

*Global Forum on Migration and Development
Civil Society Programme 2012*

**Evaluation Survey
Results**

Results Evaluation Survey

GFMD Civil Society Days 2012¹

Introduction

The sixth Civil Society Days of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) were organized in Mauritius on 19 and 20 November, just prior to the GFMD Government Summit on 21 and 22 November 2012. Following the meetings, all participants of the Civil Society Days 2012 were invited to fill out an online survey and/or provide feedback by e-mail. In total 42 responses were received from: 39 delegates, (among them 17 speakers/moderators/rapporteurs); 1 observer and 2 uncategorized.

The evaluation was structured around 32 questions, pertaining to the following 5 elements of the GFMD Civil Society Days: (1) Programme, Working and Plenary Sessions; (2) Interaction and Common Space with Governments; (3) Outcomes, Impact and Follow-up; (4) Future; and (5) Organization & Participation.

Except that the number of respondents was lower than last year (70 responses were received in 2011), the results of the 2012 survey were very similar to the 2011 results, with almost the same overall rating: 3.97 this year, compared to 3.96 last year (on a 1 to 5 satisfaction scale). Overall the comments provided by respondents were positive and constructive in nature, with respondents in particular expressing satisfaction with the focus on operationalizing and setting benchmarks, with the involvement of many African stakeholders and with the Common Space format of break-out sessions.

Key Recommendations

In summary, these were the most important or most innovative recommendations for future organizing:

- 1. On interactions with governments:** to have more **joint preparations** and **joint presentations** between governments, civil society and private sector on best practices/examples to be showcased GFMD meetings; to **link up selected civil society delegates with the national government delegation** of their country prior to the Forum; and to provide more time for dynamic exchange in break-out groups between governments and civil society, preferably in **a full day of interactions**, which also allows for more informal exchanges.

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

2. **On format of the Civil Society Days:** to provide more space and time for strategizing civil society actions in between GFMDs and for networking, e.g. by introducing a civil society marketplace.
3. **On preparations and follow up:** to ensure better mechanisms for the preparation of and follow up to GFMD recommendations by further organizing the global civil society network into thematic working groups, tasked with identifying opportunities and issues that need pursuing, organizing thematic meetings and preparing thematic briefing paper. The network should also be organized regionally and nationally, with consultations meetings among civil society and with governments to discuss how recommendations of previous GFMDs can be implemented and monitored regionally and nationally and to look at key priorities and inputs for the upcoming GFMD.
4. **On outcomes and impact:** to invest in better defining what civil society's expectations are with regards to impact and outcomes of the Civil Society Days; to introduce a consultation process prior to the GFMD to start formulating key recommendations and benchmarks; and to ensure the Civil Society Days Chair(s) come(s) on board early in the process.
5. **On agenda and themes:** to maintain the focus on operationalizing in the next years, and to work on further specifying the benchmarks and monitoring mechanisms. The agenda should keep a focus on:
 - a. Labour mobility, decent work and recruitment
 - b. Protecting and promoting the rights of migrants, migrant workers and their families
 - c. Human security and migrants in distress
 - d. Migrants and diaspora in development
 - e. Migration and the post-2015 development framework
6. **On participation in the Civil Society Days:** to ensure diversity and quality by:
 - a. Expanding the network and ensuring global coverage, investing in particular in strengthening participation from the Middle East, Central and Eastern Europe and Latin America.
 - b. Striking a balance between an open call for applications and targeted invitations and nominations
 - c. Ensuring all sectors of civil society are represented, including making a specific effort to involve more private sector representatives and civil society organizations working with companies, investors, in fair-trade and on corporate social responsibility.
 - d. Ensuring timely funding support for participants, in particular from lower income countries and from migrant and diaspora communities

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 3.97. For each of the question respondents were also invited to share any comments. The sections below provide a short analysis of these comments for each of the questions.

