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Survey Results
Survey Results Summary

• Survey open from 11 to 30 September 2020. Eight survey respondents.
• The availability of the sessions online was appreciated as it allowed members of the SDG team to join the discussion.

Session content:
• The session on the regional socioeconomic impact of COVID-19 was rated as most useful session, followed by the overview and sharing of VNR presentation experiences in the HLPF 2020 and the discussion on Financing for Development.
• Respondents indicated the segment of the interactive discussion as most useful, as it provided countries with the opportunity to exchange their experiences, challenges, lessons learned and best practice especially with regards to the pandemic’s effects on the VNR process and national strategies to overcome these challenges.
• Presentations by experts were considered helpful for setting the context.
Topics for Community of Practice future sessions:

• Post-VNR activities directed at the implementation of the SDGs, stakeholder engagement and buy-in (inside and outside government), prioritization and financing to outweigh the impacts of COVID-19 and climate change, “Second-Generation” VNRs, institutional mechanisms and frameworks for SDG coordination, localization and integration of the SDGs, accelerating progress on the SDGs, and national monitoring and reporting

• Other suggestions: to produce an ECLAC publication on the lessons learned from the Community of Practice, including the display of practical scenarios; focus on one sector per session to allow a more profound discussion; further discussion and follow-up after the monthly meeting via networking.

Session organization:

• All respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the sessions were well organized and structured and that the level of the discussions fulfilled their expectations. Also respondent found the sessions conducive to the discussion.

• The time allocated for the sessions (60-75 minutes) was considered just right by over 60% of all respondents, whereas one quarter considered the duration long.
How would you rate past sessions of the Community of Practice in support of your country’s VNR preparation? Please select the category that best reflects your opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Event</th>
<th>VERY USEFUL</th>
<th>USEFUL</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>OF LITTLE USE</th>
<th>NOT USEFUL</th>
<th>I DID NOT PARTICIPATE</th>
<th>TOTAL DE ENCUESTADOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10- dic-19: Expectations</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-jan-20: Data</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 4-feb-20: Regional VNR workshop</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mar-20: Stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-abr-20: COVID-19 regional socioeconomic impact</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-may-20: meeting of high-level national authorities on 2030 Agenda implementation</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-jun-20: Financing for development</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-aug-20: HLPE overview and sharing of VNR presentation experiences</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The level of discussion with other participants fulfilled my expectations.
The quality of ECLAC’s presentations fulfilled my expectations

Respondidas: 8   Omitidas: 0
The information received prior to the meeting was timely and appropriate.
The structure of the sessions (introduction, presentations, discussion, conclusion) was appropriate and conducive to exchange among participants.
The time allocated for the sessions (60-75 minutes) was:

- Too long: 0%
- Long: 20%
- Just right: 70%
- Short: 0%
- Too short: 0%
- I prefer not to answer: 10%