This document presents the results of the satisfaction survey on the preparation and organization of the tenth ordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. These results are accompanied by a summary of actions taken by the Secretariat to address recommendations made to improve the efficiency of meetings.
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 six sessions of the governing bodies: two sessions of the Conference of Parties (fourth and fifth sessions, June 2013 and 2015) and four 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 and tenth sessions, December 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016).

2. The satisfaction survey assesses a range of areas, 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 ordinary session of the Conference of Parties, questions specific to the exchange sessions were added. Since the tenth ordinary 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 purpose of this document is to provide Parties with an overview of all responses received, to track the general progress of participant satisfaction based on the results of the six surveys conducted, and to suggest improvements where necessary.

1. Response rate

4. As shown in the table below the response rate for the six surveys varies between 11 and 25 percent of all registered participants, with the majority of responses submitted by Parties to the Convention. The response rate for the tenth session of the Committee is by far the highest recorded to date. In particular, there has been a sharp increase in both the proportion and the absolute number of non-governmental observers participating in the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.CP</td>
<td>7.IGC</td>
<td>8.IGC</td>
<td>5.CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>46 of 305 or 15%</td>
<td>43 of 256 or 17%</td>
<td>50 of 293 or 17%</td>
<td>51 of 279 or 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parties that responded</td>
<td>35 of 46 or 76%</td>
<td>19 of 43 or 44%</td>
<td>29 of 50 or 58%</td>
<td>40 of 51 or 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of (governmental) observers that responded</td>
<td>8 of 46 or 17%</td>
<td>15 of 43 or 35%</td>
<td>14 of 50 or 28%</td>
<td>6 of 51 or 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of (non-governmental) observers that responded</td>
<td>3 of 48 or 7%</td>
<td>7 of 43 or 16%</td>
<td>7 of 50 or 14%</td>
<td>5 of 51 or 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Methodology

5. The satisfaction survey, distributed in French and in English, contains 14 questions relating to 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.

6. 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.

3. Overview of results

7. Annex I presents a table with the average score for each of the 14 questions across all six statutory meetings, as well as a total average score for each statutory meeting and a total average score for all six meetings. Annex II presents all unedited qualitative comments received through the online survey for the tenth session of the Committee.

Quantitative results

8. Overall, the 61 Parties and observers that participated in the survey for the tenth session of the Committee have given the Secretariat a rating equal to the average score for all six meetings. As regards the 14 aspects that were surveyed, the scores most frequently awarded by the respondents were “excellent” and “good”, with an average overall rating of 3.4.

9. The respondents were very satisfied with the quality of the working and information documents, with a rating of 3.7, as well as with the support they provided for informed decision-making by the Parties. With a score of 3.8, the latter category received its highest rating since the introduction of the survey, which constitutes a substantial improvement over its 3.5 average for all meetings. Similarly, the satisfaction level has remained high for the quality of the translation of working and information documents, with a score of 3.5.

10. In addition to working and information documents, an increase in the respondents’ level of satisfaction can also be noted regarding the time given to Parties to reply to the questionnaires sent by the Secretariat, whose score of 3.3 is the highest ever obtained for this category. For its part, the respondents’ rating of the quality of interpretation in the official languages of the Committee during the session is showing a linear increase, with a score of 3.6 for the tenth session of the Committee.

11. The responses received with regard to the quality of the support given to civil society by the Secretariat, which was surveyed for the first time, were also generally positive, with a score of 3.4. Respondents also submitted several constructive comments. The Secretariat takes notes of these comments and will take action to improve the support given to civil society.

12. The satisfaction level has remained stable concerning the on-time delivery of working and information documents (3.3 rating against a 3.2 average), the quality of real-time document revision during the session (3.4 rating against a 3.3 average) and quality and timeliness of Secretariat’s response to various queries pertaining to the session and the working documents (3.4 rating against a 3.4 average). For this last category, several written comments for improvement were received.

---

1 Qualitative comments received for the fourth and fifth ordinary sessions of the Conference of Parties and the seventh, eighth and ninth ordinary sessions of the Committee 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 and DCE/16/10.IGC/INF.6 respectively.
13. On the technical side, a slight improvement has been recorded with regard to the **quality of the web-cast transmission (live stream)**, with a rating of 3.1. This score nevertheless remains relatively low, which can be explained by the technical issues that certain participants faced when they tried to access the live stream (see comments in Annex II). Similarly, the rating given to the **usefulness, clarity and ease of navigation of the Convention’s website** went down from 3.3 for the ninth session of the Committee to 3.1 for its tenth session, although it is still higher than the average score across all sessions.

