



CRPM CPMR

CONFÉRENCE DES RÉGIONS PÉRIPHÉRIQUES MARITIMES D'EUROPE
CONFERENCE OF PERIPHERAL MARITIME REGIONS OF EUROPE

6, rue Saint-Martin 35700 RENNES - F
Tel. : + 33 (0)2 99 35 40 50 - Fax : + 33 (0)2 99 35 09 19
e.mail : secretariat@crpm.org – web : www.crpm.org

Corrective actions will be initiated if the limit of 15% of negative answers is reached.

Results of the Member Satisfaction Survey
37th General Assembly of the CPMR
Göteborg (Västra Götaland, Sweden), 1/2 October 2009

108 people representing 64 member regions (out of the 101 member regions attending) replied to the questionnaire: representing a response rate of 63 %

There were 288 participants in total, excluding General Secretariat staff. 118 people filled in all or part of the questionnaire, including 1 person from a state, 4 people from European institutions (EC, CoR, EIB) and 5 people from other organisations.

NB: Only the replies from the 108 delegates from CPMR member regions are taken into account

1. Are you satisfied with the time in which you received the working papers?

Yes = 82%

No = 11%

No opinion = 7%

Analysis

Overall, many delegates were “satisfied”. The documents were sent earlier this year, yet ironically the number of delegates “dissatisfied” remains the same as last year. It should be pointed out that during the Baltic Sea Commission mini GA, information was given that certain documents, namely the financial papers, were only sent to the members of the CPMR Political Bureau.

In reality, between the 10 and 13 September 2009, the papers were sent to each CPMR President, officer and registered participant.

Follow-up

- On 19 October 2009, an email was sent to Ms Anne Stahl-Mousa, Executive Secretary of the Baltic Sea Commission (+ copy to President Christel Liljestrom) with supporting evidence that each CPMR President, officer and registered participant had been sent the financial papers and the link to access the working papers.
- An increased exchange of information between the General Secretariat and the Secretariats of the Geographical Commissions will have to take place before each GA.

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No Other Yes No

2. Standard of translation of the papers received:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Incomprehensible	No opinion
40%	53%	1%	0	6%

Analysis

The very positive results exempt us from making any comments.

Follow-up

- Inform the CPMR's translators of the good results by sending them the results of this survey.

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No Other Yes No

3. Practical and logistical organisation:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory	No opinion
48%	46%	1%	0	5%

Analysis

The organisation was deemed to be good or excellent. The CPMR and the host region worked perfectly together.

Follow-up

- A letter of thanks was sent to the President of Västra Götaland, Mr Roland Andersson (with copies sent to his close colleagues). Innovative and positive elements shall be added to the "Logistical Preparation" paper (For example, internet points which made it possible for lots of delegates to consult their emails without waiting too long, due to the standing internet points)...

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No Other Yes No

4. Standard of simultaneous interpretation:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory	No opinion
42%	49%	2%	0	7%

Analysis

- The standard of the simultaneous interpreters recruited in Sweden was excellent. The fact that another team was provided for the Political Bureau on the evening of Thursday 1 October helped to ensure the highest level of interpretation was always provided. In addition, they were managed by a person responsible for the documentation, which facilitated their work.
- The 2 people who deemed the interpretation "poor" were of Italian and Portuguese mother tongue.

Follow-up

- Always stress the importance of having excellent interpreters to new host regions. It is the key to reliable and accurate debates.

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No Other Yes No

5. The General Assembly debates are of:

Great interest	Interest	Little interest	No interest	No opinion
19%	63%	7%	0	11%

Analysis

- Generally speaking, the results were positive. If criticisms were made, it was mainly due to the fact that some debates remained too general and did not lead to concrete solutions.

Follow-up

It is difficult to find an appropriate balance and to satisfy all the participants on the issues addressed. We can organise the debates but not their content, it is the freedom of expression which takes precedence at the CPMR.

