

IPGRI Online Communication Strategy

First Online Survey: Results

Rome, July 21st 2004

Luigi Canali De Rossi
Massimo Curatella
IKONOS New Media

Introduction to the First Online Survey Report – Scope and Expected Use

This document presents the results of the first online survey held from the 14th to the 20th of July at 14.00 to follow-up to the live discussion happened during the first meeting of the 14th of July.

The process, facilitated by IKONOS New Media, is headed to build the guidelines to define an Online Communication strategy for the IPGRI organization.

How results have been interpreted: the “Importance Ranking” method

The final ranking in the “Importance Ranked” results table has been calculated considering only the “Very important” and “Important” votes assigning 5 points to the first and 4 points to the second.

This criterion should clearly indicate what the respondents perceive as the top priority issues to be faced.

Alternative results evaluation

See Appendix A for three alternative results evaluation methods: all confirming the trend outlined by the first analysis.

- Relevance Ranking
- Balanced Ranking
- Scientific Ranking

Results of the First Survey

As of 20 July 2004, 14.00

Rank	Issue	Score	Comments
1	1 . Usability and accessibility	105	44
2	18 . Support for multiple languages	91	22
3	5 . Content Organization	90	27
4	15 . Institutional Identity	83	20
5	3 . Publishing Workflow	82	27
6	10 . Visibility – Exposure	79	19
7	2 . Compatibility	76	25
8	4 . Separating Content from Design	65	24
9	11 . Updating the audience	63	12
10	12 . News publishing	63	19
11	6 . Understanding User Needs	62	20
12	14 . Transparency – Credibility	56	15
13	8 . User Participation	51	14
14	7 . Customer Support	46	14
15	17 . Decentralized Web sites	41	17
16	9 . Community Building	40	15
17	13 . Other distribution channels	40	6
18	16 . Comparative analysis	39	5

legenda:

Rank: position in the ranking based on the score

Score: 5 points for each “very important” plus 4 points for each “important”

Comments: total number of comments received by each issue. The brighter is the higher.

Detailed Comments for each Issue

The following list of issues is presented according the order given by the “Importance ranking” method.

1. Usability and accessibility issues

Ranked: 1

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. *The website needs to be more compact*
2. *These issues are fundamental to any web site. If a user has to wait for pages to load or cant easily (intuitively)find the information they want, then they click out.*
3. *Being an international institution we need to be sure that we provide the fastest and easiest access to our pages (to ensure that people with slow internet connections etc are able to access our pages) and the ability to go back to specific pages as easily as possible.*
4. *accessibility to users with slow access is something I face everyday and it is up of my mind to make available easily the information I want to provide. Always I try to reduce the "weight" of the documents I have to publish.*
5. *site should be accessible to all users, not just those in developed countries*
6. *Internet happens to be the main gateway to information, I believe it is fundamental to ease access to teh users. No particular issue arises from my experience, although I should connect via a smal modem and not via IPGRI's 100 Mbps!*
7. *At the moment it is difficoult to find information . We should provide an easy tool for the users to browse and find what they need.*
8. *Usually, If I visit a website and I find problems (sloww access, dificult to find the right information, etc.), I do not try to sort them out, but I leave immediately that page.*
9. *it can improve the success of the web site*
10. *nowadays it is very hard to find information in the website. this is a very old-fashioned way of organizing and presenting webs*
11. *Obviously this is an important. Besides the quality of the information offered, the accessibility is a key issue whcih decide if users stay on/come back to the website. With the growing processing capacities page load times will become less important.*
12. *Current home page is too heavy, loads slowly, and lacks useful information - - many 'readers' will bounce straight back out. many of our key audiences are in the developing world and thus are likely to have slow access. navigation is not intuitive, and not always in the same place on all pages.*