14. The respondents were less satisfied with the **clarity and effectiveness of the Secretariat’s communication prior to the meeting**, whose score of 3.4 was slightly lower than the 3.6 it received for the previous session. The comments provided on this matter mostly concern the preliminary draft operational guidelines on the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment.

15. Likewise, the satisfaction rate remains relatively low for the **quality of meeting time management**, whose score of 3.2 is the lowest ever given since the introduction of the survey, as well as for the **duration of the session in comparison to the number of items on the agenda**, which received a rating of 3.1 for its first inclusion in the survey. The respondents indicated that the limited time afforded to the negotiation of the preliminary draft operational guidelines on digital issues (6 hours) and its repercussions on the following agenda items was the primary cause for their dissatisfaction.

**Qualitative results and lines of action**

16. An analysis of the respondents’ qualitative comments across all statutory meetings corresponds to the quantitative ratings. While many positive comments were made on the Secretariat’s work in preparing the governing bodies’ sessions, suggestions for improvement were also offered. These recommendations and the actions taken by the Secretariat to address them are summarized below.

(a) **Improve communication prior to statutory meetings**

17. The respondents indicated the need for the Secretariat to improve its means of communication prior to statutory meetings, regarding both the conduct of the statutory meeting itself as well as the events leading up to it. They underlined that the working documents and the agenda of the meeting should be prepared as far in advance as possible, and that they should be made easily accessible in order to facilitate the participants’ planning and involvement in the meetings. In addition, the Parties expressed a specific interest in the working sessions involving civil society, and asked that documents pertaining to these sessions be made available online in the same way as statutory documents.

18. The Secretariat ensures that working and information documents are made available on the Convention’s website in accordance with the statutory deadlines set by the rules of procedures of the governing bodies (four weeks ahead of the sessions) and, to the extent possible, makes them accessible even earlier (for example, the document on the preliminary draft operational guidelines on digital issues was published three months in advance). The Secretariat sends an additional email informing the Parties and civil society organizations when working documents become available. The transmission of information to civil society organizations is particularly challenging when they have not completed the necessary steps to register in advance for the statutory meetings, given that the identity of these participants often becomes known to the Secretariat only a few days before the meeting. The Secretariat will, to the extent possible, distribute documents associated with civil society events as soon as they become available.
(b) Clarify the procedures for participation before and during statutory meetings

19. Several respondents mentioned being uncertain about some aspects of the consultations leading up to the draft operational guidelines on digital issues and during the session of the Committee in general. They expressed the wish that the Secretariat would provide more information on these matters before and during meetings. Some respondents indicated their dissatisfaction concerning the late submission of amendments to the preliminary draft operational guidelines to the Committee.

20. The procedures governing the conduct of the sessions and the submission of amendments to resolutions or decisions can be found in the respective rules of procedure of the Conference of Parties and the Committee. The Secretariat does not organize a formal training session, but provides informal working sessions on demand by electoral groups. Concerning the submission of amendments to the preliminary draft operational guidelines, the delay in presenting the consolidated document during the meeting can be partly explained by the late submission of amendments that needed to be translated and integrated into the text in both languages the morning the agenda item was scheduled to occur. This explains why it is important for the Secretariat to receive amendment proposals sufficiently in advance, and in both languages. The Secretariat will set firm deadlines for the receipt of amendments ahead of future negotiations on preliminary draft operational guidelines.

(c) Improve time management during statutory meetings

21. The duration of the session in comparison to the agenda as well as time management were raised. The respondents placed particular emphasis on the importance of not underestimating the time required to conduct discussions on complex agenda items such as the preliminary draft operational guidelines on digital issues, in addition to allowing sufficient time for thorough debates on each agenda item.

22. The Secretariat has taken note of these comments and will take them into account when preparing the agenda for future sessions. Concerning the tenth session of the Committee, although the item relating to the preliminary draft operational guidelines did require more time than originally planned, digital issues and the future content of the guidelines had been discussed by the Committee and the Conference of Parties over several years.

(d) Improve the Convention’s website

23. Finally, the respondents provided comments on the Convention’s website. The suggestions concern the technical operation of the website and the organization of the information.

