

eceee Summer Study 2001 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

Number of questionnaires returned to the CMs : 74

All percentages are calculated based on the number of written answers for each question.

1. What is your affiliation?

University	22	30 %
Inter-governmental organisation	6	8 %
National government organisation	9	12 %
Local government organisation	0	0 %

Utility	3	4 %
Other private firm	12	16 %
Non-profit organisation	12	16 %
Other	10	14 %

Comments from the CMs: although academic staff represents the largest population, representation from government institutions and private organisations (many "others" turned out to be independent consultants) is not lacking, contrary to "public belief". A stronger focus on issues which interest people from local (and regional) government organisms could however be strategic for future summer studies: these are in many countries the people who will ultimately be dealing with the concrete programmes to achieve greater energy efficiency and reduce climate change, and they often seem absent from debates on these subjects (not just at eceee but elsewhere also).

2. How many times have you attended the eceee Summer Study?

1 time	46	63%
2 times	9	12%
3 times	5	7%
4 times	9	12%
5 times	4	5%

Comments from the CMs: Seems like a very high number of new participants, however there may have been some confusion in answering the question: does the answer include the present Summer Study or not? In any case, if this data is consistent with previous summer studies (maybe available through Nil's database) it means that there is a strong rate of turnover, which would indicate a broad base of persons exposed throughout the years... (members ???).

3. Do you intend to come back in the future?

Yes	67	91%
No	3	4%
n/a	4	5%

4. Why?

Networking / Best or most comprehensive meeting of ee experts in Europe /
 Interesting topics, papers, useful information / Informal atmosphere.

Of the 3 who answered no, 2 stated that energy efficiency was not their normal field of work and the third that company policy was to send a different person each time.

5. Please rate the following

Note: on this and subsequent rating questions, certain participants chose to modulate their response by checking several ratings for a single question or using the width of the columns to indicate a higher or lower rating. In all these cases, only the lowest rating was taken in consideration.

	Not interesting		Interesting		Very interesting		No opinion	
Panel sessions	2	3%	28	39%	42	58%	0	0%
Informal sessions	6	8%	32	44%	32	44%	2	3%
Poster session	10	14%	36	52%	15	22%	8	12%
Plenary sessions	2	3%	37	51%	33	46%	0	0%
Proceedings	1	1%	19	26%	47	65%	5	7%
Graffiti	4	6%	35	49%	33	46%	0	0%

Coverting the verbal descriptions to numeric averages					
	Not interesting, no. of responses	Interesting no. of responses	very interesting no. of responses	Total # responses	average
	1	3	5		
Panel sessions	2	28	42	72	4,1
Informal sessions	6	32	32	70	3,7
Posters session	10	36	15	61	3,2
Plenaries	2	37	33	72	3,9
Proceedings	1	19	47	67	4,4
Graffiti	4	35	33	72	3,8

Comments from the CMs: a very large number of participants used the "comments" column below this question to deplore the formal character of what they expected to be informal sessions and therefore the lack of discussion in these sessions. Suggestions made to discourage such behaviour by session promoters include reserving sign-up to a next-day-only basis, using free slots in the panel program for formal-but-not-refereed presentations (thus freeing up "true" informals) or not providing slide projection equipment...

6. How do rate the panel sessions (papers presented, debates...) of the Summer Study?

	Poor		OK but could be better		Excellent		No opinion	
P1 Energy efficiency policy	0	0%	14	29%	19	40%	15	31%
P2 Dynamics of consumption	0	0%	17	35%	14	29%	18	37%
P3 Mobility & transport	1	4%	14	54%	8	31%	3	12%
P4 Sustainable energy use in buildings	0	0%	14	29%	12	25%	22	46%
P5 Energy efficiency markets & financing mechanisms	0	0%	13	30%	14	32%	17	39%
P6 Energy efficiency under JI & the CDM	0	0%	13	30%	14	32%	17	39%

How do you rate...

Poorly organised OK but could be better Well organised No opinion

7. The general organisation of the Summer Study?	3	4%	3	4%	64	91%	0	0%
8. The paper submission, review and preparation process?	1	1%	17	24%	44	63%	8	11%
9. The registration process?	4	6%	15	21%	49	70%	2	3%
10. On-site organisation?	0	0%	8	11%	62	89%	0	0%
11. Accommodation and meals	1	1%	2	3%	67	96%	0	0%
12. Social programme and excursions	3	4%	12	18%	13	19%	39	58%

Comments from the CMs: Three excursions (catering mainly to accompanying persons) were offered for a minimum of 15 people in each. Since there were only 16 accompanying persons, it was completely impossible to meet the limit... Participants suggested to organise one excursion only and to schedule it during free time for all participants (i.e. make some space in conference programme). This last request appears quite difficult to satisfy but there may be some means to do so, with better preparation (see CM report, item on conference schedule).