

First meeting of the 2009/2010 Bureau
Washington D.C. (United States), 15-16 October 2009

Item 9 of the Provisional
Agenda

EVALUATION OF THE JUNE 2009 CES PLENARY SESSION
(Summary of replies to the evaluation questionnaires)

Note prepared by the UNECE secretariat

1. As a rule, all participants in the meetings organised under the CES work programme are asked to fill in an evaluation questionnaire at the end of the meeting. Below is the summary of the evaluation questionnaires filled in by the participants of the 2009 June CES plenary session.
2. There were 141 registered participants at the meeting (excluding members of the UNECE secretariat). 73 responses to the evaluation questionnaires were received (response rate 52%).

Summary of replies

Question 1: How do you evaluate the quality of the meeting in general?

	Evaluation	Number of replies	%
Content	Very good	31	42%
	Good	40	55%
	Fairly good	2	3%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0%
Documentation	Very good	33	46%
	Good	37	52%
	Fairly good	1	1%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0

Question 2: Are you satisfied with the organization of the seminars?

	Evaluation	Number of replies	%
Seminar on balancing principles of professional autonomy and accountability with the mandate to produce policy relevant data			
Organization	Very good	47	64%
	Good	22	30%
	Fairly good	4	5%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0%
Discussion	Very good	34	47%
	Good	31	43%
	Fairly good	6	8%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1%
Seminar on strategic issues in business statistics			
Organization	Very good	33	45%
	Good	34	47%
	Fairly good	6	8%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0%
Discussion	Very good	23	32%
	Good	38	52%
	Fairly good	9	12%
	Unsatisfactory	3	4%

Question 3: How do you evaluate the discussion under the “formal business” part of the meeting?

	Evaluation	Number of replies	%
Outcomes of the in-depth reviews by the Bureau	Very good	23	32%
	Good	44	62%
	Fairly good	4	6%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0%
In depth review of statistical dissemination and communications	Very good	29	41%
	Good	38	54%
	Fairly good	2	3%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1%
Approval of Principles on confidentiality of statistical data integration; Guidelines on migration statistics; and the Manual on victimisation	Very good	18	26%
	Good	45	66%
	Fairly good	5	7%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0%

Suggestions for improvement and other comments:General

- Very good organisation, comfortable meeting room.
- I want to congratulate the organization team, this conference has been excellent, thanks so much!
- I appreciate all the efforts staff members made for the preparation and the management.
- Session should be longer.
- One thing I would like to suggest you is the beverage because some participants stood up to gain their refreshments during the session.
- WIFI is good step forward, electricity supply can be improved.

“Formal business”

- The timing for the formal business was better, not just a half-day run as it was in the past.
- There should be more time for discussions.
- Shorter discussions at the meeting and more consultations before the meeting.
- In-depth review of selected statistical areas can be part of the seminars.
- The confidentiality principles should be discussed at a face-to-face meeting of a drafting (review) group. Going paragraph by paragraph, moving to the next one when a consensus is found. Maybe one round would be enough, because there were no major disagreements.
- The procedure of approval of documents proposed for endorsement should be improved, e.g. “Principles of confidentiality” were not properly evaluated by all countries and time for “electronic comments” was too short.
- The procedure of adopting the “Confidentiality Principles” - taking into account the problems raised by the Polish colleague, the document should have been more thoroughly reviewed before adoption.
- It would be better to go through the draft report at the end of the meeting (at the moment it is a pseudo agreement).
- Would like to discuss more the questions of international migration and to have a current methodology to measure migration.

Organisation of seminars

- The first seminar was organised in a much better way than I have seen ever before. It was more focused on discussion (within the panel and within the audience), and there was no lecturing. The topic was appropriate to Chief Statistician’s audience. The second seminar was more in line with the tradition, and in part (a small part) too technical for CES plenary.
- Seminar must focus on strategic issues for official statistical systems. Experience should illustrate broad issues. UK discussant questions approach on the first seminar worked very well.

- We should reconsider seminar format, in its three components: 1. Selection of topics - 2. Nature of presentations, discussion, participation from the floor- 3. Follow-up.
- The seminars were not very interactive.
- In the seminar sessions, there are too many papers. A limited number (4-5) of papers per session would let participants to focus more on an issue.
- Fewer topics, more controversial commenting would be good.
- There should be more room for discussion during the seminars.
- As usual, too little time for discussion but the discussion was excellent !
- More time for discussion and maybe less content.
- More time for discussion is needed.

* * * * *