24. The technical issues that hindered the use of the website before the Committee have been resolved. In addition, the Secretariat is currently reviewing the architecture of the website in order to facilitate its navigation, make its information more accessible and easier to locate and organize its contents in a more logical manner. The Secretariat is aware of the technical challenges faced in the development of the website and is committed to resolving them as they come up.
### ANNEX I

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total average score</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Quality of the Secretariat’s working and information documents</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Working and information documents provide the necessary information needed to support informed decision-making by the governing bodies</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Delivery of working and information documents on time</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Parties to the Convention are given sufficient time to respond to specific issues requested through questionnaires sent by the Secretariat</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Quality of the translation of the working and information documents</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Clarity and effectiveness of Secretariat’s communication prior to the meeting</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Usefulness, clarity and ease of navigation of the Convention website</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Quality and timeliness of response by the Secretariat to various queries pertaining to the session and the working documents</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Quality of real-time document revision during the session</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Quality of interpretation in the official languages of the meetings of the governing bodies during the session</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Quality of the web-cast transmission (live stream)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Quality of meeting time management</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Duration of sessions in comparison to the number of agenda items</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Quality of the support given to civil society by the Secretariat (eg. working sessions)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Overview of comments and suggestions regarding the tenth ordinary session of the Committee

The qualitative comments support the data generated through the survey. The respondents have expressed a level of satisfaction with the Secretariat and its preparation of the tenth ordinary session of the Committee equal to the average score for the last six meetings. A full list of the written comments received in the survey for the tenth session is provided below and is organized according to theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of meeting documents was very high, and the real-time document revision in two languages was impressively managed. Webstreaming the meeting is valuable - though if it helps save UNESCO resources, an audio-only service might be equally useful. And the Senegalese installation was excellent!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mention all the activities planned for the session on the agenda, even if they are limited.
- For the informal meeting, it would be advisable to allow for more time, because the time allotted to this meeting was insufficient.
- During the informal meeting, the speaking order was not respected. After giving the floor to a participant, the organizers gave it to another expert (Cuba) who had arrived later.

In 2015, I hadn't thought that the Secretariat could even further improve its practice in preparing the IGC sessions.

I was proven wrong! The 2016 session exceeded all expectations: The combination with hands-on artistic expressions like the film "The Idol" and the Senegalese light installation which turned UNESCO's concrete walls into life were a sheer delight. And very much needed brain food/cultural vitamins. Also, the option to start the work on the text of the Operational Guidelines on the Convention in the digital context with a tandem panel, proved to be an excellent approach. CONGRATS!

Workshop on capacity building, Raising awareness campaign for the Convention in order to make the work easier for evaluating the files. And more projects can be approved. It will be good idea if more trainers can be trained.

Excellent work (and guidance) from the Secretariat, despite the limited resources. In particular the innovative agenda, integrating first-hand experience from practitioners and experts from the cultural field, enriched the debates.

Congratulations to the Secretariat’s dynamic team. They should be afforded the possibility to strengthen their team with competent human resources, given the workload they have to accomplish.

Attention by the Secretariat is not the same for all geographical areas. There could be more equal attention for all (NGO observer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational guidelines on the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was some confusion, in our Delegation and others, about the process for finalising the operational guidelines on digital. I had not understood that the only way drafting comments could be made by Parties not members of the Committee would be in writing in advance of the meeting, or through Committee members during the meeting itself. I understand the rationale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Qualitative comments received for the fourth and fifth ordinary sessions of the Conference of Parties and the seventh, eighth and ninth ordinary sessions of the Committee 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 and DCE/16/10.IGC/INF.6, respectively.
for this, given the limitations of time during the meeting, but the process at the previous IGC had been more open, with all Parties being able to propose changes. It might have been useful to receive a letter or email of invitation to provide comments in writing (if one was sent it did not reach me), though I understand it would have been open to me to submit written comments proactively, since the draft was posted online well in advance of the meeting. The main text change we wished to propose - avoiding the phrase "digital cultural goods" in English - had already been explicitly proposed by our Delegation, and alluded to be 3 other Parties at the 9th IGC. It is partially recorded in the summary record of that meeting paragraph 129 as a preference for the phrase "digital cultural content" or "digitized cultural expressions". http://en.unesco.org/creativity/sites/creativity/files/sessions/10igc_3_summary_record_9igc_en.pdf. Fortunately a neat drafting solution was found during the meeting and the issue was resolved. But as a result of this, and the late circulation of an amended text, the discussions on 15 December were rather more frustrating than they needed to be.

On the guidelines this time probably was a mistake to wait for the consolidated document before to start the discussion. But it's true that working on a consolidated document made the work easier and smoother, even if not necessarily faster.

Review the presentation to the Committee of the suggestions made by non-governmental organizations to the "Preliminary draft operational guidelines on the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment".

It was a pity that the consolidated version including all amendment was made available too late. This delay didn't give enough time to reflect and to eventually merge proposals and to avoid repetition. Nevertheless the final overall result was good, but it was obtained through a very stressful process that put under pressure the Secretariat...