13. *What is the use of having so much information in the web if our users can't have access to it easily?*
14. *Our research and information products are global public goods and as such they should be as widely available as possible. I agree with all of the technical issues highlighted by IKONOS (heavy front page graphics, poor naming of links and so on.) Accessibility compliance for handicapped users was not discussed, but in the process of redesign we should aim not to exclude ANY Web users. Many governments have mandated their agencies to have accessible Web sites and as an international organization we should follow this excellent example.*
15. *It seems to me that these concepts have to be clearly kept in mind before any development. A web page has to be easily and quickly downloaded. It is necessary to take care of the weight of the pages especially the one of the homepage. Tools to easily find information are necessary, even if an easy navigation is also a need.*
16. *Our partners are based in regions where internet access is not always very fast. It is essential to provide a web site optimized for users with slow access. A visitor stays on web site few minutes and if he does not find the information easily, he will not visit again this site. So, the navigation must be user friendly and well organizer.*
17. *Internet users are "impatient" users. if a site is loading slowly, they have tendency to jump to another one. This is the principle of using the web: to quickly get an answer or a page from which you can navigate. The connection has also a cost for the user. The quick access to the most pertinent information is required. A web site access has to be designed to satisfied the larger audience, so has to take into consideration compliance for handicapped user and consideration for users having slow access.*
18. *If the website is difficult to access, takes long time to load, information is difficult to find, etc then users will be discouraged from using it. It would therefore defeat the purpose of having a website...*
19. *For people who are living in advanced country they are now accustomed to see web pages loaded very quickly. If it is not the case surfer will go away. For people who are living in developing country the bandwidth is not always big so if they have to wait for pages to be loaded, they will also go away. At last IPGRI website is automatically ignored!*
20. *Performance and page load time is essential specially when we have lot of users in the third world countries. Ease to finding information is critical as well. Users should locate what they are looking for with two or three clicks max.*
21. *Navigability is essential for users.*
22. *We still have a digital divide in terms of web access and I think we need to recognize that some of the people that we are really trying to reach, who are*

high priority for us, still have limited ability to access the web. We need to make our site friendly to those people and have fewer "bells and whistles" that slow down access

23. *There's a lot of different types of things in there. Ease of finding information is quite different to page load times! The former is very much more important than the latter....*

18. Support for multiple languages

Ranked: 2

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. We have no translation capacity in house. Buying it in and keeping it up to date will be a real problem.
2. As IPGRI wants to address a global public, we should try to provide at least the key information in the most important languages. Due to the high cost of translation. It will be difficult to get all information translated. No consistent policy on this. Some parts of the site being translated, others not.
3. No consistent policy on this. Some parts of the site being translated, others not.
4. Reaching our audiences in relevant languages will enhance good perception of our services. It will also ensure loyalty.
5. Currently some sub sites, and some Web pages are produced in languages other than English. Web focal points have perceived there is a need for their users to be able to read information in their mother tongue.
6. We are working for different countries and different cultures so we have to take care about them to address their needs without hurting them.
7. Of course it is because of the geographical diversity of the users. INIBAP has an entire trilingual web site to reflect the banana production area in Africa, Latin America and Asia: English, Spanish, French
8. International organizations should provide material in different languages
9. This is very important and needs more attention, both in the translation work of IPGRI and in the web presentation. Even small businesses often offer the ability to view the web in multiple languages.
10. Crucial to participation and loyalty

