

eceee 2003 Summer Study: Key figures and participant evaluation

Summary

The 2003 edition of the eceee Summer Study was held at Valescure just outside St-Raphaël in Southern France 2-7 June 2003. This year's event attracted 214 participants, which is almost 10 percent more than in 2001. The number of submitted abstracts has also grown considerably over the years. This was also shown in the conference proceedings, with 146 printed papers, which is an increase by almost 25% compared to 2001.

The participation from Eastern and Central Europe, and the Former Soviet Union (FSU) showed a slight increase, but still remains low. On the other hand, the number of authors from Central and Eastern Europe and the FSU more than doubled between 2001 and 2003. Nevertheless, this region and the Southern EU countries remain a challenge in terms of attracting papers and participants in the future.

52% of all participants (111 individuals) filled out the post summer study evaluation form. Participants keep valuing the summer study very highly in general, but there is still room for improvements in several areas.

53% of all respondents have attended 2 or more summer studies (including the 2003 edition), and as many as 23% have attended at least 4 summer studies. 91% of all respondents said that they intend to attend future summer studies.

Of the contents part of the summer study, the panels, the informal sessions, the proceedings and the conference newsletter Graffiti are valued the highest. This year's poster session indicated that the trend started in 2001 towards higher ranking of the poster session continues. The number of posters also increased by almost 50%.

Plenary sessions were not rated so highly. The problems with last-minute drop-outs, partly due to the transportation strike, continues to be a challenge for eceee and much effort must be made to create interesting and "provocative" plenary sessions.

The general organisation of the summer study was highly rated by participants, with 59% of all respondents rating it as 5 (where 1 is lowest and 5 the best), and 92% of all respondents giving it either a 4 or a 5 rating. The registration process and the on-site registration received similar high ratings, whereas meals and accommodations received lower, but still acceptable, ratings.

The Valescure venue was new for this year. Because of a major reconstruction at the Mandelieu venue (the site for three previous summer studies) a new venue had to be found. Participants gave mixed ratings of this year's venue, where the largest drawback seems to be its distance from the Nice airport and other means of public transport.

For some comparisons over the years, please see the eceee website at www.eceee.org. Go to "summer Study" and "evaluation".

A. Key figures

Participants, abstracts and papers

	2001	2003	change
Number of summer study participants	196	214	↗ 9%
Number of abstracts submitted	224	237	↗ 6%
Number of abstracts selected	165	185	↗ 12%
<i>of which were posters</i>	37	45	
Number of final papers received	118	146	↗ 23%
<i>of which were posters</i>	22	32	
Drop-out rate (abstracts selected minus final papers published)	28%	21%	↘ 17%
<i>poster drop-out rate</i>	41%	27%	

Distribution of papers between panels in 2003

Panel no. and theme*	no. of final papers
Panel 1. Energy efficiency: a strategic choice for Europe:	32 (n/a in 2001)
Panel 2. Comfort and energy use in buildings:	25 (19 in 2001)
Panel 3. Land use, transportation and mobility:	13 (13 in 2001)
Panel 4. Building the bridge from lab to customer:	33 (n/a in 2001)
Panel 5. Market-based instruments:	21 (n/a in 2001)
Panel 6. Dynamics of consumption:	22 (14 in 2001)

* The titles of panels 1, 3 and 6 were different in 2001, but the general themes were the same: Policy (p1), Transportation (p3) and Dynamics of Consumption (p6). Panels 2, 3 and 5 had different themes that overlapped more or less depending on the panel, thus a meaningful comparison is not possible.

Country of origin for authors and participants in 2001 and 2003

The rise in participation rates is a sign of health for the eceee summer study, but the low participation rate from Southern EU¹ countries as well as Eastern and Central Europe and the Former Soviet Union (FSU) continues to be a concern, especially since these many of these countries are entering EU shortly. Participants from Eastern and Central Europe and the FSU increased slightly from 8 to 11, giving a slightly higher percentage than in 2001 (an increase from 4% to 5%). On the other hand, the number of authors from Central and Eastern Europe and the FSU more than doubled between 2001 and 2003.

Participants from Southern EU countries were fewer this year, with a decline from 26 to 21 participants. (not counting IEA and EC JRC affiliates from France and Italy respectively). The main reason for this decline was the drop in the participation rate from France, whereas the increase in participation from Portugal and Italy makes the Southern EU participation more evenly distributed.

It remains a challenge for eceee to attract a wider audience from Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean countries. The table overleaf gives a detailed overview of where authors and participants came from in 2001 and 2003 respectively.

Country of origin	Authors of papers and posters	Participants
-------------------	-------------------------------	--------------

¹ France, Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain.