Table 1. Participants' rating of GFMD Civil Society Components

1.	Pre-event information	4.51
2.	Coordinating Office	4.48
3.	Transportation	4.36
4.	Preparatory materials	4.27
5.	Online registration system	4.31
6.	Website	4.28
7.	Opening Plenary	4.25
8.	Co-Chairs	4.14
9.	Working Session 1.A. Regulating and Monitoring Recruitment, Placement and Employment Practices	4.13
10.	Conference Venue	4.06
11.	Inspiration Session – “Migration & Development Goals”	4.00
12.	Common Space break-out session 2. Common ground and partnerships to protect migrants in distress	4.00
13.	Civil Society Statement	3.96
14.	Concluding Debate	3.93
15.	Working Session 3.B. Protecting Migrants in Dire Humanitarian Situations	3.92
16.	Working Session 1.B. Improving Jobs, Skills and Education Matching	3.88
17.	Cultural evening	3.88
18.	Common Space Break-out session 3. Labour mobility and skills development for inclusive growth and jobs	3.87
19.	Future Session	3.84
20.	Overall Civil Society Program	3.76
21.	Final Plenary	3.75
22.	2.B. Rights-based Development Solutions and Migration	3.75
23.	Working Session 3.A. Protecting Vulnerable Migrant Workers	3.71
24.	Common Space Plenary	3.70
25.	Common Space break-out session 1. Diaspora alliances and partnerships for development	3.60
26.	Working Session 2.A. Engaging Diaspora as Entrepreneurs, Social Investors and Policy Advocates	3.47
Overall Average		3.97

Part I: Programme, Working and Plenary Sessions²

1. Overall Civil Society Programme - *Operationalizing Human Development and Protection in International Migration*.

What is your overall evaluation of the GFMD Civil Society Programme 2012?

Grade

3.76

Overall the 2012 GFMD Civil Society Programme was evaluated positively, with many of the 20 comments qualifying the programme as “*very good*”, “*enriching*”, “*excellent from every perspective*” and as an “*educative and accomplished event*”. Quite a number of comments emphasized the improvements made compared to previous GFMD’s, and someone noted “*we are getting better and better*”. In particular the focus on operationalizing and concrete recommendations was appreciated, as well as the time distribution, and the scheduling of fewer break-out sessions.

However with regards to time allocations there were also a few responses suggesting more free time to “*share information and to strategize properly*”. Some comments also suggested some improvements in the level of participation (see question 30.) and the final statement (see question 13). One respondent suggested that “*regional and national advocacy strategies and engagement on the ground should be given equal attention*”.

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 GFMD civil society recommendations, and the analysis of links with government GFMD recommendations?

Grade

4.27

The comments about the *Preparatory Materials* were largely positive, indicating that the documents prepared for the event were “*very helpful*”, “*of good quality*”, “*top notch*” and “*short/deep enough that people read them*”. One respondent in particular found the guiding questions very helpful. A few respondents suggested to have more focused briefing papers on particular themes further in advance.

3. Opening Plenary - Theme and Methodology GFMD Civil Society Days 2012 *Operationalizing Protection and Human Development in International Migration (with John Bingham, Wies Maas, Milka Isinta)*

What did you think of the opening session that presented the programme and objectives for the Civil Society Days 2012?

Grade

4.25

² The CSD program 2012 can be downloaded from: www.gfmdcivilsociety.org

The respondents that provided comments to this question appreciated that some time was spent in the opening plenary to address the themes, objectives and methodology for the GFMD Civil Society Days, describing the session as “an excellent introduction”, “good in framing the discussion” and “very helpful”. One respondent in particular appreciated the “presence and work done by the Pan-African Network”. One other respondent suggested the opening session in the future to focus more on “studies, quantitative and qualitative reflections on migration ... that would help to condense stronger civil society thinking.”

4. Inspiration Session - “Migration & Development Goals” – setting targets and benchmarks to achieve goals in migration and human development **Grade 4.00**
(with Nunu Kidane, Clariste Soh Moube, George Joseph)
What did you think of the Inspiration Session?

The *Inspiration session* received some positive and some critical comments. “The idea of the inspiration session was good” someone remarked and “helped to move into the substance of the meeting”. However the session would have benefitted from greater input and exchange from the floor some others remarked. A few respondents also noted that the session was not very focussed and that the speakers could have been more substantive and should have focused more on targets and benchmarks.

