



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](mailto:secretariat@crpm.org) - web: [www.crpm.org](http://www.crpm.org)

## Results of the Member Satisfaction Survey

### 34<sup>th</sup> CPMR General Assembly - Murcia 25/27 October 2006

(Dated 20 November 2006)

**95 people representing 56 Member Regions (out of the 109 Member Regions attending) replied to the questionnaire, representing a response rate of 51.4 %**

There were 315 participants in total, excluding General Secretariat staff. 100 people filled in all or part of the questionnaire, including 1 non-Member Region person, 3 people from other organisations and 1 person from a European institution (European Commission).

In the context of a CPMR General Assembly, only those responses from Member Region delegates will be taken into account.

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

Yes = 89

No = 2

#### **Analysis:**

In general, working papers were received on time. The 2 negative responses concern people who had registered too late for hard copies of the documents to be sent to them by mail. Therefore they did not receive the working documents until the beginning of the session and consequently could not study them.

#### **Follow-up:**

Stress to delegates that registration deadlines must be respected in order to receive the working documents on time (reminder letters, forms etc...)

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

Optimisation form  yes  no

Other  yes  no

Person in charge :

## 2. Standard of translation of papers received:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Incomprehensible
25	63	2	0

### **Analysis:**

The documents were translated well with a satisfaction rate of 97% which proves the excellent quality of the translation. The 2 people who judged the standard of translation as poor based their judgment on the syntax of the phrases (sentences were often too long which led to difficulties in comprehension of certain phrases).

### **Follow-up:**

1 - Ensure that the documents produced by the General Secretariat (often in French) are written in a style which is easy to translate, (particularly shorter phrases to facilitate translation, especially into English).

2 - In addition, do not forget that not all of our documents are translated into all languages, thus the difficulty in comprehension for some people. It is therefore imperative that our documents are written in a simple style.

Quality Action Plan (QAP)  yes  no

Optimisation form  yes  no

Other  yes  no

Person in charge :

## 3. Practical and logistical organisation:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
25	60	4	0

### **Analysis:**

On the whole, the organisation was good, excellent even. The 4 negative responses referred to:

- Firstly, the difficulties in getting hotel reservations. To recall, two international events were taking place on the same dates as the CPMR General Assembly. Hotels were therefore soon fully booked. A cut off date was given for CPMR hotel reservations, but this was not respected by all delegates. Too many people left their hotel reservations until the last moment.
- Secondly, the lack of transfers provided. The organisation of transfers for conference members who arrive from all over Europe is a difficult, trying and onerous task for the host Region. As the airport is situated 70kms from Murcia, all transfers had to be organised such a way as to accommodate the majority of delegates.

### **Follow-up:**

**Hotels:** those delegates who experienced difficulties in their hotel reservations had not respected the registration deadlines. The hoteliers withdrew their room quotas at the cut off date without clear warning to the organisers. In the future, more insistence is needed that the hoteliers give a written letter (by mail, fax) warning of the cancellation of the room quota.

**Transfers:** The organisation of transfers is always complicated and often generates dissatisfaction. Dilemma: Not to organise any transfers, which would be expensive for delegates who would have to pay for taxis or organise transfers, at the risk of upsetting a small minority (4 people in this case, which is not many).

Conclusion: Leave it to the discretion of the host Region whether or not they organise transfers.

Quality Action Plan (QAP)  yes  no

Optimisation form  yes  no

Other  yes  no

Person in charge :

4. Standard of simultaneous interpretation:

Excellent	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
22	60	5	1

**Analysis:**

In general, the translation was very satisfactory. It was considered poor, even unsatisfactory because of technical problems due to the installations (especially during session 1 - this does not concern the interpreters). Some people made complaints about the headphones being uncomfortable. Lastly, one delegate (of Romanian origin) felt that during the translation, the principal ideas were badly conveyed (language listened to: English). Given the very high percentage of satisfaction, the negative comments do not justify being followed up.

**Follow-up:**

Notify the team of interpreters of these good results (send an email to the person responsible for the interpreters to disseminate throughout the team).

Quality Action Plan (QAP)  yes  no

Optimisation form  yes  no

Other  yes  no

Person in charge :

5. The General Assembly debates are of:

Great interest	Interest	Low interest	Little interest
22	61	10	0

**Analysis:**

First of all, the debates won over the delegates, 90% of whom were satisfied. In addition, the presence of a member of the European Commission was also greatly appreciated. Nevertheless, certain subjects such as Maritime Policy and globalisation could have been discussed in further detail according to some delegates.

**Follow-up:**

See below.

Quality Action Plan (QAP)  yes  no

Optimisation form  yes  no

Other  yes  no

Person in charge :

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

Too long?	Satisfactory?	Too short?
5	73	11

**Analysis:**

The majority of delegates felt the time reserved for debates was appropriate. 11 people felt it was too short.

**Follow-up:**

The start time of the debate session must be respected. The Chair of the session must ensure that the schedule is respected and, wherever possible, interrupt speakers who overrun.

Quality Action Plan (QAP)  yes  no

Optimisation form  yes  no

Other  yes  no

Person in charge :

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

Great interest	Interest	Low interest	Little interest
19	65	8	0

**Analysis:**

88% of delegates were satisfied with the quality of the speeches. However, some critics put forward the individualistic dimension of the speakers - that the debate session would be a platform for personal promotion. This resulted in speeches that were too long and went off the subject...

**Follow-up:**

The Chair of the session must not hesitate to re-focus the debates on the themes raised in the General Assembly.

Quality Action Plan (QAP)  yes  no

Optimisation form  yes  no

Other  yes  no

Person in charge :

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

Personal Invitation	Visit to our Website	Invitation sent by your Region	Having received our newsletter "TENOR"
52	2	37	2

**Analysis:**

Two methods clearly stand out, personal invitations and those sent out by the Regions. This demonstrates that information circulates well between the CPMR and its Regions.

**Follow-up:**

None

Quality Action Plan (QAP)  yes  no

Optimisation form  yes  no

Other  yes  no

Person in charge :

## CPMR WEBSITE / NEWSLETTER

In order to improve its website and access to information for its Members, the CPMR would like to know:

1. Do you download working documents from the CPMR website:

Often	From time to time	Never
22	55	10

### **Analysis:**

88% of people declared downloading documents from our site. These results can only encourage us to make more working documents available to our Members via the internet.

### **Follow-up:**

Include more working documents on the website.

2. Would you be willing to download more CPMR working documents from the CPMR website?

YES	NO
71	12

### **Analysis:**

85% of participants are willing to download more documents but they voice their conditions: an alert to be sent to their mailbox and document size must be reasonable.

### **Follow-up:**

Whenever possible, systemise the sending of an email with a link to our website.

3. Do you prefer to receive these documents:

By Mail	By Email
20	57

### **Analysis:**

This information coincides with all the results of this section.

### **Follow up:**

Reduce the mailing of hard copies and encourage the use of email correspondence as much as possible.

4. Do you receive our newsletter, the "TENOR"?

YES	NO
25	58

If no, would you like to receive it?:

YES	NO
49	9

### **Analysis:**

The participants appear interested in the TENOR and are eager to receive it.

### **Follow up:**

Forward the list of people wanting to receive the TENOR to Lejla. Review the addressees with the person responsible for IT.