

GFMD Civil Society Days 2011

Evaluation Survey¹ Summary results

To take stock of the results of GFMD Civil Society Days 2011 (CSD) and to look towards 2012, all 186 civil society delegates, 45 observers, and 43 special guests were invited to fill in the online survey. In total 70 responses were received from: 53 delegates, (among them 4 moderators/rapporteurs); 5 observers; 2 special guests; and 10 uncategorized.

The evaluation was structured around 26 questions, pertaining to the following 5 elements of the GFMD Civil Society Days: (1) Program, Working and Plenary Sessions; (2) Common Space with Governments; (3) Outcomes, Impact and Follow-up; (4) Future; and (5) Organization & Participation.

In general the results of the evaluation survey were positive in tone, with many respondents expressing appreciation for the renewed format, the efforts to ensure continuity and intentions to follow-up on the conclusions of the CSD. The Common Space with governments was hailed as a great improvement, to be further built upon.

In summary, these were the most important recommendations, most frequently referred upon by respondents:

Main recommendations for improvement

- 1. On CSD format:** to adopt a format that works towards even more concrete recommendations and actions plans, including attention for what civil society itself can do. Such a format would include more preparatory work throughout the year and formulating recommendations prior to the Forum. The final CSD statement might well focus on a limited number (+/- 3) of specific outcomes and pragmatic steps forward.
- 2. On impact:** to develop clear indicators to evaluate the impact of the GFMD CSD on the work of civil society as well as governments and to make an inventory of achievements, and lessons learnt, in relation to implementing GFMD outcomes since 2007.
- 3. On working groups:** to create working groups on: (a) labour migration; (b) the future of the forum and the 2013 High level Dialogue, where possible including representatives of the private sector and governments.
- 4. On preparations and follow-up:** to strengthen and institutionalize a global network of migrant rights and development leaders, in order to better follow-up on GFMD recommendations, and prepare upcoming GFMD meetings. The network should facilitate: (a) communication; (b) (online) consultations and preparations of position papers; (c) national and regional meetings; and (d) keep track of impacts and actions.

¹ The Evaluation Survey was conducted by ICMC's GFMD Civil Society Coordinating Office. For more information about the GFMD Civil Society Days see: www.gfmdcivilsociety.org

5. **On Common Spaces:** to retain the common space model and explore alternative models for genuine dialogue between governments and civil society, for example by proposing to organize some joint workshops or roundtable sessions, and/or to include a small number of civil society representatives in the government roundtable sessions to report perspectives from the corresponding civil society session.
6. **On civil society delegates and participation:** to ensure a balance (a) between new participants, and organizations that have participated in previous forums, to both preserve continuity, and ensure new leadership; and (b) between diaspora/migrant groups working on “development” and migrants' rights advocacy groups; and to include more participants from Africa organizations and development NGO’s.
7. **On agenda:** for the agenda to integrate a deeper development focus, together with attention for migrant rights’ protection and labour mobility.

Evaluation Scores

For most questions respondents were invited to provide a grade on a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being most positive and 1 being least positive. In addition respondents were invited to provide comments. As indicated in Table 1 below, all questions were graded fairly positively with an overall average of 3.96.

Table 1. Participants’ rating of GFMD Civil Society Components

1	Online registration system	4.5
2	Welcome and Registration in Paexpo	4.45
3	Coordinating Office	4.34
4	Chair	4.34
5	Working conditions at Paexpo	4.23
6	Opening Plenary	4.2
7	Final Civil Society Statement	4.13
8	Website	4.11
9	Working Session 1.B. Migrant Workers’ Families	4.09
10	Working Session 3.B. Circular/Temporary Migration	4.08
11	Pre-event Information	4.04
12	Preparatory Materials	3.97
13	Overall Civil Society Program	3.95
14	Working Session 1.A. Rights-based Labour Migration Policies	3.85
15	Working Session 2.A. Access to Protection for Migrants Workers with Irregular Status	3.82
16	Common Space	3.82
17	Cultural evening	3.79
18	Working Session 4.B. Diaspora, Employment and Development	3.71
19	Final panel discussion and debate	3.71
20	Working Session 3.A. Labour Matching	3.63
21	Final Plenary - Peter Sutherland	3.58
22	2.B. The “Business” of Irregular Migration	3.5
23	4.A. (Co-)Development for Decent Jobs “at Home”	3.35
	Overall Average	3.96