5. Content Organization

Ranked: 3

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. People need to be able to locate the information that they want in as few mouse clicks as possible. We'll lose users if they have to go too deep in the site because the site navigation or terminology we use is un-intuitive.
2. end users can be different/multiple. Hierarchy of subdivision is necessary but not always there is the same point of view...
3. it is incredibly important that the visitor can easily understand where to find the content he/she wants from the moment they enter the site. This must be intuitive.
4. I think it is important to have a customizable web site, users may want to arrange the display of the info in their own style
5. This will help with navigation and will make our site more user friendly
6. content should not be tightly organized in IPGRI-programmed (not only at least)
7. Cf question 1 on accessibility. Users will only stray and/or come back if they can easily find the information they are looking for.
8. Focus of organisation is currently inward looking -- no real consideration of user needs. Little internal linking of information (information too often repeated within site, rather than linked), and little linking to related topics.
9. Content organization should be user driven. We should avoid organizing information according to IPGRI administrative strategy. It has to also be carefully tagged so it can be successfully retrieved
10. Currently there is a lot of useful information on our Web site but it is difficult to find, even with insider knowledge of the institute. Some content is repeated; links are missing between some similar material; some links are inappropriate; some information on the Web has been re-purposed from printed matter without taking into account what a user needs to find on the Web; different labels are used to get to the same pages; links don't take you to the pages you expect; sometimes you have to click through levels and levels of page to find straightforward info about IPGRI (e.g. telephone numbers). The current Web master has no idea about the content of the Web only technical knowledge: content categories, hierarchies and sub-divisions are thus decided by different people leading to an inconsistent Web.
11. I think is useless to show the information based on IPGRI internal organisation.

12. A necessary exercise and not easy regarding the structure of IPGRI and all the information provided in the actual site map.
13. It is important to use "generic" words on the homepage for new visitors and provide some documents more "fun" like quizz on biodiversity, Animated presentation (flash technology) to introduce IPGRI (objectives etc.)
14. It should be considered during the restructuring of the website.
15. I think I covered this pretty well in my response to the previous question

15. Institutional Identity

Ranked: 4

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. Our website is our visiting card to the world and therefore the design must be carefully thought out and planned by design and communications experts. There should be a certain design continuity in sub-sites - ensuring that the institutional identity is maintained. However, having said this, the design should not drive the content of the site. There is a balance required.
2. Importance of a brand is nowadays always more important - an FAO logo will be recognized no matter the color, the shape, the font used (I do recognize that FAO has also a little more years...). This is the importance of having an identity and with this communicating clearly the mission we are wanting to pursue.
3. I think this is already well done
4. Absolutely the most important to give to the world a coherent idea of a unique Institute.
5. It is crucial, in this time of re-organization and having well in mind the present structure and state of the website, assuring a very good and constant supervision, a unique corporate identity.
6. it is important to provide a unique and well organized structure worldwide
7. A good design is essential to give the web site a corporate identity and the make its use pleasant.
8. Currently well addressed in 'original' pages, but breaking down in newer material difficulty of maintaining balance between unity and diversity, required by dispersed nature of the organisation. Current design too 'print' oriented.
9. This is important but as I said before, it may be the cause of conflict. We have to have a corporate identity but we also have to take into account that we do things with partners (databases, web pages of projects, knowledge bases, etc.) that will be placed in our web with elements that would call for a somewhat different look.
10. An IPGRI web design is important to provide an unique look to the institute.
11. Should represent corporate identity they say that this is important (from a public relations perspective) so I could agree with it

3. Publishing Workflow

Ranked: 5

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. Fundamental - the content must be kept current (uptodate) thus ease of publishing is critical
2. The only way to get up-to-date information up on the web in a timely fashion is to empower authors and content editors to do this to avoid a delay in waiting for others to do it for them. They should not need to be web specialists to do this or to know anything about html.
3. To have an easy access to on-line publication is something that really helps in the day-by-day work. I find it fundamental even though there is the risk of loosing consistency with the rest of the Web site.
4. ease of use and time to publish will ensure that site stays up to date. but there still must be a vetting process.
5. sometime it takes ages before having a new/revised webpage published.
6. I strongly suggest a document managment tool. Staff needs also to be trained.
7. Obviously infromation has to be updates in a regular and fast way. However there should be a mechanism to assure the quality of te published information as well.
8. Currently difficult and slow to update home page. Approach seems to depend heavily on technical expertise of Web Specialist to publish any new material. web authors have too much flexibility in creating 'new-look' pages that do not conform to the overall style of the site -- navigation placed in different places, use of different fonts etc. lack of quality control in current workflow - - web authors are creating web pages without consultation with editors or 'knowledge workers', with the result that some poor pages (poor organisation of information, no real audience identified etc) are being published.
9. Our website will be updated depending on the above.
10. Currently the approval process is slow and involves one key person -- in their absence content cannot be published.
11. Consider a web content management solution for publishing workflow is in my opinion the right way to approach this task and facilitate the update process.
12. Too many steps in getting the content validated and finally published. Difficulties for the regional offices to get updated information on the region updated.

