	34.8	129	40.4	38	11.9	2.51
Time for question	52	16.3	116	36.4	116	36.4	35	11	2.42
Lessons learned	2	0.6	84	26.3	175	54.9	58	18.2	2.91

Total number of respondents n= 319

The total number of respondents for track C is 319 people which is the highest among all the oral sessions. The average score for each assessment is round about 3. Similarly, the score “Time for discussion” and “Time question” are the lowest.

### 4. Evaluation track D

Assessment Score	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1		2		3		4		
	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	6	10.5	36	63.2	15	26.3	3.16
Quality of speakers	1	1.8	11	19.3	35	61.4	10	17.5	2.95

Quality of discussion & debate	2	3.5	20	35.1	30	52.6	5	8.8	2.67
Coverage of topic issues	1	1.8	11	19.3	38	66.7	7	12.3	2.89
Usefulness of information	1	1.8	11	19.3	31	54.4	14	24.6	3.02
Time for discussion	4	7	20	35.1	27	47.4	6	10.5	2.61
Time for question	6	10.5	25	43.9	22	38.6	4	7	2.42
Lessons learned	0	0	16	28.1	29	50.9	12	21.1	2.93

Total number of respondents n=57

Total number of respondents is 57. The assessment with the highest average score is “Overall quality of the session”; 3.16 and the lowest score is “Time for question” 2.42

## 5. Evaluation track E

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Score	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	5	7.9	45	71.4	13	20.6	3.13
Quality of speakers	0	0	10	15.9	44	69.8	9	14.3	2.98
Quality of discussion & debate	4	6.3	21	33.3	32	50.8	6	9.5	2.63
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	13	20.6	39	61.9	11	17.5	2.97
Usefulness of information	2	3.2	12	19	32	50.8	17	27	3.02
Time for discussion	8	12.7	29	46	21	33.3	5	7.9	2.37
Time for question	10	15.9	31	49.2	17	27	5	7.9	2.27
Lessons learned	0	0	14	22.2	34	54	15	23.8	3.02

Total number of respondents n=63

The total number of respondents for Track E is 63. The average score for “Overall quality of session”=3.13, “Quality of speakers” = 2.98, “Quality of discussion & debate”=2.63, “Coverage of topic issues”=2.97, “Usefulness of information”=3.02, “Time for discussion”=2.37, “Time for question”=2.27, “Lessons learned”=3.02. Similar to other sessions there were a few portion of the participants were not satisfied the session for the reasons of no time for discussion and question.

## 6. Evaluation track F

Assessment  Score	No of participants who response (percentage)								Average Score
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		
	1		2		3		4		
	count	percentage	count	percentage	count	percentage	Count	percentage	
Overall quality of session	0	0	3	9.7	20	64.5	8	25.8	3.16
Quality of speakers	0	0	5	16.1	20	64.5	6	19.4	3.03
Quality of discussion & debate	3	9.7	7	22.6	20	64.5	1	3.2	2.61
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	7	22.6	19	61.3	5	16.1	2.94
Usefulness of information	1	3.2	6	19.4	13	41.9	11	35.5	3.10
Time for discussion	2	6.5	15	48.4	12	38.7	2	6.5	2.45
Time for question	3	9.7	16	51.6	10	32.3	2	6.5	2.35
Lessons learned	0	0	11	35.5	13	41.9	7	22.6	2.87

Total number of respondents n=31

The total number of respondents for Track F is 31. The average score for “Overall quality of session”=3.16, “Quality of speakers” = 3.03, “Quality of discussion & debate”=2.61, “Coverage of topic issues”=2.94, “Usefulness of information”=3.10, “Time for discussion”=2.45, “Time for question”=2.35, “Lessons learned”=2.87.

## Symposium

Symposium	No.	Percentage
1. HIV and AIDS in ASEAN...	87	16.9
2. Towards a Roadmap to Treatment...	55	10.7
3. HIV travel restrictions...	12	2.3
4. HIV and AIDS Sensitive...	43	8.3
5. Building the capacity...	58	11.3
6. Women Echoes...	16	3.1
7. Health Care Provider Training...	38	7.4
8. Arresting HIV: Programs that work...	27	5.2
9. Eliminating new paediatric HIV...	37	7.2
10. “Young and at higher risk of HIV”...	51	9.9





11. Getting to Zero...	91	17.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>n=515</b>	<b>100</b>

The number of people who participated in 11 symposium sessions is 515. The session “Getting to Zero” occupies the highest number 91 (17%) and follow by “HIV and AIDS in ASEAN: Progress & Challenges” 87 (16.9%). There are only 12 participants for session 3 “HIV Travel Restrictions – A Primary Obstacle to Universal Access for Migrant Workers”. The average scores for the assessments for the symposium are similar to plenary sessions and oral tracks. Most of the scores for the assessments of each session were round about 3. The average score for “Overall quality of session” in nearly every symposium session were above 3. “Time for discussion” and “Time for question” are the assessments with the lowest average score in all session. Of all sessions, the session 3 is the only session which all the scores are under 3.