Part I: Program, Working and Plenary Sessions²

<p>1. Overall Civil Society Program <i>Taking Action on Labour Migration, Development and the Protection of the Migrant Workers and their Families - What is your overall evaluation of the GFMD Civil Society Program 2011?</i></p>	<p>Grade 3.95</p>
<p>2. Preparatory Materials What did you think about the preparatory materials that were distributed, in particular the background notes and guiding questions, as well as the overview of past recommendations?</p>	<p>Grade 3.97</p>

The 28 comments to this question on *Preparatory Materials* were largely positive, expressing appreciation for the availability of background notes and questions in three languages, and the particular usefulness of the notes and questions in “*focusing and directing our thoughts*”. One respondent found the documents too long, and distributed too little in advance.

Respondents seemed to approve of the “*innovative*” approach to include a consolidated overview of past recommendations made by civil society and recommended to keep this for future years.

Some suggestions for improvements were made including:

- ⇒ To make an overview of “*where action was taken and where action has been lacking*” and to develop “*clear indicators to evaluate the impact of Civil society on its own work and the government work*”.
- ⇒ For future years to also include an overview of governments’ GFMD recommendations, in addition to the overview of civil society recommendations.

<p>3. Opening Plenary and Discussion Key Agents of Change (Sharan Burrow, Oscar Chacon, Göran Hultin, Gloria de Pascual) What did you think of the opening plenary?</p>	<p>Grade 4.20</p>
--	-----------------------

35 respondents provided comments. On the positive side many respondents found the opening plenary “*inspiring*”, “*provocative*”, “*enriching*” and other such qualifications and that it “*set the right tone*” for the rest of the civil society days. However one respondent said that the opening session should have had a “*more welcome spirit*” and several respondents indicated that they would have wanted more time for interventions from the floor and asked for better time management for the future.

In general the line-up of speakers “*representing diverse backgrounds*” was appreciated. Above all Sharan Burrow’s intervention impressed many respondents. Some respondents also expressed delight about including a speaker from the private sector, and from a diaspora community. Although respondents also appreciated ILO’s presence in the opening panel, they seem to have expected more engagement and a stronger positioning from ILO’s side.

Suggestion for improvement:

- ⇒ To spend some time on outlining the themes, methodology and objectives of the programme, and to put this up front during the opening session.

² The CSD program 2011 can be downloaded from: www.gfmdcivilsociety.org

		Grade
4. Working Sessions A	1.A. Rights-based Labour Migration Policies	3.85
	2.A. Access to Protection for Migrants Workers with Irregular Status	3.82
	3.A. Labour Matching	3.63
	4.A. (Co-)Development for Decent Jobs “at Home”	3.35
5. Working Sessions B	1.B. Migrant Workers’ Families	4.09
	2.B. The “Business” of Irregular Migration	3.50
	3.B. Circular/Temporary Migration	3.63
	4.B. Diaspora, Employment and Development	3.71

All working sessions received some positive and some critical comments (57 comments were made in total). In general respondents seem to have appreciated the methodology used for the sessions, including the expanded length of the session (3 hours), the preparatory questions, the introductory presentations by panelists and the (co)moderators for the various sessions. *“The system of co-moderating worked very well, as it gave the moderators a chance to work together and ensured balance of perspectives”*. For some panels it was suggested to include less academics and more migrants, and to be aware to keep a gender balance.

