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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is an evaluation of the 47th Union World Conference on Lung Health held in Liverpool, UK, from 26-29 October 2016. Over 3,000 participants from 126 countries attended to confront resistance to improving lung health and reducing lung disease. The evaluation was carried out through an online survey completed by 35 percent of all participants (1,063 responses) and through three focus groups (attended by 15 participants).

HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS THE CONFERENCE IN ACHIEVING ITS OBJECTIVES?

The large majority of survey participants agreed that new insights were provided on multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) (90%) and antimicrobial resistance (85%). Less agreement was seen for the tobacco control areas (40–43%), including high ‘Don’t know’ responses (40–41%); this was not surprising given that the reported focus of participants was overwhelmingly in the TB field.

Regarding benefits, 99.9 percent of survey participants indicated that they benefited from the Conference. The main benefit participants gained was “New knowledge” (86%), followed by ‘New contacts/opportunities for collaboration’ (63%) and ‘Strengthening collaboration with existing contacts’ (63%). Ninety-three percent of survey participants said the Conference met their needs in respect of their work focus, expertise level and role.

WHAT DID THE CONFERENCE OFFER AND HOW WAS IT RATED BY PARTICIPANTS?

The 47th Conference offered a range of sessions and activities including abstract-related sessions (21 tracks with 925 abstracts presented), seven post-graduate courses, 15 workshops, a poster display, an exhibition area, satellite sessions and a Community Commons (CC) space that offered session to delegates and general public.

Although most survey participants (79%) were interested in TB-related areas, 54 percent indicated that they attended sessions outside their main discipline. In assessing the quality of the science, TB was rated the highest topic at 95 percent and Zoonotic TB the lowest at 77 percent for “Excellent” and “Good” ratings.

Of those survey participants who had attended a post-graduate course or a workshop (37%), the majority indicated they were “Very useful” or “Useful” – 85 percent for courses and 89 percent for workshops. Eighty-four percent of survey participants indicated that they visited the poster and exhibition area, with 76 percent rating the area “Excellent” or “Good”. Seventy-seven percent of survey participants indicated that they had visited the Community Common, with nearly half (45%) visiting it one to two times. Scientific and community-focused sessions were the most useful Community Common activity for participants.
HOW WERE PARTICIPANTS SUPPORTED IN THEIR PREPARATION FOR AND PARTICIPATION IN THE CONFERENCE?

Exhibitors rated the onsite signage and support from the Conference Secretariat highly (86% for “Excellent” and “Good” ratings) but location of the exhibition area and their individual booths lower (48% and 52%). Even though the majority of exhibitors (62%) considered that there were too few visitors to the exhibition area, 72 percent were “Very likely” or “Likely” to exhibit again.

SatelliteSessions organisers rated support from the Conference Secretariat both positively before (100% “Excellent” and “Good” ratings) and during the Conference (80%). Eighty percent of organisers were “Very likely” or “Likely” to organise a Satellite Session at a future Union conference.

Seventy-seven percent of Community Common activity organisers and 79 percent of workshop and course coordinators were “Very likely” or “Likely” to organise CC activities at future conferences.

Scholarship applicants and recipients rated positively the new online application process (87% for “Excellent” and “Good” ratings), pre-conference support (82%) and onsite support (89%).

As a resource to support speakers, chairs and abstract/poster presenters, the new pre-conference guidelines were rated the highest (75% “Very useful and “Useful”). Poster exhibitors rated the area, signage and layout positively – between 71 and 79 percent for “Excellent” and “Good” ratings – although location of their own posters was rated lower at 59 percent.

Just over half (51%) of participants reported that they had used the app, and among these participants, 51% found the application “Very useful” to prepare for the Conference and 65% “Very useful” during the Conference. Ninety-one percent of participants who used the online app did or would recommend it to a friend or colleague.

Only two-thirds of respondents found the email newsletters sent by the Conference Secretariat “Very useful” or “Useful”. Less than one-third (29%) of survey participants reported that they had followed the Conference through social media.

Over three-quarters (78%) of survey participants found the Conference volunteers to be “Very useful” or “Useful”.

WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED FOR THE NEXT CONFERENCE?

PROGRAMME

When asked about changes desired to the session type balance for the next conference, half the participants wanted “No change” for the different programme components (plenary sessions, abstract sessions, symposia, etc.) and the other half split between “No opinion” and “More”. The greatest request for change was to have more symposia and meet-the-expert sessions (33% requesting “More”). Other suggestions of participants included:

- avoid having sessions of similar/same topics at the same time;
- have daily themes and/or plenaries on key topic areas;
- avoid having speakers present the same paper in a workshop and then in an abstract session;
- avoid repetition of papers/topics presented in previous years;
- allow more time for questions/answers and discussions;
- provide a way to identify onsite which session is part of which track.

TOPICS

Survey participants were asked if the conference should expand beyond TB and lung health; half (52%) responded “Yes”, slightly more than one-third responded “No” (35%) and a small minority replied “Not sure” (13%), with those under 40 and first- or second-time participants being more in favour of expansion than those over 60 and those who had attended more than five conferences.

When provided with a list of suggested topics, survey participants ranked “Air pollution” and “Community engagement” the highest.

ORGANISATION

Thirty percent of comments on the logistical organisation were positive remarks. Other comments focused on issues of space and rooms at the venue, potential participants not being granted visas, availability of food, cost of attending the Conference, language issues and the printing of the programme (i.e. some thought it was not needed).
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, this evaluation has found that the Conference largely met its set goals. The added value of the Conference was anticipated to be networking and learning, which was confirmed by most participants as having been attained, although slightly more for learning (86%) than for networking (63%). To reinforce and build on the success of the 47th Conference, the following recommendations are proposed for the 48th Conference and those beyond (further specific suggestions from participants are summarised in annex 2):

1. NETWORKING
Given that this is the highest anticipated benefit for participants and it was not quite met (70% desired benefit compared to 63% attained benefit), activities and actions could be carried out to facilitate networking such as: include more informal break-out spaces in the venue, programming longer breaks and structured networking activities.

2. PROGRAMMING
The Conference was ambitious in the number of abstracts featured and consequent parallel sessions. This caused some frustrations amongst participants in not being able to attend all sessions of interest. The CCSA should consider reducing the number of abstracts accepted, streamlining tracks and trying to prevent overlap of sessions on similar topics.

3. TOPICS
The survey participants were split as to whether future conferences should expand the range of topics presented; half thought it should, one-third did not and the rest were not sure. A solution could be to pilot topics where support was strongest, e.g. air pollution and community engagement, for the 48th Conference and assess consequent interest.

4. VENUE SET-UP AND PLANNING
The venue caused some concern for participants in terms of lack of seating, meeting places and size of session rooms. Although these issues are largely beyond the control of the Conference Secretariat (since the venue changes each year), this should be considered when booking and designing spaces.

5. EXHIBITIONS
The exhibition area did not fully meet its expectations considering that 62 percent of exhibitors thought that there were not enough visitors and that it had the lowest “Very likely / likely” ratings to participate again from exhibitors of all organising groups (72% compared to 77% for CC organisers and 79% for course/workshop organisers). Both exhibitors and participants thought that the exhibition area was not central enough to the Conference space. It is suggested that for future conferences, the exhibition area be more centrally located where significant traffic is guaranteed (venue set-up allowing), incentives to visits are introduced and the exhibition area concept “refreshed” (London ERS conference mentioned as an example).

6. COMMUNITY COMMON
The CC was seen as a key component for the Conference, visited by two-thirds of participants. However, the noise levels at some moments potentially diminished its impact and networking possibilities and signalled to some a lower priority for this component. It is suggested for future conferences that the location of the CC be carefully considered to provide it with visibility while still a conducive setting for networking and discussions, venue constraints allowing.

7. WORKSHOPS AND POST-GRADUATE COURSES
Participants who took a workshop or course perceived them as being of considerable value. However, feedback from participants indicated that some improvements could make them even more valuable. Suggestions include indicating the level of knowledge offered by the workshops/courses (e.g. introductory, intermediary, advanced); greater quality control of the workshop/course schedules to ensure interactivity (e.g. Conference Organisers to request and validate lesson plans for all workshops/courses) and clearer communication and control (e.g. taking attendance and monitoring participants) as to who can attend workshops/courses.
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INTRODUCTION

This report is an evaluation of the 47th Union World Conference on Lung Health held in Liverpool, UK, from 26-29 October 2016. The evaluation was carried out by an external evaluation consultant, Dr Glenn O’Neil, with the support of Ms Laetitia Lienart for the survey set-up and preparation.

Over 3,000 participants came together from 126 countries for the world’s largest gathering of clinicians and public health workers, health programme managers, policymakers, researchers and advocates working to end the suffering caused by lung disease. Further information is found on the Conference website: http://liverpool.worldlunghealth.org
METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was completed using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods:

AN ONLINE SURVEY OF PARTICIPANTS
An email invitation to complete the survey was sent to 3,046 email addresses of participants. 1,063 participants returned the survey; 90 percent of respondents fully completed the survey, while 10 percent partially completed it. The response rate from 35 percent of Conference attendees is sufficient to allow findings and conclusions to be drawn from the survey findings.

