

ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTED TO REPRESENTATIVES OF COMPANIES EXHIBITING AT IPAC'14

Prepared by Christine Petit-Jean-Genaz (IPAC Coordinator for Europe)

Number of Booths: 100

Number of Responses to Questionnaire: 28

The questions are reproduced below with the number of responses

Annex 1 is a summary of the exhibitor comments and some answers/explanations/spontaneous comments from Christine Petit-Jean-Genaz

Annex 2 is the Questionnaire

The IPAC'14 OC/SPCs are aware of what follows and will keep it in mind in the organization of future IPAC exhibitions, and seminars.

Section A: Organization of the Industrial Exhibition

1. Please comment on the organization and preparation of the industrial exhibition. Do you consider it:

- | | |
|------------------------------|----|
| a) well organized | 17 |
| b) relatively well organized | 9 |
| c) could be better organized | 1 |

Analysis of Responses: Clear majority that the organization was good. But, with 9 “relatively well organized” there is room for improvement.

Comments:

- 1. Start on Monday 13:00 is a waste of time when the setting up was Sunday*
- 2. Space was a bit tight*
- 3. Food and drinks free*
- 4. Great layout and including posters and food and exhibition works well, AT LEAST 3 EXHIBITOR PASSES PER BOOTH*
- 5. It would be fine if all exhibitors would have full access to all sessions and events*
- 6. The PCO was a great help*
- 7. More power plugs needed. Tables too small.*
- 8. Information about conditions and times for setup of the exhibition booths could have been better*

2. Please comment on the suitability of the location of the exhibition at the convention centre, the contact and interface with conference delegates, opportunities for networking. Did you consider it:

- | | |
|---------------------------|----|
| a) well suited | 22 |
| b) relatively well suited | 5 |
| c) could be better suited | 0 |

Analysis of Responses: Clearly the Convention Centre met with a clear majority of satisfied exhibitors.

Comments

- 1. Booth somewhat separated from posters, food. Need little more close contact with conference participants.*
- 2. Much better than previous years*
- 3. Booths in gallery not accessible enough*
- 4. Important to have the venue with local destinations reachable on foot*
- 5. Expensive. 25% reduction would be appreciated*
- 6. The location itself is very good, but there is no lift going from the parking deck to this floor. Better information about use of the terrace for delivery would be good (signs leading exhibitors for delivery of goods)*
- 7. We'd appreciate coffee breaks in advance for the exhibitors only!*

Section B: The Special Session for Industry, Wednesday, 18 June

This session is intended primarily for the benefit of the industrial exhibition participants.

1. Is two hours sufficient time for the invited oral session on Engagement with Industry?

a) Yes 18 b) No 3

Analysis of Responses: *Clear majority of satisfied exhibitors. However, since only 18 apparently attended the Seminar, more communication/publication/encouragement is necessary.*

Comments:

1. Two hours is too long
2. We suggest a full day!
3. Much better communication this time

2. Are the aims of the session matched to the audience?

a) Yes 17,5 b) No 2,5

The half points reflect one exhibitor who was “half and half”.

Analysis of Responses: *Clear majority of satisfied exhibitors.*

Comments:

1. Yes and No. Hard to match whole audience, but industry should be more of the focus, small and large companies included.

3. Did you think that the topics covered in the oral presentations were:

a) well suited to the session 5
b) fairly well suited to the session 16
c) not suited to the session. 0

Analysis of Responses: *A majority found the session “fairly well suited to the session”, indicating that more attention is required on the choice of oral presentation.*

List of Topics Proposed by Industry for Future Seminars:

1. Power Electronics Best Practice
2. RF Systems
3. Particle therapy. Operational costs of facilities (mainly power)
4. Simulation of accelerator components would be an interesting topic.
5. How to better level the playing field and provide maximum advance notification for tenders.
6. WEXA01 Low Emittance Upgrade for Existing Mid-size Light Sources.

4. Were the presentations of good quality? Was the level of science/technology about right?

a) Well presented, with the right level of science/technology 17
b) Presentation/level of science/technology could be better 2

Analysis of Responses: *Majority in agreement that the level of science/technology was right.*

Comments:

1. We missed the relevance to industry engagement.

5. Should the session focus on one major project or several projects?

a) One major project 3 b) Several projects 17

Analysis of Responses: Clear majority in favour of reporting on several projects.

6. Should the session be composed of market reviews by representatives of industry or tactical project reports by researchers?