### 1 . HIV and AIDS in ASEAN: Progress & Challenges

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	7	56	24	3.20
Quality of speakers	0	10	57	20	3.11
Quality of discussion & debate	5	22	50	10	2.75
Coverage of topic issues	1	17	56	13	2.93
Usefulness of information	0	13	60	14	3.01
Time for discussion	11	23	41	12	2.62
Time for question	12	24	42	9	2.55
Lessons learned	0	15	53	19	3.04

Total number of respondents n=8

## 2. Towards a Roadmap for Treatment 2.0 in Asia and Pacific

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	4	39	12	3.15
Quality of speakers	1	8	38	8	2.96
Quality of discussion & debate	3	20	30	2	2.56
Coverage of topic issues	2	15	30	8	2.80
Usefulness of information	2	10	35	8	2.89
Time for discussion	8	22	18	7	2.44
Time for question	9	22	19	5	2.36
Lessons learned	1	15	30	9	2.85

Total number of respondents n=55

## 3. HIV Travel Restrictions – A Primary Obstacle to Universal Access for Migrant Workers

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	5	4	3	2.83
Quality of speakers	1	3	6	2	2.75
Quality of discussion & debate	1	3	5	3	2.83
Coverage of topic issues	0	4	5	3	2.92
Usefulness of information	0	5	5	2	2.75
Time for discussion	3	3	3	3	2.50
Time for question	3	2	4	3	2.58
Lessons learned	0	5	3	4	2.92

Total number of respondents n=12

## 4. HIV and AIDS Sensitive Social Protection for the Asia and Pacific Region

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	8	22	13	3.12
Quality of speakers	1	6	23	13	3.12
Quality of discussion & debate	3	13	20	7	2.72
Coverage of topic issues	0	6	27	10	3.09
Usefulness of information	0	7	23	13	3.14
Time for discussion	8	13	17	5	2.44
Time for question	7	17	15	4	2.37
Lessons learned	0	8	25	10	3.05

Total number of respondents n=43

### 5. Building the Capacity and Will of Governments and Communities in South East Asia for Harm Reduction In South East Asia: Achievements, Lessons Learn And Unresolved Issues

Assessment	No of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	4	41	13	3.16
Quality of speakers	0	5	40	13	3.14
Quality of discussion & debate	3	15	31	9	2.79
Coverage of topic issues	0	8	38	12	3.07
Usefulness of information	0	11	34	13	3.03
Time for discussion	6	24	21	7	2.50
Time for question	10	21	21	6	2.40
Lessons learned	0	15	26	17	3.03

Total number of respondents n=58

### 6. Women Echoes: Raising Up the Volume

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	2	9	5	3.19
Quality of speakers	0	1	13	2	3.06
Quality of discussion & debate	0	3	11	2	2.94
Coverage of topic issues	0	4	8	4	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	2	10	4	3.13
Time for discussion	2	6	6	2	2.50
Time for question	4	3	6	3	2.50
Lessons learned	0	3	9	4	3.06

Total number of respondents n=16

### 7. Health Care Provider Training...

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	4	27	7	3.08
Quality of speakers	2	6	23	7	2.92
Quality of discussion & debate	1	14	19	4	2.68
Coverage of topic issues	0	9	23	6	2.92
Usefulness of information	1	6	22	9	3.03
Time for discussion	3	15	17	3	2.53
Time for question	4	18	15	1	2.34
Lessons learned	1	8	20	9	2.97

Total number of respondents n=38

### 8. Arresting HIV: Programs that Work with Police to Reduce HIV Vulnerability in Sex Workers, IDU and MSM

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	2	21	4	3.07
Quality of speakers	0	3	19	5	3.07
Quality of discussion & debate	1	9	13	4	2.74
Coverage of topic issues	0	9	14	4	2.81
Usefulness of information	0	7	18	2	2.81
Time for discussion	4	12	10	1	2.30
Time for question	2	12	12	1	2.44
Lessons learned	0	8	17	2	2.78

Total number of respondents n=27

### 9. Eliminating New Paediatric HIV Infections and Congenital Syphilis in Asia Pacific

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	3	21	13	3.27
Quality of speakers	2	2	23	10	3.11
Quality of discussion & debate	0	12	21	4	2.78
Coverage of topic issues	0	10	16	11	3.03
Usefulness of information	1	6	18	12	3.11
Time for discussion	3	20	9	5	2.43
Time for question	5	18	9	5	2.38
Lessons learned	2	6	17	12	3.05

Total number of respondents n=37

### 10. “Young and at Higher Risk of HIV”: Programming with Young People from Key Affected Populations (KAP): Progressive and Positive Practices in the Region

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	5	35	11	3.12
Quality of speakers	0	5	34	12	3.14
Quality of discussion & debate	1	12	32	6	2.84
Coverage of topic issues	1	12	29	9	2.90
Usefulness of information	0	10	29	12	3.04
Time for discussion	5	21	21	4	2.47
Time for question	6	22	18	5	2.43
Lessons learned	0	12	26	13	3.02

Total number of respondents n=51



## 11. Getting to Zero...

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	8	63	20	3.13
Quality of speakers	0	14	59	18	3.04
Quality of discussion & debate	4	26	56	5	2.68
Coverage of topic issues	1	17	57	16	2.97
Usefulness of information	0	18	54	19	3.01
Time for discussion	8	41	34	8	2.46
Time for question	11	39	36	5	2.38
Lessons learned	0	22	52	17	2.95

Total number of respondents n=9

### Satellite meeting

There were 180 participants responded for the satellite meeting that they have attended. Overall assessments for the session is calculated and the results shows that the average score for “Overall quality of session” is 3.14, “Quality of speakers” is “Quality of speakers” = 3.11, “Quality of discussion & debate”=2.79, “Coverage of topic issues”=3.01, “Usefulness of information”=3.09, “Time for discussion”=2.51, “Time for question”=2.51, “Lessons learned”=3.05. The scores for most of the assessments are above 3 except “Quality of discussion & debate”, “Time for discussion” and “Time for question”. And the calculated scores of each and every individual topic of satellite meeting were also calculated and the results can be seen in the following tables.