**Communication of information by the Secretariat prior to the meeting**

The information goes through the National Commission and takes a lot of time to make it to the relevant people (focal points, experts, representatives from the Ministry of Culture). It would be better to simultaneously send an email with the necessary information (dates, documents, etc.) in order to give sufficient time to study the documents and to prepare mission orders and visas.

The debate sessions preceding the Committee should be announced well in advance in order to reach local civil society actors, to interest them in the Committee’s work and the importance of the Convention.

In my opinion, the Secretariat is working very well, and has improved its methods. However, we need to have the documents, at least, 1 month before the meeting, so that, we can have time to make the consultations and to be able to participate with concrete responses.

It would have been appropriate for the Secretariat to better inform the Parties concerning the day dedicated to civil society. No information was available on UNESCO’s website regarding the goals or the agenda of this day. It would be useful to make the relevant documents (for instance the agenda, information on the trainers and the workshops) available online, just like the working and information documents prepared for the Committee.

Prompt sharing of documents to States Members of the Committee and observers.

Timetable to be ready well in advance to facilitate participation from capital

Transmit amendments presented to the Secretariat as early as possible to allow all IGC participants enough time for thorough examination (this could also be done via E-Mail to the registered participants).

As concerns the examination procedure of the draft op. guidelines during the session: prior to the debate it was not clear to all participants who may introduce amendments to the draft text respectively whose amendments will be considered in the consolidated version prepared by the Secretariat (Parties, Member to the Committee / Parties, non-Members to the Committee /
observers-NGOs). The proposed procedure should be clearly communicated in advance to avoid any misunderstandings.
Distribute the information on planned civil society sessions (date/intended topics) as early as possible through all communication channels to enable more civil society representatives to participate/contribute/prepare.

**Time management and agenda**

The quality of the work of the Secretariat in accomplishing its very task is very appreciable. If there's something which needs to be improved is to better suit the duration of sessions and number of item agendas.
Maintain your good quality until the very objectives of the Convention are attained.

By reinforcing the quality of the interpretation and improving time management, more realism regarding the number of elements put up for debate vis-à-vis the time available.

The Secretariat accomplished some remarkable work. We regretted however that the study of the preliminary draft guidelines was “underestimated” in the agenda.

The meeting schedule needs to be reviewed because the programme was too crowded. The Secretariat may have to explore avenues for States Parties to host the meetings. A situation, where there are no coffee breaks after very long sessions is not good enough.

The work accomplished by the Secretariat during this last session was remarkable. The only issue was time management within the schedule. Officially, the study of the amendments to the preliminary draft guidelines should have lasted 3 hours, but required over 6 hours. It would advisable to officially allocate it more time in the future.

**Civil society involvement**

I appreciated the Secretariat’s initiative to work more closely with civil society representatives (NGOs), namely through workshops, working session with NGOs at the beginning of the Committee’s work. In a context where State participation can be somewhat restricted due to national interests, the avenue of working with NGOs should be paid even more attention, as NGOs have more flexibility in their actions and carry the sincere wishes of civil society.
Citizens are participating more and more in the political sphere, in a direct manner, so it is also the moment for citizens to participate more, in a direct manner, to the activities of international organizations.

The working day for civil society organizations is an excellent idea. However, the list of participants should be transmitted in advance.

The relevance and the quality of the Secretariat’s work in guiding observer members from civil society deserve a special mention.
This work is remarkable and absolutely necessary.

Good luck with the next meeting.

I thought the organization was already very good, and that the team works magnificently. Maybe civil society could be contacted more often in the month before the Convention so that it can organize itself better, but this was already suggested by the Secretariat.

**Website of the Convention**

The French website of the Convention has been difficult to use for a certain time, those technical problems should be solved.

Improve the form for the submission of the periodic reports by States Parties, as mentioned during the meeting.
Concerning the website, the sections on news, events and videos are much appreciated. However, accessing some of them is sometimes complicated. It would be appropriate to facilitate this access and, mainly, to keep the videos online for an additional period of time. Furthermore, regarding live streaming, certain people encountered difficulties to launch the app and were unable to follow the panel in real time. At the next meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee, it would be important to ensure that the livestream link works and is compatible with a great number of software, to allow the people who cannot attend the meeting to follow the work related to the 2005 Convention. It would also be important to offer a French version of the #supportcreativity for French communications on social media. For instance, #appuielacréativité could be used.

It would be important to improve the structure and navigation within the online form for periodic reporting.

Survey

In this form, for questions 2, add a "not applicable" option. I had to answer two questions that did not apply to me (quality of webcast transmission – I did not watch because I was in the room, and quality of the support given to civil society – I am not part of a civil society), which skews the survey.