Civil Society Registration & Feedback Survey Results

2019 Spring Meetings Civil Society Policy Forum
2019 SPRING MEETINGS
CSO PARTICIPATION IN NUMBERS

- 1942 APPLICANTS
- 1835 REGISTERED
- 1072 ARRIVED
- 46 SESSIONS
- 109 COUNTRIES REPRESENTED
- 10 INNOVATION FAIR BOOTHS

19 SM CSPF HIGHLIGHTS

- LARGEST CSO ATTENDANCE
- REGIONAL CSO NETWORKING SPACE
- MAIN THEMES: DEBT & ECONOMY ACCOUNTABILITY CLIMATE/ENERGY

NEW
YEAR-TO-YEAR TREND

RECEIVED APPLICATIONS
-1%
1961 1942

APPROVED & REGISTERED
+7%
1719 1835

ARRIVED & PICKED BADGES
+6%
1010 1072

COUNTRIES REPRESENTED
+24%
88 109

NUMBER OF SESSIONS
+2%
45 46

2018 Spring Meetings CSPF

2019 Spring Meetings CSPF
5 YEAR SPRING & ANNUAL MEETINGS
CSO REGISTRATION TREND

Approved & Registered

Arrived
TOP 5 CSO DELEGATIONS

- Oxfam: 22
- Gates Foundation: 20
- Bank Information Center: 18
- World Resources Institute: 16
- Mercy Corps: 15

BREACKDOWN BY REGION

- US & Canada (66.98%)
- Western Europe (13.99%)
- Africa (7.84%)
- Latin America & Caribbean (4.48%)
- East Asia & Pacific (2.05%)
- South Asia (1.77%)
- Eastern Europe & Central Asia (1.59%)
- Middle East & North Africa (1.31%)
CSPF PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK
SURVEY RESULTS

n = 201 (19% of arrived CSOs)

Q1: What type of organization do you represent?

- NGO: 147
- Other: 16
- Think Tank: 12
- Foundation: 9
- FBO: 6
- Professional Assoc.: 5
- Youth Group: 3
- CBO: 2
- Trade/Labor Union: 1

n = 201

Q2: Location of your organization

- North America: 116
- Africa: 31
- Western Europe: 27
- South Asia: 8
- Mid. East North Africa: 7
- Easter Europe: 4
- Central Asia: 4
- Latin America: 3
- East Asia Pacific: 3

n = 201
Q3: Top reasons for attending  
To network and share information with other CSOs  
To advocate policies with WBG/IMF staff and EDs  
Professional development - to learn about WBG/IMF  
To organize a CSPF session  
n= 198

Q4: Satisfaction with the registration process  
Very satisfied  
Somewhat satisfied  
Somewhat unsatisfied  
Very unsatisfied  
Don’t know/other  
n= 198

Q5: Most attended days of the CSPF  
Tuesday, April 9  
Wednesday, April 10  
Thursday, April 11  
Friday, April 12  
n= 184
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of session topics</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of speakers or panelists</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of sessions</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBG/IMF staff participation on panels</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New regional CSO networking space</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7: To what extent were the following sessions useful to you:

- **WBG Orientation**: 53% to a very high degree, 18% to a somewhat high degree, 18% to a somewhat low degree, 5% to a very low degree, 1% did not attend.
- **EDs Roundtable Moderator Prep Session**: 56% to a very high degree, 17% to a somewhat high degree, 17% to a somewhat low degree.
- **EDs Roundtable**: 58% to a very high degree, 18% to a somewhat high degree, 10% to a somewhat low degree, 2% to a very low degree.
- **CSO Innovation Fair**: 46% to a very high degree, 16% to a somewhat high degree, 11% to a somewhat low degree, 2% to a very low degree.
- **CSO-led Sessions**: 51% to a very high degree, 39% to a somewhat high degree, 38% to a somewhat low degree, 38% to a very low degree.
- **WBG or IMF-led Sessions**: 39% to a very high degree, 38% to a somewhat high degree, 13% to a somewhat low degree, 9% to a very low degree, 12% did not attend.
- **Lunch Session with CSPF Working Group**: 43% to a very high degree, 38% to a somewhat high degree, 13% to a somewhat low degree, 9% to a very low degree, 12% did not attend.
Q8: Rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of the EDs Roundtable