FOCUS GROUPS WITH PARTICIPANTS
Three focus groups of a total of 15 participants (five per group) were held during the Conference. The participants were selected randomly, in addition to a selection of those who had taken a workshop or post-graduate course.

FIGURE 1: Comparison of survey participants and all participants by region

The evaluation consultant also attended the Conference for three days and therefore could observe first-hand the functioning of the Conference. A comparison between the participants who completed the survey and all participants illustrates a balanced level of response from all regions, with a slight under-representation of European and North American participants and a slight over-representation of African and South-East Asian participants, as seen in figure 1.

A detailed description of the profile of the survey participants is found at annex 1.

Within this report, survey graphs are noted with the indication “n=xx”, which indicates the number of participants who responded to that given survey question. Of note, some survey questions were for all participants whereas others were for only certain profiles, i.e. participants who attended a workshop. In addition, variance was seen, given that 10 percent of respondents only partially completed the survey.

Quantitative and qualitative analytical methods were used to analyse the data collected, and this report is based on the consequent findings. The survey questions are found at annex 7. A summary of the focus group discussions is found at annex 3.

Limitations in carrying out the study were seen in several areas. The survey was only available in English and therefore disadvantaged participants who were not comfortable responding in English. Participants with limited Internet access also faced some challenges in completing the survey. Finally, as this was the first systematic evaluation of the Conference, there was no possibility to compare the findings to previous conferences.
KEY FINDINGS

HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS THE CONFERENCE IN ACHIEVING ITS OBJECTIVES?

The theme of the 47th Conference was “Confronting Resistance: Fundamentals to Innovations” and aimed to address a number of critical areas to end the suffering caused by lung disease. Participants were asked to what extent they believed the Conference provided them with new insights into these areas, as displayed in figure 2. Ninety percent of survey participants agreed that new insights were provided in multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) area, followed by antimicrobial resistance. There was less agreement on the tobacco control areas, as measured by high “Don’t know” responses (40–41%), which is not surprising given that the interest of participants was overwhelmingly in the TB field (79%) and much less in tobacco control (7%). See figure 6 below for further details.

FIGURE 2: Extent to which conference provided new insights in the critical areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Do not agree</th>
<th>Do not agree at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antimicrobial resistance</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to confront resistance to the 2015’s “New Agenda”</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to confront resistance from the tobacco industry</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative policies to de-normalise and reduce tobacco use</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3: Why participants came to the conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities, including meeting peers, colleagues, friends and/or partners</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning opportunities</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting an abstract, poster, research progress/results, product, service and/or work</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy opportunities</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from my employer</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring Continuing Medical Education (CME) accreditations</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation from a friend/colleague</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising opportunities</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of benefits, virtually all survey participants (99.9%) indicated that they benefitted from the Conference. The main benefit participants gained was “New knowledge” (86%), followed by “New contacts/opportunities for collaboration” and “Strengthening collaboration with existing contacts” (63% for both), as illustrated in figure 4. Following are some quotes from the focus group discussions on what participants saw as the benefits for them:

“The networking is most important to me — to meet with people from all over the world even work on projects together.”

“To get inspired... to see what people are advocating for and what is important for them.”

“There is what I learn that I apply directly... TB is a big area and I want to keep up and develop a deeper point of view on all aspects.”

FIGURE 4: Benefits gained from the conference
Survey participants were asked how they would use these benefits; the majority (84%) indicated that they would share the information with their colleagues, peers and partners and, to a lesser extent, build capacity within their organisations and for motivation (55% and 54% respectively). Of note, 38 percent indicated that they would initiate a new project, activity or research. Further details are found in figure 5.

Survey participants were asked if the Conference met their needs of their work focus, expertise level and role: 93 percent responded that “Yes” it had. Participants were asked if they had the opportunity to network and/or discuss challenges in their current work with other participants/speakers in different areas of expertise: 84 percent responded “Yes”; 10 percent “No” and 6 percent “Not sure”.

**FIGURE 5: How participants will use benefits of conference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share information with colleagues, peers and/or partner organisations</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity within my organisation/network</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate my colleagues, peers and/or partners</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence work focus/approach of my organisation</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen existing collaborations</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine/improve existing work/research practice or methodology</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate a new project/activity/research</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new collaborations (e.g., creation of a partnership/network)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand/scale up existing programmes/projects</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information/experience with new contacts met at the conference</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen advocacy and/or policy work</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness of populations at risk</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness of community, policy and/or scientific leaders</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join existing partnership(s)/network(s)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine/improve existing work/research practice or methodology</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unsure</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=975
WHAT DID THE CONFERENCE OFFER?

The 47th Conference contained a range of sessions and activities including abstract-related sessions (21 tracks with 925 abstracts presented), seven post-graduate courses, 15 workshops, a poster display, an exhibition area, satellite sessions and a Community Common space that was open to delegates and general public.

INTERESTS

The interest of survey participants was overwhelmingly in TB-related areas. Adding together all TB-related areas represented, 79 percent said their focus was TB (figure 6); however, over half (54%) indicated that they attended sessions outside their main discipline. This reinforces the Conference’s role to provide a multidisciplinary programme for our delegate base.

FIGURE 6: Main interest at the conference
ABSTRACT-RELATED SESSIONS

The Conference received 1,780 abstracts as submissions, with 930 accepted in addition to 21 abstracts for Late-Breaker sessions (of which five participants did not attend the Conference). Abstracts were submitted from 107 countries with the most popular tracks being Tobacco control (222 abstracts submitted), TB diagnostics, including drug-resistance determination (177 submitted) and Drug-resistant TB care and treatment- except clinical trials (171 submitted). Further details on abstract statistics are found at annex 4.

QUALITY OF SCIENCE AND PRESENTATIONS

Survey participants were asked to assess the quality of the science by the main areas, as displayed in figure 7. General TB was rated the highest at 95 percent while Zoonotic TB was lowest at 77 percent of “Excellent” and “Good” ratings. Participants’ comments were generally positive about the quality of the science:

“Keep up the good work — the scientific content of the conference is improving each year. Please keep up the momentum and try to increase science/abstract driven sessions.”

Although there were some dissenting opinions:

“I found the programme this year somewhat underwhelming, particularly compared to last year and given the focus on innovation that the chosen theme was supposed to have. Many big names in tuberculosis were absent and the sessions I attended generally did not meet my expectations in terms of novelty and overall scientific quality.”

FIGURE 7: Quality of science by section area

The quality of presentations and discussions was rated very highly by survey participants, at 94 percent for “Excellent” and “Good”. An analysis by age of participants shows that younger participants rated higher the quality of presentations and discussions (see annex 6). In the focus group discussions, participants were generally positive about the quality of the presentations given, although some felt there were shortcomings with presentation skills, language and science presented by some speakers (see also annex 2, recommended improvements for speakers). Mentoring presenters as well as abstract submitters may help to address this in future conferences.

FIGURE 8: Quality of the presentations/discussions
NON-ABSTRACT RELATED SESSIONS

WORKSHOPS AND POST-GRADUATE COURSES
Of the survey participants, over a third (37%) reported that they attended a workshop or post-graduate course. Of these participants, they attended on average 2.2 workshops and 1.4 post-graduate courses. A majority of respondents indicated that the workshops and courses were “Very useful” or “Useful” – 85% for courses and 89% for workshops (figure 9).

FIGURE 9: Usefulness of workshops and post-graduate courses

Also significant is that 88 percent of workshop participants and 85 percent of course participants said they were “Very likely” or “Likely” to recommend conference workshops or courses to a friend (figure 10). If the programme allows it, there should be provision for more of these sessions to be included in the programme.

However, one-fifth (21%) of survey participants who reported that they attended a workshop or course indicated that the workshops or courses did not meet fully their expectations. When asked to explain why they were not satisfied, participants mentioned issues of cost, lack of interactivity, limited time and organisational issues. The focus groups also raised similar issues in addition to the varied time-duration of the courses, the unclear levels of the courses/workshops (e.g. introductory, intermediary or advanced), the absence of control in who attended, the lack of pre-reading material and the process for receiving CME credits. Annex 5 provides a summary of participants’ comments on the courses and workshops.

FIGURE 10: Likely to recommend to a friend
POSTER AND EXHIBITION AREA
A vast majority of participants (84%) indicated that they visited the poster and exhibition area. Both the quality of the posters and the organisation of the exhibition area were rated slightly higher than the organisation of the poster area, as illustrated in figure 11. This was confirmed by participants’ comments that mainly focused on the layout and location. On the exhibition area, some participants felt that the set-up was old-fashioned and that incentives were needed to encourage people to visit the area (see annex 2 for further details).