On the positive side many respondents found the session “very good and inspiring”, a “frank talk” and others such qualifications and one respondent said that the session was “important in creating the right mood of sensitivity to the personal circumstances of the individual migrant. Speakers conveyed their passion and concern for the human priority in the migration and development discourse.” In general the diverse background of the speakers was appreciated, although some respondents hinted that they would have appreciated more “proven inspirational speakers”.

5. Future Session - Towards the UN High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development 2013 (HLD) and the Future of the Forum - Grade 3.84
(with John Slocum, Danielle de Garcia, Ambassador Servansingh, Thomas Stelzer, William Gois)
How did you appreciate the Future Session?

This session was also generally appreciated by respondents, describing the session as “very good”, “interesting” and “an important session”, that “gave an overview of what is to be expected in the years to come.” Yet others thought the session was “too vague and not concrete enough” and that it lacked strategizing from civil society’s side how to influence the HLD and GFMD process in the future, with some of the speakers described by someone as “non-visionary”.

Some respondents in particular referred to the presentation of the Social Impact evaluation commissioned by the MacArthur Foundation of civil society’s role in the GFMD, and appreciated the challenge set forth to better define what civil society sees expectations are for the GFMD in terms of outcomes and impact. However one respondent found that the Social Impact report was “a bit too detached from what is happening at the grassroots level.”

6. What did you think of the working sessions on day 1 (19 November)? Please respond only for the working sessions you attended.		Grade
Working Sessions A	1.A. Regulating and Monitoring Recruitment, Placement and Employment Practices	4.13
	2.A. Engaging Diaspora as Entrepreneurs, Social Investors and Policy Advocates	3.47
	3.A. Protecting Vulnerable Migrant Workers	3.71
Working Sessions B	1.B. Improving Jobs, Skills and Education Matching	3.88
	2.B. Rights-based Development Solutions and Migration	3.75
	3.B. Protecting Migrants in Dire Humanitarian Situations	3.92

All working sessions received some positive and some critical comments. By and large respondents seem to have appreciated the *“well planned”* sessions, including the size of groups, duration of sessions, the format and reporting process which were all *“well thought out”*.

A large majority of the speakers and moderators also received positive critiques e.g. speakers were called *“relevant”* and *“competent”*; *“the moderators were knowledgeable”* and *“the session was well facilitated and it was kept focused”*. However for some of the sessions some respondents felt that the *“moderators took much space, instead of moderating the session”*, and one respondent felt there is need for *“more technical expertise in facilitation”*.

Some respondents remarked that the discussions were really *“engaging”* and *“involving”*, while quite a few others remarked that not everyone participated in the session, that interventions from the floor were at times poor, and that perspectives were sometimes *“one-sided and strongly dominated by a single or small number of voices. These ‘experienced’ voices tend to crowd out some other voices perhaps of less experienced delegates.”* Suggestions were made for the future to involve more recruitment agencies, companies and policy makers in the discussions (see also question 30 on participation). Two respondents also felt that the groups could have been even smaller, and themes more focussed e.g. *“the spectrum was too broad”*.

In terms of outcomes, some groups worked directly together on the outcome document (*“the reporting template”*), and this seems to have been appreciated, whereas other groups did not use such a model, and relied on the rapporteurs to capture the main recommendations. Some respondents felt that *“not all of the practical suggestions and recommendations were captured in the final report”*. Lastly one respondent cautioned civil society against the risk of sounding like *“a broken record”* - *“it will be important to consider new and updated recommendations”*.

<p>7. Plenary Session - Review of recommendations from the GFMD Civil Society 2012</p> <p>What did you think about the process of going through a first draft of the final civil society statement together?</p>	<p>Grade 3.75</p>
---	-------------------------------------

The comments provided were equally split between positive comments and more critical reflections. On the positive side respondents found the session “*very good*”, “*well managed*”, and “*very participatory*”. Respondents also seem to have appreciated the “*many voices*” and “*full participation*” of civil society. Yet someone called it “*more of a necessary evil*”, which was backed by some other respondents who found that there were too many suggestions made, and that there was no room for real exchange. Some other respondents asked for more time to review the document(s), and two respondents regretted that there was no French version of the document. *(There were also some concerns about the process of developing the statement, and how the outcomes of the morning sessions of the second day would be further included – see question 13)*