### Overall assessments for satellite meeting

Assessment	No. of participants who response				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	18	118	44	3.14
Quality of speakers	1	19	119	41	3.11
Quality of discussion & debate	9	45	101	25	2.79
Coverage of topic issues	0	33	112	35	3.01
Usefulness of information	1	27	106	46	3.09
Time for discussion	23	62	76	19	2.51
Time for question	25	62	70	23	2.51
Lessons learned	0	33	105	42	3.05

Total number of respondents n= 180

#### 1. Political Commitment and HIV/AIDS: What's Next?.

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	7	5	3.31
Quality of speakers	0	1	7	5	3.31
Quality of discussion & debate	1	3	7	2	2.77
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	11	1	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	3	5	5	3.15
Time for discussion	2	6	4	1	2.31
Time for question	2	6	4	1	2.31
Lessons learned	0	0	9	4	3.31

Total number of respondents n= 13

#### 2. Where is the Money for HIV and AIDS

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	11	1	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	3	6	4	3.08
Quality of discussion & debate	2	4	6	1	2.46
Coverage of topic issues	0	2	10	1	2.92
Usefulness of information	1	11	1	1	2.14
Time for discussion	3	3	6	1	2.38
Time for question	1	6	5	1	2.46
Lessons learned	1.0	6.0	5.0	1	2.46

Total number of respondents n= 13

### 3. Scaling-up the AIDS response in Myanmar – Technical and Financial Resources Need for Implementing the National Strategic Plan 2011-2015

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	6	1	3.14
Quality of speakers	0	0	6	1	3.14
Quality of discussion & debate	0	2	5	0	2.71
Coverage of topic issues	0	3	2	2	2.86
Usefulness of information	0	1	5	1	3.00
Time for discussion	2	2	2	1	2.29
Time for question	3	1	2	1	2.14
Lessons learned	0.0	2	4.0	1	2.86

Total number of respondents n= 7

### 4. Launch of The Global Fund's Regional Results Report for Asia

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	7	3	3.30
Quality of speakers	0	0	7	3	3.30
Quality of discussion & debate	0	4	4	2	2.80
Coverage of topic issues	0	2	7	1	2.90
Usefulness of information	0	0	7	3	3.30
Time for discussion	2	3	3	2	2.50
Time for question	1	4	3	2	2.60
Lessons learned	0.0	1	6	3	3.20

Total number of respondents n= 10

### 5. Scaling up a Nation-wide Response to HIV – Leveraging Gains to Address a Diverse Epidemic

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	10	3	3.14
Quality of speakers	0	1	12	1	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	3	9	2	2.93
Coverage of topic issues	0	3	8	3	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	2	8	4	3.14
Time for discussion	1	6	6	1	2.50
Time for question	3	5	4	2	2.36
Lessons learned	0.0	2	10.0	2.0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 14

## 6. New Collaborations for Action on Sex Work and HIV

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	3	1	3.25
Quality of speakers	0	0	1	3	3.75
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	3	1	3.25
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	2	1	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	3	1	3.25
Time for discussion	0	0	1	3	3.75
Time for question	0	0	1	3	3.75
Lessons learned	0	1	2	1	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 4

## 7. Moving from Sheer Quantity to Queer Quality: Emerging HIV and Social Research Issues among MSM and Transgender People

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	6	1	3.00
Quality of speakers	1	0	4	3	3.13
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	6	1	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	4	3	3.25
Usefulness of information	1	1	5	1	2.75
Time for discussion	1	2	5	0	2.50
Time for question	1	3	2	2	2.63
Lessons learned	0	1	3	4	3.38

Total number of respondents n= 8

## 8. Call for Action: Safeguarding Access to Medicines from FTAs

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	3	1	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	3	1	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	3	1	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	3	1	1	2.60
Usefulness of information	0	3	1	1	2.60
Time for discussion	1	2	1	1	2.40
Time for question	1	1	2	1	2.60
Lessons learned	0	1	3	1	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 5



### 9. Scaling up of New Innovative Partnerships for HIV/AIDS Prevention – Mongolia and Papua New Guinea Experience

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	1	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	1	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	0	1	4.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	1	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	1	0	3.00
Time for discussion	0	0	1	0	3.00
Time for question	0	0	1	0	3.00
Lessons learned	0	0	1	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 1

### 10. Collaboration for Health in Papua New Guinea (PNG): A Review of a Unique Approach to Supporting In-Country Health Service Delivery

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	1	1	3.50
Quality of speakers	0	0	2	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	2	0	0	2.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	1	1	3.50
Usefulness of information	0	1	0	1	3.00
Time for discussion	0	2	0	0	2.00
Time for question	0	2	0	0	2.00
Lessons learned	0	1	0	1	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 2

### 11. Lessons Learned in Delivering Technical Support for Civil Society HIV Responses

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	2	1	2	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	2	2	3.20
Quality of discussion & debate	0	2	2	1	2.80
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	4	1	3.20
Usefulness of information	0	0	4	1	3.20
Time for discussion	1	1	2	1	2.60
Time for question	1	2	1	1	2.40
Lessons learned	0	0	4	1	3.20

Total number of respondents n= 5

## 12. Evidence for Better AIDS Policy in Asia

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	4	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	1	3	3.75
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	2	1	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	2	1	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	1	2	1	3.00
Time for discussion	1	0	3	0	2.50
Time for question	0	1	0	3	3.50
Lessons learned	0	1	2	1	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 4

## 13. Policy & Practice: Prioritising Male Sexual Health in Integrating SRH and HIV Programs

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	5	1	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	4	2	3.14
Quality of discussion & debate	1	1	4	1	2.71
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	5	2	3.29
Usefulness of information	0	0	5	2	3.29
Time for discussion	1	2	3	1	2.57
Time for question	1	2	2	2	2.71
Lessons learned	0.0	2	3.0	2	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 7

## 14. The Impact of Laws on South Korean Sex Workers

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	2	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	2	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	2	0	0	2.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	2	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	2	0	3.00
Time for discussion	1	0	1	0	2.00
Time for question	0	1	1	0	2.50
Lessons learned	0	0	2	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 2

