Feedback Survey from IWC67 – Summary of Results

Prepared by: IWC Secretariat

1. **Background**

    1.1. After each Commission Meeting the Secretariat issues a questionnaire to delegates to assess their experience of the meeting and to identify areas for improvement.

    1.2. This paper outlines the key points raised in the survey from IWC67. Full details of the survey are provided in Annex 1.

2. **Results**

    2.1. We received 42 responses to the feedback questionnaire sent out after IWC67 in Florianopolis, Brazil. This is 32 less than for the IWC66 survey and a significant drop given the overall sample size. Of these responses, 16 came from Commissioners or Alternate Commissioners, 17 from NGO observers/IGO observers, 7 came from national delegates, and 2 came from staff.

    2.2. Respondents gave scores between 1 and 5, 1 meaning very bad, to 5 meaning very good.

    2.3. Most areas scored above 4 indicating a generally positive experience of the meeting.

3. **Summary**

    3.1. The Secretariat welcomes the F&A Committee's views on the outcomes of this survey and their experience of IWC67.

    3.2. The Secretariat encourages all IWC68 participants to complete the end of meeting survey after IWC68 in order to ensure the Secretariat can address issues encountered by the participants.

ANNEX 1 – Survey Results

Unless otherwise stated, all answers were scored between 1 (very bad) to 5 (very good).

(1) Registration

We asked: How do you rate the online pre-registration process?

> ***Average: 4.40 (score has DECLINED from IWC66: 4.46)***

We asked: How do you rate the onsite badge collection and photo-id process?

> ***Average: 4.76 (score has IMPROVED from IWC66: 4.47)***

We asked for suggestions for improvements to the registration process, one common suggestion is for the portal to be more reliable.

Secretariat comment: for IWC68 we are aiming to have registration and photo-ID badges to be ready prior to the sub-committee meetings; this is to some extent in the hands of the particpants, who must supply the relevant information in their registration information.

(2) Technical provisions and document delivery

We asked: How would you rate the ease of access to documents?

> ***Average: 4.21 (score has IMPROVED from IWC66: 3.73)***

We asked: How would you rate the network (wireless) and internet at the venue?

> ***Average: 2.71 (score has DECLINED from IWC66: 4.43)***

We asked: How would you rate the other meeting-related technical provisions (e.g. AV and Translation)?

> ***Average: 4.45 (score has IMPROVED from IWC66: 4.22)***

We asked: Do you feel the technical facilities (network, wireless, internet) have improved since IWC66?

> ***Average: 3.17 (this is a newly formatted question for IWC67)***

We asked: For delegates to rate the online live video stream (if used).

> ***Average: 4.05 (this is a newly formatted question for IWC67)***

(3) Meeting duration

We asked: Was enough time provided for the Sub-Committee meetings?

> ***Yes: 83.33% (score has DECLINED from IWC66: 87.84%)***

> ***No: 16.6% (score was 12.16% for IWC66)***

We asked: Was adequate time provided for the Plenary session?

> ***Yes: 90.48% (score has IMPROVED from IWC66: 89.19%)***

> ***No: 9.52% (score was 10.81% for IWC66)***

We asked whether the duration of the meeting was appropriate, the majority of respondents said yes.

(4) Agenda and report preparation and presentation

We asked: Do you have any suggestions on the format and construction of the Agenda?

> ***Most respondents said no.***

We asked: Was enough time given to the Sub-Committee and Scientific Committee reports in Plenary?

> ***Yes: 90.48% (score has DECLINED from IWC66: 90.54%)***

> ***No: 9.52% (score was 9.46% for IWC66)***

We asked: Please rate the presentation of financial data, particularly the budget documents and accounts.

> ***Average: 4.17 (score has IMPROVED from IWC66: 3.91)***

We asked: Please rate the financial information provided on the voluntary funds

> ***Average: 4.14 (score has IMPROVED from IWC66: 4.05)***

(5) Overall meeting experience

We asked for improvements to information provision in regards to Commission meetings

> One suggestion was to move the deadline (up or back?) for opening statements.

We asked: Please rate the voting process.

> ***Average: 4.79 (this is a new question for IWC67)***

We asked: How would you rate the service of the Secretariat?

> ***Average: 4.98 (score has IMPROVED from IWC66: 4.82)***

We asked: How would you rate the venue?

> ***Average: 4.14 (score has DECLINED from IWC66: 4.68)***

We asked: How would you rate the security at the venue?

> ***Average: 4.55 (score has DECLINED from IWC66: 4.64)***

We asked: How do you rate the media handling arrangements for the meeting?

> ***Average: 4.38 (this is a new question for IWC67)***

We asked: Do you feel the changes implemented from IWC66 feedback have improved the meeting?

> ***Yes: 69.05%   No: 2.38%   Not attended previous meetings: 28.57%***

We asked: How did IWC67 compare to meetings by other organisations that you have attended?

> ***Much worse: 2.38%   Worse: 2.38%   The same: 35.71%   Better: 33.33%***

> ***Much better: 9.52%   Not attended other meetings: 16.66%***

We asked: Overall meeting score?

> ***Average: 4.40 (score has IMPROVED since IWC66: 4.34)***

(6) Additional questions to the survey

We asked: Are there any questions you would like adding to future surveys?

> ***A question was suggested about whether space in the meeting rooms is adequate, and another suggestion was to add a function to skip questions.***