FIGURE 11: Rating of poster and exhibition area (“Excellent” and “Good” ratings)

For those survey participants who did not visit the poster and exhibition area, the main reason given was the lack of time, as illustrated in figure 12. Those who replied “Other” mentioned that they were Conference volunteers or present only for specific sessions.

FIGURE 12: Reasons for not visiting the poster and exhibition area
COMMUNITY COMMON
Over three-quarters (77%) of survey participants visited the Community Common (CC), with nearly half (45%) visiting it one to two times (figure 13). Those who did not visit the CC explained that they were either too busy in other sessions and/or assigned higher priority to other content of the Conference. Only a small minority (4 persons) indicated that they did not know what the CC was or where it was located.

Survey participants were asked what were the most useful activity/feature of the CC, with some half (54%) indicating the scientific and community-based sessions (figure 14).

FIGURE 13: How often visited Community Common

- Did not visit it – 33%
- 1-2 times – 45%
- 3-5 times – 15%
- More than 5 times – 6%
- I was there throughout the conference because I was a CC activity organizer – 1%

Survey participants were asked to explain their experience and what they gained from visiting the CC. Nearly a third of all respondents (318 participants) provided comments, with the majority mentioning the knowledge gained and exposure to new topics, themes or perspectives. To a lesser extent, participants mentioned the networking possibilities. Some 40 participants were also critical of the location of the CC and its noise levels.

FIGURE 14: Most useful activity/feature of the Community Common

- Scientific and community based sessions: 54%
- Networking space/activities: 14%
- NGO exhibition booths: 14%
- Daily plenary broadcasts: 8%
- Cultural activities: 7%
- Other: 4%

Following are some select quotes from participants that illustrate these points:

"The CC activities were very interesting including the NGO Exhibitions. It was also a great place to interact, network and learn new opportunities."

"Good opportunity to meet new persons working in the same field. Paved the way for networking and inviting new contacts. Shared my experiences, knowledge, our community works with similar friends from all over the world. Feel empowered and boosted our interest and commitment to do more for TB friends."

"Involvement of the community network was quite visible. I watched a drama which was used a tool to create awareness about TB in the community. It was amazing."

"CC was not conveniently located as there was too much going around and did not allow the participants to follow the conversation/discussions."

"It was good to have it at the centre of the conference, however, when listening to speakers via a headset it felt rather detached / solitary which was a shame when we are trying to build a community spirit."
HOW WERE PARTICIPANTS SUPPORTED IN THEIR PREPARATION FOR AND PARTICIPATION IN THE CONFERENCE?

This section provides findings on support provided to both participants with a special role within the Conference and participants in general.

SUPPORT PROVIDED TO PARTICIPANTS WITH A SPECIAL ROLE

SPEAKERS, CHAIRS, ABSTRACT/POSTER PRESENTERS

Three-quarters of respondents said pre-conference guidelines were “Very useful” or “Useful”, making them the most useful resources and support. Support from the Conference Secretariat during the conference was the lowest rated, as illustrated in figure 15, but perhaps it was not clear that the Conference Secretariat staff was in the Speakers’ Centre, which rated well.

FIGURE 15: Usefulness of resources to prepare sessions (“Very useful” and “Useful” ratings)

![Bar chart showing use of resources.]

POSTER EXHIBITORS

As illustrated in figure 16, 71 to 79 percent of poster exhibitors gave “Excellent” and “Good” ratings to the location, signage and layout of the poster area; however, when asked about the location of their own poster, only two-thirds rated it “Excellent” and “Good”.

FIGURE 16: Poster exhibition area (“Excellent” and “Good” ratings)

![Bar chart showing poster exhibition area satisfaction.]

n=385

n=336
Three-quarters of exhibitors found the “Brochure for Exhibitors and Sponsors” to be “Very useful” (21%) or “Useful” (55%). Only two exhibitors responded that they were not aware of the brochure. The key aspects of the exhibition area were rated by exhibitors, with the onsite signage and support from the Conference Secretariat rated the highest (86% for “Excellent” and “Good” ratings). Location of the exhibition area and their individual booths were rated lower (48% and 52% respectively), as illustrated in figure 18.

FIGURE 17: Type of entity of exhibitors

Three-quarters of exhibitors found the “Brochure for Exhibitors and Sponsors” to be “Very useful” (21%) or “Useful” (55%). Only two exhibitors responded that they were not aware of the brochure. The key aspects of the exhibition area were rated by exhibitors, with the onsite signage and support from the Conference Secretariat rated the highest (86% for “Excellent” and “Good” ratings). Location of the exhibition area and their individual booths were rated lower (48% and 52% respectively), as illustrated in figure 18.

FIGURE 18: Rating by exhibitors of key aspects (“Excellent” and “Good” ratings)
Not surprisingly, the majority of exhibitors (62%) felt there were too few visitors to the exhibition area while the rest thought there were an “Optimal number or visitors”. Despite this, nearly three-quarters of exhibitors responded that they were “Very likely” or “Likely” to exhibit at future conferences, as illustrated in figure 19.

FIGURE 19: Likely to exhibit at future conferences

SATellite SESSION ORGANISERS
There were only five respondents who were satellite session organisers, all of whom rated the Conference Secretariat support “Excellent” or “Good” before the conference (figure 20). During the conference, those ratings slipped but the majority (80%) was still very pleased. The same percentage of the satellite session organisers said they were “Very likely” or “Likely” to organise a satellite session for future conferences.

FIGURE 20: Support for satellite session organisers
COMMUNITY COMMON ACTIVITY COORDINATORS
Not many survey respondents self-identified as CC activity organisers. Among those who did, over one-third (38%) had organised cultural activities, just under one-third had a networking space (31%), 19 percent had an NGO exhibition booth and six percent organised a session or selected “Other”. When asked how they had heard about the CC, word of mouth came out to be the most successful marketing tool, followed by promotional emails from the Conference Secretariat. Other routes of communication are illustrated in figure 21.

FIGURE 21: How coordinators heard about Community Common

Unlike the satellite session organisers, CC activity organisers rated support from the Conference Secretariat better during the Conference (67% “Excellent”) than before the Conference (22% “Fair” and 11% “Poor”); see figure 22.

FIGURE 22: Support for Community Common activity coordinators

As with other conference components, the majority of CC activity organisers responded that they were “Very likely” (67%) or “Likely” (11%) to organise a CC activity at future conferences (figure 23).

FIGURE 23: Likely to organise a Community Common activity for future conferences
WORKSHOP AND POST-GRADUATE COURSE COORDINATORS
Workshop and course coordinators rated promotional and logistic support from the Conference Secretariat positively before the Conference (76% “Excellent” and “Good” ratings) but somewhat less so during the Conference (62% for both). Exactly half of the workshop and course coordinators said they were “Very likely” to organise a workshop/course for future conferences. Less than a third (29%) chose “Likely”, as illustrated in figure 24.

FIGURE 24: Likely to organise a course/workshop for future conference
SUPPORT PROVIDED TO PARTICIPANTS WITH A SPECIAL ROLE

SCHOLARSHIPS
The Conference offered two scholarship programmes for potential participants:

- Registration waivers for affected communities/community volunteers: 100 recipients were granted registration waivers from 90 initial application plus 10 additional grantees;
- Partial or full scholarships for symposium speakers/abstract authors: 37 recipients were awarded scholarships from 259 applications.

As shown in figure 25, scholarship applicants and recipients rated positively the online application (87% for “Excellent” and “Good” ratings), pre-conference support (82%) and onsite support (89%). Comments by participants focused on the need for more scholarships, earlier decision-making and communications with scholarship recipients (see annex 2 for further details).

FIGURE 25: Rating of scholarship support

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION
Survey participants were asked to rate the usefulness of the newsletters sent by the Conference Secretariat. While 31 percent found them “Very useful”, this was countered by the 29 percent who rated them between “Somewhat useful” to “Not useful at all” or “Didn’t read”, as illustrated in figure 26.

FIGURE 26: Usefulness of email newsletters
Survey participants were asked a series of questions on the newly introduced online application for mobile phones. Over half (51%) of participants reported that they had used the application. Of these participants, 51 percent found the application “Very useful” pre-conference, which grew to 65 percent reporting it was “Very useful” during the Conference, as seen in figures 27 and 28. It is worthy to note that while 11 percent did not use the app pre-conference, only one percent of the respondents did not use the app at all.

Even after the conference, half of the survey participants responded that they were likely to use the application, as seen in figure 29. Nearly all (91%) participants who used the application did or would recommend it to a friend or colleague.

Concerning social media, less than one-third (29% of 960 survey participants) reported that they followed the Conference through social media (Facebook, Twitter or LinkedIn), so more effort needs to be focused on promotion of these tools. Participants’ comments on social media were generally positive, although some felt it could be further boosted for the Conference (see annex 2).
VOLUNTEERS
More than three-quarters of survey participants found the Conference volunteers “Very useful” or “Useful” (figure 30). Surprisingly, two percent reported not seeing any volunteers, so organisers should think of ways to notify delegates of their presence.

