

Feedback Survey from IWC/65 in 2014 – Summary of Results

The Secretariat (Andrea Cooke)

We have received 53 responses to the feedback questionnaire sent out after IWC/65 in Portorož, Slovenia. Of these, 28 came from national delegates, 22 from NGO representatives, and 3 from elsewhere/not stated.

Respondents had a wide variety of experience from previous IWC meetings:

Number of previous meetings attended	Total number of delegates	National delegates	NGO delegates
IWC/65 was the first meeting attended	7	5	2
Attended 1-5 meetings previously	17	11	6
Attended 6-10 meetings previously	5	2	3
Attended more than 10 meetings previously	19	8	11
Did not answer	5	-	-

Unless otherwise stated, all answers with an average score were ranged from 1: very bad to 5: very good.

(1) Registration

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

Average: 4.04.

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

Average: 4.53.

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

Average: 4.72

Problems with registration noted under this section included:

Problem reported	Number of responses
Problems with passwords/email addresses used previously on IWC website	4 responses
Problems with payments from non-UK accounts	2 responses
Problems with clashes between the IWC system and the user's browser	4 responses
Unspecified technical problems	1 response

Suggestions given under this section included:

- larger sign-posts to the Registration area at the meeting;
- the ability to upload a photo before arriving at the meeting (2 people suggested this);
- a return email with the InfParts information in it when a delegate first registers;
- adapt the system so that it is easier to deal with 'unique' problems such as a delegate needing 2 badges; and
- allow delegations to register multiple people using one email address (so do not require a unique email address for every delegate).

(2) Document delivery

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

Average: 4.28.

We asked: How much printing did you need to do?

Amount of printing	IWC/65	Comparison to SC/65b
None	18.87%	29.23%
Very little	47.17%	[this category not in SC questionnaire]
Some	28.30%	64.62%
Lots	5.66%	3.08%
Everything	0	3.08%

We asked: *How would you rate the internet speed?*

Average: 3.43

(3) Meeting duration

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

Yes: 67.92%

No: 32.08%

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

Yes: 64.15%

No: 35.85%

We asked delegates to comment on the duration of the meeting. Responses can be summarised as follows.

Would an extra day be useful?

Yes: 30	National Delegates: 13	NGOs: 17
No: 15	National Delegates: 11	NGOs: 4
Maybe: 1	National Delegates: 0	NGOs: 1
Not sure/no answer: 6	National Delegates: 3	NGOs: 3

Of those who gave an opinion, where did they think the extra day should be added?

During sub-committees: 4	National Delegates: 2	NGOs: 2
Whole day for Conservation Committee: 4	National Delegates: 2	NGOs: 2
Between sub-committees and Plenary: 11	National Delegates: 6	NGOs: 5
During Plenary: 10	National Delegates: 6	NGOs: 4
Not stated: 7		

Several delegates responded that an extra day between sub-committees and Plenary AND an extra day of Plenary would be useful, i.e. 2 more days in total.

Summary of some other comments:

- Biennial meetings mean there is twice as much work to review.
- Delegation coordination was difficult this year.
- Plenary should be longer now the meetings are biennial.
- Conservation Committee needs more time.
- Interactive voting system might make voting faster.
- ‘The duration of meetings should be set according to the volume of work to be discussed and not for budgetary reasons’.
- Not enough time to review SC and CC reports.
- Need more time to read documents and reports.

(4) Agenda and report preparation and presentation

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

Responses to this question divided into people who prefer the ‘old’ format and people who prefer the ‘new’ ‘decisions-first’ one:

Decisions first: 3

Old format: 3

Other/unclear response: 7

No response: 12 + 27 who did not fill in this bit.

Other comments:

- Observer interventions worked well.
- Remove the Future of the IWC item.
- Some people find the Agenda confusing.
- Video presentations should be done over lunchtime.
- SC report summaries should be verbally presented at each Agenda item (2 responses).
- The Agenda should be more adaptable to the proposals that are brought forward.

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

Yes: 64.15%.

No: 35.85%.

We asked: Please rate the presentation of financial data, particularly the proposed budget?

Average: 3.58.

We asked: Do you feel that financial scrutiny and decision making are sufficiently transparent and robust?

Yes: 27

No: 12

Maybe/unsure: 3

Other response: 7

No response: 3

Several people indicated 'no' on the grounds that NGOs and observers cannot attend the F&A Committee.

We asked: Suggestions for improvements to information provision in regards to Commission meetings.

Suggestions included:

Suggestion	Number of mentions
Monitors showing next agenda items, next document etc.	3
Quicker uploading of Revised documents	2
Clearer sign-posting of Revised documents	3
Better internet access	1
A USB stick with all the documents on it	1
Printing facilities	1
All Verbatim Records available on the web, including Bureau meetings	1
SC presentations on each item	1

(5) Overall meeting experience

We asked: How would you rate the venue?

Average: 4.45.

We asked: Overall meeting score?

Average: 4.17.

We asked: Do you have any suggested improvements to any aspect of IWC meetings?

Summary of responses as follows:

Idea	Number of times mentioned
Venue:	
Always hold the meeting in Slovenia!	1
Friendlier security guards	1
Facilities:	
Better internet connections	5
Better printing facilities	1
Bring back pigeonholes	1
More plug sockets	2
Sockets, tables and name signs for observers	4
Quicker/clearer uploading of Revised papers	2
Screens to inform of what is coming next on the Agenda	2
Get rid of coffee breaks	1
Water in the meeting rooms	2
Meeting practices:	
Improve information about the Bureau	1
Improve technical services (outside providers)	1
Improve translation system hardware	3
More help for the Chair	3
More help from Secretariat to facilitate dialogue	1
More time in Plenary	1
More NGO participation	3
More time for SC and sub-committee business in Plenary	3
Remove SC sections	1
More detailed research budget	1
Use of outside media:	
Create a Twitter hashtag	1
Have side-events	1
Monitor media coverage	1
Use Earth Negotiations Bulletin	1
Other:	
Lower observer fees	2
More help travelling to venue	1
Work more with other organisations	1
Praise!	5