



6TH EUROPEAN PUBLIC HEALTH CONFERENCE

***Health in Europe: are we there yet?
Learning from the past, building the future***

13-16 November 2013, Brussels, Belgium



RESULTS OF THE PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION

This publication arises from the conference "Brussels 2013" which has received funding from the European Union, in the framework of the Public Health Programme (2012 43 05).

Copyright: EPH Conference, January 2014

Author: Dineke Zeegers Paget, EPH Conference office

Summary of main results

A total of 1321 public health professionals from 60 countries attended the Brussels 2013 conference, of which 361 participants (34% of those invited to evaluate) filled out the evaluation form.

Overall outcome:

81.0 % of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the Brussels 2013 conference

Background of participants:

75.4 % of the participants of the Brussels 2013 conference were research-based.

Networking:

72.2 % of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the networking possibilities offered at Brussels 2013.

Information provided:

77.8 % of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the information provided for Brussels 2013.

Abstract supplement:

77.3 % of the participants of Brussels 2013 were very satisfied/satisfied with the new way of organizing the abstract supplement of the European Journal of Public Health.

Exhibition area:

89.8% of the participants visited the exhibition area at least once.

55.6 % of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the exhibition area at Brussels 2013.

Plenary programme:

69.9% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the plenary programme at Brussels 2013.

Parallel programme:

84.2% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the parallel programme at Brussels 2013

Moderated posters programme:

66.7% of participants participated in the moderated posters programme. 73.8% were very satisfied/satisfied with the moderated posters programme at Brussels 2013.

Poster walks:

41.5% of participants participated in at least one poster walk. 76.7% were very satisfied/satisfied with the poster walks at Brussels 2013.

Pre conferences:

38.5% of participants attended one or more pre-conferences; 80.4% were very satisfied/satisfied with the pre conferences at Brussels 2013.

Registration:

88.2% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the registration at Brussels 2013.

Conference venue:

68.8% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the conference venue at Brussels 2013.

Catering:

42.2% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the catering and the social programme at Brussels 2013.

Filmfestival

51.5% of the respondents were aware of the Filmfestival during the conference and 66.7% rated this as important/very important.

Abstract submission:

92.0% of the respondents were very satisfied/satisfied with the abstract handling system at Brussels 2013.

Future conference (Glasgow 2014):

86.3% of the participants remember receiving the first announcement for our next conference and 82.7% is planning to attend Glasgow 2014.

Table of contents:

Summary of main results.....	3
Introduction	6
1. Background of the participants	8
2. General	8
3. Information	9
4. Abstract supplement.....	12
5. Exhibition area	13
6. Plenary programme.....	14
7. Parallel programme	15
8. Moderated posters programme	16
9. Poster walks.....	18
10. Pre conferences.....	19
11. Registration	20
12. Conference venue	21
13. Catering.....	23
14. Social Programme	23
15. Filmfestival Open Society Foundations	24
16. Abstract handling.....	24
17. Future conference (Glasgow 2014).....	26
18. Any other input.....	26
19. Comparison of the participants' evaluation with the data from 2009-2013.....	27

Introduction

The 6th European Public Health Conference took place in SQUARE, Brussels, Belgium from 13-16 November 2013 and was organised by EUPHA and ASPHER:

In partnership with:

- Belgian Association of Public Health
- EuroHealthNet

With the support of:

- European Commission
- Visit Brussels
- Open Society Foundations

In collaboration with:

- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control – ECDC
- European Health Management Association - EHMA
- European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies
- European Public Health Alliance - EPHA
- National Institute for Public Health and the Environment - RIVM
- Netherlands institute for health services research - NIVEL
- Scientific Institute of Public Health - WIV/ISP
- Vaccines Europe
- WHO Regional Office for Europe

A total of 1321 public health professionals from 60 countries attended the conference. The programme included 8 plenary sessions, 31 parallel sessions, 37 workshops, 30 moderated poster sessions and 10 poster walks. More information on the conference and the organisation can be found in the Brussels 2013 report.

Each European Public Health Conference is subject to a multi-layered evaluation. The objectives of this evaluation are:

- to learn from our experiences;
- to improve the organisation of future conferences.

The full evaluation report is an internal document that is distributed to our partners and future organisers. This part of the evaluation, the participants' evaluation, is made publicly accessible on the conference website.