Other respondents voiced some reservations with regards to some moderators and rapporteurs. Quite a number of respondents asked for even longer working sessions, and for more time for discussion, perhaps spending less time on panel presentations. Two respondents suggested working in even smaller groups (less than 50). One respondent noted that the themes of the working groups were still rather broad and that the methodology was too much focussed on reaching agreement on recommendations, and thus did not allow space for a genuine discussion: another respondent actually said that the methodology should work towards *“more focussed and specific recommendations”*. Two respondents criticized participants for speaking too much out of self-interest and not focussing on the theme and questions at hand. Most critical remarks were made towards the reporting process, in particular with regards to the rapporteurs not having enough time to prepare the report back and reports-back not adequately reflecting what was discussed.

Some improvements suggestions made:

- ⇒ Within the working groups to break up into even smaller groups to enable more direct interaction between delegates
- ⇒ To have discussions and formulate recommendations *prior* to the Forum

(Several other comments were made on the themes discussed during the Working Sessions – these comments have been integrated under question 15 on themes)

6. Final Plenary (Part 1) – the Future of the Forum and the Road towards 2013 <i>(Session with Peter Sutherland by video conference)</i>	Grade
What did you think about the video conference with Peter Sutherland?	3.58
7. Final Plenary (Part 2) panel discussion and debate <i>(Thomas Stelzer, Sergio Marchi, Kathleen Newland, Colin Rajah)</i>	Grade
What did you think about the final panel discussion and plenary debate?	3.71

The twin sessions were both generally appreciated by respondents (20 comments in total), qualifying the sessions as *“very useful”*, *“very interesting”* and *“informative”*. It was *“very good to simply have had such discussions”*. Two respondents would have like to see more focus on which concrete actions and steps civil society could and should take in the future. A few respondents expressed disappointment on *“the lack of vision”*, the *“opposition of returning the Forum to the UN”* and the *“GMG-bashing”* by civil society.

Although it was unfortunate that Peter Sutherland could not be present in the room, the video hook-up worked well. Respondents appreciated that he could be asked (and then answered) direct questions, and felt that this was well prepared from civil society’s side, although one respondent felt that more guidance should have been given on the type of questions that could have been asked.

The various panellists were evaluated with mixed results. The push for action by several panellists was appreciated by several respondents, but the harsh tone of some panellists on the one hand and the weak stance by others, were not appreciated by two respondents. Two other respondents called for “new voices” in the M&D debate, and putting some more representative civil society speakers on the panel.

Suggestion:

⇒ For future years efforts should be made to further institutionalize relations with Peter Sutherland, as a civil society “partner”.

<p>8. Bilateral Meetings Did you have a bilateral meeting with a/your government before or during the GFMD?</p>
--

22 respondents indicated that they had a bilateral meeting. The following 11 countries were mentioned: Brazil, Canada, UAE, Mali, Nepal, Netherlands, Philippines, Switzerland, Thailand and USA. Most of these meetings were evaluated as useful and frank discussions and a great opportunity to get to know each other. Respondents said that three governments indicated to arrange follow up meetings after the GFMD with civil society and one government delegation agreed with their civil society delegation “to pursue commonly identified priorities” and to together assess the relevance of the GFMD on national level for both government and civil society.

(For further comments on bilateral meetings, see question 16 on format)

Part II: Common Space with Governments

<p>9. Common Space - “Looking at the Big Picture” – Demographics, Youth (Un-) Employment, Development and Migration” What is your evaluation of this year’s Common Space format and theme?</p>	<p>Grade 3.82</p>
---	-----------------------

The 29 comments provided by respondents were almost equally split, with slightly more positive comments than critical reflections.

On the positive side respondents used many superlatives and qualifications such as: “very good”, “fantastic to witness as an experience”, “innovate”, “excellent”, “highlight of the entire event” and so on. Several respondents in particular expressed appreciation about the format and the theme discussed. Three respondents specifically commended the big-picture-presentation, and five respondents were very positive about the “professional” moderator. Yet three other respondents found the moderator too “dominant” and “hectic” and would have liked her to give more time to interventions from the floor and discussion among the panelists.