**Choice of topics**
- Very satisfied: 30%
- Somewhat satisfied: 34%
- Very unsatisfied: 28%
- Somewhat unsatisfied: 7%
- Don't know: 1%

**Number of topics**
- Very satisfied: 31%
- Somewhat satisfied: 35%
- Very unsatisfied: 28%
- Somewhat unsatisfied: 7%
- Don't know: 1%

**Format and structure**
- Very satisfied: 24%
- Somewhat satisfied: 38%
- Very unsatisfied: 30%
- Somewhat unsatisfied: 6%
- Don't know: 1%

**CSO Moderator: Amanda Mukwashi**
- Very satisfied: 26%
- Somewhat satisfied: 31%
- Very unsatisfied: 28%
- Somewhat unsatisfied: 14%
- Don't know: 1%

\( n = 158 \)
Q9: Please share any ideas to improve future Roundtables with WBG Executive Directors

n= 60

**Time**
- Time is key. I know you did a good job, but we need more time!
- Please extend the duration of meeting and let the people ask questions in a conversation manner
- We need more time with the WB directors

**Format**
- We need a bigger space that will allow all the CSOs to attend
- The meeting room preparation for two sessions I spoke at were fantastic
- Want to affirm that the lunchtime “prep” and discussion with the CSO Moderator was extremely helpful and contributed to the overall success of the Roundtable
- It would be helpful to allow those CSO representatives from a particular country to meet the Executive Directors from their own country
- Online Round-tables to reach more people
- Announcement of the chair could be done earlier so that those not able to make it could send questions earlier
- I would like to see more on the use of technology/data in this space

**Topics**
- Amanda did an AMAZING job moderating and for identifying the governance issue
- We need more time to take on thematic macro economic issues
- More focus on health and health budget impact
- Make the outcome of the discussions public and keep the dialogue going
- It would have been interesting to know the outcomes of the previous year’s session

**EDs representation**
- I think that very few Executive Directors were present.
- The conversation is largely dominated by a few EDs from the Global North
- Need an agenda that will engage the EDs as only a few actually participated and also could not identify which country they represented
Q10: Please share any other ideas to improve the CSPF:

Format
- I can't say enough how wonderful it was to have Ms. Georgieva participate in Tuesday's opening
- Include clear and transparent criteria for CSPF panels that are accessible at the time of submission
- Identify new issues and innovative approaches not the usual crowd working on the same things as in the last century
- Time allotted to sessions could use 30 more minutes
- There should be more programs on technology, civic technology, technology-inclusion, open source movement
- The session rooms in the WB building were not great
- More food/drinks; bigger space
- There should be more information available about the attending civil society organisations and also the government delegations of the respective countries
- More preparation via email

Networking
- Encourage NGOs to make use of the space for regional networking
- More networking session with WB/IMF staff and with regional CSOs
- A post-Spring Meetings platform could be also an effective tool to keep people connected

CSPF Working Group
- The involvement of civil society organisations in setting the agendas could be further improved by involving the CSPF working group more closely in making the programme
- Establish a stronger and active CSPF Working Group with its 11 members

WBG/ IMF Participation
- More participation of WB/IMF staff members in the CSO sessions
- The level of interaction and engagement from the World Bank and IMF was impressive

Inclusion
- It is important that people from other countries can join if they have critical demands and are not denied Visas
- CSOs need to have a broader, more inclusionary role with WB and IMF in their decision making process
- Please give voice to those of us who have innovative and evidence-based solutions to prevent violent extremism in fragile states
- The registration process makes it extremely difficult to include Global South voices