	(first author)			
	2001	2003	2001	2003
Argentina	-	1	1	-
Australia	2	2	2	2
Austria	6	4	8	9
Byelorussia	1	-	-	-
Belgium	4	3 (incl. 1 EC)	6 (incl. 3 EC)	13 (incl. 4 EC)
Brazil	1	-	1	-
Bulgaria	-	1	1	3
Canada	1	-	1	1
Czech Republic	-	-	1	-
Denmark	9	5	26	13
Finland	2	3	5	3
France	15 (incl. 5 IEA)	8 (incl. 5 IEA)	27 (incl. 4 IEA & 4 ICE)	18 (incl. 4 IEA & 4 ICE)
Germany	13	23	13	20
Hungary	1	4	1	3
India	-	-	1	1
Indonesia	-	-	-	1
Italy	1	7 (incl. 4 JRC)	4 (incl. 1 EC)	8 (incl. 2 EC)
Japan	3	4	6	9
Latvia	-	-	1	-
Lithuania	1	-	1	-
Norway	5	9	14	20
Poland	-	-	-	1
Portugal	1	5	3	5
Romania	-	1	1	1
Russia	-	1	-	2
Slovakia	-	1	-	1
Slovenia	-	-	1	-
Spain	-	-	1	-
Sweden	12	16	20	27
Switzerland	1	3	2	3
Thailand	1	1	-	-
The Netherlands	5	11	10	13
United-Kingdom	15	19	18	24
Ukraine	1	2	1	-
USA	16	11	19	12
Uzbekistan	-	1	-	1
TOTAL	118	146	196	214

Respondent's affiliation

The affiliation of participants has been assessed both through analysis of the returned forms (in total 111 forms) as well as through a search in the eceee database.

Based on the participant evaluation forms submitted, the number of participants from university or research institutes appears to be steadily growing, from 21% in 1999, to 30% in 2001 and 36% in 2003 (the 2003 number was verified through the database). At the reverse, inter-governmental organisations appear to have dropped from 15 to 2% since 1999. But this drop is not quite as dramatic when compared with the database search, where 6% percent of the participants had such an affiliation. There has been no

significant change in the other categories since the 1999 edition, except for a positive one: With 3% of participants this year (none in 1999 and 2001), it seems local government organisations are taking an interest in eceee. Based on the database search, the local and regional government/energy agency category was even better represented, with 8% of the participants belonging to such an organisation.

Affiliation (2003): assessment based on returned survey form

36% University/research institute	1% Energy utility
2% Inter-governmental organisation	23% Other private firm, i.e.:
19% National government organisation	13% Non-profit organisation/environmental NGO
3% Local government organisation	5% Other

Affiliation (2003): assessment based on eceee database search

University, research institute	81	38%
National government organisation	45	21%
Consultant	38	18%
Local/regional government organisation or energy agency	17	8%
NGO (environmental NGO, non-profit)	16	7%
Inter-governmental organisation	12	6%
ESCO	8	4%
Energy utility	6	3%
Suppliers of services and goods (incl trade association)	6	3%
Industry as energy consumer	3	1%
Property managers	2	1%
Finance sector, funding organisation	3	1%

Note: The eceee database allows multiple entries to describe affiliation so the total percentage will be higher than 100.

Respondents' attendance frequency, intention to come back

The survey also tried to assess participants' loyalty and their intention to come back in the future. The question on attendance frequency was complemented by a simple search in the database. Finally, in this section a question on the intention to return in the future was asked.

How many times have you attended the eceee Summer Study (including this year)?

1 time	47%
2 times	25%
3 times	5%

4 times	5%
5 times	13%
6 times	5%

New participants among respondents only represent 47% this year, down from around 60% in 1999 and 2001 (but since the response rate was not as high these years, comparisons must be made with care). While still drawing new crowds, the eceee summer study continues to appeal to a group of loyal fans who return each year. 53% of

all respondents had attended 2 or more summer studies (including this one), and as many as 23% have attended at least 4 summer studies.

A cross-check with the eeeee database reveals that 32% of the 2003 participants also participated in 2001, so this indeed does support the conclusion about “loyal fans”. The database is not complete enough to provide comparisons for summer studies older than this.

Do you intend to come back in the future? **91%** YES **4%** NO **5%** no answer

Participants who intend to return to future summer studies answered:

- “The right mixture between formal and informal, information, discussions, networking, etc.”, “The best energy efficiency conference in Europe”; “Best source to find out about what’s happening”, “Great forum for exchange of ideas and opinions”;
- “Networking”, “Unique mix of policy-makers, private, researchers”, “Developing ideas for future co-operation with international colleagues”;
- “Multidisplinary”, “Exchange of thoughts, new ideas”, “Opportunity to think laterally”;
- “Informal environment”, “Relaxing, “Good dance music, nice pool”.

Among the few who do not intend to return, most said:

- “Not really my focus”, “Not sure of relevancy of work in the future”, “Less useful for my current work”.