More generally speaking, many respondents indicated that although the format of interaction between government and civil society representatives has improved over the years, the current format does not lend itself to genuine and meaningful dialogue, because the group is too big and governments and civil society are too much pitted against each other. Also the theme could have been more focused. Some respondents expressed disappointment about the non-participation of some governments. Two respondents found the common space “just a show”. Several respondents suggested a more informal structure for dialogue. In particular the following suggestion was made:

- ⇒ In addition to an introductory plenary exchange between civil society and governments, options should be explored to involve some civil society representatives in the government roundtables.

(In addition question 16 on format also includes a number of suggestions on Common Space)

10. Statement	
What do you think of the final statement of the civil society days that was presented to governments on December 1?	Grade 4.13

Respondents (32 in total) greeted the statement and its delivery with great enthusiasm, in wordings such as: *“delivery was fantastic”, “perfect presentation”, “conveying the main messages in a rhetorically brilliant manner”, “very adequately conveyed the outcomes of the civil society days in a very approachable way to governments”* and so on. Yet many respondents also felt that the statement was *“too long”* and *“not sharp enough”* and that it could have been a *“bit more succinct and precise for clearer take away”* and some asked the question what the *“impact”* is of the statement. Several respondents made the suggestion:

- ⇒ For the statement to focus on a limited number (+/- 3) of specific outcomes and pragmatic steps forward.

Part III: Outcomes, Impact and Follow-up

11. You
What do you take away from the GFMD Civil Society Days that matters for your daily work?
12. Implementation and follow-up by you
Do you have any thoughts on following up on this year’s GFMD Civil Society outcomes and recommendations, whether for your own organization, in partnership with other civil society organizations and/or with governments? Please describe:

The answers to question 11 and 12 were along similar lines and thus have been combined. Many of the responses (98 in total) to these questions indicated to concretely follow-up on the new knowledge and networks acquired during the CSD, as well as on the recommendations made in the statement. Some mentioned specific themes for follow up, such as temporary/circular migration, domestic migrant workers, and co-development.

Most of the answers received to question 11 pertained to the value of networking and knowledge sharing for participants of the GFMD Civil Society Days. The majority of answers included reference to notions and phrases such as: *“fruitful contacts with others organisations and migrant leaders”, “important networking”,* learning from and sharing *“experiences”, “knowledge”* and *“best practices”*. Respondents indicated to take away from the CSD *“passion”, “inspiration”* and *“useful ideas”* and one respondent said the GFMD *“totally changed my perspective”*. More specifically several respondents said to have gained a better understanding of several issues and themes including: *“international labour’s view on migration”; “problems faced by migrant workers in the world”;* more generally *“the multidimensional complexity of migration”;* and *“global trends that impact my work at a regional and national level”*.

In terms of follow-up, a large number of responses (39 in total) signalled that they would use the results of the GFMD in follow up actions, research and advocacy. Several said they would share the statement within their own organizations and networks, and draw attention to the GFMD CSD outcomes through newsletters and network meetings. Two respondents said they would use the outcomes to advocate within their own organization and programme to mainstream migration into development. Another groups of responses indicated to already have planned specific meetings that will look at various aspects of the Global Forum, including: two academic-civil society meetings on

“the place of women in migration and development” and on *“Labour Rights as Human Rights”*; a global meeting focussing on the role of *businesses and local authorities*; and participation in the brainstorm meeting held by the 2012 GFMD Chair in January in Mauritius. Another 4 organizations indicated that they would use the results of the GFMD in future (academic) research and writing.