13. I don't know the actual process of update pages of the website.
14. Do authors have any content management system? Is there an established workflow to publish contents on the web?
15. One web master does not have the time or the technical expertise needed to physically manage the entire site. We need to be able to do this ourselves, with some but minimal controls

10. Visibility – Exposure

Ranked: 6

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. It's pointless to have a website unless people know it's there. And since the web is potentially THE vastest communication mechanism (being able to reach more people in the world) it is important that people know it's out there, that it is linked well on other websites, giving it more credibility, and that it is publicized in every way possible.
2. I think IPGRI is well "advertised" in the main search engines
3. it is already happening
4. it is important to strengthen the ipgri name
5. Nowadays a lot of users look for information through search engines like google instead of browsing through institute websites. So appearing high on these search results will automatically lead to more visitors. Obviously we will have to take care that the visitors come back when they need other information (offering high quality information).
6. Currently seems quite well served.
7. Our products should appear first in any search outcome
8. You don't go to the IPGRI website by chance. It is important to find the website on google on the first page for the keywords "IPGRI" and maybe "Biodiversity" etc for a wider audience.
9. IPGRI web site is well referenced by search engines. e.g. On Google, a query on "genetic resources" gives a list where IPGRI is on the second place after grain. See hereunder: GRAIN - [Traduire cette page] ... organisation which promotes the sustainable management and use of agricultural biodiversity based on people's control over genetic resources and local knowledge ... www.grain.org/ - 21k - 13 juil 2004 - En cache - Pages similaires CGIAR Agricultural Biodiversity Centre - [Traduire cette page] IPGRI, the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute, is the CGIAR international agricultural...
10. Ensure its visibility at international and regional level
11. Search engines are the primary resource for users
12. Seems like a good idea, but not sure of the implications of this

2. Compatibility

Ranked: 7

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. Faster downloading speed
2. Again fundamental - IPGRI must confirm to international standards and its site must be accessible from all well used browsers
3. Same answer as for item 1 - Being an international institution we need to be sure that we provide the fastest and easiest access to our pages - no matter what browser they are using.
4. site must be accessible to all users--
5. As from answer provided in the first box of 1. Usability and accessibility issues, I think it is important to easily access the information
6. please also note the number of browsers on the internet, IE6 has something like thge 85% / 90% of the market
7. it need to looks nice readable and professional to all users
8. I am not familiar with this issue, but have seen that Microsoft Internet Explorer is the browser that is used by nearly all users.
9. Many features currently supported only by latest versions of Microsoft browser.
10. Same arguments as in question 1. Our web should be "universal" in many ways. We have a variety of audiences with a variety of conditions to access the website. If we don't respond to that range, we would be excluding the market we want to reach
11. We do not employ W3C standards in our Web, and there is inconsistency in coding, poor coding and pages that do not load in even the most common browsers. I perceive that most Web Focal Points have no idea about Web standards.
12. All Internet users have to be able to access the IPGRI web site even if the design can be a little different from a browser to another. The important point is that the user access and does not loose information. Validation by the W3C appears to me the best solution for that.
13. Internet Explorer is still very used. However, other browser like Mozilla, Mozilla firefox, Opera begin to be popular. These browsers are compliant avec the W3C recommendations. Internet Explorer is not supported on Linux platform. A web site must be compliant with other Internet browsers and the better solution is to apply the W3C recommendations.