The results presented here are based on the evaluation by the conference participants. 1070 participants¹ received two emails shortly after the conference (on 22 November and 3 December 2013) inviting them to evaluate the conference through a web-based questionnaire. A total of 361 participants (33.7% of all invitees) filled out the evaluation form.

The questionnaire was divided in 18 parts and included 74 questions:

1. Background of the participants
2. General
3. Information
4. Abstract supplement
5. Exhibition area
6. Plenary programme
7. Parallel programme
8. Moderated posters programme
9. Poster walks
10. Pre conferences

¹ Of the 1321 registered for the conference, we did not include the late cancellations (49), the pre conference only participants (120) and the day registrations (82) in this evaluation.


11. Registration
12. Conference venue
13. Catering
14. Social programme
15. Filmfestival Open Society Foundations
16. Abstract handling
17. Future conference (Glasgow 2014)
18. Any other input

1. Background of the participants

75.4 % of the participants of the Brussels 2013 conference were research-based

The first part of the evaluation contained one question on the background of the participants. The rationale was to find out who we are reaching with our conference. About three quarters of the participants have a background in research.

1.1. What is your background/work field?



■ Researcher
■ Policymaker
■ Practitioner
■ Trainer
■ Other

Respondents: 357
75.4% research background
2.5% policy background
7.3% practice background
5.3% training background


2. General

81.0 % of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the Brussels 2013 conference

The second part of the questionnaire included three questions and a possibility to comment:

2.1. How important was the conference theme "Are we there yet?" for your work?

The European Public Health Conference in Brussels 2013 had a very general theme to include the very large definition of public health. Comments from the respondents included the theme being too broad and or too cliché.




■ Poor
■ Very important
■ Important
■ Not very important

Respondents: 354

2.2. How would you rate the conference as a whole?


Most comments received appreciated the scientific content and technical organisation. The venue was described as not very 'user-friendly'. The networking was highly appreciated. Again, some comments were received on the high number of activities (too many parallel sessions) and the walking distance within the venue.



2.3. How would you rate the scientific programme as a whole?

The scientific part of the programme included 14 pre conferences, 8 plenary sessions, 186 oral presentations in 31 parallel sessions, 37 workshops, 240 posters presented in 30 moderated poster sessions, 150 posters presented in 10 poster walks and 7 lunch meetings.

Most respondents appreciated the wide range of interesting and topical issues, "good to see where we are across Europe". Several commented on the amount of tracks and overlap of sessions on a similar topic. It was reported that the parallel session were of a higher standard than in previous years.



3. Information


72.2 % of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the networking possibilities offered at Brussels 2013.

77.8 % of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the information provided for Brussels 2013.

This part included nine questions on networking, the website, the online conference programme, the information given before the conference and the conference newsletters.

3.1. We aim to offer networking at our conferences, how did this work for you?

Overall, the conference was an excellent place to network. The extended networking lunch on Friday was highly appreciated. The Meet&Greet at the EUPHA stand was seen as a good tool to network. For newcomers, the networking opportunities at the conference could be better supported.




3.2. Do you have any ideas on how to improve the networking at our conferences?

Several ideas were proposed including:


- A twitter wall or message board for participants to interact directly.
- One or more 'meeting points' to find each other.
- More areas to sit for networking.
- Coffee and tea available throughout the day.
- Have 'socials' after specialized topic sessions.
- A small social event on the first day for newcomers to the conference.
- Offer 'topic' tables during coffee and lunch breaks or organise 'speedy networking' sessions during lunch.
- Producing a 'conference app'.

3.3. How would you rate the conference website?



3.4. How would you rate the online conference programme?

Most participants highly appreciate the online conference programme. Some would like to see an easy downloadable version, one suggested to improve the lay-out.




Respondents:	352
Average score:	4.00

3.5. Did you create your own personal programme?

Four out of ten participants (N=317) used this highly appreciated extra service, which allowed for creating and printing your personal preferences for the conference programme.


3.6. If yes, how would you rate this extra service?



Respondents:	180
Average score:	4.22

3.7. How would you rate the amount of emails received before the conference?


Only very few participants (7.5%) indicated that the amount of emails before the conference was too much.



Respondents:	347
--------------	-----

3.8. How would you rate the information provided in the conference newsletters?

The information in the conference newsletters are highly appreciated. Some commented on the length (too long) of the newsletter, whilst others proposed to include more local information (maps, how to get a taxi, etc.).