<p>8. Concluding Debate (with Peter Sutherland, Amb. Åkerman Börje, William Gois)</p> <p>What did you think about the concluding debate?</p>	<p>Grade 3.93</p>
---	-------------------------------------

In the main comments to this question were appreciative, using descriptions such as “*excellent*”, “*spirited*” and “*informative*”. In particular Peter Sutherland received positive critiques, being described as “*splendid*” and “*terrific*”. However a few other respondents felt a lack of practical/operational elements in the debate and that the concluding session should be more about the mandate and role of civil society.

Part II: Interaction and Common Space with Governments

<p>9. Bilateral Meetings</p> <p>Did you have a bilateral meeting with a/your government before or during the GFMD?</p>

14 respondents indicated that they had a bilateral meeting. The following 11 countries were mentioned: *Bangladesh, Jamaica, Mauritius, Myanmar, The Netherlands, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Switzerland, Thailand and the United States*. Most of the bilaterals were seen by the respondents as useful for exchanging ideas, for creating better understanding of each other’s work and perspective and for maintaining a dialogue. Two respondents indicated that there plans to continue the consultations with the government. A few respondents answered that they were not aware whether there were any representatives from their government and would have appreciated “*more social and informal interaction with government representatives.*”

10. Common Space “Migration and Development: Common Ground and Partnerships in Action”	Grade
What is your general evaluation of this year’s Common Space format and theme?	3.70

The average grade for this year’s Common Space, was slightly lower than for last year’s (3.70 this year, compared to 3.82 last year), yet many of the respondent indicated that the Common Space is “*getting better all the time*”; in particular the format (for the first time) of three break-out sessions on focused themes was regarded positively. The focus on common ground and partnerships also seems to have been appreciated, and someone called the Common Space a “*beautiful exchange space*”; another respondent said that “*there was a lot of respect*”.

However the plenary parts of the Common Space seem to have been appreciated less, with too many speakers speaking too long, no adequate time keeping, and too little time for the final plenary. Respondents would rather have preferred a more dynamic debate and more time for exchange in the break-out groups. In terms of participation some respondents regretted that there were few private sector representatives and that some governments were absent. The suggestion was made to organize a full day of interaction between governments and civil society. One other suggestion was for civil society participants to organize a pre-briefing on messages to bring across.

11. Common Space break-out sessions	Grade
What did you think of the Common Space break-out sessions?	
Diaspora alliances and partnerships for development	3.60
Common ground and partnerships to protect migrants in distress	4.00
Labour mobility and skills development for inclusive growth and jobs	3.87

All Common Space break-out sessions received some positive and some critical remarks, although not too many respondents replied to each of the sessions. On the positive side, respondents thought the break-out sessions were “*very educative*”, “*instructive*” and “*excellent*”. For all sessions respondents remarked that there was too little time for discussion and perhaps too many participants. Particularly for the break-out session on diaspora alliances three respondents felt that for the future more care should be taken to select the relevant civil society experts. Specifically for the panel on labour mobility, there was a complaint that the panel was “*under-represented by civil society delegates*” and that the panel included a government with “*no collective bargaining rights, nor protection mechanisms for migrant workers. This should be avoided in future.*” Two respondents expressed appreciation for how concrete and practical the discussions were in the break-out session on migrants in distress.

Part III: Outcomes, Impact and Follow-up

12. General outcomes

Civil society's had set itself the objective for this year's GFMD to focus on operationalizing recommendations with concrete implementable mechanisms and - where feasible – benchmarks against which success can be measured in the next years. To what extent did we succeed in achieving this objective?

The majority of respondents expressed explicit appreciation for the focus on operationalizing, mechanisms and benchmarks, calling it *“a laudable achievement”*, *“a good approach”* and stating that the programme matched the objectives. At the same time quite a number of respondents also said that some working sessions were more successful than others in formulating concrete implementable mechanisms and measurable outcomes and that the benchmarks could have been even more practical and concrete. Many advised to maintain the focus on operationalizing in the next years, and to work on further specifying the benchmarks, e.g. *“be more focussed, more concrete and more practical.”* In addition to further refining measurable outcomes, respondents also noted the challenge to work with government to adopt these benchmarks, and to monitor progress.

