# COUNTRY COVID-19 INTRA-ACTION REVIEW (IAR) – PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK FORM

1. **On a scale of 1 (fully disagree) to 5 (fully agree) to what extent do you agree that the Intra-Action Review (IAR) reached the following objectives?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Fully disagree** |  |  |  | **Fully agree** |
| i. The IAR allowed participants to identify challenges and gaps encountered during the COVID-19 outbreak response. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ii. The IAR allowed participants to share experiences and best practice encountered during the COVID-19 outbreak response. |  |  |  |  |  |
| iii. The IAR contributed to strengthening interdisciplinary collaboration and coordination among the health sector stakeholders involved in the COVID-19 outbreak response. |  |  |  |  |  |
| iv. The IAR contributed to strengthening multisectoral collaboration and coordination between health and non-health sectors involved in the COVID-19 outbreak response. |  |  |  |  |  |
| v. The IAR allowed participants to propose actions for improving the response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **On a scale from 1 (very ineffective) to 5 (very effective), how effective was the IAR methodology in achieving the objectives:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Very ineffective** |  |  |  | **Very effective** |
| i. Presentations on the methodology and process of the IAR were clear and useful. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ii. **Introductory session** on the Country COVID-19 Response Plan and the actual timeline of the response was helpful and efficient. |  |  |  |  |  |
| iii. **Session 1** (What went well? What went less well? Why?) was efficient. |  |  |  |  |  |
| iv. **Session 2** (What can we do to improve for next time?) was efficient. |  |  |  |  |  |
| v. **Session 3** (The Way forward) was efficient. |  |  |  |  |  |
| vi. Was the number of participants adequate? |  |  |  |  |  |
| vii. Were participants’ profiles adequate for the pillar(s)/function(s) of the response examined? |  |  |  |  |  |
| viii. Would you use this IAR methodology for other public health emergencies in your country? |  |  |  |  |  |
| ix. Overall, what is your assessment of the effectiveness of the IAR methodology to achieve the objectives and results? |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **On a scale of 1 (not at all likely) to 5 (extremely likely), to what extent do you think the results of the IAR can contribute to:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Not at all likely** |  |  |  | **Extremely likely** |
| i. Addressing the most important gaps in the COVID-19 outbreak response in a timely manner. |  |  |  |  |  |
| ii. Address gaps in coordination and collaboration. |  |  |  |  |  |
| iii. Identify, replicate, and sustain productive practices. |  |  |  |  |  |
| iv. Empower individuals to better appreciate the challenges of emergency response. |  |  |  |  |  |
| v. Highlight best practices or new capacities developed in-country during the COVID-19 outbreak response. |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Other comments/suggestions on the IAR methodology**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Other comments on the results of the IAR**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THE INTRA-ACTION REVIEW (IAR)!**