4. Abstract supplement


77.3 % of the participants of Brussels 2013 were very satisfied/satisfied with the new way of organizing the abstract supplement of the European Journal of Public Health

4.1. Were you aware of the new way of providing the Abstract Supplement?

For the first time, there was no hard copy of the abstract supplement produced, nor included in the conference bag. The abstract supplement was made available both per session and in full via the partner website (OUP). Linked to the abstract supplement was a three-month free subscription to the European Journal of Public Health. Out of 354 respondents, 46.9% were aware of the new way of providing the abstract supplement.

Out of the 354 respondents, only 32.5% consulted the supplement before or during the conference (question 4.2.). 48.0% of respondents (N= 354) knew that the online supplement was linked to a 3-month complimentary subscription to the EJPH (question 4.3.). And 59.4% (N=340) indicated that they intend to use this extra service (question 4.4.).

4.5. How would you rate this extra service?



5. Exhibition area

89.8% of the participants visited the exhibition area at least once.

55.6 % of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the exhibition area at Brussels 2013


The exhibition area was organised in the Exhibition hall, where coffee and lunch was served. There were 17 exhibitors present:

- 4 European institutions;
- 6 publishers;
- 3 European NGOs;
- 1 patient network; and
- 2 organisers.

5.1. Did you visit the exhibition area?


Of the 315 respondents, 89.8% confirmed they visited the exhibition area at least once.

5.2. If yes, how would you rate the stands at the conference?



Respondents:	325
Average score:	3.53

5.3. How relevant were the exhibition stands according to you?



Respondents:	327
Average score:	3.42

On average, the exhibition stands were seen as very relevant.

5.4. Did you take brochures/leaflets/etc. from the exhibition stands?

Out of 339 respondents, 66.7% took materials offered at the stands.

5.5. Would you like to see more exhibition stands?

41% of the respondents (N=334) would like to see an increase in exhibition stands. Several respondents would like to see more publishers and more EU-funded projects in the exhibition area.

6. Plenary programme

69.9% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the plenary programme at Brussels 2013

The 6th European Public Health Conference included 6 plenary sessions, an opening and a closing ceremony.

Plenary programme

The plenary programme included 6 plenary sessions:

Plenary 1: Are we there yet? Learning from the past, building the future

Moderator: Walter Ricciardi, EUPHA

Speakers:

Zsuzsanna Jakab, WHO Regional Office for Europe

Sir Muir Gray, National Knowledge Service, United Kingdom

Plenary 2: Hurling towards the edge? Population dynamics and public health

Moderator: Monika Kosinska, EPHA

Speaker: Johan Mackenbach, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands

Panellist: Robert Johnstone, European Patients Forum

Plenary 3: No limits for public health! Using evidence for policy changes

Moderator: Josep Figueras, European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies

Panellists:

Tomaz Gantar, Minister of Health, Slovenia

Miklos Szocska, Minister of Health, Hungary

Antonio Correia de Campos, Member European Parliament, Portugal

Dominique Polton, National Health Insurance, France

Clive Needle, EuroHealthNet

Plenary 4: How to make it happen! On the development of people and institutions in public health

Moderator: Helmut Brand, University of Maastricht, Netherlands

Panellists:

Peter Piot, Dean, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom

Julio Frenk, Harvard School of Public Health, United States

Marianne Olsson, President EHMA

Late breaker session: Health in all policies @ the European Commission

Moderator: Kieran Walshe, Manchester Business School, United Kingdom

Speakers:

Katja de Sadeleer, European Commission, DG Enlargement

Barbara Kerstiëns, European Commission, DG Research

Plenary 5: Investing in Health: good practices from the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing


Moderator: Andrzej Rys, European Commission, DG Health and Consumers

Speakers:

Bernadette Hannigan, Department of Health, Northern Ireland

Jean Bousquet, Chairman of the WHO Global Alliance against Chronic Respiratory Diseases

6.1. What was your general impression of the content of the plenaries?



6.2. What was the most interesting plenary session you attended or speaker you have heard?


The keynote speakers were much appreciated. Both Sir Muir Gray and Johan Mackenbach were specifically mentioned as inspiring. The lay-out of the session organised by EuroHealthNet (panel discussion with twitter wall) was mentioned as good example ('the new way forward').