13. Statement

What do you think of the final statement of the Civil Society Days that was presented to governments on the 21st of November?

Respondents were somewhat split between positive and more critical reflection on the final statement. On the one hand several respondents called the statement *“inspirational”* and *“motivating”* and said that the statement *“captures the civil society conversations quite well”*. On the other hand several respondents, while acknowledging how difficult it is to write a concise outcome document overnight, felt that the statement was too long and could have been even more precise on practical recommendations and achievable targets. Two specific suggestions were made to improve the outcome document(s) of the Civil Society Days.

- One suggestion was to make two outcome documents: one in the form of a “public speech” to be delivered by the civil society (Co-)Chairs and to be much shorter and focussed on only a few messages, and; one longer version that bullet-lists specific recommendations and benchmarks, structured around the main themes – this should also be useful as direct input for the relevant Common Space and government roundtable sessions.
- Another suggestion was to work towards an outcome document in a *“consultation process before the GFMD and check the statement against the outcome of discussions.”*

14. You.

What do you take away from the GFMD Civil Society Days that matters for your daily work?

15. 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.

16. 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?

The answers to question 14, 15 and 16 were largely along similar lines and thus have been combined. While some responses were very concrete in suggesting steps that have been or will be taken (see below), other responses were more reflexive on the nature and effectiveness of the GFMD process.

On a personal level some respondents called participation in the GFMD a *"gainful"* experience. Respondents mentioned the value of networking, of *"meeting many interesting and committed experts and activists"* and of learning about ideas and work from other organizations on the ground *"in order to not re-invent the wheel"*. Several respondents again commented on the usefulness of the *"benchmark"*-approach, e.g. indicating that the *"benchmarks will be helpful in setting long-term advocacy goals at the national, regional, and international level"*.

Respondents raised a few challenges and questions in terms of implementation and impact. Comments addressed the challenge of the lack of binding mechanism for implementation and accountability, as well as the difficulty of measuring impact on the ground of such a global process. A challenge is also that the Forum addresses so many different issues that it is sometimes difficult to know on what to focus. Some respondents also questioned whether participants in the GFMD are actually reporting back to their constituencies back home, and suggested improvements could be made there. It would also help if documents could be translated in French (and possibly other languages) as soon as possible after the event.

On the other hand a few respondents did remark that the impact of the GFMD has been great with regards to tabling issues on the global agenda, and with regards to some issues actual progress has been made, partly thanks to the GFMD, e.g. the protection of domestic workers. Some respondents indicated that another impact has been to consolidate *"transnational civil society linkages"*.

Some concrete avenues for impact and follow-up were mentioned by the respondents:

- **Sharing the outcomes:** Many respondents indicated that they share the outcome documents of the GFMD Civil Society Days with local partners, organize debriefings and use the documents for further dialogue with governments.
- **New partnerships and actions:** In addition to the networking-value expressed by many respondents, some respondents also specifically indicated to have forged new

partnerships with other organizations nationally and transnationally, e.g. for joint advocacy or for sharing information. Another very specific action was provided by a labour union: “we agreed to create a desk in our union to deal with migration issues and to team up with the labor ministry to form a national steering committee on migration”.

- **Working with governments on policies and legislation:** Many respondents indicated to share and discuss the civil society statement with national governments, as well as with regional bodies and to continue the dialogue to push for policy changes and new legislation to protect and empower migrant workers and the diaspora, e.g.: “I will work with the Government of Jamaica and also the CARICOM Working Group on Migration and Development to carry forward the recommendations of the GFMD 2012”.
- **Advocacy and campaign:** Quite a number of respondents also said they would be using the outcomes of the GFMD, and the networks forged to further advocacy campaigns. One specific campaign mentioned was the Destination Unknown Campaign (www.destination-unknown.org) to protect children on the move. A suggestion was also made to create “more cohesion amongst existing thematic campaigns”.

