

CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

For information

Second Meeting of the 2007/2008 Bureau
Helsinki (Finland), 18-19 October 2007

Item 10 of the Provisional
Agenda

EVALUATION OF THE JUNE 2007 CES PLENARY SESSION
(Summary of replies to the evaluation questionnaires)

Note prepared by the UNECE secretariat

1. As a rule, all participants to 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 2007 June CES plenary session.
2. There were 153 participants at the meeting (excluding members of the UNECE secretariat). 69 responses to the evaluation questionnaires were received (response rate 45%).

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

		Number of replies	%
Content	Very good	24	36%
	Good	37	55%
	Fairly good	6	9%
	Unsatisfactory	0	0%
Documentation	Very good	30	45%
	Good	28	42%
	Fairly good	8	12%
	Unsatisfactory	1	1%
Organisation	Very good	34	52%
	Good	23	35%
	Fairly good	6	9%
	Unsatisfactory	2	3%

Question 2: Allocation of time between presentations and discussions.

More time needed for presentations	7	10%
More time needed for discussion	11	15%
Good balance between presentations and discussion	55	75%

Question 3: Do you consider the topics discussed useful for your future work?

Formal business	Very useful	32	54%
	Partly useful	25	42%
	Not useful	2	3%
Seminar on increasing efficiency and productivity	Very useful	46	70%
	Partly useful	20	30%
	Not useful	0	0%
Seminar on measuring capital	Very useful	28	42%
	Partly useful	34	52%
	Not useful	4	6%
Coordination of international statistical work	Very useful	39	63%
	Partly useful	21	34%
	Not useful	2	3%
Progress reports	Very useful	33	52%
	Partly useful	29	46%
	Not useful	1	2%

Suggestions for improvement and other comments

General:

- Good leadership by Chairperson.
- It would be desirable to hold the CES meetings on Tuesday-Thursday.
- Water is still appreciated.
- Translation to Russian could be more qualified.

Organization:

- Meeting room was very good!
- The negotiation process at the Pregny Gate on initial arrival for the conference is extremely inefficient and annoying and needs to be fixed.
- Serious complaint: security clearance for badges is a complete mess. It is not acceptable that delegates are kept waiting for hours outside to receive their badges!

Documentation:

- The papers should be put on the website earlier in order to allow time for preparation.
- The documents arrived rather late.
- Strange UNECE paper on population statistics.

Seminars:

- More opportunity for floor discussion during seminars.
- Presentations to be made by heads of NSIs, not from national experts.
- Need for presentation of papers by the authors.
- Suggestion: there is an urgent need to bring more countries into the discussion, partly by restraining the presently most forward ones, partly by requesting now «silent»

- countries to write papers and finally by selecting topics that are likely to encourage general discussion.
- There is a need for more detailed explanations about practice at the developed statistical offices in relation to the discussed questions.
 - Shorten the seminars, whole meeting, to max 1.5 day. The seminars should also be more focused. The papers cover areas too diverse, resulting in unfocused discussion.
 - It seems awkward to have a chair for a seminar session who is separate from the session organiser.
 - Countries are at different stages in their understanding and appreciation of issues like capital measurement.
 - Would it be better to organise sessions by:
 - tutorial of key concepts;
 - paper by a leading country;
 - structured discussion of issues for NSOs?

* * * * *