7. Parallel programme

84.2% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the parallel programme at Brussels 2013

7.1. What was your general impression on the content of parallel sessions?


Most respondents reported the variety of experiences from across the countries as very positive. Comments focussed on the little time left for discussion in the oral sessions (6 presentations in 90 minutes) and the variety of quality in the presentations. The problem of too many interesting sessions at the same time was reported again.



Respondents:	350
Average score:	3.91

7.2. What was your general impression concerning the chairs?

The chairs were highly appreciated. For the first time, there was a possibility for 'eager to learn' participants to co-chair with an experienced chair. This was specifically mentioned as positive in the comments.



Respondents:	344
Average score:	4.03

7.3. What was the most interesting parallel session you attended?

There was a wide variety in the answers received on this question. The workshop: Pampers or pamper? Should we celebrate an ageing population or fear it?, the skills building sessions and the attention given to austerity were mentioned the most.

8. Moderated posters programme

66.7% of participants participated in the moderated posters programme. 73.8% were very satisfied/satisfied with the moderated posters programme at Brussels 2013


In Brussels 2013, we organised 30 moderated poster sessions on Friday 15 November from 15:30-16:30 and on Saturday 16 November from 11:00-12:00. Moderated poster sessions combine displaying a poster in the Poster Hall and giving a 5-minute presentation in a parallel session room.

8.1. Did you attend a moderated poster session?

Out of 339 respondents, 66.7% reported that they did attend at least one moderated poster session.

8.2. What was your general impression of the content of the moderated poster sessions?


Several comments were received on the used model of a poster combined with a five minute oral presentation in a session room. Posters should either be presented in front of the poster, or an oral presentation should be given in a session room. The combination continues to raise questions.



Respondents:	248
Average score:	3.84


8.3. What was your general impression of the location of the moderated poster sessions?

Even though it was appreciated that the posters were very visible in the Poster Hall, it was still reported as confusing to have the poster in the Poster Hall and the presentation in a session room.



Respondents:	248
Average score:	3.73

8.4. How would you rate the quality of the moderated poster presentations?



Respondents:	245
Average score:	3.84

9. Poster walks

41.5% of participants participated in at least one poster walk. 76.7% were very satisfied/satisfied with the poster walks at Brussels 2013


Next to the oral programme, 10 poster walks were organised in the poster area (Poster Hall). Poster walks consisted of summarizing up to 17 posters by a moderator with poster presenters being present to answer questions.

9.1. Did you attend one of the Poster walks?

41.5% of 340 respondents did attend at least one poster walk. Comments received were that people were unable to attend the poster walks because of the fully packed programme. Several organised their own poster walk.


9.2. What was your general impression of the content of the walk?

The poster walks were seen as informative and an excellent opportunity for networking.



Respondents:	155
Average score:	3.94


9.3. Could you easily find the location of your poster walk?



Respondents:	156
Average score:	3.92

9.4. How would you rate the quality of the posters?

In general, the posters were of good quality. There were some empty poster boards (in total there were 29 posters not displayed). It was reported that the English language skills of presenters was sometimes poor.



10. Pre conferences

38.5% of participants attended one or more pre-conferences; 80.4% were very satisfied/satisfied with the pre conferences at Brussels 2013

10.1. Did you attend a pre-conference?

38.5% of the participants (N=348) attended at least one pre-conference.


10.2. Please list the one(s) you have participated in:

The information below is based on the registration data for Brussels 2013.

Number	Organised by	Title
20	EUPHA	Public health - the next step
89	ECDC	ECDC
79	EHMA	Satellite meeting ECHO project
26	EUPHA	Supporting a Healthy Nutrition Policy for Europe
23	EUPHA/HSR Europe	One-day training session for starting HSR researchers
84	EUPHA	Current approaches to screening and management of communicable diseases
44	EUPHA	The use of injury data for mainstreaming accident prevention within national and EU-level health and consumer safety policies
40	EUPHA/Uni Louvain	Migrant health
91	OSI	Round table: Novel ways of improving Roma people's health: collaborative national, regional and European strategies
24	ASPHER	Public health workforce
22	EUPHA	The burden of mental health in Europe: future needs for monitoring and research
128	European Commission	Mechanisms of successful knowledge transfer: operating at multiple levels of the science-policy interface
46	EUPHA	11th Preconference on social security and health: How to gain knowledge on consequences of sickness absence or disability pension
43	ASPHER	ASPHER Young Researchers Forum

10.3. What was your general impression on the content?


Overall the pre conferences are seen as very informative, interactive and interesting. Pre conferences continue to offer an excellent opportunity to network and interact with others in the same field. The content of the pre-conference organised by the European Commission was highly appreciated ('Should be repeated'). The best comment was 'Worth the extra day'.