### 15. Successes and Challenges in Providing HIV Prevention, Treatment and Social Protection for Migrant Workers along the Migration Continuum

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	1	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	1	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	1	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	0	1	4.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	0	1	4.00
Time for discussion	0	1	0	0	2.00
Time for question	0	1	0	0	2.00
Lessons learned	0	0	1	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 1

### 16. Roads, Connectivity and HIV

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	5	2	3.29
Quality of speakers	0	1	5	1	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	1	1	5	0	2.57
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	7	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	1	6	0	2.86
Time for discussion	0	4	3	0	2.43
Time for question	0	3	4	0	2.57
Lessons learned	0	1	6	0	2.86

Total number of respondents n= 7

### 17. Political Sciences and the Politics of HIV Responses in Asia and the Pacific

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	2	1	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	3	1	3.25
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	1	3	3.75
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	4	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	3	1	3.25
Time for discussion	1	1	2	0	2.25
Time for question	1	1	2	0	2.25
Lessons learned	0	0	3	1	3.25

Total number of respondents n= 4

### 18. Engaging the Health Sector for Scaling Up Services for MSM and Transgender People

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	7	1	3.13
Quality of speakers	0	1	6	1	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	5	2	3.13
Coverage of topic issues	0	2	4	2	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	2	4	2	3.00
Time for discussion	0	3	4	2	2.89
Time for question	0	2	4	2	3.00
Lessons learned	0	2	4	2	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 8

### 19. How Can Professional Health Care Societies Contribute to National HIV Programs?

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	3	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	3	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	1	1	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	2	0	2.67
Usefulness of information	0	0	3	0	3.00
Time for discussion	0	1	2	0	2.67
Time for question	0	1	2	0	2.67
Lessons learned	0	1	2	0	2.67

Total number of respondents n= 3

### 20. How Failed 'War on Drugs' Impacts the Current Response to Drugs and HIV – Recommendations from Global Commission on Drug Policies

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	2	2	3.50
Quality of speakers	0	1	3	0	2.75
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	4	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	4	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	1	2	1	3.00
Time for discussion	0	2	1	1	2.75
Time for question	0	1	2	1	3.00
Lessons learned	0	2	2	0	2.50

Total number of respondents n= 4

## 21. Universal Access in Asia Pacific – Community Experience in Four Countries and Is There a Way Forward?

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	4	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	3	0	2.75
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	3	0	2.75
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	4	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	4	0	3.00
Time for discussion	0	1	3	0	2.75
Time for question	0	0	4	0	3.00
Lessons learned	0	0	4	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 4

## 22. TB & HEPATITIS C Virus (HCV) CO-Infection

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	0	1	4.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	1	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	1	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	0	0	2.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	0	1	4.00
Time for discussion	0	1	0	0	2.00
Time for question	1	0	0	0	1.00
Lessons learned	0	0	1	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 4

## 23. Working together

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	2	4	3.67
Quality of speakers	0	0	3	3	3.50
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	4	1	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	2	4	3.67
Usefulness of information	0	0	1	5	3.83
Time for discussion	0	3	2	1	2.67
Time for question	1	3	1	1	2.33
Lessons learned	0	0	3	3	3.50

Total number of respondents n= 6

#### 24. HIV and AIDS Data Hub: The Application of Data to Better Inform Planning and Programming

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	3	2	3.40
Quality of speakers	0	0	3	2	3.40
Quality of discussion & debate	2	0	1	2	2.60
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	2	3	3.60
Usefulness of information	0	0	3	2	3.40
Time for discussion	1	1	2	1	2.60
Time for question	1	0	3	1	2.80
Lessons learned	0	1	2	2	3.20

Total number of respondents n= 5

#### 25. Drug Resistant TB in People Living with HIV: Challenges in Scaling Up Diagnosis and Treatment

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	2	3	2	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	6	0	2.86
Quality of discussion & debate	0	2	5	0	2.71
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	6	0	2.86
Usefulness of information	0	1	5	1	3.00
Time for discussion	0	2	5	0	2.71
Time for question	0	3	4	0	2.57
Lessons learned	0	2	4	1	2.86

Total number of respondents n= 7

#### 26. The Role of Religion in Encouraging and Discouraging Stigma and Discrimination

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	3	3	3.29
Quality of speakers	0	0	5	2	3.29
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	7	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	4	2	3.14
Usefulness of information	0	0	4	3	3.43
Time for discussion	1	3	1	2	2.57
Time for question	1	2	2	2	2.71
Lessons learned	0	0	4	3	3.43

Total number of respondents n= 7

### 27. I am What I am: Transgender Health and Challenges

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	8	2	3.09
Quality of speakers	0	2	6	3	3.09
Quality of discussion & debate	1	4	5	1	2.55
Coverage of topic issues	0	3	6	2	2.91
Usefulness of information	0	3	5	3	3.00
Time for discussion	1	5	4	1	2.45
Time for question	1	8	2	0	2.09
Lessons learned	0	6	4	1	2.55

Total number of respondents n= 11

### 28. Is SRH/HIV Integration Serving the Needs of Key Populations? A Satellite Session Presenting Regional Experiences

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	2	0	2.67
Quality of speakers	0	1	2	0	2.67
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	1	1	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	2	0	2.67
Usefulness of information	0	2	1	0	2.33
Time for discussion	0	1	1	1	3.00
Time for question	0	2	1	0	2.33
Lessons learned	0	2	1	0	2.33

Total number of respondents n= 3

### 29. Sex, Drugs & Technology: Findings from Asia's Largest Multi-country Internet Survey

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	4	0	2.80
Quality of speakers	0	1	4	0	2.80
Quality of discussion & debate	0	3	1	1	2.60
Coverage of topic issues	0	3	2	0	2.40
Usefulness of information	0	2	3	0	2.60
Time for discussion	0	2	3	0	2.60
Time for question	0	2	3	0	2.60
Lessons learned	0	2	3	0	2.60