14. The most compatible the web is to all standards, the most the IPGRI site will be visited and will reach the audience.
15. As an international institute we have to fully support the international standards defined by W3C.
16. Sorry but I don't know exactly what this means, but if it is about accessibility by the widest possible audience, I support it fully

4. Separating Content from Design

Ranked: 8

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. The authority for the web should be with the content manager (covering design and editing and oversight of clearance). The IT aspects are just a service role.
2. Sometimes the 'content' can get lost in the 'design' of a page and it's important that people putting up information on the web (who don't need to be design experts or web experts) can do so in the most straightforward way possible - they should not have to deal with design issues. There does need to be thought about the 'image' that IPGRI decides to project to the world through the design of the site but the 'design' should not dominate over the substance.
3. The publishing procedure is pretty slow and not always useful
4. the quality of the web site is related to a good organization of the roles
5. Lack of consistency in new web pages. Authors have too much control over appearance, do not follow guidelines. Lack of quality control of content.
6. This is crucial. It has been the source of many misunderstandings
7. Currently the site's design is inconsistent, and difficult for users to follow. More effort is spent on correcting design issues than on checking accuracy of content. It requires specialized technical knowledge of the Web to create new pages. Redesign of the Web is not a case of applying new style sheets: every page needs to be corrected!
8. Making a clear distinction between the content and the container is an important matter in such exercise. Identify the necessary content and structure is a first necessary step for building web information.
9. The XML/CSS technology allows to do that. It is useful to ensure the design evolution to the website. This technology could allow to provide and maintain easily a multi language website.
10. This will facilitate the update of information.
11. IT department has nothing to do with the content authoring/editing. There should be clear distinction between content management, look and feel and IT infrastructure.
12. Again, your questions are not very friendly to those who are not experts in IT, but if I understand your point, basically as a user and staff member, I could care less about the IT infrastructure and it should definitely not drive

the web. The web should be driven by the content and the user needs, and the needs to communicate about IPGRI

11. Updating the audience

Ranked: 9

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. In this day and age there is a myriad of information out there and yet people have less and less time available to go looking in the hope of finding new and interesting information that is relevant to their work or interests. Simple mechanisms such as allowing users our website to register to receive email notifications of updates or new postings on specific topics would "bring the news to them". I think that this would make the site a more useful tool for users.
2. we need to reach them until they recognize the value of the site and visit on their own. This may never happen of course.
3. We have to be careful not to overflow the users' mailboxes with updates and newsletters. Much of these messages are never read and go directly to the trash bin. A good update should include very compact information with a link for those who want additional information.
4. No 'push' mechanisms at present.
5. This is key to expand our market for new users/partners as well as to enhance our institutional image
6. As for community building.
7. The audience should tailor the content of the web site
8. Important to be up to date on technical and policy developments

12. News publishing

Ranked: 10

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. News from other sources on topics related to IPGRI's work would make the site more interesting and encourage more repeat visitors
2. This will increase our visibility
3. anything related to our mandate should be on the homepage very frequently updated and easily reaching the interest stakeholders
4. This can be interesting for specific users, but should only be provided in a link session. I don't think users will visit the IPGRI website to look for news publications.
5. Little done in this area
6. I see this as desirable, not necessary or priority. This will also require human resources to be doing this on a continuous basis
7. An important topic (service) that the user is waiting for.
8. News publishing is fundamental to keep alive the web site
9. Seems like a good idea
10. Not sure how this is different from above

6. Understanding monitoring and evaluating end user needs

Ranked: 11

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. *Fundamental*
2. *It is important to know who our users are and what they most frequently look for on our site in order to improve our site to meet their needs in the future.*
3. *transparency and reliability towards the users strategic tool for the development of the web site - that occurs continuously*
4. *If we can monitor user needs we will be able to improve what we are doing... if any*
5. *content should not be tightly organized in IPGRI-programmed (not only at least)*
6. *Very limited ability to monitor web site usage.*
7. *The issues are expressed in the question*
8. *Feedback from and knowledge about our users is some of the most valuable information we can have: currently we cannot adapt easily to this input or the anecdotal information we have is not being well captured. The statistics we receive from CG Net about our site usage are very flawed.*
9. *Making regular analysis of the traffic with concrete outputs: most visited pages, percentage of online and repeat visitors, most downloaded publications, effectiveness of databases request...That's a good way to assess the impact of the web site as information tool and to understand the user needs.*
10. *User needs are important.*
11. *This seems as if it would be important, but perhaps an occasional survey of users would be sufficient. Also an occasional survey of the perspectives of IPGRI staff would also be a good idea.*