Out of the responses, 13 specifically focussed on lobbying and following up with national governments and towards the ILO. Several respondents referred to a follow up process that has been agreed upon with the government of the Philippines to look at the implementation of GFMD recommendations. Some others also indicated to already have planned consultation meetings with their governments, whereas others said to continue lobbying their government and parliamentarians, for example for the ratification of ILO Convention on Domestic Workers. Concretely one respondent indicated to have *“initiated a civil society committee to help us tackle issues from home using knowledge we got from previous GFMDs.”*

Concretely two suggestions were made for future GFMD civil society organizing:

- ⇒ To make sharing experiences of practices during the CSD even stronger, by showcasing *“successful”* migration & development projects.
- ⇒ To establish a working group with representatives of the private sector (including intermediary organizations), civil society and governments to explore the future of labour migration to prepare for GFMD 2012 and the HLD 2013.

(Several other comments were made relating to the themes discussed; these answers have been integrated with the answers to question 15 on themes. Some other comments related more generally to ‘implementation and assessment’ have been added to question 14 on process)

13. Impact and follow-up

What do you think is the impact of the GFMD civil society days on the ground and what follow-up actions would you like to see materializing the coming year?

Almost all of the 48 responses to this question also related to question 14 on the process towards the next GFMD and question 16 on the format of the CSD, and as such have been integrated there. One concrete follow-up action was mentioned (that does not fit with Q.14 or Q.16): several respondents called for increased ratifications and rights protection for migrant workers and joint advocacy campaigns hereto, in particular with regards to the ILO Convention on Domestic Workers.

Part IV: Future CSD organizing

14. Process

What would you like to see happen between now and next years’ GFMD Civil Society Days in Mauritius (in terms of preparations, consultations, actions, etc)?

Combining the responses from question 11, 13 and 14 relevant to this question, some 80 responses centred on the following 5 areas:

1. Communication and networking: quite a number of responses again referred to the important *“networking”* value of the GFMD CSD (see also Q 11/12) *“between organisations across borders and across types of organisations”* and several responses pleaded for further deepening, expanding and institutionalizing this network, making use of existing online networking tools *“in order to promote the exchange of information and practices in the field of migration and development: news, actions, best practices, guidelines - and diffusing the civil society recommendations”*, and *“to organize for follow-up actions”* throughout the year. Several responses also asked for regular updates and information on developments including on upcoming meetings and on the government agenda.

2. Consultations and preparations: In addition to the value of networking, several responses also called for continued consultation, like was done in 2011, on themes for next year's GFMD Civil Society Days. Some responses also asked for more work on position papers and recommendations during the year, so that the final document of the CSD would be the conclusion of the year work. In calling for consultations, several groups were specifically mentioned to be consulted with: civil society in Mauritius, migrant communities, African civil society organisations and scholars, development NGOs and trade unions.

3. National and regional processes: the largest number of comments (both for question 13 and 14) made reference to better preparatory and follow-up mechanisms, particularly through national and regional meetings and processes, that could in turn feed into the annual GFMD meeting, as well as the HLD meeting in 2013. The national/regional meetings could include dialogue with governments and local authorities. Some suggestions were made to create dedicated national and regional commissions, which could select one or several representatives to represent the commission at the GFMD and spear-head implementation and follow-up. Another suggestion was made for regional meetings to all adopt a similar agenda, so that their conclusions can feed into the global agenda. One specific suggestion was made to include civil society organization working on migration and development "*in the work of UNITED NATIONS Country Teams resulting in the inclusion of migration issues in the respective Development Plans*".

4. Review and impact assessment - About a dozen responses called for a reflection and review of "*existing recommendations made between 2005-2011, to see what worked and why, as well as what did not work and why*". One response specifically asked whether "*national GFMD CSD platforms can start making an inventory of their achievements, and lessons learnt, in relation to implementing GFMD outcomes since 2007? How have they taken forward GFMD recommendations? What have they learnt? What are their recommendations for the post-2013 era?*" Another response suggested for future years that participants make specific commitments to actions, which can then be reviewed the year after. One specific recommendation was made to transform the recommendations from the statement into a "*checklist*", to be used for the GFMD CSD 2012.

