

Survey of Proadapt Conference, Cartagena de Indias, May 2016

A Survey Monkey was sent out on three dates in June of 2016, and a total of 43 responses were received. Below is a brief summary of the results with the most significant results – the full report is available at <http://proadapt.fomin.org>.

How well organized was the event?

Venue	90.70% Excellent
Logistics	88.37% Excellent
Technical	79.07% Excellent
Flow	72.09% Excellent

Selected Comments:

- “Field trip would have been good addition to agenda”
- “Networking should be improved using roundtables of discussion...”
- “Quality of the participants was incredible”
- “All vegetarian event would be great to reduce GHG emissions”
- “Right emphasis on business opportunities, not just recitation of business risk from adaptation and resiliency”

How was the content of the conference?

Fit with objective	69.77% Excellent, but 4.65% Not very good
Relevance of topic	67.44% Excellent, but 6.98% Not very good
Presentation of topic	64.29% Excellent, but 2.38% Not very good
Quality of speakers	69.05% Excellent, but 7.14% Average
Quality of presentations	59.52% Excellent, but 14.29% Average

Selected comments:

- “Good balance of presentations and discussion”
- “A true learning experience”
- “Overwhelming presence of North American examples/presentations....High performing Latin American examples may have been more inspiring to the audience”
- “Each panel should have a longer duration” “No simultaneous panels...”
- “Some repetition.....”
- “More time for questions/discussions. Make more use of the experience and knowledge in the room”
- “The message was clear for governments, investors and civil society. The knowledge of presenters and deepness of the issues were very compromising.....”

Any topics/issues that in your opinion were missing from this Proadapt Conference program?

Selected answers:

- “We need more dedicated conference on medical resilience and investing”
- “More farmer and rural business leaders to speak of their experience”
- “Include case studies”
- “More representation from Latin America experience and speakers”
- “More presentations of projects outside Proadapt”
- “Not only economic viable opportunities of climate change but more emphasis on environmental neutrality.....”
- “More focus on private financing” “More corporate participants”
- “Climate resilience education”
- “More on insurance”
- “More on government licensing and the corruption attached”

How would you rank individual panels?

Difficult to compare ranking, as attendance differ greatly from panel to panel.

3 highest ranked panels (high attendance and high level of Excellent score):

- Keynote Address with Sean Kidney and Brigit Helms
- Panel 1: Financial Innovation in Climate Resilience: Bridging the Finance and Investment Gap
- Panel 5: A Strategic View of Private Climate Resilience

How was the networking during the conference?

Time and space available	65.12% Excellent, but 4.65% Average
Profile of participants	58.14% Excellent, but 20.93% Average
Balance network/content	55.81% Excellent, but 2.33% Not very good

Selected comments:

“Great balance of presentations, discussions, and networking time”

What additional sectors/topics/issues would you like to see included in future events?

Selected answers:

- “More on Insurance” / “Tourism” / “Medical resilience and innovation” / “CSA” / “Education and Energy” / “Mining Sector” / “Metrics”
- “Success stories of public/private sector engagement in resilience improvement”

“More on innovative finance solutions”
“Usage of analytics in risk adaptation/mitigation/transfer decision making processes – but presented by decision makers”
“More private sector actors implementing resilient actions, instead of consultancies”
“Impacto de la resiliencia – cuanto cuesta o aporta ser resiliente”
“How to implement?”
“Look more at cross-sectoral themes instead of sectors”
“Permits and licenses from governments”

What profile of speakers would you recommend for future Proadapt Conferences?

Selected answers:

“More regional representatives” / “Latin American business leaders”
“PAHO, WHO, CDC, combined with Wall Street”
“Technically proficient” / “Scientists” / “Farmers”
“Even more private actors: insurances, commercial banks, rating agencies”
“Investors, asset managers” / “Deal makers”
“Government policy makers”

Apart from sessions and networking activities, what other activities do you recommend for future Proadapt conferences?

Selected answers:

“Additional smaller sessions – webinars”
“Field trips to resilience activities”
“Networking collaboration among existing projects....(i.e. Proadapt projects Chaco and Sertao)”
“A marketplace to connect projects and investors” / “Matchmaking”
“Tech workshop on infra sectors: water, wastewater, coastal defenses, etc.”
“Climate resilience start up pitches”
“Longer breaks to accommodate networking” / “Activities for networking groups”

Would you be willing to pay to participate in the next Proadapt conference? If yes, what would be an appropriate conference fee?

Selected answers:

Answers of “yes”, “no”, and “maybe”.
For “yes”, most answers state <\$500
“Save money by having less social events (even though they were amazing)”
“Suggest private sector sponsors”
“Yes, but by doing so you will automatically change the range and diversity of the participants attending. Part of the value was derived from the diversity”

Any additional recommendations, ideas, or suggestions for future Proadapt conferences?

Selected answers:

“Focus session on specific topics. Brainstorming with a moderator and some teeth”

“Focus on medical resilience and investment”

“Try to make it carbon neutral (excluding flights)”

“Keep the initiative moving forward through focus groups before the excitement wears off”.