14. Transparency – Credibility

Ranked: 12

Comments

1. *Clear freshness of information, crediting of sources, direct contact information... these all give more credibility to the site.*
2. *Again I want to stress the importance of building up a community of practice. This is done with a regular interaction, in a friendly way, towards all the stakeholders.*
3. *This is closely related to accountability*
4. *We have to take care that the information is up to date. If a lot of dead links are present, this will also generate some questions about the rest of the information offered. The use of credits to the external sources is also necessary to spread a credible image.*
5. *Information currently buried too far down, behind pages of links. Inconsistent crediting of sources, information on freshness etc.*
6. *This is necessary but I see it as a routine activity. I also see it as something that can easily be put off because it requires control of many details*
7. *We take care in our printed publication to ensure we include references, affiliations, statements about the institute's objectives, but we do not always follow this on the Web. We view ourselves as an 'honest broker' in PGR, and this should be apparent on our Web site too.*
8. *This will give a focus on our partners.*
9. *Important to provide a high-quality information*
10. *Seems like a good idea*

8. User Participation

Ranked: 13

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. *TRICKY We must not be seen to be taking ownership or other people's information We can have special pages, or a minin site within IPGRI site for this, but it MUST not bear the IPGRI desigfn/logo - it must be clear that this is where others are uploading. IPGRI can then state it is 'supporting' this ventilation of partners information and put a disclaimer to its quality.*
2. *Feedback from users is beneficial and should be encouraged. Discussions on specific topics relating to IPGRI work by IPGRI staff and also by experts in the field would make the site more dynamic and interesting and would attract more repeat visits.*
3. *it is important but almost never done, unfortunately.*
4. *Agaiin this has gotr ot do with the community of people that must feel they "belong" to a big family*
5. *Will help to improve tasks*
6. *A content managment tool should do this*
7. *Cf. Custumor support. A lot of discussion groups have only limited contributions due to the fact that users are more looking for information than they are looking to contribute information. It can be interesting to set up specific discussion groups on specific topics. A detailed section with additional links (also to on line publications), where users can post their links could be envisaged.*
8. *Very little opportunity at present.*
9. *This is desirable, not required, or at least not a priority at the beginning*
10. *I think it is important to contribute to the content and a web site should provide a forum, a mailing list and specific contacts but I don't think the participation will be very active.*
11. *The current Web site provides very little opportunity for feedback and this is not well captures. There is no opportunity for external users to provide content. As the main IPGRI Web site could not address this need, some sub-sites for IPGRI projects have been set up externally.*
12. *I think we should concentrate on getting our own house in order before we move onto this level. I can't imagine that we are having an IPGRI chat page, or an interactive web site. Let us get a functional traditional web site first and then maybe think about this issue. I see this as possibly another technology area looking for a problem that does not exist.*

13. *Web site should be a collaborative venture with stakeholders.*

7. Customer Support

Ranked: 14

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. *Yes, important that surfers know where they can get more info or better explanation*
2. *We need to make the visit to our site as hassle-free and user-friendly possible. Part of this is ensuring that we make it easy for people to find contact information for specific staff in the organization. It should be easy for people to know who to contact when they have specific questions regarding specific issues and also to locate and download publications.*
3. *In creating and maintaining a community of practice, it is very important that users feel, and actually are promptly, taken care of. It is really an important point. On my side, as the administrator of a web site hosted in IPGRI, I have always benefited of a prompt and effective service whenever required.*
4. *Obviously customer support has to be available. However in my opinion the majority of the users will look for an alternative source of information if they are experiencing any problems. A user has to be very eager for specific information in order to request additional support.*
5. *Very limited interaction possible.*
6. *This is desirable but not absolutely necessary if the site is organized with the user in mind*
7. *site map menu, search menu and contact menu are highly recommended.*
8. *IPGRI is a 'people centred' organization and this should be reflected in the Web. Currently it's hard to find 'real' people contacts on the Web or for users to give us input or ask questions. Showing that we are a genuine organization with researchers and experts will also improve people's 'trust' in our site and the authority of the information we provide.*
9. *We have to be sure to address the right information to the right person. As much as possible give them the possibility to find by their own the right information instead of contacting somebody. This kind of task needs dedicated person!*
10. *Is this not fundamentally our number one goal?*