FIGURE 30: Likelihood to use the application after the conference
WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED FOR THE NEXT CONFERENCE?

This section provides findings on suggested improvements for the Conference based on 550 suggested improvements made in participants’ feedback. A detailed list of improvements suggested by participants is found at annex 2.

PROGRAMME

When asked about changes to the programme balance for the next conference, half of the participants wanted “No change” to the balance of session types while the other half split between “No opinion” and “More”, as illustrated in figure 31. The strongest consensus (33%) for change was to have more symposia and meet-the-expert sessions. Plenaries solicited the highest “No change” at 55 percent, while poster discussion sessions had the highest call for fewer sessions (13%).

FIGURE 31: Changes desired to programme balance for next conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Type</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Fewer</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symposia</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet-the-expert sessions</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral abstract sessions</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenaries</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short oral abstract sessions</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special sessions</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate courses</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-poster sessions</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster discussion sessions</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite sessions</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50 suggestions from participants focussed on programming aspects. The main points raised were as follows:

- In all sessions, budget more time for questions/answers and discussions;
- Avoid having sessions of the same or similar topics at the same time in the programme (example of tobacco control was given);
- Consider having sessions running at same time as plenaries;
- Avoid having the same speaker presenting the same paper in a symposium or workshop and then in an abstract session;
- Avoid repetition of papers presented in previous years;
- Plan daily themes and/or plenaries on key topic areas on which to focus on a given day;
- Provide an easy way onsite to identify which sessions are of which track.
EXPANDING TOPICS
Survey participants were asked if the conference should expand beyond TB and lung health; over half (52%) responded “Yes”, slightly more than one-third responded “No” (35%) and a small minority replied “Not sure” (13%) (figure 32). The only age group that had less than a majority in favour of expansion was those over 60 years of age (figure 33).

When these preferences were compared to their role at the conference, those most in favour of expanding the focus were scholarship recipients (90% – “Yes”) and CC organisers (71% – “Yes”). Those least in favour of expanding the focus were postgraduate course coordinators (only 33% said “Yes”) and session chairpersons (37% said “Yes”).

Participants who attended fewer Union conferences in the past (1–5 previous Union conferences) were also more in favour of expanding focus over those who had attended six or more (see annex 6).

FIGURE 33: Should conference expand focus beyond TB and lung health – by age
In addition to the above topics, survey participants suggested a focus on the following topics for future conferences:

- More on MDR-TB; childhood TB; TB/HIV and recent developments in TB control/management/treatment in general;
- More on tobacco control and related subjects;
- Expanded topics on the role of civil society and other non-scientific groups in lung health;
- More on indigenous people and vulnerable groups;
- More on new laboratory and diagnostic tools;
- Expanded focus on innovative solutions and technology.

**FIGURE 34: Additional topics recommended to be covered by the conference**

In addition to the above topics, survey participants suggested a focus on the following topics for future conferences:

- More on MDR-TB; childhood TB; TB/HIV and recent developments in TB control/management/treatment in general;
- More on tobacco control and related subjects;
- Expanded topics on the role of civil society and other non-scientific groups in lung health;
- More on indigenous people and vulnerable groups;
- More on new laboratory and diagnostic tools;
- Expanded focus on innovative solutions and technology.

**ORGANISATION**

Over one hundred comments were received on organisational aspects of the Conference. Of note, 30 percent of these comments were positive remarks, for example:

“Excellent team and support given to delegates”

Improvements suggested by survey participants are detailed in annex 2 for the following areas: speakers, abstracts, workshops and post-graduate courses, poster exhibition, E-posters, exhibition area (commercial and non-commercial area), Community Common, scholarships, conference website and iPlanner, planner mobile application and social media.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, this evaluation has found that the Conference has largely met its set goals considering the key findings from survey participants:

- **99.9%** could identify direct benefits for themselves from the Conference;
- **93%** thought the Conference met their needs;
- **90%** agreed that new insights were provided in the key thematic area of MDR-TB.

The added value of the conference was anticipated to be networking and learning, which were confirmed by most participants as having been attained, although slightly more for learning (86%) than for networking (63%).

To reinforce and build on the success of the 47th Conference, the following recommendations are proposed for the 48th Conference and those beyond. Further specific suggestions from participants are summarised in annex 2, which are also for consideration by the Conference Secretariat.

1. NETWORKING
   Given that this is the highest anticipated benefit for participants and it was not quite met (70% desired benefit compared to 63% attained benefit), activities and actions could be carried out to facilitate networking such as: more informal seating and break-out spaces in the venue, programming longer breaks, and structured networking activities.

2. PROGRAMMING
   The Conference was ambitious in the number of abstracts featured in parallel sessions. The Conference Secretariat could consider reducing the number of abstracts accepted, streamlining tracks and trying to prevent overlap of sessions on similar topics.

3. TOPICS
   The survey participants were split as to whether future conferences should expand the range of topics presented; half thought it should, one-third did not and the rest were not sure. A solution could be to pilot topics where support was strongest, e.g. air pollution and community engagement for the 48th Conference and assess consequent interest.

4. VENUE SET-UP AND PLANNING
   The venue caused some concern for participants in terms of lack of meeting places and issues with size of session rooms. Although these issues are largely beyond the control of the Conference Secretariat (since the venue changes each year), this should be considered when booking and designing spaces.

5. EXHIBITIONS
   The exhibition area did not meet fully its expectations considering that 62 percent of exhibitors thought that there were not enough visitors and that it had the lowest “Very likely / likely” to participate again from exhibitors of all organising groups (72% compared to 77% for CC organisers and 79% for course/workshop organisers). Both exhibitors and participants thought that the exhibition area was not central enough to the conference space. It is suggested that for future conferences, the exhibition area be more centrally located where significant traffic is guaranteed (venue set-up allowing), incentives to visits are introduced and the exhibition area concept “refreshed” (London ERS conference mentioned as an example).

6. COMMUNITY COMMON
   The CC was seen as a key component for the Conference and visited by some two-thirds of participants. However, the very noisy location potentially diminished its impact, networking possibilities and signalled for some a lower priority for this component. It is suggested for future conferences that the location of the CC be carefully considered to provide it with visibility while still a conducive setting for networking and discussions, venue constraints allowing.

7. WORKSHOPS AND POST-GRADUATE COURSES
   For those participants who took a workshop or course, they were seen as being of considerable value to them. However, the feedback from participants indicated that some improvements could make them even more valuable. Suggestions include indicating the level of knowledge offered by the workshops/courses (e.g. introductory, intermediary, advanced); greater quality control of the workshop/course schedules to ensure interactivity (e.g. Conference Secretariat to request and validate lesson plans for all workshops/courses) and clearer communication and control (e.g. taking attendance and monitoring participants) as to who can attend workshops/courses.
ANNEX 1: PARTICIPANT PROFILE

It is important to note that one-third of participants (31%) were attending the conference for the first time; one-fifth (21%) had attended one conference previously, with the attendance decreasing from there on, as illustrated in table 1. Notably, 20 percent have attended five conferences or more.

TABLE 1: Attendance at previous conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>First time</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly half of participants (45%) had no specific role at the Conference and could be considered persons attending the Conference without presenting an abstract, etc. Further roles are described in figure 35.

FIGURE 35: Main role during Conference

Survey participants were nearly evenly split between female (51%) and male (49%), with 0.5 percent identifying as “Other”, as illustrated in figure 36. Almost all respondents were between 27 and 60 years of age (figure 37).
Participants indicated they were from 95 countries with a sizable number (156) indicating they were working at the “global” level. The countries represented by the highest number of delegates were UK, India, USA, South Africa and Nigeria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global*</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Korea, Rep (Seoul)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan, Province of China</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, DR(Kinshasa)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia, FYR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova, Republic of</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants who worked in more than one country selected the option “Global”*
ANNEX 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

For each area, the main points are given summarised from the given set of comments, ordered by the number of comments received. The approximate number of comments per area is also listed.

SPEAKERS (150 COMMENTS)
- Greater diversity: fewer academics and more field-based practitioners; more regional balance (Asia mainly requested); more presenters from high TB burden countries; more women; other languages aside from English (Spanish and French mentioned); more patients/patient advocates.
- Newer speakers: same speakers each year (too “clubby”); senior people should free up places for younger speakers; more exciting and “challenging” speakers.
- Quality of speakers: better presentation and language skills; ability to discuss and engage audience.

ORGANISATION (130 COMMENTS)
- Venue: limited signage; limited areas to sit, discuss and for informal meetings.
- Improve on-site coordination with staff on room preparation and set-up.
- Set-up: mismatching of rooms to number of attendees; lack of staff to support participants when volunteers were unable to help; limited service of speakers centre.
- Visas: more support to participants to obtain visas; hold future conferences in “visa-friendly” countries or where TB is a public health issue.
- Late notification made it difficult to attend.
- Food: lack of tea, coffee and water; little choice to eat close by; more time allocated for breaks.
- Location: hold in city easy to reach.
- Language: offer some sessions in other languages than English (French and Spanish mentioned).
- Printing: no need to print programme book – electronic version is sufficient.