Some other suggestions for follow up have been integrated under question 18. (E.g. civil society working groups and preparatory national and regional meetings). Also note that the GFMD Civil Society Coordinating Office will publish a publication early 2013 on “Recommendations into Action” based on a survey among 550 civil society organizations, inviting them to share how they have been working on implementing recommendations.

Part IV: Future

17. High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development (HLD) in 2013

What one priority issue would you like to be taken up by the HLD? How would you like to be involved in HLD preparations?

Most prominent among the priority issues suggested for the HLD were:

1. **Post-2015 Development Framework:** A great number of respondents reiterated “the need to bring more development, development actors, and development policies into the equation, including ensuring diaspora’s, migrants’ and migration’s rightful place on the global development agenda, as the Millennium Development Goals approach expiration in 2015”
2. **Labour mobility, decent work and recruitment:** Many suggested including a focus on labour migration mechanism, decent work, skills development and recruitment and employment practices
3. **Human security and migrants in distress:** Many also suggested to build upon the proposal that came out of the Common Space Session on migrants in humanitarian contexts to create a government-civil society group to work on issue and report to the HLD

4. **Rights:** Quite a number of respondents felt the HLD should have a crosscutting focus on protecting and promoting the rights of migrants, migrant workers and their families
5. **Migration and Development Governance:** looking at better coordination between UN agencies, International Human Rights Law, International Humanitarian Law and building a more permanent institutional global structure for migration and development governance
6. **Other** issues that were mentioned one or a few times:
 - a. *Diaspora dynamics and entrepreneurship*
 - b. *Migration, children and family*
 - c. *Migration, gender and women's rights*
 - d. *Media and perception of migration.*

Civil Society preparation and participation towards the HLD: Almost all respondents indicated they would like to be involved in civil society preparations for the HLD, for example through e-mail consultations, or by being a member of thematic drafting/recommendations groups or of the International Advisory Committee (or a similar body steering the HLD civil society process). Some emphasized the importance of involving representatives from developing countries, as well as migrant's voices and more private sector representation. One respondent suggested organising side activities with local migrant organizations in New York.

18. Preparatory Process

What would you like to see happening between now and the next GFMD in term of preparatory process (e.g. national, regional or thematic meetings, working groups, actions, etc)

In terms of the preparatory process towards the next GFMD in 2014, respondents largely suggested two lines of preparations:

1. **National and regional consultations:** in response to various questions in the evaluation survey respondents emphasized the need for national and regional meetings among civil society organizations and with governments. The meetings would on the one hand discuss how recommendations of previous GFMDs can be implemented and monitored and on the other hand look at key priorities and possible inputs for the upcoming GFMDs. Several respondents expressed the hope for sufficient funding to be available for such a regional approach.
2. **Working groups and thematic meetings:** throughout the evaluation many respondents suggested preparatory (and follow-up) activities along thematic lines. One respondent described it as follows *“working groups could be established to take forward recommendations and promote follow-up actions to ensure there is some form of coordinated action between GFMD meetings and to take advantage of momentum*

generated by the event. Working groups could be tasked with specific responsibilities, including taking up identified opportunities and issues that need pursuing/strengthening.

3. Other suggestions that were made are:

- a. To continue the (e-mail) consultations with the civil society network
- b. To ensure more democracy in managing the GFMD, e.g. in selecting the members for the International Advisory Committee
- c. To have more joint preparation between governments, civil society and private sector towards *“joint presentations on best practices/examples to be shown at the next GFMD”*.

19. 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 future (civil society) agenda towards the next GFMD in May 2014?

In general respondents advised to maintain the focus on operationalizing in the next years, and to work on more specific indicators. The main themes and focus areas suggested for the next GFMD agenda, are very much in line with the focus issues suggested for the HLD, except for more focus suggested on engaging diaspora and less focus on governance and on migrants in distress in humanitarian situations. The top four issues suggested for the agenda are:

- 1. Labour mobility, decent work and recruitment**
- 2. Protecting and promoting the rights of migrants, migrant workers and their families**
- 3. Migrants and diaspora in development**
- 4. Migration and the post-2015 development framework**

Other issues that were mentioned only one time are:

- 5. Climate change and migration**
- 6. Internal and rural-urban migration**
- 7. Improving data collection on migration and development**
- 8. Gender, migration and women's rights**
- 9. Migration, youth and children**
- 10. Business, migration and human rights:** the suggestion was made to organize a session around migration and *“the UN Guiding Principles for Business (the John Ruggie ‘Protect, Respect and Remedy Framework).”*

20. Format

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

Most respondents were quite pleased with the current format of the GFMD Civil Society Days. Most suggestions for improvements were made in the area of preparations, participation, duration and interactions with governments.