- a) Market reviews by representatives of industry 2
- b) Tactical project reports by researchers 4
- c) A mixture of a) and b) 12

Analysis of Responses: Clear preference for a mixture of market reviews by representatives of industry and tactical project reports by researchers.

Section C: General Questions

1. Are you a regular exhibitor at IPAC and other JACoW conferences?

- a) Yes 8
- b) No 9

Analysis of Responses: Only 17 out of 28 exhibitors responded to this question. Probably does not reflect the true picture since with 100 exhibitors more than half are regular exhibitors (around 50).

2. Have you been able to establish a good level of networking with conference delegates during the exhibition and the session for industry?

- a) Yes 24
- b) No 2

Analysis of Responses: Clear majority who have experienced a good level of networking.

Comments:

- 1. Needed a booth in a more attractive position with more products.
- 2. Met top level people.
- 3. New contacts are not efficient. Mostly existing contact persons.

3. Will you consider exhibiting at future IPACs?

- a) Yes 25,5
- b) No 0,5

Analysis of Responses: Clearly the majority of IPAC exhibitors are regular exhibitors, establishing IPAC as one of the most important of JACoW conferences for exhibitors.

Comments:

- 1. Perhaps, needs thought (the 2 x 0,5 above).
- 2. Neither a) nor b), Possibly

Annex 1

SUMMARY OF EXHIBITOR COMMENTS AND SOME ANSWERS/EXPLANATIONS/SPONTANEOUS COMMENTS

Section A: Organization of the Industrial Exhibition

1. Please comment on the organization and preparation of the industrial exhibition.

A1 COMMENTS:

1. Start on Monday 13:00 is a waste of time when the setting up was Sunday

CPJG: The 13:00 start was an idea of the PCO, taken without consultation. CHPJG was informed of this on Monday morning when she began visiting exhibitors. She asked the PCO to modify the start. This was done half way through Monday morning.

Lesson to be learnt: a clear policy document for industrial exhibition organization is needed.

2. Space was a bit tight

3. Food and drinks free

4. Great layout and including posters and food and exhibition works well, AT LEAST 3 EXHIBITOR PASSES PER BOOTH

CHPJG: Three "booth staff passes" has normally been the policy for IPACs in Europe.

Lesson to be learnt: a clear policy document for industrial exhibition organization is needed, in particular concerning this issue.

5. It would be fine if all exhibitors would have full access to all sessions and events

CPJG: The policy to allow extra delegate registrations for exhibitors at a reduced rate should cover this situation.

6. The PCO was a great help

7. More power plugs needed. Tables too small.

8. Information about conditions and times for setup of the exhibition booths could have been better

Section A: Organization of the Industrial Exhibition

2. Please comment on the suitability of the location of the exhibition at the convention centre, the contact and interface with conference delegates, opportunities for networking.

A2 COMMENTS:

1. Booth somewhat separated from posters, food. Need little more close contact with conference participants

2. Much better than previous years

3. Booths in gallery not accessible enough

CPJG: The booths located in the galleries were added when the "normal" space was full. The companies booking late were aware of the situation.

4. Important to have the venue with local destinations reachable on foot

5. Expensive. 25% reduction would be appreciated

CPJG: It's true booth rental is expensive. Rental however also includes 1 full delegate registration and up to 3 booth staff who have access to the welcome cocktail and the conference reception. Furthermore, the organization of a seminar for industry, as well as the production of the booklet Future Accelerator Projects and Upgrades are part of the package offered to exhibitors.

A policy document on "conditions" for exhibitors at IPACs would be useful.

6. The location itself is very good, but there is no lift going from the parking deck to this floor. Better information about use of the terrace for delivery would be good (signs leading exhibitors for delivery of goods)

7. We'd appreciate coffee breaks in advance for the exhibitors only!

CPJG: The coffee breaks "normally" begin a quarter to half an hour before the end of the oral sessions, until a quarter or half an hour after. This issue should be addressed for future IPACs.

Section B: The Special Session for Industry, Wednesday, 18 June

1. Is two hours sufficient time for the invited oral session on Engagement with Industry?

B1 COMMENTS

1. Two hours is too long

2. We suggest a full day!

3. Much better communication this time

CPJG: I think this comment be due to the visit made by myself and the IPAC'15 exhibition organizers to all Exhibitors (100) each morning Monday to Wednesday to: a) improve communication!, b) draw attention to the Seminar for Industry, c) to hand out the booklet Future Accelerator Projects and Upgrades, d) to hand out the Questionnaire for feedback.