POSTER EXHIBITION (130 COMMENTS)
- Organisation of display: make easier to navigate; clearer organisation of posters by themes; mapping of posters by themes and with numbering/colouring signage; have better lighting; more time to visit poster area.
- Presentation: a more formal presentation of posters; difficult to hear presentations in a large room; more presence of poster authors; limit number of posters in a poster tour.
- Discussion: more feedback from poster discussion chair to presenters; increased dialogue with the participant.
- Quality: posters repeating themes of previous years; more stringent requirements for submission; higher quality of research and science.

ABSTRACTS (120 COMMENTS)
- On the number of abstracts, the majority of participants who commented would like to see fewer abstracts presented.
- Shorter oral presentations and more time for questions/discussions.
- Better quality assurance particular for posters, oral presentations to a lesser extent.
- Availability of abstracts before sessions where possible.

ONLINE MOBILE APPLICATION (110 COMMENTS)
- Features: an “add contact” to facilitate networking; search by speaker; list speakers and not just facilitators; ability to add own appointments in your schedule; better ability to synch with other applications (e.g. calendars); improve compatibility with iPhones; improve stability; difficult to view on a mobile phone (some felt it more suited to an iPad).

E-POSTERS (100 COMMENTS)
- Set-up: need larger rooms with larger screens to ensure e-posters can be seen by all; have e-posters available on computer terminals to browse during whole conference.
- Discussion: more time for discussions and presentations.
- Quality: higher quality of research and science.

COMMUNITY COMMON (100 COMMENTS)
- Set-up: central location positive but very noisy; sound system unsuitable for discussions; not private or intimate given sensitive nature of some topics.
- Timing: do not schedule early morning sessions as poorly attended.
- Participation: greater participation needs to be encouraged.
- More creativity: more theatre, cultural activities, demonstrations, video and photo exhibitions as part of CC.
SCHOLARSHIPS (100 COMMENTS)

- More scholarships to be awarded, particularly for younger people from lower- and middle-income countries.
- Scholarships to a broader range of professions, e.g. social scientists, community activities, advocates.
- Communications: communication on scholarships was slow and sometimes confusing (as from different persons within the Conference Secretariat).
- Timeliness: need for timely feedback on scholarship decisions.

CONFERENCE WEBSITE AND IPLANNER (100 COMMENTS)

- iPlanner: needs to better synchronised with programme updates (e.g. changes to rooms and speakers); difficult to download into a Word document or pdf for printing; better synchronisation with calendar programmes (e.g. Google calendar); finding link to iPlanner on website not easy.
- Website: make it easier to find session materials; quicker and easier access to accepted abstracts; more information about speakers (e.g. job title and organisation); list sessions chronologically in addition to by type; hard to browse abstracts in the schedule.

EXHIBITION AREA (COMMERCIAL AND NON-COMMERCIAL AREA) (90 COMMENTS)

- Setting: need to locate more centrally; more visible location needed with greater transit traffic.
- Format: old-fashioned “stale” format; more suppliers/commercial companies; health professions (nurses mentioned); increase number of booths in general.
- Incentives: increase meeting places and refreshments in exhibition area to encourage visits.

SOCIAL MEDIA (60 COMMENTS)

- More presence on social media; e.g. shorter hashtag for Twitter; streaming of some sessions live on main platforms; post photos on platforms (good use of some platforms, i.e. Twitter, commented on).

WORKSHOPS AND POST-GRADUATE COURSES (20 COMMENTS)

- New topics: suggestions included more on innovations in treatments, tobacco control, advocacy, laboratory workshops, advanced modelling, community engagement/interventions.
- Interactivity: higher level of interactivity needed in workshops (and not just presentations); too often workshops are panels and presentations; there should be more hands-on training.
- Language: offer workshops/courses in other languages (French mentioned).
- Cost: reduce cost as too expensive for some participants.
- Duration: too short for most who commented but several felt they were too long.
- Communication: it was not clear that workshops were only open to people who paid and registered for them.
- Organisation: issues with room set-up; no control of who attended (issues with preparation required for participants); workshops announced.
ANNEX 3: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS SUMMARY

During the Conference, three focus group discussions were held with participants. A total of 15 persons participated in the focus groups (five persons per group). Participants were selected randomly, in addition to a selection of those who had taken a workshop or post-graduate course.

The main findings of the discussions are summarised below in relation to the broad questions discussed.

WHAT WERE THE POSITIVE AND LESS-THAN-POSITIVE EXPERIENCES WITH THE CONFERENCE TO DATE?

Participants were asked to note down their points on Post-It notes that are summarised in the following table. The numbers in brackets indicate the number of persons who mentioned this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>LESS THAN POSITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking – chances to meet people (4)</td>
<td>Food selection (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse participants (3)</td>
<td>Small room size for sessions (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue (3)</td>
<td>Visa refusals for participants (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content – scientific programme (3)</td>
<td>Coherence of the programme (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile app (3)</td>
<td>Concurrent sessions (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications from organisers (3)</td>
<td>Cost (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (2)</td>
<td>Opening ceremony (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of speakers (2)</td>
<td>Speakers (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive sessions/panel discussions (2)</td>
<td>Programme book “too posh” (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping to time (1)</td>
<td>Cost of post-graduate course (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel accommodation (1)</td>
<td>Varying formats of poster sessions (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses’ t-shirts (1)</td>
<td>Not keeping to time (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students forum (1)</td>
<td>Location far away from major airport (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome “greeter” volunteers (1)</td>
<td>Diversity of participants – non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops (1)</td>
<td>General organisation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate courses (1)</td>
<td>Lack of informal meeting places (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of power plugs in rooms (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email communication before post-graduate course (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel accommodation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to find civil-society sessions (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking workshops in small groups (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IS THE CONFERENCE PROGRAMME RELEVANT TO TODAY’S PRIORITIES IN TERMS OF LUNG HEALTH AND RELATED DISEASES?

- The broad focus of the conference helps people to learn – as you are confronted with topics outside of your area of interest.
- The focus of the conference is very broad, too many types of abstract sessions and presentations.
- The focus on TB is still appropriate; the new technology and drug development is good and could be further emphasised.
- The focus on tobacco control is welcome but often the sessions are not well attended; there should be some assessment as to what is well attended or not to support an analysis.
- The organisers could have a better measure of what is popular and what is not – as room allocation is important for this; some sessions extremely crowded in small rooms and other sessions empty in large rooms.
- The abstract sessions could be better streamlined; there seems to be a lot of duplication within the different tracks.
- The community focus is welcomed but the CC was disappointing in terms of location and the noise levels.

WHAT IS THE ADDED VALUE FOR YOU? WHAT DOES IT INFLUENCE IN TERMS OF YOUR WORK AND THAT OF YOUR ORGANISATION?

- The networking is the most important – to meet past and new colleagues and consider ideas and projects for the future.
- The opportunity to meet colleagues from all over the world – to take advantage to be here in the same place to advance common projects.
- The learning is important, like on surveying that we can take back and work with it directly.
- TB is a big area and we want to keep our knowledge updated – what we learn goes directly into our reports and future priorities.
- The inspiration provided by the advocacy community and what is important to them.
- As a speaker, what is important is the feedback you receive on your work.

WHAT FEEDBACK DO YOU HAVE ON THE ORGANISATION OF THE CONFERENCE?

- VENUE: Lack of places to sit and congregate; few places to meet.
- Food: You have to look hard to find the food or go out of the venue, no free tea or coffee but discount card for restaurants positively commented on.
- TIME-KEEPING: There was an effort to keep to the set times and that was appreciated.
- COMMUNICATION: The communication from the organisers was good – we were updated and could use the planner application.
- ONLINE REGISTRATION: The online registration was improved compared to previous years and made a big difference for participants.
- VISAS: The visa issues to enter the UK for many colleagues stopped them from attending.
- PARTICIPANT DIVERSITY: How to keep younger people coming to the conference? Scholarships are good in this respect.

WHAT IMPROVEMENTS WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN TERMS OF CONTENT AND ORGANISATION?

- VENUE: Select a venue that has more space for networking, small meetings and a better CC area.
- Food: A different set-up and availability of drinking water, tea and coffee.
- CONTENT: How to better streamline content and avoid overlaps between similar sessions in the different tracks.
- COMMUNICATION: If possible to have more information available other than the outline of the sessions as registration is required before full content is known.
- VISAS: The need for both participants and organisers to prepare in advance – and select a visa-friendly country for the conference location.
IF YOU ATTENDED A POST-GRADUATE COURSE OR WORKSHOPS – DO YOU HAVE ANY FEEDBACK ON THIS EXPERIENCE?