Total number of respondents n= 5

### 30. “Encouraging & Enhancing Responsibility, Involvement & Participation of Private Companies during the Economic Crisis”

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	0	1	4.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	0	1	4.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	1	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	0	0	2.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	0	1	4.00
Time for discussion	0	1	0	0	2.00
Time for question	0	0	1	0	3.00
Lessons learned	0	0	1	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 1

### 31. Integrating Epidemiological and Economic Analysis in Asia

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	3	2	3	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	2	4	2	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	3	2	3	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	2	4	2	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	2	3	3	3.13
Time for discussion	2	0	3	3	2.88
Time for question	2	0	3	3	2.88
Lessons learned	0	2	3	3	3.13

Total number of respondents n= 8

### Skill Building

Compare to other session, skill building has the least number of participants, 111 people. Similar to the satellite the assessment with the highest score is “Overall quality of the session” and the lowest score is “Time for discussion”. the average score for “Overall quality of session” is 3.18, “Quality of speakers” is “Quality of speakers” = 3.11, “Quality of discussion & debate”=2.88, “Coverage of topic issues”=2.99, “Usefulness of information”=3.09, “Time for discussion”=2.62, “Time for question”=2.59, “Lessons learned”=3.12. The scores for most of the assessments are above 3 except “Quality of discussion & debate”, “Time for discussion” and “Time for question”. The assessments of each particular session can be seen in the tables.



## Overall assessments on Skill Building session

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	7	77	27	3.18
Quality of speakers	1	11	74	25	3.11
Quality of discussion & debate	2	23	72	14	2.88
Coverage of topic issues	0	23	66	22	2.99
Usefulness of information	2	14	67	28	3.09
Time for discussion	7	42	48	14	2.62
Time for question	12	36	48	15	2.59
Lessons learned	0	19	60	32	3.12

Total number of respondents n=111

### 1. YOUTH VOICES COUNT: The Missing Link!

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	4	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	3	0	2.75
Quality of discussion & debate	0	2	2	0	2.50
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	3	0	2.75
Usefulness of information	0	0	4	0	3.00
Time for discussion	1	3	0	0	1.75
Time for question	1	2	1	0	2.00
Lessons learned	0	0	4	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 4

### 2. Stigma and Discrimination

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	4	3	3.43
Quality of speakers	0	0	5	2	3.29
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	7	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	4	2	1	2.57
Usefulness of information	0	0	4	3	3.43
Time for discussion	0	4	2	1	2.57
Time for question	0	4	2	1	2.57
Lessons learned	0	0	3	4	3.57

Total number of respondents n= 7

### 3. Strategic Planning for Linked Response to Sexual and Reproductive Health and HIV/AIDS

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	2	2	3.50
Quality of speakers	0	0	1	3	3.75
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	2	2	3.50
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	1	2	3.25
Usefulness of information	0	0	3	1	3.25
Time for discussion	0	0	2	2	3.50
Time for question	0	0	2	2	3.50
Lessons learned	0	0	1	3	3.75

Total number of respondents n= 4

### 4. Strengthening Community Leadership in Country Coordinating Mechanisms

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	2	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	2	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	1	1	3.50
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	1	1	3.50
Usefulness of information	0	0	1	1	3.50
Time for discussion	0	0	2	0	3.00
Time for question	0	0	2	0	3.00
Lessons learned	0	0	1	1	3.50

Total number of respondents n= 2

### 5. Community Led Structural Intervention approaches and strategies to improve quality and sustainability of HIV program

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	5	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	5	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	4	0	2.80
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	2	2	3.20
Usefulness of information	0	2	2	1	2.80
Time for discussion	0	2	3	0	2.60
Time for question	0	2	2	1	2.80
Lessons learned	0	1	2	2	3.20

Total number of respondents n= 5

## 6. Sex Workers Advocating for Human Rights in the International HIV Response

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	5	0	2.83
Quality of speakers	1	2	2	1	2.50
Quality of discussion & debate	0	4	2	0	2.33
Coverage of topic issues	0	5	1	0	2.17
Usefulness of information	0	3	3	0	2.50
Time for discussion	2	1	3	0	2.17
Time for question	2	2	2	0	2.00
Lessons learned	0	3	2	1	2.67

Total number of respondents n= 6

## 7. MARPS and Sex Workers... not So Hard to Reach

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	4	1	3.20
Quality of speakers	0	0	4	1	3.20
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	3	1	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	4	1	3.20
Usefulness of information	0	0	4	1	3.20
Time for discussion	1	1	2	1	2.60
Time for question	1	1	3	0	2.40
Lessons learned	0	1	3	1	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 6

## 8. Stigma and Discrimination

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	5	2	3.29
Quality of speakers	0	1	4	2	3.14
Quality of discussion & debate	0	2	3	2	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	2	4	1	2.86
Usefulness of information	1	0	4	2	3.00
Time for discussion	0	2	4	1	2.86
Time for question	1	1	3	0	1.71
Lessons learned	0	1	4	2	3.14

Total number of respondents n= 7

### 9. The Numbers Game: Key Affected Populations (KAP), Use of Data and Advocacy to Strengthen The National Response

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	1	2	3.67
Quality of speakers	0	0	1	2	3.67
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	1	2	3.67
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	1	2	3.67
Usefulness of information	0	0	1	2	3.67
Time for discussion	0	1	1	1	3.00
Time for question	0	0	1	2	3.67
Lessons learned	0	0	1	2	3.67

Total number of respondents n= 3

### 10. Arresting HIV: Programs that Work with Police to Reduce HIV Vulnerability in Sex Workers, IDU and MSM

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	4	1	3.20
Quality of speakers	0	0	4	1	3.20
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	5	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	3	1	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	1	2	2	3.20
Time for discussion	0	2	2	1	2.80
Time for question	0	2	2	1	2.80
Lessons learned	0	0	3	2	3.40

