

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS**

For information

Second Meeting of the 2005/2006 Bureau  
Washington, D.C. (United States), 24-25 October 2005

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda

**EVALUATION OF THE JUNE 2005 CES PLENARY SESSION**  
(Summary of replies to the evaluation questionnaires)

**Note prepared by the UNECE secretariat**

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 2005 June CES plenary session.

There were 148 participants at the meeting (excluding members of the UNECE secretariat). 69 responses to the evaluation questionnaires were received (response rate 47%).

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

<b>Content</b>	Very good	24	38 %
	Good	34	53 %
	Fairly good	6	9 %
	Unsatisfactory	0	0 %
<b>Documentation</b>	Very good	28	45 %
	Good	26	42 %
	Fairly good	7	11 %
	Unsatisfactory	1	2 %
<b>Organisation</b>	Very good	25	40 %
	Good	26	41 %
	Fairly good	10	16 %
	Unsatisfactory	2	3 %

**Question 2: Allocation of time between presentations and discussions.**

More time needed for presentations	4	6 %
More time needed for discussion	18	28 %
Good balance between presentations and discussion	42	66 %

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

<b>Formal business</b>	Useful	23	40 %
	Partly useful	34	58 %
	Not useful	1	2 %
<b>Improved data reporting</b>	Useful	46	72 %
	Partly useful	18	28 %
	Not useful	0	0 %
<b>Sustainable development</b>	Useful	28	43 %
	Partly useful	35	54 %
	Not useful	2	3 %

<b>Question 4: Duration of the meeting.</b>			
<b>Was it...</b>	Too short	1	2 %
	About right	56	86 %
	Too long	8	12 %

<b>Question 5: Are you satisfied with the proposed topics of substantive discussion for the next plenary session?</b>			
	Satisfied	47	76 %
	Partly satisfied	14	22 %
	Not satisfied	1	2 %

### **Replies to question 6: Suggestions for improvement and other comments**

#### General organization:

- Formal business should be placed at the beginning of the meeting.
- To start the meeting on Tuesday and finish on Thursday.
- Possibilities for reducing the combined time for CES/OECD meetings from 4 days to something less should be examined.

#### Organization of sessions/discussion:

- Organization of seminars should ensure more diverse range of countries involved as presenters/discussants. More time for discussion from the floor in seminars.
- Discussants might draw out key points from the papers, rather than summarise each paper. This would provide more time for discussion from the floor.
- Enforce practice in seminars that only the discussants make presentations.
- Contributors should present their papers rather than the discussants.
- More focused discussion of sustainable development, perhaps into three (not 4) sessions or a ½ day session, given the way discussion took place on this issue here.

#### Documentation:

- Improve administration concerning the presentation of documents (difficult to find/identify the presented documents on web. Which version is valid in case of revisions? Sessions? – to add the date, for example).
- Better organization of papers – produce an itemised list of documents earlier.
- Items of the agenda should be written on each document. Distribution of the documents should happen only electronically.
- Documentation for the seminar sessions was too comprehensive!
- Many papers are much too long!

#### Room:

- A better room and some water would be nice.
- Conference room inadequate.
- Better projection arrangements close to the speakers would help participants to be able to follow the discussion better.

\* \* \* \* \*