• **DURATION OF COURSES:** The quality and duration varied – some went for six hours and others went for one hour. There should be more consistency.

• **LEVELS OF COURSES:** There should be a clear level rating for the courses; e.g. introductory, intermediate, advanced, as one participant took a course that was in fact an introductory course but it wasn’t described as such.

• **COST:** the extra 100 euros for a one-hour discussion (duration of a course according to several participants) was not acceptable.

• **PARTICIPATION:** You have to pay and pre-register for courses and workshops but there was no control as to who was attending on the day.

• **PRE-READING MATERIALS:** Suggest that courses have pre-reading materials sent to participants to ensure maximum learning during the day of the course.

• **LEVEL OF INTERACTIVITY:** Reported as positive in some workshops/groups (“good discussions with a panel”), but in others it was a series of lectures with no interaction.

• **CME CREDITS:** The process for receiving the CME credits was not clearly explained to participants.
### ANNEX 4: ABSTRACT STATISTICS

#### TABLE 4: Abstracts per track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Basic science – immunology and vaccines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Civil society and community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Clinical trials for new treatments for DS-TB and MDR-TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – COPD, pneumonia, asthma and other lung health in adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Drug-resistant TB care and treatment, except clinical trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F – Drug-sensitive TB care and treatment, except clinical trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G – Global Plan to End TB 2016–2020 and End TB Strategy – country-level experiences on paradigm shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H – HIV-TB and other HIV-related lung health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I – Latent TB infection (LTBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J – Paediatric lung disease, including TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – Patient-centred care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L – TB and non-HIV comorbidities, i.e. diabetes, COPD, tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M – TB diagnostics, including drug-resistance determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N – TB education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O – TB epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P – TB in key affected populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q – TB infection control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R – TB laboratory service implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S – TB other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T – Tobacco control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U – Zoonotic TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>No. of draft Abstracts</th>
<th>No. of submitted Abstracts</th>
<th>No. of accepted Abstracts</th>
<th>% of acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>141%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*higher than 100% acceptance rate as abstracts have been reassigned from other tracks.
### TABLE 5: Abstracts per country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of submitted Abstracts</th>
<th>No. of accepted Abstracts</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of submitted Abstracts</th>
<th>No. of accepted Abstracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, DR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Rep. of</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tanzania, United Rep.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Rep.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia FYR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eighty-two survey participants provided comments on why the workshops or courses did not meet their expectations. Of these 82 respondents, 25 indicated they had nothing to comment on and 16 provided general positive comments about the workshops or courses. Thirty-four participants provided general negative comments about cost, lack of interactivity, limited time and organisational issues. Suggested improvements are also listed in annex 2. The following table provides an overview of the comments. Only workshops or courses mentioned by name are featured.

**TABLE 6: Workshop and Post-Graduate Course feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>No. of comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST-GRADUATE COURSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB prevention in children and people living with HIV in high-burden settings: contact investigation, active case finding and preventive therapy</td>
<td>Content too simplistic and nothing new; more needed on TB contact management; lack of group work.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative data inquiry and analysis</td>
<td>Excellent content but rushed due to time constraints.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the design of a TB TeleECHO programme</td>
<td>“Sales pitch” for telehealth model; symposium with no learning objectives.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An introduction to costing tuberculosis strategies and services</td>
<td>No hands-on experience or group exercises; lack of concrete information about specific questionnaires and instruments for costing different types of TB services.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKSHOPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital health technology for the End TB Strategy: developing priority products and making them work</td>
<td>Not targeted towards countries where the bulk of the epidemic is; no discussions on what works and why; not insightful.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society: becoming equal and key partners in the national TB response</td>
<td>More a series of presentations than a workshop.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned from increasing access to Bedaquiline and Delamanid for management of drug-resistant TB</td>
<td>More needed on resistance to the new drug.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building environment for active case detection, treatment management and adherence using the rural T4D model</td>
<td>Trainer did not attend and no explanation was given.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppressing resistance emergence in TB programmes using PK/PD science</td>
<td>Workshop was good but same presentations were given later in the week in other sessions.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What brought about a 10 percent annual decline in TB incidence? Lessons learnt from Japan, Western Europe and North America</td>
<td>Historical data with no relevance with current situation (misleading title).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 6: SELECTED GRAPHS – ANALYSIS BY DEMOGRAPHICS

Following are a selection of survey questions that have been analysed by the demographics of age, number of conferences attended and profile of participants.

FIGURE 38: Quality of the presentations/discussions – by age

FIGURE 39: Quality of the presentations/discussions – by role
FIGURE 40: Should conference expand focus beyond TB and lung health – by role

FIGURE 41: Should conference expand focus beyond TB and lung health – by attendance
ANNEX 7: ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. WHY DID YOU COME TO THE 47TH UNION WORLD CONFERENCE ON LUNG HEALTH?

Select up to 3 choices

☐ Presenting an abstract, poster, research progress/results, product, service and/or work
☐ Learning opportunities
☐ Networking opportunities, including meeting peers, colleagues, friends and/or partners
☐ Advocacy opportunities
☐ Fund-raising opportunities
☐ Acquiring Continuing Medical Education (CME) accreditations
☐ Request from my employer
☐ Recommendation from a friend/colleague
☐ Other (please specify):

2. DURING THE CONFERENCE, WHAT WAS YOUR MAIN ROLE?

Select all that apply

☐ Speaker
☐ Chair
☐ Oral abstract presenter
☐ Poster or e-poster presenter
☐ Workshop coordinator
☐ Post-graduate course coordinator
☐ Community Common activity organiser (of a booth, session, activity and/or space hosted by the Community Common
☐ Exhibitor (responsible for a booth in the exhibition area
☐ Satellite organiser
☐ Committee member
☐ Scholarship recipient
☐ Delegate not fitting into the above categories

ONLINE RESOURCES

3. OVERALL, HOW USEFUL WERE THE MONTHLY EMAIL NEWSLETTERS SENT BY THE CONFERENCE SECRETARIAT?

☐ Very useful
☐ Useful
☐ Somewhat useful
☐ Not very useful
☐ Not useful at all
☐ Did not read
☐ Not aware of/did not receive

4. DID YOU USE THE PLANNER APPLICATION FOR MOBILE PHONES?

☐ Yes
☐ No

4.1 HOW USEFUL WAS THE APPLICATION TO HELP YOU PREPARE FOR THE CONFERENCE?

☐ Very useful
☐ Useful
☐ Somewhat useful
☐ Not very useful
☐ Not useful at all
☐ Did not use it before the conference

4.2 HOW USEFUL WAS THE APPLICATION DURING THE CONFERENCE?

☐ Very useful
☐ Useful
☐ Somewhat useful
☐ Not very useful
☐ Not useful at all
☐ Did not use it during the conference
4.3 HOW LIKELY ARE YOU TO USE THE APPLICATION AFTER THE CONFERENCE?

☐ Very likely
☐ Likely
☐ Somewhat likely
☐ Not very likely
☐ Not likely at all

4.4 DID YOU OR WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THE APPLICATION TO A FRIEND/COLLEAGUE?

☐ Yes
☐ No

5. HAVE YOU FOLLOWED THE CONFERENCE THROUGH SOCIAL MEDIA (FACEBOOK, TWITTER AND/OR LINKEDIN)?

☐ Yes
☐ No

VOLUNTEERS

6. HOW USEFUL WERE CONFERENCE VOLUNTEERS?

☐ Very useful
☐ Useful
☐ Somewhat useful
☐ Not very useful
☐ Not useful at all
☐ I did not see any volunteer at the conference
☐ I did not need/request the help of any volunteer

SCHOLARSHIPS

7. DID YOU APPLY FOR A UNION’S SCHOLARSHIP?

☐ Yes, I applied as a speaker
☐ Yes, I applied as a civil society representative
☐ No

7.1 HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS?

Scholarship online application

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ N/A (I did not receive any scholarship)

Pre-conference support once your scholarship was awarded

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Onsite support

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

If you have any suggestions for improvement of the conference scholarship programme, please use the open text box in the section “Comments and suggestions” – that will come later in the survey – to provide your input.
8. Looking at the conference theme “Confronting Resistance: Fundamentals to Innovations”, please state your level of agreement with the following statements:

“The Conference Programme Provided New Insights on . . .”

- **Antimicrobial resistance**
  - [ ] Strongly agree
  - [ ] Agree
  - [ ] Somewhat agree
  - [ ] Do not agree
  - [ ] Do not agree at all
  - [ ] Don’t know

- **Multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB)**
  - [ ] Strongly agree
  - [ ] Agree
  - [ ] Somewhat agree
  - [ ] Do not agree
  - [ ] Do not agree at all
  - [ ] Don’t know

- **Strategies to confront resistance from the tobacco industry**
  - [ ] Strongly agree
  - [ ] Agree
  - [ ] Somewhat agree
  - [ ] Do not agree
  - [ ] Do not agree at all
  - [ ] Don’t know

- **Innovative policies to de-normalise and reduce tobacco use**
  - [ ] Strongly agree
  - [ ] Agree
  - [ ] Somewhat agree
  - [ ] Do not agree
  - [ ] Do not agree at all
  - [ ] Don’t know

9. What was your main section/sub-section of interest at the conference (the section/sub-section in which you attended most sessions)?