Total number of respondents n= 5

### 11. Skills Building Workshop for Medical Doctors and Health Care Professionals on Clinical Management of HIV Infection and Antiretroviral Therapy

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	3	1	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	4	0	2.80
Quality of discussion & debate	1	1	3	0	2.40
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	4	0	2.80
Usefulness of information	0	1	4	0	2.80
Time for discussion	1	1	3	0	2.40
Time for question	1	1	3	0	2.40
Lessons learned	0	2	3	0	2.60

Total number of respondents n= 5

## 12. Skill Building Workshop to Understand the Need of Young Key Affected Populations (in Asia Pacific)

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	2	1	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	1	2	3.25
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	2	1	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	3	1	3.25
Usefulness of information	0	0	3	1	3.25
Time for discussion	0	0	2	2	3.50
Time for question	0	0	3	1	3.25
Lessons learned	0	0	3	1	3.25

Total number of respondents n= 4

## 13. Stigma and Discrimination

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	1	4	3.80
Quality of speakers	0	1	1	3	3.40
Quality of discussion & debate	0	2	2	1	2.80
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	1	3	3.40
Usefulness of information	0	1	0	4	3.60
Time for discussion	0	2	1	2	3.00
Time for question	0	3	0	2	2.80
Lessons learned	0	1	0	4	3.60

Total number of respondents n= 5

## 14. Improving Quality of TI through Outcome Study Protocol

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	1	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	1	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	1	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	1	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	1	0	3.00
Time for discussion	0	0	1	0	3.00
Time for question	0	0	1	0	3.00
Lessons learned	0	0	1	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 1

### 15. Skill Building Workshop to Understand the Need of Young Key Affected Populations (in Asia Pacific)

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	1	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	1	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	1	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	1	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	1	0	3.00
Time for discussion	0	1	0	0	2.00
Time for question	0	0	1	0	3.00
Lessons learned	0	0	1	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 1

### 16. HIV/Hepatitis C Co-infection Treatment Advocacy 101

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	2	1	3.33
Quality of speakers	0	0	3	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	2	0	2.67
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	0	2	3.33
Usefulness of information	0	0	3	0	3.00
Time for discussion	0	0	3	0	3.00
Time for question	1	1	0	1	2.33
Lessons learned	0	0	3	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 3

### 17. Deconstructing Gender - Evaluation & Budgeting of HIV/AIDS Programmes at Policy and Community Level

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	1	1	3.50
Quality of speakers	0	0	2	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	1	0	2.50
Coverage of topic issues	0	2	0	0	2.00
Usefulness of information	0	1	0	1	3.00
Time for discussion	0	2	0	0	2.00
Time for question	1	1	0	0	1.50
Lessons learned	0	1	1	0	2.50

Total number of respondents n= 2

### 18. Advocacy and Scale Up of Prevention for Health Promotion of HIV Positive People in the Health Care Settings

Assessment	No of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	2	13	4	<b>3.10</b>
Quality of speakers	0	2	14	3	<b>3.05</b>
Quality of discussion & debate	1	3	12	3	<b>2.89</b>
Coverage of topic issues	0	5	11	3	<b>2.89</b>
Usefulness of information	1	3	11	4	<b>2.95</b>
Time for discussion	2	4	11	2	<b>2.68</b>
Time for question	5	1	11	2	<b>2.53</b>
Lessons learned	0	4	11	4	<b>3.00</b>

Total number of respondents n= 19

### 19. HIV/AIDS Control in Korea

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	3	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	3	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	3	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	3	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	3	0	3.00
Time for discussion	0	1	2	0	2.67
Time for question	0	0	3	0	3.00
Lessons learned	0	1	2	0	2.67

Total number of respondents n= 3

### 20. Churches and Faith Communities as HIV&AIDS Channels of Hope

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	2	2	3.50
Quality of speakers	0	0	2	2	3.50
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	2	2	3.50
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	3	1	3.25
Usefulness of information	0	1	2	1	3.00
Time for discussion	0	1	3	0	2.75
Time for question	0	1	3	0	2.75
Lessons learned	0	0	3	1	3.25

Total number of respondents n= 4

### 21. Churches and Faith Communities as HIV&AIDS Channels of Hope

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	1	1	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	0	2	3.33
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	2	0	2.67
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	2	0	2.67
Usefulness of information	0	1	0	2	3.33
Time for discussion	0	2	1	0	2.33
Time for question	0	3	0	0	2.00
Lessons learned	0	1	0	2	3.33

Total number of respondents n= 3

### 22. Double Disclosure - How to support MSM PLHIV to Come to Terms with Their Sexuality and Status

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	1	1	0	2.50
Quality of speakers	0	1	1	0	2.50
Quality of discussion & debate	0	0	2	0	3.00
Coverage of topic issues	0	1	1	0	2.50
Usefulness of information	0	0	2	0	3.00
Time for discussion	0	1	1	0	2.50
Time for question	0	1	1	0	2.50
Lessons learned	0	1	1	0	2.50

Total number of respondents n= 2

### 23. Skills Building Workshop for NGOs and CBOs in Proposal Writing for Global Fund

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	7	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	0	7	0	3.00
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	6	0	2.86
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	6	1	3.14
Usefulness of information	0	0	6	1	3.14
Time for discussion	0	4	3	0	2.43
Time for question	0	4	3	0	2.43
Lessons learned	0	1	5	1	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 7



#### 24. Simple Pleasures: Getting on with it ‘Again’ (Living Longer with HIV)

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	3	0	3.00
Quality of speakers	0	1	2	0	2.67
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	2	0	2.67
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	3	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	0	3	0	3.00
Time for discussion	0	3	0	0	2.00
Time for question	0	2	1	0	2.33
Lessons learned	0	0	3	0	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 3