Section B: The Special Session for Industry, Wednesday, 18 June

2. Are the aims of the session matched to the audience?

B2 COMMENTS

1. Yes and No. Hard to match whole audience, but industry should be more of the focus, small and large companies included.

Section B: The Special Session for Industry, Wednesday, 18 June

B3 COMMENTS: List of Topics Proposed by Industry for Future Seminars:

1. Power Electronics Best Practice

2. RF Systems

3. Particle therapy. Operational costs of facilities (mainly power)

4. Simulation of accelerator components would be an interesting topic

5. How to better level the playing field and provide maximum advance notification for tenders

6. WEXA01 Low Emittance Upgrade for Existing Mid-size Light Sources (???)

Section B: The Special Session for Industry, Wednesday, 18 June

4. Were the presentations of good quality? Was the level of science/technology about right?

B4 Comment:

1. We missed the relevance to industry engagement

CPJG: A good point. Engagement with industry was the title of the session decided by the IPAC'14 Organizers this year, in parallel with the elaboration of the session, and following the Coordinator's reflection as to what were the aims of the session. The old title was simply "Seminar for Industry". Future IPACs to keep this in mind when developing the topics to be addressed in this session.

Section C: General Questions

2. Have you been able to establish a good level of networking with conference delegates during the exhibition and the session for industry?

C2 Comments:

1. Needed a booth in a more attractive position with more products

2. Met top level people

3. New contacts are not efficient. Mostly existing contact persons

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF COMPANIES EXHIBITING AT IPAC'14

INTRODUCTION

The IPAC'14 Organizing Committees are seeking feedback from exhibitors at IPAC'14 on issues relating to collaboration with industry, and in particular:

- the organization of the industrial exhibitions, and
- the talks scheduled within the special session on Engagement with Industry (new session title recently adopted by the IPAC'14 OC) which is part of the conference oral programme.

The IPAC Sessions on Engagement with Industry traditionally take place on Wednesday afternoons, at the close of the three day industrial exhibitions.

These two-hour oral sessions are devoted to issues of interest to representatives of industry, in particular emerging markets, collaboration between accelerator laboratories and industry, technology transfer, etc. The sessions are also intended to appeal to a wide cross-section of other delegates at the conference.

We appreciate your feedback on the organization of the IPAC'14 industrial exhibition and the talks scheduled during the special session on Engagement with Industry. Your responses to the questions below will be carefully considered in connection with future IPACs to better target and satisfy the requirements of exhibitors.

Please hand in this questionnaire immediately following the Session on Engagement with Industry at IPAC'14, on:

Wednesday afternoon, 18 June, 2014 at 14:00

QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A: Organization of the Industrial Exhibition

1. Please comment on the organization and preparation of the industrial exhibition. Do you consider it:

- a) well organized
- b) relatively well organized
- c) could be better organized

Comments:

2. Please comment on the suitability of the location of the exhibition at the convention centre, the contact and interface with conference delegates, opportunities for networking. Did you consider it:

- a) well suited
- b) relatively well suited
- c) could be better suited

Comments:

Section B: The Special Session for Industry, Wednesday, 18 June

This session is intended primarily for the benefit of the industrial exhibition participants.

1. Is two hours sufficient time for the invited oral session on Engagement with Industry?

- a) Yes
- b) No

Comments:

2. Are the aims of the session matched to the audience?

- a) Yes
- b) No

Comments:

3. Did you think that the topics covered in the oral presentations were:

- a) well suited to the session
- b) fairly well suited to the session
- c) not suited to the session.

Please list topics that would be of interest for you:

4. Were the presentations of good quality? Was the level of science/technology about right?

- a) Well presented, with the right level of science/technology
- b) Presentation/level of science/technology could be better

Comments:

5. Should the session focus on one major project or several projects?

- a) One major project
- b) Several projects

6. Should the session be composed of market reviews by representatives of industry or tactical project reports by researchers?

- a) Market reviews by representatives of industry
- b) Tactical project reports by researchers
- c) A mixture of a) and b)

Section C: General Questions

1. Are you a regular exhibitor at IPAC and other JACoW conferences?

- a) Yes
- b) No

2. Have you been able to establish a good level of networking with conference delegates during the exhibition and the session for industry?

- a) Yes
- b) No

Comments:

3. Will you consider exhibiting at future IPACs?

a) Yes

b) No

Comments:

If you have any further comments, or suggestions how the Industrial Exhibition or the Special Session for Engagement with Industry at IPAC could be improved, please let us know by writing in the space below.

Many thanks for your feedback!