- 1. Preparations:** Along similar lines as the responses under question 18 (preparatory process) respondents suggested that more work needs to be done in advance of the GFMD at national and regional levels and in thematic working groups. A practical suggestion was made to link selected civil society delegates with the government delegation of their country prior to the Forum. Another suggestion was to create an online space for both government and civil society to post updates on GFMD preparations. Someone also suggested that governments should make an assessment of what has changed in their country since the last GFMD. Another respondent reiterated the challenge posed by the external GFMD Civil Society Evaluation; to invest in better defining what civil society's expectations are with regards to impact and outcomes of the Civil Society Days.
- 2. Participation:** Some suggestions were made on increasing the participation from developing countries, the private sector, migrant workers and more (see question 30 for further details). It was also suggested by several respondents to carefully select speakers and moderators, and to work with targeted invitations and nominations to ensure diversity and quality.
- 3. Format:** Responses were slightly contradictory whether there should be more time spent in plenary sessions versus more time in working sessions, but either way respondents agreed to ensure as much interaction as possible between participants, possibly in even smaller groups. Several respondents also suggested that a two day meeting is rather short, in particular if people have to travel from all over the world for it, and suggested adding an extra day, possibly a full day of interactions with governments (see below). Someone also suggested not having a global meeting every year.
- 4. Interactions with governments:** Quite a number of respondents, being appreciative of this year's Common Space in break-out groups, suggested more time for debate and discussion with governments and where possible also more joint preparations. Some suggested one full day of interactions, also allowing for more informal exchanges between civil society and government representative.
- 5. Network space:** Some respondents suggested allowing for more networking opportunities during the Civil Society Days, for example by having an extra day, by building in more "free space" into the programme, by partnering delegates based on common working areas or migration corridors, and by ensuring that delegates are staying in the same hotel.

Part V: Organization & Participation

21. Online registration system

What did you think of the online registration system?

Grade

4.31

The online registration system received a high overall grade (4.31) and respondents indicated that the system was very user-friendly. However, some respondents commented on the application form (not so much the registration form), suggesting the form was too long and too detailed and should be reduced in the future.

22. Pre-event Information

Was the content of the pre-event e-mails that were sent to you useful?

Grade

4.51

This question got the highest overall grade (4.51). Respondents expressed appreciation for the information provided and the timely response to e-mails by staff and volunteers. Three respondents asked for more timely information, so colleagues could be involved more.

23. Website

To what extent was the website (www.gfmdcivilsociety.org) useful for your preparation?

Grade

4.28

The website was described as “*very useful*” and “*of great help*”. Someone suggested that the website should include “*spaces for information about preparatory activities by civil society around the world*”.

24. Welcome and transportation from airport, hotel and venue.

What did you think of transportation from the airport to your hotel, and from hotel to the venue?

Grade

4.36

Respondents were very positive about the transportation provided describing it as smoothly and pleasantly. However someone suggested to have transportation from the venue to the hotel all day or to ensure that venues are better connected to other services.

25. Working conditions at the Swami Vivekananda Convention Centre (registration desk, information desk, internet, facilities, etc.) **Grade 4.06**
What did you think of the working conditions at the Convention Centre?

Although respondents rated the working conditions at the venue fairly high (4.06), and described it as good and professional, quite a number of respondents said that the venue was too big and thus not conducive for full and active engagement. The names of the various rooms could have been indicated more clearly, and three respondents regretted that the internet in the venue was unstable, and that there were not facilities for those who did not carry a laptop. Some respondents suggested improvement for future catering services, including more vegetarian options and providing tea and coffee in the morning. Lastly respondents appreciated the space provided for exhibitions. To further encourage networking, some suggested setting up a simple “marketplace” and encourage more organizations to bring materials.

