



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Diversity of
Cultural Expressions

12 IGC

DCE/18/12.IGC/INF.3
Paris, 20 November 2018
Original: French

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS

Twelfth session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
11 – 14 December 2018

INFORMATION DOCUMENT

This document presents the results of the satisfaction survey on the preparation and organization of the eleventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

1. In order to evaluate the preparation and organization of statutory meetings of the governing bodies of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as the “Convention”) and to contribute to the efficiency of future meetings in accordance with [Decision 191 EX/15 \(I\) Part C/5](#) of the Executive Board, the Secretariat of the Convention started conducting satisfaction surveys in 2013. As such, survey results have been collected for eight sessions of the governing bodies: three sessions of the Conference of Parties (fourth, fifth and sixth sessions, June 2013, 2015 and 2017) and five sessions of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as the “Committee”) (seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh sessions, December 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017).
2. The satisfaction survey is designed to assess a range of issues, from the quality of working and information documents to time management, translation and interpretation services as well as communication with the Secretariat. For each session, the same electronic survey was sent by the Secretariat to all participants immediately following the closing of the session, and reminders were sent in order to receive as many responses as possible. From the fourth session of the Conference of Parties, questions specific to the exchange sessions were added. Since the tenth session of the Committee, questions were also added concerning the duration of sessions and the quality of the support given to civil society by the Secretariat, thereby reflecting the governing bodies’ current priorities on its working methods.
3. The satisfaction survey is distributed in French and in English and contains 14 questions on the preparation and organization of the session. Respondents are asked to rate the Secretariat’s services as “excellent” (4 points), “good” (3 points), “adequate” (2 points), or “poor” (1 point) with respect to each item, and to provide comments and suggestions for improvement.
4. The responses are submitted by the participants through an online form and respondents are not required to identify themselves by name or country/organization. The results are combined and the average scores are calculated for each question and session. Qualitative comments are collected and analyzed in relation to the quantitative responses.
5. As shown in the table below, the response rate for the eight surveys organized since 2013 is on average 17%. The highest participation rate was achieved for the tenth session of the Committee, with a 25% response rate. This has significantly decreased, with the lowest number of responses at 9% for the eleventh session of the Committee. Regrettably, this low participation is not sufficiently representative, nor statistically viable to draw any meaningful conclusions.

	2013		2014	2015		2016	2017	
Responses	4.CP	7.IGC	8.IGC	5.CP	9.IGC	10.IGC	6.CP	11.IGC
Total number of respondents	46 of 305 or 15%	43 of 256 or 17%	50 of 293 or 17%	51 of 279 or 18%	27 of 253 or 10.7%	61 of 245 or 25 %	51 of 347 or 15%	27 of 300 or 9%
Number of Parties that responded	35 of 46 or 76%	19 of 43 or 44%	29 of 50 or 58%	40 of 51 or 78%	13 of 27 or 48%	36 of 61 or 59 %	40 of 103 or 39%	16 of 74 or 22%
Number of observers (governmental) that responded	8 of 46 or 17%	15 of 43 or 35%	14 of 50 or 28%	6 of 51 or 12%	8 of 27 or 30%	9 of 61 or 15 %	3 of 20 or 15%	6 of 11 or 55%

	2013		2014	2015		2016	2017	
Responses	4.CP	7.IGC	8.IGC	5.CP	9.IGC	10.IGC	6.CP	11.IGC
Number of NGO observers that responded	3 of 48 or 7%	7 of 43 or 16%	7 of 50 or 14%	5 of 51 or 10%	6 of 27 or 22%	15 of 61 or 26 %	8 of 51 or 16%	5 of 51 or 10%

6. Annex presents a table with the average score for each of the 14 questions across the previous seven statutory meetings, a total average score for each statutory meeting and a total average score for all seven meetings. Meaningful calculations could not be made for the eleventh session due to the overall low response rate and the fact that many questions were left unanswered or considered non-applicable by the respondents.
7. Unedited, qualitative comments received through the satisfaction survey for the previous sessions are available in Documents [CE/13/7.IGC/INF.3](#), [CE/15/9.IGC/INF.3](#), [CE/14/8.IGC/INF.7](#), [CE/15/5.CP/INF.6](#), [DCE/16/10.IGC/INF.6](#), [DCE/17/6.CP/INF.5](#) and [DCE/17/11.IGC/INF.3](#) respectively. These documents also include a number of actions taken by the Secretariat to respond to the comments received.
8. Written comments are very important to have more specific feedback from Parties and observers on the working methods of the Secretariat. Unfortunately, the number of qualitative responses is in decline each year, with the lowest number recorded for the eleventh session. This prevents the Secretariat from making a full qualitative analysis or a meaningful action plan to address calls for improvement to specific working methods that are based on a critical mass of voices, as it has done in the past.

ANNEX

Average scores per session and per question on the preparation and organization of statutory meetings of the Convention

Items	4.CP 2013	7.IGC 2013	8.IGC 2014	5.CP 2015	9.IGC 2015	10.IGC 2016	6.CP 2017	11.IGC 2017	Average Rating
Total average score	3,1	3,2	3,3	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,3	NSV	3,3
a. Quality of the Secretariat's working and information documents	3,4	3,6	3,5	3,8	3,7	3,7	3,6	NSV	3,6
b. Working and information documents provide the necessary information needed to support informed decision-making by the governing bodies	3,2	3,3	3,4	3,6	3,7	3,8	3,2	NSV	3,5
c. Delivery of working and information documents on time	3	3,1	3,2	3,4	3,3	3,3	3,2	NSV	3,2
d. Parties to the Convention are given sufficient time to respond to specific issues through questionnaires sent by the Secretariat	2,9	3	2,9	3,1	3,1	3,3	2,9	NSV	3,0
e. Quality of the translation of the working and information documents	3,2	3,2	3,4	3,5	3,6	3,5	3,5	NSV	3,4
f. Clarity and effectiveness of Secretariat's communication	3,2	3,2	3,6	3,3	3,6	3,4	3,4	NSV	3,4
g. Usefulness, clarity and ease of navigation of the website	2,8	2,9	2,8	2,8	3,3	3,1	2,9	NSV	2,9
h. Quality and timeliness of response by the Secretariat to various queries pertaining to the session and the working documents	3,2	3,4	3,3	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,3	NSV	3,4
i. Quality of real-time document revision during the session	3	3,3	3,2	3,5	3,3	3,4	3,1	NSV	3,3
j. Quality of interpretation in the official languages of the meetings of the governing bodies during the session	3,1	3,2	3,4	3,3	3,5	3,6	3,2	NSV	3,3
k. Quality of the web-cast transmission (live stream)	2,9	3,1	2,9	3	3	3,1	3,0	NSV	3,0
l. Quality of meeting time management	3,4	3,2	3,5	3,5	3,4	3,2	3,1	NSV	3,3
m. Duration of sessions in comparison to the number of agenda items						3,1	3,1	NSV	3,1
n. Quality of the support given to civil society by the Secretariat						3,4	3,2	NSV	3,3

Note: "excellent" (4 points); "good" (3 points); "adequate" (2 points); or "poor" (1 point).

NSV= Not statistically valid