Respondents:	151
Average score:	4.07

10.4. What was your general impression on the organisation?

The organisation of the pre conferences was highly appreciated. The organisation of coffee/tea in a distant location was sometimes mentioned as disruptive to the discussions.




Respondents:	154
Average score:	3.95

11. Registration

88.2% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the registration at Brussels 2013

11.1. What was your general impression of the online registration process?


Online registration was highly appreciated. Some comments were received on the extra fees which had to be paid when using credit card or Pay Pall. The fee to be paid by for example post-doctoral researchers was experienced as being too high. Some thought the registration process was somewhat confusing.



Respondents:	348
Average score:	4.14

11.2. What was your general impression of the information you received prior to the conference?


The information prior to the conference was highly appreciated.



Respondents:	349
Average score:	4.11

11.3. What was your general impression of the on-site registration process in Brussels?

Onsite registration was described as running smoothly. Comments were made about the hosts not always being fully briefed on the organisation. Also comments were received on how the organisation dealt with the loss of badges.




Respondents:	298
Average score:	4.12

12. Conference venue

68.8% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the conference venue at Brussels 2013

12.1. How would you rate the conference venue?


The conference was organised at Square. Most respondents were very positive about the conference venue. The comments we received were mostly about the difficulty to find the rooms and the distance between them, which did not leave much time between sessions, and the distance to the exhibition area. Words like 'maze', 'complex' and 'labyrinth' were used. A map would have been useful. The hosts and signs were helpful to give directions. The cold environment was also commented on. There was not enough space to just sit down and socialize.



Respondents:	353
Average score:	3.51

12.2. What was your impression of the session rooms?


The session rooms were mostly appreciated. There were some comments on the darkness of some rooms, the air conditioning (too cold or too hot), and the fact that some rooms were not suitable for the sessions (e.g. the plenary hall for parallel sessions) or had uncomfortable chairs.



Respondents:	353
Average score:	3.79

12.3. How would you rate the technical support at the conference?

The technical support was rated as good. Various comments on the technical support were rated as being excellent. It was not always clear where the presentation was to be uploaded.




Respondents:	348
Average score:	3.97

13. Catering

42.2% of the participants were very satisfied/satisfied with the catering at Brussels 2013.

13.1. How was the catering provided at the conference venue?

The catering was averagely appreciated by most respondents. Comments received were on serving sandwiches and not a hot meal on Thursday, and on the fact that there were not enough vegetarian options. The food on Friday was judged as being a lot better. Overall, there was not always enough available. There was also not enough access to water and drinks during the day. The registration fee was considered by some to be too high in comparison to the quality of the food served.



■ Poor
■ Sufficient
■ Average
■ Good
■ Excellent

Respondents: 351
Average score: 3.00

14. Social Programme

Due to a mistake in the system, the answers on the social programme were lost. Below is a brief summary of comments received through the other evaluation channels.

The social programme included:

- Two Welcome Receptions
- Conference dinner
- Charity event.

Having two welcome receptions with limited space was very confusing. After registration, it was unclear to many participants which welcome reception they selected. The strict checking of badges at the door was necessary because of safety and fire regulations.

The conference dinner was highly appreciated, especially the combination dinner-dance.

The charity event was organised by the Belgian Association of Public Health and consisted of cycling (on home trainers) for a local charity.

15. Filmfestival Open Society Foundations

51.5% of the respondents were aware of this extra activity and 66.7% rated this as important/very important.


Out of the 340 respondents, more than half was aware of this film festival, which was organised by the Open Society Foundations both in the exhibition hall as well as during lunch breaks in the Plenary hall. Two thirds of respondents felt that the filmfestival was a valuable addition to the programme.

16. Abstract handling

92.0% of the respondents were very satisfied/satisfied with the abstract handling system at Brussels 2013

16.1. How would you rate the abstract submission process?


Abstract submission is organised via internet, with a possibility to update your abstract/workshop until the deadline of 1 May 2013. Information on submission is also provided on the website of the conference. Both the abstract submission process and the information on how to submit abstract remains highly appreciated.



