



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
36th General Assembly of the CPMR
Bayonne (Aquitaine, France), 1-3 October 2008

**99 people representing 69 Member Regions (out of the 113 Member Regions attending)
Replied to the questionnaire: representing a response rate of 61%**

There were 340 participants in total, excluding General Secretariat staff. 105 people filled in all or part of the questionnaire, including 1 person from a non-Member Region, 1 person from a State (outside the EU) and 4 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	No	No opinion
89%	11%	0%

Analysis

Generally speaking, the papers were sent well enough in advance and therefore received in time. People who replied “No” often registered too late. However they received an email giving the link to the CPMR website in order to consult/download the papers available online.

Follow-up

- Place greater emphasis on respecting registration deadlines (invitation letter, registration form...).
- Increase the use of email to send working papers as it helps to reduce delivery time.

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No

Optimisation form Yes No

Other Yes No

2. Standard of translation of the papers received:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Incomprehensible	No opinion
34	63	1	0	2

Analysis

- The working papers received were well translated. The satisfaction rate is 97%, which proves the high standard of translation.
- Some participants suggested the use of Scandinavian languages.

Follow-up

- Inform the CPMR's translators of these good results by sending them the results of this survey.
- The use of Scandinavian languages involves high costs (as considered as an “exotic” language) and the CPMR budget does not allow for this.

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

Optimisation form Yes No

3. Practical and logistical organisation:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory	No opinion
23	72	3	0	2

Analysis

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

The people whose response was "poor" mentioned the lack of information in the hotels regarding transfers and the services provided at the meeting venue.

Follow-up

- The hotel bookings were managed by an Agency who supplied all the necessary information on the hotels and how to access them.

NB: The agency responsible for the logistics ("D-Day") put up notice-boards in each hotel where rooms had been reserved (with negotiated rates). People who had reserved rooms in hotels which were not recommended would not have received this information.

- Members must be encouraged to stay in the recommended hotels.

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

Optimisation form Yes No

4. Standard of simultaneous interpretation:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory	No opinion
31	59	5		5

Analysis

- Generally speaking, the simultaneous interpretation was satisfactory.
- The 5 people who gave no opinion considered that they did not need simultaneous interpretation.
- Some participants requested simultaneous interpretation in other languages (Scandinavian, Danish, and Turkish).

Follow-up

- Inform the simultaneous interpretation team of these good results by sending them the results of this survey.

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

Optimisation form Yes No

5. The General Assembly debates are of:

Great interest	Interest	Little interest	No interest	No opinion
23	71	6	0	0

Analysis

- The response rate of 94% shows that the debates are satisfactory. Furthermore, the presence of a European Commissioner was greatly appreciated.
- Participants requested that the speeches be short and keep on the issue being addressed.
- One of the replies, which judged the debates of little interest, felt that the time allocated to the debates was not sufficient to deal with the internal questions of the CPMR.

Follow-up

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

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

Optimisation form Yes No

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

Too long?	Satisfactory?	Too short?	No opinion
5	90	5	0

Analysis

The response rate is very encouraging and satisfactory. Indeed, the time reserved for debates was perfectly adequate.

Follow-up

Continue along the same lines.

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

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

Great interest	Interest	Little interest	No interest	No opinion
17	75	4	0	4

Analysis

92% of the participants were satisfied with the standard of the speeches.

Follow-up

Continue along the same lines.

Inclusion in the Quality Action Plan (QAP) Yes No *Optimisation form* 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
58	39	8	5

Analysis

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

Follow-up

N/A

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

Specific requests from the Regions

- Try to give the names of speakers during each debate (Each speaker must introduce themselves clearly).
- Before the General Assembly, systematically confirm the date and time of their speech to all speakers and to manage the content of this speech so as to ensure it keeps to the issue being addressed.
- Have a computer available to download the PowerPoint presentations (NB: These presentations are uploaded to the CPMR website after the General Assembly).

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
88	0	12

Analysis

88% of the participants were satisfied with the online registration used for the 2008 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
52	34	3	11

Analysis

86% state that 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
83	8	8

Analysis

83% 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
3	55	31	11

Analysis

55% of the participants preferred to receive the 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 documents sent as an attachment.

Follow-up

Try to limit sending documents by post and encourage sending an email with a URL to the CPMR website.

5. Do you receive our newsletter, the TENOR?

Yes	No	No Opinion
38	52	11

If not, would you like to receive it?

Yes	No	No opinion
40	9	51

Analysis

Participants seem to be interested by the TENOR and wish to receive it. 38% of people who completed the questionnaire receive the TENOR and 40% wished to receive it. This is an additional way for the CPMR to communicate on its activities and is proving to be useful...

Follow-up

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