



Brussels, 19 September 2016  
(OR. en)

12353/16

CSC 255

**NOTE**

---

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	The Security Committee
Subject:	Satisfaction survey results

---

1. In March 2016, the GSC launched a survey to assess the level of satisfaction among delegates of the Council Security Committee with the services provided.
2. The GSC would like to thank the delegations who took the time to respond to the survey. Reactions were received from seventeen Member States and additional comments were provided by eight of them.
3. Delegations will find attached a summary of results, including a summary of comments under each section of questions. The results show a generally high degree of satisfaction with the services delegations receive from the GSC. In order to improve services to delegations in some of the areas of weakness signaled, the Chair intends to take the following steps:
  - (i) the Chair will prepare at the start of each year a schedule of meetings, with the possibility of organising some meetings over one and a half days;
  - (ii) a renewed effort will be made to ensure papers for discussion are circulated at least ten working days ahead of any meeting (in line with the Committee's agreed working methods);

(iii) with regard to use of the Delegates' Portal, the Secretariat will take contact bilaterally with delegations experiencing difficulties.

4. Delegations are invited to suggest at the Committee's next meeting any additional improvements to the GSC's working methods in the light of the survey's findings.

---

## SURVEY RESULTS

## A

	<b>Preparation of CSC meetings</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
A1	A one day meeting is sufficient to tackle all CSC business in the appropriate depth	2	6	5	4	
A2	Four meetings a year are sufficient for routine CSC work	2	13	1	1	
A3	The current practise of scheduling meetings when we have a substantive agenda, including at relatively short notice, allows the Committee to fulfil its role in providing timely advice to the Council	1	12	3	1	
A4	Meetings are held at convenient intervals	3	11	2	1	
A5	The dates of meetings are announced in good time to plan attendance	4	12	1		
A6	I receive documents in good time to prepare agenda items		4	4	9	
A7	When requested, items are put on the agenda	3	11	3		

## (A) Comments/suggestions:

Meetings of 1,5 - 2 days duration would enable more fruitful and thorough discussions, but also bilateral debates which could ease resolution of difficult matters, especially when the agendas are heavy. On certain topics such a longer meeting followed by decision making meeting could be a useful practise.

The importance of breaks (coffee, lunch breaks) was highlighted as an useful opportunity for meeting other delegates and discussing bilateral issues. This aspect and the fact that some topics require longer discussion should be taken into consideration when planning the agenda.

It was also proposed to schedule meetings one year ahead that would allow for easier planning for delegations. There is a clear support for planning meetings in coordination with other Committees (EEAS, Commission).

Delegations requested documents to be sent more time in advance (at least two weeks before the meeting) which would allow to consult nationally and prepare an MS opinion. Also, steering notes

could already at the time of release clearly point out problematic areas of the agenda items which are to be addressed at the meeting.

Some Member States highlighted that the CSC needs better coordination with other preparatory bodies of the Council. The Chair and CSC should be vigilant within the Council and should function better as an early warning system for the NSAs, so that the CSC is involved when EUCI issues are debated.

## B

	<b>Conduct of CSC meetings</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
B1	There is sufficient time to discuss agenda items	1	8	7	1	
B2	Delegates are sufficiently encouraged to comment on agenda items	6	11			
B3	Substantive discussions are facilitated by the CSC Chair	7	10			
B4	The Chair allows a sufficient number of breaks (technical and lunch) to facilitate a productive meeting	4	10	2	1	
B5	The presence and participation of Agencies' representatives for appropriate agenda items in the meetings is valuable	6	8	1	1	1
B6	The audio-visual facilities help me to easily follow the meeting	2	14	1		

(B) Comments/suggestions:

Member States valued the participation of the Agencies' representatives what is reflected in the outcome of the survey. However, it was pointed out that the input and participation of agencies' delegates in respective matters should be encouraged to be more pro-active and substantive.

The fact that the Chair permits adequate time for delegations to intervene was appreciated. Also conducting the meeting in a commendable way, proposing draft solutions and producing clear conclusions was appreciated.

## C

	<b>Follow-up of CSC meetings</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
C1	The outcome of proceedings is a useful summary of points agreed and decisions taken	2	14			
C2	The outcome of proceedings accurately reflects the main conclusions reached during the CSC meeting	4	11		1	
C3	The outcome of proceedings is distributed in an acceptable timeframe following a CSC meeting	1	14		1	
C4	There should be an annual feedback/comments process for CSC meetings	1	6	8	1	

(C) Comments/suggestions:

One Member State proposed that it would be useful to have a list of participants and their contact details attached to the outcome of proceedings. Receiving an annual summary of discussions and actions taken by the CSC would also be valuable.

The outcome of proceedings was considered as useful but some delegations expressed the need to summarise and elaborate discussions in greater detail in the outcome as well as to have it circulated in shorter period of time after the meeting.

## D

	<b>Review and endorsement of security policies and guidelines</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
D1	The GSC Security Policy Architecture addresses all the main areas where further development of the security rules is required	2	14		1	
D2	GSC security policies and guidelines are a useful standard or reference on which to base national policies and guidelines on protecting classified information	4	11	2		
D3	The duration of the period for gathering comments is sufficient to analyse and to comment on a document		9	7	1	
D4	The duration allowed for silence procedure (at least 10 working days except in cases of urgency) is sufficient for my delegation to approve a text	1	11	4	1	
D5	The GSC makes sufficient effort to accommodate my comments on a document, bearing in mind the need to reach a convergence of views	3	13	1		
D6	My request to extend the deadline for commenting on or approving a document is usually accommodated	2	11	4		

### (D) Comments/suggestions:

A proactive reminder system for deadlines was proposed. It seems that the date of the meeting when discussions are foreseen works as the only deadline. An additional functionality in the Delegates' Portal could be an option.

Where possible, there should be stricter deadlines for comments so as to give time to distribute final commented documents before the meetings in a timely manner.

**E**

	<b>Logistical support</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
E1	My communications with the GSC are handled appropriately	5	11	1		
E2	I receive answers to my communications with the GSC in a reasonable timeframe	5	10	2		
E3	I can access the Justus Lipsius building with ease	2	14		1	
E4	I can access the meeting rooms with ease	6	11			
E5	If applicable, I can access the visitors' parking with ease		2	8		1
E6	The information provided on new communication channels such as the Delegates' Portal is satisfactory	2	9	4	1	
E7	I receive all CSC related documents distributed via Delegates' Portal with ease	2	7	5	2	
E8	The GSC has provided me with sufficient information on the purpose and functioning of the Delegates' Portal	3	9	3		1
E9	I can access Extranet with ease	2	10	4		
E10	I can access Extranet-R with ease	2	6	3	3	
E11	The process to refund delegates' travel expenses is well-run and accurate	2	5	8		

(E) Comments/suggestions:

Since the Delegates' Portal does not seem to fully function yet, the wish for parallel distribution channels (email and Delegates' Portal) until the full operation mode of the latter was expressed.

**F**

	<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
F1	On the whole, I consider that the CSC functions well	3	13	1		

(F) Comments/suggestions:

No comments