5. Links with governments and the UN – A smaller number of responses called for stronger links between the government agenda and preparatory process and preparations by civil society. Suggestions were made such as shared national workshops, shared agendas, consultations and a workgroup. A suggestion was also made to forge a more structural link with the UN and with Peter Sutherland. (see also question 16 on format)

In sum, the following recommendations can be formulated:

- ⇒ To strengthen and institutionalize the "*global network of migrant rights and development leaders*", in order to be better able to follow-up on GFMD recommendations, and prepare upcoming GFMD meetings. The network should facilitate: (a) communication; (b) (online) consultations and preparations of position papers; (c) national and regional meetings; and (d) keep track of impacts and actions.
- ⇒ To create a working group on: (a) labour migration; (b) the future of the forum and the 2013 High-Level Dialogue.
- ⇒ To make an inventory of achievements and lessons learnt, in relation to implementing GFMD outcomes since 2007.

15. Themes

Picking up from the discussions during this year's Civil Society Days, what themes and focus areas would you like to see on the (civil society) agenda for GFMD 2012?

Throughout the evaluation form respondents indicated preferences for several thematic focus areas, largely following from themes that have been on the agenda in previous GFMD years, but also making some suggestions for new focus areas. One general suggestion was made to focus on exactly

the same themes as in 2011, and to look more closely at follow-up and implementation. One other suggestion was made to align the thematic agenda more closely with the government agenda. About 10 themes were mentioned more than once, with an overwhelming majority focussing on a deeper development focus, and sustained attention for rights protection. The 10 themes suggested are:

1. **(Co-)Development:** Many proposed to retain the theme *“Investing in Development Alternatives to Migration”*, looking at the role of diaspora and co-development, and beyond at employment opportunities at home, also for return migrants and other programs that expand economic and social opportunities at home.
2. **Human rights of migrants and families:** An equal number of suggestions proposed to retain the theme: *“Rights-based Policy-making for the Benefit of Migrant Workers and Families”* and to integrate a *“right based approach to migration and development”* throughout the entire agenda. Some specific ‘rights’-issues were referred upon, such as equal access to social services and pathways to citizenship, the protection of labour rights and trade unionism, women migrants in the Gulf, ratification of conventions, and *“working models of compliance, monitoring and enforcement measures to protect migrant workers rights”*. Also quite a number of responses specifically referred to the protection of irregular migrants, regularization and the prevention of detention and deportation.
3. **Migrant/diaspora empowerment:** Several suggestions called for a more *“migrant-centred”* approach, focusing on the competences, capacities and voice of migrants to be an *“actor of change”* and engage in development process in host and home countries.
4. **Labour mobility:** Several suggestions were made pertaining to various aspects of global labour mobility, including a continued focus on circular/temporary migration programs for different skills levels and a deepened focus on recruitment practices.
5. **Children and Family:** About five suggestions focussed on protection, capacities and competences of young migrants and migrant children, whether unaccompanied or not. Family unity was also mentioned as a theme.
6. **Gender:** About four suggestions were made to include a gender focus in the agenda, and focus on women in domestic work, and to revisit the gender *“check-list”* developed for GFMD 2010.
7. **Global and Regional Governance:** Three concrete suggestions were made to unpack the concept of *“global migration governance”*, to start exploring what realistic options there are. A suggestion was made to look at other fields of governance for inspiration, and to move the focus to regional governance, looking at the *“potential role (and responsibilities) of regional bodies such as MERCOSUR, ASEAN etc.”*
8. **Climate/Environment:** Three responses referred to climate and environmental induced displacement.
9. **Society and national workers:** another three comments suggest looking at the link and tensions between migrant workers and the local population.
10. **Return and reintegration:** Three responses referred to reintegration, the rights of returnees and job creation for returning migrants.

Various other themes were mentioned once: Disability, Health, Human smuggling, ILO multilateral framework, Leadership, Mixed migration, Trade, and South-South migration.

