



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

35th CPMR General Assembly Florence (Tuscany, Italy), 17/19 October

100 people representing 63 member regions (out of the 113 member regions attending) replied to the questionnaire, representing a response rate of 55,75%

There were 327 participants in total, excluding General Secretariat staff. 106 people filled in all or part of the questionnaire or their contact details, including 1 person from a non-member region and 5 people from other organisations.

NB: Only replies from delegates from CPMR Member Regions are taken into account

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

Yes = 84.5 %

No = 6.5 %

No opinion = 8 %

Analysis:

Generally speaking, the papers were sent well enough in advance and therefore received in time. Persons who replied "no" often registered too late to be sent documents by post. However, they received an email giving the link to the CPMR website in order to consult/download the documents available on line.

Follow-up:

- Place greater emphasis on respecting registration deadlines (invitation letter, registration form, etc.).
- Increased use of email to send working papers in order to shorten delivery time.

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP)? yes no

Optimisation form yes no

Other yes no

2. Standard of translation of papers received:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Incomprehensible	No opinion
32.5	59.5	0	0	7

Analysis:

The working papers received were well translated. The satisfaction rate is 92% which proves the high standard of translation.

Follow-up:

Inform CPMR's translators of these good results by sending them the results of the present survey.

Quality Action Plan (QAP) yes no

Optimisation form yes no

Other yes no

3. Practical and logistical organisation:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory	No opinion
23	66	2	0	8

Analysis:

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

One or two people whose response was "poor" mentioned the lack of information about accommodation.

Some delegates asked to be able to consult the list of participants.

Follow-up:

- The hotel bookings were managed by an agency that had provided all the necessary information on the category of hotels and the negotiated room rates. People were able to contact the agency for more information (by internet, fax or telephone).
- The list of participants is always distributed on site on the first day of the General Assembly in the afternoon once it has been updated. It is then published on the CPMR website.

Quality Action Plan (QAP) yes no

Optimisation form yes no

Other yes no

4. Standard of simultaneous interpretation:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory	No opinion
23	56	7	7	6

Analysis:

Generally speaking, the simultaneous interpretation was satisfactory. It was deemed poor by some people because of the background noise in the booths. Translation from French into English was deemed poor by some people. Others considered the simultaneous interpretation to be unsatisfactory because the interpreters did not have the written speeches.

Follow-up:

- Check the standard of the booth installations (sound-proofing) and underline this in the specifications.
- Urge the speakers to provide the written version of their speeches and distribute this to the interpreters before the presentation.

Quality Action Plan (QAP) yes no

Optimisation form yes no

Other yes no

5. The General Assembly debates are of:

Great interest	Interest	Little interest	No interest	No opinion
20.5	67.5	4	0	7

Analysis:

The response rate of 88% shows that the debates are satisfactory. Furthermore, the presence of a European Commissioner was greatly appreciated.

The 4 people who considered the debates to be of little interest justified their remark by indicating a drop in the standard of the debates.

Follow-up:

It is difficult to satisfy all participants concerning all the issues addressed.

Quality Action Plan (QAP) yes no

Optimisation form yes no

Other yes no

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

Too long?	Satisfactory?	Too short?	No opinion
6	80	3	10

Analysis:

This response rate is very encouraging and satisfactory. The length of time reserved for debates was very reasonable. CPMR's President was democratic while also managing to successfully moderate the debates. This was highly appreciated.

Follow-up:

Continue along the same lines and inform CPMR's President of the quality of his chairmanship.

Quality Action Plan (QAP) yes no
 Other yes no

Optimisation form yes no

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

Great interest	Interest	Little interest	No interest	No opinion
14	71	6	0	8

Analysis:

85% of delegates were satisfied with the standard of the speeches. One of the criticisms concerned presentations being used as a "platform for personal promotion", which generated speeches that were out of touch with the issue at hand.

Follow-up:

Make sure that the chairs of the sessions are aware of this point and ask them to urge speakers to keep to the topics addressed during General Assembly.

Quality Action Plan (QAP) yes no
 Other yes no:

Optimisation form yes no

8. How did you learn about the CPMR General Assembly?

Personal invitation	Invitation sent by your Region	Visit to our web site	Having received our newsletter "TENOR" by email
65	31	2	1

Analysis:

The majority of invitations were received personally or forwarded by the Region

Follow up:

N/A

Quality Action Plan (QAP) yes no
 Other yes no:

Optimisation form yes no

CPMR Website/NEWSLETTER

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

1. Do you download working papers from the CPMR web site?

Often	Sometimes	Never	No opinion
24	56	7	13

Analysis:

80% state that they download documents from CPMR's website.

Follow-up:

These results encourage the CPMR to use this tool to greater effect in order to disseminate working papers.

2. Would you be willing to download more CPMR working papers from our web site?

YES	NO	No opinion
74	8	18

Analysis:

74% of delegates are willing to download more documents.

Follow-up:

This method of distribution therefore needs to be promoted.

3. Would you prefer to receive these documents:

By post	By e-mail	No opinion
31	51	18

Analysis:

51% of delegates prefer to receive working papers by email, but provided that a link to the website is also given, since there is always a high probability of being unable to retrieve documents sent as an attachment.

Follow-up:

Try to limit sending documents by post and prefer email making sure to include a URL for the CPMR website.

4. Do you receive our newsletter "TENOR"?

YES	NO	No opinion
41	41	18

If not, would you like to receive it?:

YES	NO	No opinion
32	7	20

Analysis:

Delegates seem to be increasingly interested in the TENOR and wish to receive it. Last year only 25% of people who completed the survey received the TENOR. Today, this has risen to 41%. This is an additional way for CPMR to communicate on its activities and is proving to be useful.

Follow-up:

Forward the names of people wishing to receive the TENOR to the secretary in charge of sending the TENOR so that she can include them in the mailing list.