17. Managing a decentralized Web publishing system

Ranked: 15

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. *It is important that there be a certain continuity to the site, including in design issues, to ensure that IPGRI's institutional identity is maintained. There is also a need to ensure that the content going on the web is (1) suitable for the web (both content and style); (2) is well-written and typo-free; (3) follows IPGRI's house-style (for example that different language spellings, ie US vs. British and word/grammar usages) are consistent.*
2. *It is not always easy to manage such an amount of information coming from different places all over the world. I am very happy to be independent and not always under the "quality control". The news/info/message has to be shared and sometimes it is more important the timing.*
3. *Decentralization of the site is one of our biggest problem--it means not opportunity for oversight, quality control*
4. *I think it is important to manage a centralized system that reflects a strong and unique image of IPGRI and of its mission and strategy.*
5. *CF question 15. In order to present a coherent institutional identity, information should be standardised as much as possible.*
6. *Regional offices going their own way. Too little coordination of content, leading to duplication of content or gaps. Little editorial oversight and quality control.*
7. *Coordination is an issue here. This also calls for training of those involved so they do what is expected of them. Empowerment of web focal points to help on this is key to improving coordination and ensuring quality control.*
8. *This problem is similar to that faced with producing publications regionally. Regional and programme staff are often forced to develop their own alternative Web sites as the main IPGRI Web does not address the needs of their users. This and even within the IPGRI Web site has led to inconsistencies between different sections of the Web site and errors in the pages.*
9. *The geographical and thematic diversity of information sources is a reality at IPGRI and this has to be taken into account in the building of a web content management system.*
10. *See earlier comments*

9. Community Building

Ranked: 16

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. *Again, by allowing discussions (with both internal and external inputs)the site would be more dynamic and interesting - it would attract more repeat users. By having up-to-date content (ie pages that are current) and that users can identify are current - people will have more trust in the site and be more willing to come back to it frequently.*
2. *This is the point I made in my previous two answers.*
3. *This is a very complicated (difficult) issue. Due to the growing offer on high quality web sites with excellent information the competition is getting harder day by day. It will require a though task of regular updating and quality control.*
4. *Very little engagement at present.*
5. *Users of a brand or product are loyal to it if they are satisfied. Readers loyalty will depend on our ability to place information that is relevant for them, packed in a way that is attractive and user-friendly. I have seen websites that hold for a or discussions with their users but I don't think we have to do this in our public site. We can do that using Sharepoint.*
6. *The sketchy usage stats we have indicate that most of our users visit the site once and never return. If we are really providing useful information then we should expect loyal readers as for our physical publications.*
7. *Loyalty is built based on the quality of information available on the site. Why would user come to the site if there is no good/new information on the website.*
8. *This is why we need dynamism in the web site*
9. *Will come from participation*

13. Other distribution channels

Ranked: 17

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. *Having moved into the web-publishing world relatively quickly (considering the really rapid advances in technology in the work-world), I think that we still have to get used to the idea that information needs to be re-packaged for this new means of delivering information. It will be difficult to re-educate all of those people who are responsible for putting information on the web that the printed content is different from web content. Training will be required.*
2. *It's important to take into account mainly for those developing countries unable to use internet yet.*
3. *The more distribution channels that are offered the more user will get access/read the information. I think it is indeed a good idea to look for additional distribution channels if and when they are economically interesting.*
4. *Only manual approach at present. Few (if any) 'printable' format pages on the site. Extensive use of PDF to place 'publications' on web site. Not possible to put the web site or parts of it on CD-ROM.*
5. *This will make us a versatile source of information but it requires staff doing this regularly and training to do it. This will also enhance our ability to respond to opportunities to convey our messages.*