In sum the respondents to the evaluation seems to suggest:

- ⇒ For the agenda to integrate a deeper development focus, and sustained attention for migrant rights’ protection.

16. Format

What would like to see change in future GFMD civil society meetings? How would you like to see interactions with governments?

Combining the comments respondents made under question 13, together with this question, the 50 responses focussed on the following 5 areas:

1. Towards action: A substantial number of respondents suggested moving towards a format that lends itself better for even more concrete discussions, more specific recommendations, and commitments to what civil society can do together on the ground, *“rather than merely presenting a list of demands to governments”*. Following from some proposals made under question 14 on preparations, some also suggested to already prepare recommendations and actions plans prior to the GFMD, for example through regional meetings and working groups. Lastly a suggestion was made to schedule all the working sessions on day 1, and meet in plenary on day 2 to finalize recommendations.

2. National, bilateral and regional meetings: In addition to the suggestions made for preparatory meetings on national and regional levels, respondents also suggested to better use the CSD itself to arrange bilateral appointments between governments and civil society (like in 2011 – see question 9) and/or to have regional meetings *“between a selection of governments and civil society organizations”*.

3. On Common Space(s): Many respondents indicated to have appreciated the common space model as an important improvement from previous years and suggested to retain it, while also exploring alternative models that would lend itself better for true dialogue (see also suggestions under question 9. on Common Space). Several respondents suggested creating space for some joint workshops or roundtable sessions, possibly with some joint preparations. This could involve a smaller selected group of civil society representatives and could focus on *“showcasing how civil society and governments cooperate at local, national, and regional levels has achieved improvements in legislation, service delivery, public discourse or the like”*. Some made the concrete suggestion to suggest to governments to invite a smaller number of civil society representatives (2-3) to report back from the corresponding civil society session to the equivalent governmental session (e.g. engaging the CSD session moderators or chosen civil society participants)

4. Involvement of governments in civil society days: In addition to the suggestions made to improve the common space, and civil society roles in the government days, some also suggested that governments and international organizations could also be invited as speakers during the CSD to report back on action undertaken in the past year. A general comment was made that civil society should be more aware of the outcomes of the governmental days.

5. New format: Some more fundamental suggestions were to move towards a completely different format for the GFMD – for example suggesting to have a shared civil society and government agenda, that each would discuss in their own separate sessions, before meetings in shared sessions, such as was done with the Global Commission on International Migration in 2003-2005 consultations. Such an approach could involve extending the GFMD to encompass 3 days for both civil society and governments.

In sum these were the main recommendations made for the CSD:

- ⇒ To adopt a format that works towards even more concrete recommendations and action plans, including attention for what civil society itself can do. Such a format would include more preparatory work throughout the year.
- ⇒ To retain the common space model and explore alternative models for genuine dialogue between governments and civil society, for example, by organizing some joint workshops or roundtable sessions, and to include a smaller number of civil society representatives (2-3) in the government roundtable sessions to report back from the corresponding civil society session.

Part IV: Organization & Participation

17. Online registration system What did you think of the online registration system?	Grade 4.5
--	--------------

The online registration was given the highest rating, and the 15 comments received were very positive, including comments such as: “*Easy to handle*”, “*efficient*”, “*very user-friendly*” and “*should be maintained*”. As a point for improvement some suggested to make the forms shorter.

18. Pre-event Information Was the content of the pre-event e-mails that were sent to you useful?	Grade 4.04
--	---------------

The 17 comments received were overall quite positive, commending the information received, though some suggested providing certain information earlier.

19. Website To what extent was the website (www.gfmdcivilsociety.org) useful for your preparation	Grade 4.11
---	---------------

Most of the 17 responses commended the website, as a useful tool for practical and substantial information. Some suggestions were made to improve the website:

- ⇒ Translate the website into French.
- ⇒ Provide a space on the website where civil society organization can share news and activities relevant to the GFMD.
- ⇒ Use the website to share updates during the CSD.