B – Participants’ rating of the contents and organisation of the Summer Study

Participants global rating of the scientific part of the conference

Participants were asked to rate the following parts of the conference, where 1= not useful, 3 = useful, 5 = very useful. ²

	Average rating	1	2	3	4	5	n / a
Panel sessions	4.3	0%	2%	9%	47%	42%	1%
Informal sessions	3.7	3%	5%	20%	50%	23%	6%
Poster session	3.5	2%	13%	33%	29%	24%	7%
Plenary sessions	3.0	2%	27%	42%	20%	10%	6%
Side Events	2.8	5%	13%	36%	32%	14%	24%
Proceedings	4.1	2%	3%	9%	26%	61%	6%
Graffiti	4.3	2%	2%	7%	32%	56%	3%

Green = <50%, **orange** = 40-49%, **yellow** = 30-39% of all respondents’ rating (non-answers not included).

Panel sessions, proceedings and the summer study newsletter, Graffiti, received very high ratings, with over 80% of participants finding them useful or very useful. Plenary sessions and side events were considered less favourably and will be hot points for the organisation of future summer studies.

² The percentages of ratings 1 to 5 are calculated in relation to the number of people who answered the question (i.e. those who wrote something different from n/a or didn’t answer the question at all). On the contrary, the column n/a groups both n/a answers and no answers and the percentage is calculated in relation to the entire 111 returned forms.

Side events were a new feature at the 2003 edition and will likely be improved with experience. Nevertheless, a number of participants highly praised the “Not the Cannes Film Festival” where a selection of energy efficiency advertisements and short films were shown. Many thanks to Eoin Lees for his epic, but well appreciated, organisation of that side event.

Due to the general transport strike in France as well as full political calendars, the plenary sessions suffered from several last minute drop-outs. Participants suggest: organising less plenaries with sure-to-show speakers, inviting speakers with more controversial opinions and improving acoustics in the plenary room.

The Poster session received the highest grade ever obtained at a summer study. Many participants, both those who attended the session and those who missed it, asked that the posters remain displayed for at least two days at future summer studies.

Participants’ rating of the thematic panels

Participants were asked to give their global rating by encircling one option from 1-5. They were also asked to specify if they did not visit some panels.

(1= not useful, 3 = useful, 5 = very useful).

	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
P1 Energy efficiency: a strategic choice for Europe	0%	5%	21%	39%	34%	32%
P2 Comfort and energy use in buildings	0%	0%	15%	48%	37%	53%
P3 Land use, transportation and mobility	2%	14%	19%	37%	28%	61%
P4 Building the bridge from lab to customer	2%	3%	17%	48%	31%	41%
P5 Market-based instruments	3%	0%	20%	46%	30%	37%
P6 Dynamics of consumption	0%	1%	12%	39%	48%	33%

Green = <50%, **orange** = 40-49%, **yellow** = 30-39% of all respondents’ rating (non-answers not included).

All thematic panels received relatively good ratings, nevertheless a number of participants suggested even stronger selection criteria. According to the “n/a” – no answer – column which corresponds to people who did not attend at all a panel, Panel 1, the “policy panel” remains the most popular panel in attendance, followed very closely by Dynamics of consumption. Several participants regret the low number of papers on land use, transportation and mobility.

Organisation, social programme and value for money

Participants were asked to give their global rating by encircling one option from 1-5.

(1= not useful, 3 = useful, 5 = very useful).

	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
The general organisation of the Summer Study?	1%	1%	6%	33%	59%	1%
The paper submission, review and preparation process?	1%	3%	8%	42%	46%	10%
The registration process?	3%	3%	13%	31%	50%	2%
On-site organisation?	1%	1%	8%	37%	54%	5%
Accommodation	3%	7%	28%	37%	26%	2%
Meals	3%	9%	26%	38%	25%	2%
Social programme	2%	5%	17%	47%	29%	10%
Value for money (summer study as a whole in relation to the fee)	3%	7%	11%	49%	30%	4%

Green = <50%, **orange** = 40-49%, **yellow** = 30-39% of all respondents’ rating (non-answers not included).

Globally, the organisation of the summer study reached participants' expectations, as shown by the high rates of satisfaction for general organisation, the paper and registration processes and on-site arrangements. This year, participants also enjoyed a busy social programme, including daily activities such as karaoke, a pétanque tournament and a successful final party with a high quality live band. All in all, 79% of participants consider attending the summer study well worth the money invested.

General comments and recommendations from participants

Participants were asked the question: "In general, what recommendations would you make for the next Summer Study?" These comments are summed up in five items:

- Venue: "Closer to the sea!" exclaimed many participants, especially those who have visited previous editions held in Mandelieu. "Better accessibility to the hotel" is another strong request.
- Proceedings: there is no clear-cut majority for a unique version (paper or electronic) of the proceedings; while many applauded the introduction of a CD-ROM version, others are quite happy to have a paper version as well.
- Controversy and debate: some participants consider that while the summer study provides a good forum for exchange between like-minded people, more effort should be made in attracting people who represent other disciplines or opinions: from industry to psychology, from marketing experts to opponents of energy efficiency, future summer studies could benefit from a few more disagreements and more cross-boundary discussions.
- Swimming pool: most participants consider the new regulations for water treatment to be absurd and have threatened to boycott any eceee summer study where the pool is not open daily by 7:30 a.m.
- A strong majority of participants request public access to the Internet for future summer studies.