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No Other Yes No

6. Regarding the length of time reserved for debates is it:

Too long?	Satisfactory?	Too short?	No opinion
7%	76%	10%	7%

Analysis

The response rate is encouraging and satisfactory. Indeed, the time reserved for debates was perfectly adequate. The fact that there were not a lot of VIPs this year helped a large number of participants to have the time and the freedom to express their opinion. The negative criticisms concern the length of some speeches, and the fact that the time reserved for debates is too dependant on an already tight schedule.

Follow-up

Care must be taken to avoid overloading the agenda. The session Chair must also limit speeches which are overrunning and ensure that everyone can express their opinion in a concise way so as not to bore the audience...

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No *Other* Yes No

7. Are you satisfied with the standard of the speeches?

Great interest	Interest	Little interest	No interest	No opinion
13%	69%	6%	2%	10%

Analysis

The positive response rate was good. Nevertheless those unsatisfied underlined that the quality of the speeches varied enormously and that place should be made for speeches from all geographical areas.

Follow-up

There are not many solutions. Only prior work carried out by the General Secretariat Directors to "channel" the speeches can have a positive effect. As for spontaneous remarks made during the debates, obviously these cannot be controlled. The role of the session chair is thus crucial to avoid any risk of running over time.

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No *Other* Yes No

8. How did you learn about this General Assembly?

Personal invitation	Invitation sent by your region	Visit to our website	Having received our newsletter the "TENOR" by email
59%	36%	3%	2%

Analysis

The majority of invitation were received personally or forwarded by the region. We therefore control our registrations well...there were few "uncontrolled" registrations.

Follow-up

In the event of an "uncontrolled" registration, a call is made or an email sent to the person to find out under which capacity they have registered. This was the case this year with one person from Africa. The request was refused as there was no justification for the presence of an African representative at the CPMR GA.

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No *Other* Yes No

9 - Miscellaneous

Points to be stressed:

- Try to have the names of speakers during each debate (each speaker must clearly introduce themselves). The session chair must make sure of this detail so that the audience can clearly identify the speaker and to facilitate the work of the person writing the minutes;
- Before the GA, the CPMR Director in charge of the session must consistently confirm the date and time of their speech to all speakers and supervise the content of the speech so it is to the point.

CPMR Website/NEWSLETTER

In order to improve its website and to offer a better access to information to its members, the CPMR would like to know:

1. Are you satisfied with the online registration?

Yes	No	No opinion
85%	2%	13%

Analysis

85% of delegates were satisfied with the online registration used for the 2009 General Assembly.

Follow-up

This registration system is adopted for all CPMR events.

2. Do you download working papers from the CPMR website?

Often	Sometimes	Never	No opinion
51%	36%	3%	10%

Analysis

86% state they download papers from the CPMR website.

Follow-up

These results encourage the CPMR to use this tool to greater effect to disseminate working papers and thus become more environmentally friendly by progressively decreasing paper copies.

3. Would you be willing to download more CPMR working papers from our website?

Yes	No	No opinion
78%	7%	15%

Analysis

78% of participants are willing to download more documents.

Follow-up

This method of distribution therefore needs to be promoted.

4. Would you prefer to receive these documents:

By post	By email	By email + post	No opinion
1%	65%	28%	6%

Analysis

65% would prefer to receive working papers by email, provided that a link to the website was given as there is always a high probability of being unable to retrieve attached documents. This is what was sent this year. Only the final declaration, draft resolutions and financial papers were sent as attachments for confidentiality reasons.

Follow-up

Try to limit sending documents by post and encourage sending an email with a URL to the CPMR website. Documents put to the vote could be distributed on site, as they were this year, so that participants do not get lost in the documents available online.

5. Do you receive our newsletter the TENOR?

Yes	No	No opinion
42%	37%	21%

If not, would you like to receive it?

Yes	No	No opinion
37	7	56

Analysis

Participants appear interested in the TENOR and wish to receive it. 42% of people who completed the questionnaire receive the TENOR and 37% wish to receive it. This is an additional way to communicate our CPMR activities

Follow-up

Forward the details of the people who wish to receive the TENOR to the Secretary in charge of sending the newsletter so that they can be included in the mailing list.