20. Welcome and Registration in Palexpo What did you think of the welcome and registration in Palexpo?	Grade 4.45
--	---------------

The welcome and registration desk were regarded very positively and complimented as “*smooth*”, “*excellent*”, “*efficient*” and “*warm welcome*” and “*helpful people*”.

21. Working conditions at Palexpo (<i>information desk, business centre, internet, facilities, etc.</i>) What did you think of the working conditions at Palexpo?	Grade 4.23
---	---------------

The 17 respondents were mostly very positive, calling the venue “*comfortable*” and with “*plenty of space available*”. A specific compliment was made for the translators. Two suggestions were made to provide for more electricity plugs, and about 5 respondents said that it would have been nice to have a venue closer to the city and to involve more local population.

22. Communication and support from the Coordinating Office of the GFMD Civil Society Days What did you think of the support from the Coordinating Office?	Grade 4.34
---	---------------

Only 13 comments were made in response to this question, most positive, in particular congratulating the organization on good supporting services, fast answers and the “*great idea to involve young and dedicated volunteers*”. However some criticism was received by 4 respondents on the reimbursement process by “*post-conference bank transfer*”, as some organizations do not have the capacity to pre-finance, and have to pay interest/fees over their delayed payments. Also the amount offered to participants did not cover the full costs of participation.

23. Cultural evening (29th November) What did you think of the cultural evening?	Grade 3.79
--	---------------

Out of the 22 comments 9 indicated not to have been able to attend the cultural evening – two of these comments explained that they felt the civil society days were so full, that participants were too exhausted to attend the cultural program. One other comment also suggested the cultural program should start and end earlier to give participants some rest. Some of the other comments commended the cultural evening for the “*great performances*” and the “*cultural mix*”. Suggestions were made to involve more countries in the cultural performances and to provide space for “*spontaneous performances*”.

24. Chair What did you think about this year’s civil society Chair?	Grade 4.34
---	---------------

The 17 respondents that replied to this question were very positive and thankful towards the Chair, congratulating him for an excellent job. In particular it was appreciated that the Chair was someone from civil society itself, involved since the beginning in the GFMD process. One question was raised what exactly the role of the chair is. One suggestion was made:

- ⇒ To consider an African representative as Chair for next year

25. What did you think about the number and composition of participants (delegates and observers) to the Civil Society Days?

The 44 comments were overall quite positive with regards to the number and composition of participants, indicating that there was a “*good balanced representation with regards to gender, regions, and sectors*”. Several respondents specifically referred to the presence and contribution of a higher number of migrant and diaspora organizations (as compared to previous years) and 2 respondents indicated to appreciate the smaller size of the meeting. On the other hand 5 respondents would have like to see a higher number of participants. Three respondents suggested that there should be a better balance between diaspora/migrant groups working on “*development*” and migrants’ rights advocacy groups, feeling that the latter sometimes dominate the discussions.

Concretely it was suggested to:

- ⇒ To ensure a balance between new participants, and organizations that have participated in previous forums, to preserve continuity, and ensure new leadership; and between diaspora/migrant groups working on “*development*” and migrants’ rights advocacy groups.
- ⇒ To include more participants from: Africa organizations, development NGO’s and labour unions.

26. Other Feedback

In the category “*other feedback*” respondents largely restated and emphasized some points raised earlier in the evaluation, such as improving the reimbursement system, ensuring balanced participation, ensure quality moderators, speakers and rapporteurs and focus on preparatory and follow up work. These answers have been integrated throughout the rest of the evaluation form. One “*new*” response zoomed in on the parallel PGA meeting, saying “*it would have been better to organize the PGA prior to the CSD as was the case in Mexico*”.

Otherwise, most respondents to this question expressed appreciation and congratulation to the organizers, amongst other things congratulating ICMC and the team for “*an outstanding job*” under “*difficult circumstances*”, with only a “*limited budget*” and calling the CSD a “*BIG SUCCESS*”.