Select one

- [ ] Tuberculosis
- [ ] Tuberculosis: Bacteriology & Immunology
- [ ] Tuberculosis: Nurses & Allied Professionals
- [ ] Tuberculosis: Zoonotic Tuberculosis
- [ ] Adult & Child Lung Health
- [ ] HIV
- [ ] Tobacco Control
- [ ] No main section/sub-section of interest

9.1. Did you attend sessions that did not belong to your main discipline?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
9.2 PLEASE SELECT ALL TRACKS THAT APPLY

☐ Tuberculosis
☐ Tuberculosis: Bacteriology & Immunology
☐ Tuberculosis: Nurses & Allied Professionals
☐ Tuberculosis: Zoonotic Tuberculosis
☐ Adult & Child Lung Health
☐ HIV
☐ Tobacco Control

10. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE QUALITY OF SCIENCE PRESENTED IN EACH SECTION/SUB-SECTION?

**Tuberculosis**

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ I don’t remember
☐ I did not attend sessions in this section/sub-section

**Tuberculosis: Bacteriology & Immunology**

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ I don’t remember
☐ I did not attend sessions in this section/sub-section

**Tuberculosis: Nurses & Allied Professionals**

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ I don’t remember
☐ I did not attend sessions in this section/sub-section

**Tuberculosis: Zoonotic Tuberculosis**

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ I don’t remember
☐ I did not attend sessions in this section/sub-section

**Adult & Child Lung Health**

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ I don’t remember
☐ I did not attend sessions in this section/sub-section

**HIV**

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ I don’t remember
☐ I did not attend sessions in this section/sub-section

**Tobacco Control**

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ I don’t remember
☐ I did not attend sessions in this section/sub-section

11. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE QUALITY OF PRESENTATIONS AND/OR DISCUSSIONS MADE DURING THE CONFERENCE SESSIONS?

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
WORKSHOPS

12. DID YOU ATTEND ANY WORKSHOP OR POST-GRADUATE COURSE DURING THE CONFERENCE?

☐ Yes

☐ No

12.1 HOW MANY WORKSHOPS AND POST-GRADUATE COURSES DID YOU ATTEND?

☐ 0

☐ 1

☐ 2

12.2 OVERALL, HOW USEFUL DID YOU FIND THE WORKSHOP/POST-GRADUATE COURSES(S) YOU ATTENDED?

☐ Very useful

☐ Useful

☐ Somewhat useful

☐ Not very useful

☐ Not useful at all

☐ N/A (did not attend any)

12.3 HOW LIKELY ARE YOU TO RECOMMEND A FRIEND/OR COLLEAGUE TO ATTEND A WORKSHOP OR POST-GRADUATE COURSE AT THE NEXT CONFERENCE?

☐ Very likely

☐ Likely

☐ Somewhat likely

☐ Not very likely

☐ Not likely at all

☐ N/A (did not attend any)

12.4 IF YOU HAVE ATTENDED A WORKSHOP AND/OR POST-GRADUATE COURSE THAT DID NOT MEET YOUR EXPECTATIONS, PLEASE SPECIFY ITS TITLE AND EXPLAIN WHY IN THE TEXT BOX BELOW.

……………………………………………………………….…

……………………………………………………………….…

……………………………………………………………….…

……………………………………………………………….…

EXHIBITION AND POSTER EXHIBITION

13. OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS

Quality of posters displayed in the poster exhibition area

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Fair

☐ Poor

☐ N/A (did not visit this area)

Overall organisation of the Poster exhibition area (i.e. its location, space, number of posters displayed, posters identification, etc.)

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Fair

☐ Poor

☐ N/A (did not visit this area)

Overall organisation of the Exhibition area (location of booths, space, navigation through the booths, booth identification, etc.)

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Fair

☐ Poor

☐ N/A (did not visit this area)
14. IF YOU DID NOT VISIT ANY OF THESE AREAS, PLEASE SELECT THE MAIN REASON(S) FROM THE LIST BELOW:

Select all that apply

☐ I did not have time
☐ I was not aware of the Exhibition/Poster area
☐ I was not interested
☐ None of the exhibitors I was interested in was present
☐ None of the posters displayed was relevant to my field/experience
☐ Other (please specify):

…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………

15. HOW MANY TIMES DID YOU VISIT THE COMMUNITY COMMON (CC) DURING THE CONFERENCE?

☐ 1–2
☐ 3–5
☐ More than 5
☐ I was there throughout the conference because I was a CC activity organiser
☐ Did not visit it (Please explain why):

…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………

15.1 WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES/FEATURES DID YOU FIND THE MOST USEFUL?

☐ NGO exhibition booths
☐ Scientific and community-based sessions
☐ Daily plenary broadcasts
☐ Networking space/activities
☐ Cultural activities
☐ Other (please specify):

…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………

15.2 OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR EXPERIENCE AT THE COMMUNITY COMMON? IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT DID YOU GAIN FROM VISITING THE COMMUNITY COMMON?

…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………

Please skip this question if you did not visit this space.
SUPPORT TO YOUR SPECIAL ROLE IN THE CONFERENCE

16. HOW USEFUL WERE THE FOLLOWING RESOURCES TO HELP YOU PREPARE FOR YOUR SESSION?

Guidelines
☐ Very useful
☐ Useful
☐ Somewhat useful
☐ Not very useful
☐ Not useful at all
☐ Did not use
☐ Not applicable

Support from the Conference Secretariat before the conference
☐ Very useful
☐ Useful
☐ Somewhat useful
☐ Not very useful
☐ Not useful at all
☐ Did not use
☐ Not applicable

Support from the Conference Secretariat during the conference
☐ Very useful
☐ Useful
☐ Somewhat useful
☐ Not very useful
☐ Not useful at all
☐ Did not use
☐ Not applicable

Speaker Centre
☐ Very useful
☐ Useful
☐ Somewhat useful
☐ Not very useful
☐ Not useful at all
☐ Did not use
☐ Not applicable

16.1 LOOKING BACK TO THE POSTER EXHIBITION AREA, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS?

Onsite signage to help delegates find the poster exhibition area
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Layout of the poster exhibition area
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Location of the poster exhibition area
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Location of your poster (visibility)
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

If you have any suggestions for improvement of the sessions, abstract selection, e-posters, poster exhibition and support from the Conference Secretariat, please use the open text box in the section “Comments and suggestions” – that will come later in the survey – to provide your input.
EXHIBITORS

17. WHICH TYPE OF ENTITY/ORGANISATION DID YOU REPRESENT?
Select one

☐ Pharmaceutical company
☐ International organisation (e.g. WHO)
☐ NGO
☐ Academy (e.g. University)
☐ Ministry of Health (National TB Programme)
☐ Other (please specify):

17.1 HOW USEFUL WAS THE “BROCHURE FOR EXHIBITORS AND SPONSORS” (DISTRIBUTED BY EMAIL FROM APRIL AND DOWNLOADABLE FROM THE CONFERENCE WEBSITE) TO HELP YOU PLAN AND ORGANISE YOUR EXHIBITION?

☐ Very useful
☐ Useful
☐ Somewhat useful
☐ Not very useful
☐ Not useful at all
☐ Did not use
☐ Not aware of/did not receive it

17.2 HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS?

Support from the Conference Secretariat before the conference

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Onsite signage to help delegates find your exhibition space

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Layout of the exhibition area

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Location of the exhibition area

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Location of your booth (visibility)

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion
17.3 HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE TRAFFIC INSIDE THE EXHIBITION AREA, MEASURED IN TERMS OF NUMBER OF DELEGATES WHO VISITED THE EXHIBITION AREA?

☐ Too many visitors
☐ Optimal number of visitors
☐ Too few visitors

17.4 DID YOU GET WHAT YOU ORDERED WITH RESPECT TO THE THREE FOLLOWING CRITERIA (QUANTITY, QUALITY AND TIMELINESS)?

Please skip this question if you did not order anything to the Conference Secretariat.

I received the exact quantity of items I ordered (no items were missing).

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Comment: …………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………

The quality of the items I ordered met my expectations, my order was delivered on time.

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Comment: …………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………

17.5 BASED ON THIS YEAR’S EXPERIENCE, HOW LIKELY ARE YOU TO EXHIBIT AT FUTURE UNION WORLD CONFERENCES?

☐ Very likely
☐ Likely
☐ Somewhat likely
☐ Not very likely
☐ Not likely at all

If you have any suggestions for improvement of the Exhibition Area, please use the open text box in the section “Comments and suggestions” — that will come later in the survey — to provide your input.