Respondents:	283
Average score:	4.25

16.2. How would you rate the information on the abstract submission?

A comment received was that it was hard to find instructions for authors. The helpfulness by the secretariat was mentioned as being excellent.




Respondents:	285
Average score:	4.25

16.3. How would you rate the selection process?

Abstracts and workshops were selected by the International Scientific Committee which consisted of 51 experts from 21 countries. On average, each abstract was scored by 7.1 scorers, each workshop by 6.8 scorers.


Comments received included the lack of transparency in the selection process. One comment mentioned that the organization has maintained its high standard of abstract acceptance.



Respondents:	279
Average score:	4.12

16.4. How would you rate the information after the selection process?

Over 90% of respondents (N=281) were highly appreciative of the feedback after the selection of abstracts. The feedback included visibility of all information (accepted, oral/poster, rejected) in the personal profile of the submitters, as well as personalised emails to all submitters.



Respondents:	281
Average score:	4.17

17. Future conference (Glasgow 2014)

86.3% of the participants remember receiving the first announcement for our next conference and 82.7% is planning to attend Glasgow 2014.

Nearly all respondents were aware of the first announcement for Glasgow 2014 in the conference bag. Over 80% (N=335) is planning to attend the Glasgow 2014 conference.

The question on whether the respondent thought their organisation/institution would be interested in being active (exhibiting, organising a workshop) at the conference, 40.1% stated yes.

18. Any other input

As a last open question, we asked whether the respondents felt that something (specific topics or activities) are missing at the EPH conferences? 22.22% (N=270) gave their thoughts on this. Input received include:

Ideas on organising the conference:

- Career Exchange Market, like a speed-dating event;
- 'brainstorm' sessions on real action points and real policies with policymakers;
- Offer more networking opportunities, space and time at the conference ;
- More discussion after sessions and plenaries;
- More skills building activities organised during the conference;
- Professionals from other fields than public health should be more involved;
- Offer possibilities for research/project meetings;
- More time geared towards early career researchers.

Ideas on topics to be included:

- Problems and activities in countries in transition;
- Strengthening the public health voice in Europe;
- Obesity linked to diabetes;
- Theory development in the area
- New ideas on the future of public health research
- Accidents prevention
- Health communication
- social marketing

19. Comparison of the participants' evaluation with the data from 2009-2013

Main evaluation questions	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of respondents	85	348	345	324	361
% of participants responding	9	20,6	24	29,8	33,7
Question	% good to excellent				
Conference as a whole	-	82,5	89	72,7	81.0
Networking opportunities				75,8	72.5
Information provided				83,4	77.8
Innovation abstract suppl.					77.3
Visited the exhibition area				81,5	89.8
Exhibition area				59,4	55.6
Plenary sessions: content	60	80,5	86,7	70,5	69.9
Plenary sessions: speakers	62	85,2	92,2	74	-
Parallel sessions: content	77	67,3	75,9	76,7	84.2
Parallel sessions: speakers	79	75,5	83,3	-	-
Poster sessions: participated	67,6	64,8	85,6	75,1	66.7
Poster sessions: content	82	62,7	79,2	64,1	75.3
Poster sessions: location	26	59,4	75	46,3	71.0
Poster sessions: technical			84,6	-	-
Poster walks: participated					41.5
Poster walks: satisfaction					76.7
Pre conferences: participated	33,8	38,1	30	32,5	38.5
Pre conferences: content	72	80,4	82	89,3	84.1
Pre conferences: organisation	91	83,8	86	90,3	74.0
Registration online	81	83,4	83,8	90,7	87.9
Registration information	84	84,7	83	92,3	89.7
Registration onsite	96	80,1	87,9	89,2	86.9
Conference venue	96	81,4	90,8	87,5	59.2
Parallel rooms	93	77,8	79,8	83,3	70.3
Technical support		80	86,8	80,3	77.0
Catering	78	71,8	94,2	75,3	42.2
Welcome reception				82,9	-
Conference dinner	86	61,5	67,1	56,4	-
Abstract submission	90	89,9	89,2	93,7	94.0
Abstract submission info	87	89,5	89,3	93,7	94.7
Abstract decision	79	78,5	78,7	82	88.5
Abstract decisional information	88	80,9	78	82,8	90.7
Aware of next conference	87	79,4	78,3	85,5	86.3