26. Communication and support from the Coordinating Office of the GFMD Civil Society Days **Grade 4.48**
What did you think of the support from the organizing staff and volunteers before and during the event?

The second highest score (after the pre-event information) was for the Coordinating Office (4.48). Staff and volunteers were described as “*very helpful*”, “*commendable*” and other such qualifications. Someone did remark that the responsibility for the Coordination Office is quite a “*burden for only three people without continuity and assured funding*”.

27. Cultural evening (19 November) **Grade 3.88**
What did you think of the cultural evening?

Most of the respondents appreciated the cultural evening very much, describing the programme for example as “*a beautiful array of various cultures*”. However some respondents would have preferred the cultural evening to take place outside of the conference venue, and some others suggested that there should be more room for socializing and presentations by participants themselves. A few respondents also remarked that it was a very long day and many participants were tired after long flights – therefore attendance to the cultural evening was quite low.

28. Side events

Did you attend any of these side-events during the lunch-breaks?

23 respondents indicated to have attended one or more side events. From the few comments that respondents provided most side-events were considered informative, interesting and of added value.

29. Co-Chairs

What did you think about this year's civil society Co-Chairs?

Grade

4.14

Respondents seem to have appreciated that the two Co-Chairs came from "within" the ranks of civil society, as well as the gender balance and the Africa-flavour. One respondent found "*Clariste particularly inspiring*" and one other respondent thought "*George was impressive*". However, a few respondents said the Co-Chairs would have been more effective if they had come on board earlier and let them shape their own role.

30. Participants

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

Most respondents thought the number and composition of participants was "*well balanced*", "*a good mix*", "*very diverse*" and "*a good gender balance*". Quite a number of respondents noted that the number of participants was lower than in previous years, but commented that was actually beneficial for the quality of the sessions and meaningful interactions.

It was noted and appreciated that there was a strong representation from Africa this year, but that participation from some other continents was quite low, in particular from Latin America, the Middle East and Central/Eastern Europe. It was also noted that the participation of labour organizations was relatively low this year. The voice of business was also lacking several respondents noted and someone remarked he/she would "*welcome a greater number of civil society groups focused on migration through their work with companies, investors, in fair-trade, corporate social responsibility, etc*". Someone else suggested thinking about how governments could be more actively participate in the Civil Society Days.

Lastly many respondents noted that participation had been lower and difficult this year due to the lack of funds. Although late, it was appreciated that there was some financial support in particular for participants from developing countries, but respondents wished that in future years more funding would be secured, much further in advance. Or, if participants are responsible to secure their own funding, to make sure the selection is done much earlier so people have more time to find their own sources.

31. Government Days

Did you attend the Government Days of the GFMD (on 21 and 22 November)? If yes, what was your general impression of the Government Days?

12 respondents indicated to have attended the Government Days, although most only seem to have attended the Common Space morning on 21 November. One respondent complained that he/she would have like to attend the Government Days, but was not aware this was a possibility. *(Formally it was only possible for civil society organizations to attend the full government programme, if they were a member of their government delegation, a speaker in the government programme, or specifically invited as observer by the government organizers)*. One respondent remarked that *“the Government Days did not seem as dynamic as the Civil Society Days”*. On the other hand another respondent said that governments *“seemed to be more serious about the practical than I have seen”*.

32. Other feedback

In the category *“other feedback”* some respondents restated some points raised earlier in the evaluation, in particular with regards to ensuring timely funding assistance for participants from lower income countries and migrants themselves.

Otherwise respondents expressed appreciation for the event calling it meaningful and inspiring, and thanked the organizers, staff and volunteers for the work done: *“these were the most productive Civil Society Days yet”*, *“KEEP WORKING!”*



**Civil Society Coordinating Office
Global Forum on Migration and Development**

c/o ICMC
Rue Varembé 1
Case Postale 96
CH-1211 Geneva 20
Switzerland

Tel: + 41 22 919 1026
E-mail: contact@gfmdcivilsociety.org

www.gfmdcivilsociety.org