SATELLITE ORGANISER

18. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS?

Support from the Conference Secretariat before the conference

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Support from the Conference Secretariat during the conference

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

18.1 BASED ON THIS YEAR’S EXPERIENCE, HOW LIKELY ARE YOU TO ORGANISE A SATELLITE SESSION AT FUTURE UNION WORLD CONFERENCES?

☐ Very likely
☐ Likely
☐ Somewhat likely
☐ Not very likely
☐ Not likely at all

If you have any suggestions for improvement of satellite sessions, please use the open text box in the section “Comments and suggestions” — that will come later in the survey — to provide your input.
COMMUNITY COMMON ORGANISERS

19. HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE COMMUNITY COMMON?

☐ Attending last year conference
☐ Conference website
☐ Conference printed materials (brochure/leaflet)
☐ Email from the Conference Secretariat
☐ Through a friend, colleague, peer

19.1 WHICH TYPE OF ACTIVITY/IES DID YOU ORGANISE AT THE COMMUNITY COMMON?

Select all that apply
☐ NGO exhibition booth
☐ Scientific and community-based session
☐ Networking space/activity
☐ Cultural activity
☐ Other (please specify):
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................

19.2 HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS?

Support from the Conference Secretariat before the conference
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Support from the Conference Secretariat during the conference
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

19.3 BASED ON THIS YEAR’S EXPERIENCE, HOW LIKELY ARE YOU TO ORGANISE A COMMUNITY COMMON ACTIVITY AT FUTURE UNION WORLD CONFERENCES?

☐ Very likely
☐ Likely
☐ Somewhat likely
☐ Not very likely
☐ Not likely at all

If you have any suggestions for improvement of the Community Common, please use the open text box in the section “Comments and suggestions” – that will come later in the survey – to provide your input.

WORKSHOP AND POST-GRADUATE COORDINATORS

20. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS?

Logistic support from the Conference Secretariat before the conference
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Promotional support from the Conference Secretariat before the conference
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

Logistical support from the Conference Secretariat during the conference
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion
Promotional support from the Conference Secretariat during the conference

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ No opinion

20.1 BASED ON THIS YEAR’S EXPERIENCE, HOW LIKELY ARE YOU TO ORGANISE A WORKSHOP OR POST-GRADUATE COURSE AT FUTURE UNION WORLD CONFERENCES?

☐ Very likely
☐ Likely
☐ Somewhat likely
☐ Not very likely
☐ Not likely at all

If you have any suggestions for improvement of Workshops and/or Post-Graduate Courses, please use the open text box in the section “Comments and suggestions” – that will come later in the survey – to provide your input.

CONFERENCE ACHIEVEMENTS – MAIN BENEFITS AND ANTICIPATED ACTIONS

21. WHAT BENEFITS DID YOU GAIN FROM ATTENDING THE 47TH UNION WORLD CONFERENCE ON LUNG HEALTH?

Select all that apply

☐ New knowledge
☐ New skills, including a better understanding of best practices
☐ Continuing Medical Education (CME) credits
☐ New contacts/opportunities for future collaboration, including professional development and career development
☐ Strengthening collaboration with existing contacts (i.e. people you already knew before the conference)
☐ Meeting friends
☐ Sharing experiences/lessons learnt
☐ Affirmation/confirmation of current work/research direction, approach and/or practice
☐ Motivation/renewed energy and/or sense of purpose
☐ Opportunity to advocate on specific issue(s)
☐ Opportunity to raise funds
☐ Identification or clarification of priority needs and the ways I can help meet them
☐ I did not gain anything from the conference
☐ Other (please specify):

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
22. DURING THE CONFERENCE, DID YOU HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO NETWORK AND/OR DISCUSS CHALLENGES IN YOUR CURRENT WORK ON TB AND LUNG DISEASES WITH DELEGATES/SPEAKERS WORKING IN DIFFERENT AREAS OR THOSE WITH DIFFERENT FIELDS OF EXPERTISE?

☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ Not sure

23. HOW WILL YOU USE THE BENEFITS YOU GAINED AT THE CONFERENCE? IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT WILL YOU DO WITH WHAT YOU GAINED AT THE CONFERENCE?

Select all that apply

☐ Share information with colleagues, peers and/or partner organisations (e.g. through discussions, lectures/presentations, dissemination/translation of materials, writing papers, etc.)

☐ Build capacity within my organisation/network (e.g. through training, development/update of guidelines, procedures, manuals, other materials, etc.)

☐ Motivate my colleagues, peers and/or partners

☐ Influence work focus/approach of my organisation

☐ Refine/improve existing work/research practice or methodology

☐ Initiate a new project/activity/research

☐ ExpandSCALE up existing programmes/projects

☐ Raise awareness of populations at risk

☐ Raise awareness of community, policy and/or scientific leaders

☐ Strengthen advocacy and/or policy work

☐ Share information/experience with new contacts met at the conference

☐ Develop new collaborations (e.g. creation of a partnership/network)

☐ Strengthen existing collaborations

☐ Join existing partnership(s)/network(s)

☐ I am unsure

☐ I will not do anything differently

OVERALL ORGANISATION

24. LOOKING AT THE WAY THE CONFERENCE WAS ORGANISED, WOULD YOU SAY IT MET YOUR NEEDS WITH RESPECT TO YOUR WORK FOCUS, EXPERTISE LEVEL AND ROLE AT THE CONFERENCE?

☐ Yes  
☐ No (please use the open text box in the section “Comments and suggestions” – that will come later in the survey – to explain why)

LOOKING FORWARD

25. WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IMPROVED OR CHANGED AT THE NEXT UNION CONFERENCE (I.E. THE 48TH UNION WORLD CONFERENCE ON LUNG HEALTH)?

☐ Programme (content – including key topics you would like to be better covered – and format)

☐ Speakers (expertise, gender, regional balance, etc.)

☐ Abstracts (selection, presentation, etc.)

☐ Workshops and post-graduate courses

☐ Poster exhibition

☐ E-posters

☐ Exhibition area (commercial and non-commercial booths)

☐ Community Common

☐ Scholarships

☐ Conference website, including the iPlanner

☐ Planner mobile application

☐ Social media

☐ Overall organisation and support before/during the conference

☐ Other (please specify):

........................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................
26. LOOKING AT THE PROGRAMME BALANCE (NUMBER OF SESSIONS/ACTIVITIES), WHICH CHANGE WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE AT THE NEXT UNION CONFERENCE?

Plenaries
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

Oral abstract sessions
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

Short oral abstract sessions
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

E-poster sessions
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

Poster discussion sessions
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

Symposia
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

Meet-the-expert sessions
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

Special sessions
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

Satellite sessions
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

Workshops
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

Post-graduate courses
- More
- No change
- Fewer
- No opinion

27. LOOKING FORWARD, DO YOU THINK THE UNION WORLD CONFERENCE ON LUNG HEALTH SHOULD CONTINUE TO EXPAND ITS FOCUS BEYOND TB AND LUNG HEALTH?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure
28. PLEASE SELECT FROM THE LIST BELOW THEME/TOPIC(S) YOU WOULD RECOMMEND TO BE COVERED BY THE UNION WORLD CONFERENCE ON LUNG HEALTH.

Select all that apply

☐ Tobacco control
☐ Air pollution
☐ Pneumology
☐ Zoonotic
☐ Community Engagement
☐ Other (please specify):

…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………

A FEW DETAILS ABOUT YOURSELF

29. HOW MANY UNION CONFERENCE(S) HAVE YOU ATTENDED BEFORE THIS ONE?

…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………

30. IN WHICH COUNTRY DO YOU MAINLY WORK?

If you work in more than one country, please write 'global' as your answer.

…………………………………………………………………

31. WHAT IS YOUR GENDER?

☐ Female
☐ Male
☐ Other

32. WHAT IS YOUR AGE?

☐ Between 16 and 26
☐ Between 27 and 40
☐ Between 41 and 60
☐ Above 60

33. AS IT IS TOO EARLY TO ASSESS THE MEDIUM-TERM IMPACT OF THE CONFERENCE ON YOUR WORK AND BEYOND, WE PLAN TO CONDUCT A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY IN ABOUT 10 MONTHS’ TIME. WOULD YOU AGREE TO COMPLETE SUCH A SURVEY (IT WILL CONTAIN MAXIMUM 10 QUESTIONS)?

☐ Yes
☐ No

34. PLEASE INDICATE IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A CERTIFICATE OF ATTENDANCE FOR THE CONFERENCE?

☐ Yes
☐ No

35. BEFORE CLOSING, PLEASE INDICATE IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO ENTER THE PRIZE DRAW TO WIN AN ONLINE MEMBERSHIP (ANNUAL FEE). THREE RESPONDENTS WILL BE RANDOMLY SELECTED AND WILL BE NOTIFIED BY EMAIL (NO LINK TO SURVEY ANSWERS).

☐ Yes
☐ No