16. Comparative analysis

Ranked: 18

Comments submitted by survey participants

1. *At this point in time I think that this is the least important, but is not unimportant.*
2. *IPGRI, one of 15 centres that all together carry out excellent work. In order to maintain and improve quality of service (delivery of info/content/etc) it is important to constantly learn from each other*
3. *Has not been done in any systematic way.*
4. *This is related to studies of the market in which we operate. This could also offer opportunities for us to do information work in partnership. If other organizations are better than us in providing certain information, why compete? Let's bring them on board on a collaborative activity and is less work that we will have to do.*
5. *I don't know if it is important but that could be a good idea.*

Appendix A: Alternative Results Evaluation

Relevancy Ranking

Rank	Issue	Score	Comments
1	1 Usability and accessibility	92	44
2	5 . Content Organization	83	27
3	3 . Publishing Workflow	79	27
4	18 . Support for multiple languages	77	22
5	2 . Compatibility	77	25
6	10 . Visibility – Exposure	74	19
7	15 . Institutional Identity	70	20
8	12 . News publishing	68	19
9	11 . Updating the audience	66	12
10	8 . User Participation	66	14
11	4 . Separating Content from Design	64	24
12	6 . Monitoring and evaluating	64	20
13	14 . Transparency – Credibility	57	15
14	13 . Other distribution channels	57	6
15	7 . Customer Support	54	14
16	9 . Community Building	51	15
17	16 . Comparative analysis	49	5
18	17 . Decentralized Web sites	48	17

“Relevancy” score evaluation method:

4 points - very important

3 points – important

2 points – neutral

1 point - not very important

Balanced Ranking

Rank	Issue	Score	Comments
1	1 Usability and accessibility	38	44
2	5 . Content Organization	33	27
3	18 . Support for multiple languages	29	22
4	10 . Visibility – Exposure	26	19
5	3 . Publishing Workflow	25	27
6	2 . Compatibility	23	25
7	15 . Institutional Identity	22	20
8	12 . News publishing	20	19
9	11 . Updating the audience	18	12
10	8 . User Participation	16	14
11	6 . Monitoring and evaluating	14	20
12	4 . Separating Content from Design	10	24
13	14 . Transparency – Credibility	9	15
14	13 . Other distribution channels	9	6
15	7 . Customer Support	4	14
16	9 . Community Building	3	15
17	16 . Comparative analysis	1	5
18	17 . Decentralized Web sites	0	17

“Balanced” score evaluation method:
+2 points - very important
+1 points – important
0 points – neutral
-1 point - not very important
-2 points - irrelevant

Scientific Ranking

Rank	Issue	Score	Comments
1	1 Usability and accessibility	3,41	44
2	18 . Support for multiple languages	3,35	22
3	5 . Content Organization	3,32	27
4	15 . Institutional Identity	3,18	20
5	10 . Visibility – Exposure	3,08	19
6	3 . Publishing Workflow	3,04	27
7	4 . Separating Content from Design	2,91	24
8	11 . Updating the audience	2,87	12
9	2 . Compatibility	2,85	25
10	12 . News publishing	2,83	19
11	17 . Decentralized Web sites	2,82	17
12	6 . Monitoring and evaluating	2,78	20
13	8 . User Participation	2,64	14
14	14 . Transparency – Credibility	2,59	15
15	7 . Customer Support	2,57	14
16	9 . Community Building	2,55	15
17	13 . Other distribution channels	2,48	6
18	16 . Comparative analysis	2,33	5

“Scientific” score evaluation method:
Results from the "relevancy" ranking averaged on the valid replies received.

Details:
4 points - very important
3 points – important
2 points – neutral
1 point - not very important

Each issue’s score is than divided by the total number of valid replies for that issue