#### 25. Consultancy Soft Skills for Consultants Including the Community Consultants

Assessment	No. of participants who response (percent)				Average Score
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Overall quality of session	0	0	2	1	3.33
Quality of speakers	0	0	2	1	3.33
Quality of discussion & debate	0	1	2	0	2.67
Coverage of topic issues	0	0	3	0	3.00
Usefulness of information	0	1	1	1	3.00
Time for discussion	0	2	1	0	2.33
Time for question	0	2	1	0	2.33
Lessons learned	0	1	1	1	3.00

Total number of respondents n= 3

#### Comments and Suggestions for Sessions

- **Limited of time**

**17 people who attended in ICAAP10 session suggested that should provide more times for question and discussion:**

- 1) To many presentation need more time
- 2) Time is so limited
- 3) Time for each presentation so limited so, presentation’s in room cannot understand the issue that presenter want to share
- 4) Time constraint for discussion if possible extending
- 5) There is no time for discussion and question this arrangement is not good. There are interruption such as donor question and annulments during the session
- 6) The sessions had many topic but don't have time to ask
- 7) Should provided time to discuss and questions
- 8) Should manage time for question and discussion event the PowerPoint should prepare well before started



- 9) Should be given time more than 10 minutes for oral presentation.
- 10) Provide more times for discussion
- 11) Process to chose oral presentation should be more carefully and on time
- 12) Not enough time for question from audients, to view concluding and opinions
- 13) Need much none time to discussion on topic
- 14) Need to give more information on registration. Contents of presentation should more correlate to topics. Need to time for discussion and question
- 15) Give more time on question papers should be on programmers assessment minimizes, scientific papers
- 16) Needs more time for oral presentation
- 17) Due to logistic issues (sadden change of the room) there was no time for discussion or Questions

- **Opening and Closing Ceremony**

**4 people who attended in ICAAP10 session suggested that the open and closing ceremony taken long time:**

- 1) The opening was a bit long
- 2) There too many speakers in the opening and all in the closing ceremony. There should be cultural events instead too many people to summary each track on the last day.
- 3) Technical support for property should be improved, Opening +closing ceremonies too many speeches
- 4) In closing session the freedom impression was very limited.

- **Technical in sessions**

**24 people who attended in ICAAP10 session suggested the technical in each session**

- 1) The presentation were very good
- 2) Technical quality good , Flow of information during early session should be reduce are prepare well
- 3) The chair of the session doesn't show up
- 4) Speakers should prepare well
- 5) Oral presentations need more review above technical/scientific session
- 6) Should have more session on TB
- 7) Should have more session on HIV woman and family children with HIV.
- 8) Should have at least brief information on this plenary session.
- 9) Should be topic on culture and religion at plenary session also more on please in open windows +children and party of KAP
- 10) Session from Pacific, China, Vietnam laced content and presenters were not up to the mark
- 11) Please share all presentations by session on the net and share all speech from speakers session on net



- 12) Please share all presentation on website all session and plenary session
- 13) PowerPoint presentation so many hi-tech. Poor design of the questionnaire still for day-one session?
- 14) Co-chair and speaker - convertor need to be improved give time for discussion
- 15) Better screening of presentation
- 16) All presentation should shoot effectiveness and fit to time line
- 17) Suggest TB/HIV for all population
- 18) Quality as speakers as symposium and plenary is notably better and more organized. May be good to offer slide of session via CD/thumb drive
- 19) Some of the sessions "out-of-sex" was not very well disabled, contents of speakers are at average level
- 20) Please make available to participants to presentation they slide on e-mail. They were so much essential information we would have led to have a hand out, so I hope you will make the presentation
- 21) Non session & workshop with PLWHA
- 22) Most session lacks youth focus
- 23) Need to organize property it is bit hard to lend rooms not enough session
- 24) I guess if we could generate more dialogue on issue and have more participator in the sessions that world have been great

- **Languages**

**2 people who attended in ICAAP10 session suggested that should be English for the information**

- 1) There should be English for the information
- 2) Language presentation difficulty makes me difficult to understand in some session.

- **Technical to promote conference**

**6 people who attended in ICAAP10 session suggested that LOC of the next ICAAP should be promote more**

- 1) Provide all session to the website
- 2) Promote more in order to get more participants
- 3) Make it more interactive
- 4) Quite conference and tense. Hope next time will be better
- 5) Participation so less
- 6) I couldn't find any new findings or opinions through this congress. Venue was quite empty. Better to advertise more than put money on performance

- **Food**

**2 people who attended in ICAAP10 session suggested that should provide food for participants**



- 1) Provide lunch officially to all participant
- 2) Please the next ICAAP should organize the food by country to participant such as booth also

- **Others comments**

- 1) Working together on HIV implementing the statement of commitment.
- 2) Totally reducing HIV/AIDS in the world
- 3) Too much wastage at ICAAP on plastic disposable contains and water bottles. At the next conference, it would be great if ICAAP water bottles could be prodded and reused. ICAAP should more to be carbon
- 4) Please provide the registration free also.
- 5) Organizers should work write and presenters to ensure they present their work many speakers were absent.
- 6) Noting very new
- 7) It only we have some recommendation how we can work together to work effective.
- 8) It is poorly managed too many last minute changes especially row in traffic registration
- 9) If ICAPP 11 could make sure the participation at least 3 to 5 women living with HIV and have to -change share their view and working experience.
- 10) ICAAP should conduct every five years too short for two years to present the result.
- 11) I want to hear more voice from government and community.
- 12) Human's in authority must be mentioned that every and each human being a person and address site
- 13) Good next I coming ICAAP
- 14) For Information of all topic not clearly because on hand book. It is difficult if to understand.
- 15) A great congress
- 16) HIV is infectious disease treat it like another ones as earliest as possible
- 17) Social determinant of health do not impending human life to keep alive
- 18) Keep human get their might but also their responsible obligate

### III. Community Evaluation

#### Section:1 Personal data

##### 1. SEX

	Frequency	Percent
Male	16	37.2
Female	23	53.5
Transgender	4	9.3
Total	43	100

##### 2. Age group

	Frequency	Percent
Under 21	1	2.3
21-30	11	25.6
31-40	16	37.2
41-50	12	27.9
51-60	2	4.7
Over 60	1	2.3
Total	43	100.0

##### 3. Nationality

Nationality	Frequency	Percent
Unknown	9	20.8
American	2	4.7
Australian	2	7.0
Bangladeshi	2	4.7
Chinese	2	4.7
Indian	1	2.3
Japanese	6	14.0
Korean	6	14.0
Malaysian	1	2.3
Philippines	1	2.3
Thai	5	11.5
Timorese	2	4.7
Indonesian	3	7.0
Total	43	100.0

#### 4. Occupation

Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Unknown	3	7.0
Clinician/Physician	2	4.7
Student	1	2.3
Media representative	1	2.3
Researcher-others	10	23.3
Policy/ administrator	2	4.7
Other (please specify)	5	11.5
other health care workers	7	16.3
Sex Worker	12	27.9
Total	43	100.0

Among 43 respondents of the community forum, there were 4 people of transgender, 16 male and the rest 23 male. More of them were between the ages of 21-50 years, 1 under 21 years old, 3 over 50. The participants are from 12 different countries. And a few of them did not identify their nationalities. The occupation of them covers sex workers, researchers, health care workers, clinician, media representative, policy maker and others etc.

#### 5. Source of information about ICAAP10

	Frequency	Percent
Recommended by colleagues/friends	21	48.8
ICAAP website	12	27.9
Other ICAAP communication	5	11.6
Media coverage	1	2.3
Advertisement in journal	0	0.0
Attended previous conference/aware of the schedule	8	18.6
ASAP website/other correspondence	2	4.7
Conference invitation programme	7	16.3
Not sure	0	0.0
Other	1	2.3

About half these participants replied that they were recommended by their colleagues for the information about ICAAP 10, 12 people confirmed that they access the source of information



from the ICAAP website. There were 8 people of them have participated the previous ICAAP and aware of the schedule. The rest got the information from media coverage, other ICAAP communication and ASAP website etc.

### 6. Reason for attending ICAAP10

	Frequency	Percent
Scientific programme	4	9.3
Geographic location	1	2.3
Global focus	3	7.0
Opportunities for networking or collaboration	35	81.4
Presenting paper or poster	13	30.2
Recipient of Scholarship or Grants	8	18.6
Other	4	9.3

When asking the reasons for attending the ICAAP 10, 35 (81.4%) replied for seeking opportunities for networking or collaboration, 13 of them answered that they came to present their paper or poster. 8 of them received scholarships or grants to attend the conference. There were very few people gave reasons such as for joining the scientific program, global focus of HIV/AIDS and according to geographical location.

### 7. Which KAP populations do you belong to.

	Frequency	Percent
PLHIV	4	9.3
PUD	2	4.7
TG	4	9.3
Migration	6	14.0
SW	14	32.6
MSM	10	23.3
Women and Girls	11	25.6
Mobile Populations	3	7.0
Other	3	7.0

43 participants were identified which group of Key Affected Population they are belong to. 14 of them belong to sex worker, 10 belong to MSM, 11 were under the group of women girls,



4 cases of PLHIV, 6 migrated population, 4 transgender, 3 mobile populations, 2 people who use drug and 3 others.

## Section 2 Assessment

Assessment	Relevance and usefulness				Mean
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Overall quality of session	15 (34.9)	25 (58.1)	3 (7.0)	0 (0)	3.3
Quality of speakers	15 (34.9)	22 (51.2)	6 (14.0)	0 (0)	3.2
Quality of discussion & debate	18 (41.9)	21 (48.8)	3 (7.0)	1(2.3)	3.3
Coverage of current topic issues	15 (34.9)	20 (46.5)	7 (16.3)	1(2.3)	3.1
Usefulness of information	17 (39.5)	18 (41.9)	8 (18.6)	0 (0)	3.2
Time for discussion	16 (37.2)	19 (49.2)	5 (11.6)	3 (7.0)	3.1
Time for questions	15 (34.9)	21 (48.8)	4 (9.3)	3 (7.0)	3.1
Lessons learned	15 (34.9)	19 (49.2)	9 (20.9)	0 (0)	3.1

The result shows that the average score of all 8 assessments are over 3. The average score for “Overall quality of the session” is 3.33, “Quality of speakers” is “Quality of speakers” = 3.2, “Quality of discussion & debate”=3.3, “Coverage of topic issues”=3.1, “Usefulness of information”=3.2, “Time for discussion”=3.1, “Time for question”=3.1, “Lessons learned”=3.1. Compare to other sessions, the score for “Overall quality of discussion & debate”, “Time for discussion” and “Time for questions” was higher in community forum.

## Suggestions and comments

- 1) This is have first time done discussion on sex workers issues in ICAAP and follow up other conference
- 2) Need more time for community forum
- 3) Need use research less unspeaker
- 4) Increasing promotion of this forum due to its very useful but only few people know
- 5) I think we need to focus to achieve, those are more feasible at ground level Not to 50 over ambitious
- 6) Hope many PLWHA from Korea join here more
- 7) Hope many community join for next meeting
- 8) Good very friendly environment which enabling participation
- 9) Give session and community authority
- 10) More preparation - Time to agree on topics before - Last year was better 2 drop to plan/workshop