

IAERE Fourth Annual Conference, Bologna - February 11th–12st, 2016 Evaluation Report

Survey period	15 February - 11 March 2016
Conference participants	118
Submitted surveys	53
Response rate	44,91%

1. CONFERENCE PUBLICITY, LOGISTICS AND ORGANISATION

1a. I learnt about the conference through: (select one)

Percentage of responses 100%

Mailing list (IAERE or other)	60,38% 32
Website (IAERE or other)	3,77% 2
Personal or business contact	32,08% 17
Posts on newsgroups	3,77% 2

1b. How satisfied are you with the following (in %)? Please select one rating for each item. In case you did not need the service or did not attend the event, please select the option N/A (not applicable).

Percentage of responses 100%

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
Pre-conference publicity	0,00% 0	5,77% 3	19,23% 10	48,08% 25	23,08% 12	3,85% 2
Online information on IAERE website (call for papers, programme etc.)	0,00% 0	1,89% 1	7,55% 4	50,94% 27	39,62% 21	0,00% 0
On-line registration	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	7,55% 4	39,62% 21	47,17% 25	5,66% 3
Accommodation suggestions	0,00% 0	1,96% 1	9,80% 5	39,22% 20	11,76% 6	37,25% 19
Feedback and support (questions answered quickly)	0,00% 0	1,89% 1	1,89% 1	28,30% 15	45,28% 24	22,64% 12
Paper submission (procedure and review process)	0,00% 0	1,92% 1	1,92% 1	40,38% 21	50,00% 26	5,77% 3
Printed programme and information folder	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	7,55% 4	32,08% 17	60,38% 32	0,00% 0

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
IAERE General Assembly of Members	2,13% 1	4,26% 2	8,51% 4	27,66% 13	23,40% 11	34,04% 16
Conference venue	0,00% 0	3,85% 2	7,69% 4	50,00% 26	36,54% 19	1,92% 1
Computer access/wi-fi connection	5,77% 3	1,92% 1	23,08% 12	25,00% 13	26,92% 14	17,31% 9
Lunch	0,00% 0	3,77% 2	7,55% 4	45,28% 24	37,74% 20	5,66% 3
Coffee breaks	0,00% 0	1,89% 1	7,55% 4	43,40% 23	47,17% 25	0,00% 0
Conference Dinner – Restaurant "Cantina Bentivoglio"	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	6,00% 3	24,00% 12	50,00% 25	20,00% 10
Social Event - St. Stefano Basilica	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	2,00% 1	12,00% 6	26,00% 13	60,00% 30
Conference fee	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	28,85% 15	32,69% 17	34,62% 18	3,85% 2

1c. Any other suggestions or comments you would like us to know about the Conference Publicity, Logistics and Organisation?

Percentage of responses 13,20%

- The low score on the IAERE assembly is simply due to what I perceived a rather low participation rate. But I am unsure how the organizers can improve on this, since it is up to members to show up.
- A special care on increasing Conference publicity with SIE (Italian association of economists) and SIEP (of public economists) might be useful.
- About papers' eligibility, I believe that we should give a proper meaning to the ""I"" of IAERE. I suggest that applicants should be:
 - Italian researchers (irrespective of working place, Italy or abroad)
 - Non Italian researchers working in Italian institutions
 - Researchers (Italian or not) working anywhere (Italy or not) submitting a paper with some focus on Italy
 If one of the three is missing, I believe papers should not be eligible.
- You could advertise the conference on inomics and on the resource economics network. This should allow us to target foreign researchers or Italians abroad.
- Time to present papers is very short, and usually there is no time left for discussion. As a result is very difficult to get useful comments. Overlapping between sessions with similar topics makes it difficult to attend to presentations. My suggestion is to reduce the duration of plenary sessions/policy roundtables etc. and leave more time for presentations, possibly by reducing the number of parallel sessions.
- I believe making the program available sooner than the week before the event would help the speaker to organize their calendar better.

- Unfortunately the computers in the rooms required too much time to upload the presentations and this eventually lead to some problems in respecting the time allocated to each parallel session. It is independent from the organization of the conference but still it was a problem the Department of Economics should have informed about.

2. SCIENTIFIC CONTENTS

2a. How satisfied are you with the following (in%)? Select one rating for each item. In the case you did not attend the event, please select the option N/A (not applicable).

Percentage of responses 98,11%

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
Plenary session 1 – Jeroen van den Bergh (relevance, choice of speaker, quality of presentation)	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	13,46% 7	34,62% 18	32,69% 17	19,23% 10
Plenary session 2 – Matthieu Glachant (relevance, choice of speaker, quality of presentation)	0,00% 0	1,96% 1	11,76% 6	41,18% 21	33,33% 17	11,76% 6
Policy session (relevance, choice of speaker, quality of discussion)	4,00% 2	8,00% 4	18,00% 9	38,00% 19	24,00% 12	8,00% 4
Parallel sessions (relevance)	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	6,12% 3	44,90% 22	48,98% 24	0,00% 0
Parallel sessions (quality of presentations and papers)	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	7,84% 4	54,90% 28	35,29% 18	1,96% 1
Parallel sessions (grouping of papers into sessions)	2,00% 1	6,00% 3	14,00% 7	46,00% 23	32,00% 16	0,00% 0
Relevance and impact of conference on my work	0,00% 0	7,69% 4	11,54% 6	57,69% 30	21,15% 11	1,92% 1
Overall content compared to other conference I attended recently	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	9,62% 5	57,69% 30	28,85% 15	3,85% 2

2b. Was the balance between papers focused on theoretical aspects, and those covering applied, evidence-based and policy-oriented environmental economics appropriate? (select one)

Percentage of responses 96,22%

Yes	88,24% 45
No	11,76% 6

2c. Would you increase the number of accepted papers/sessions during the conference?

Percentage of responses 92,45%

Yes	28,57% 14
No	71,43% 35

2d. Any other suggestions or comments you would like us to know about the Conference Scientific Contents? (topics covered, quality of papers, etc)

Percentage of responses 13,20%

- Quality of papers. Some applied stuff (case study analysis) was quite poor.
- My expectation was more information and discussion about ecosystem services, but this theme wasn't discussed at all.
- Some session chairs should do a better work at keeping track of time. I did not really think it was helpful to see the same presentation twice (in the policy session and in a parallel session).
- It is time to focus more on theory.
- Maybe too many papers presented split up in only 2 days conference.
- I would appreciate more papers on empirical aspects of environmental economics.
- The judgement about keynote speakers at plenary session is affected by my previous comment.

3. CONFERENCE FORMAT

3a. The time allocated for presentations in parallel sessions was: (select one)?

Percentage of responses 98,11%

Too little	13,46% 7
Adequate	86,54% 45
Too much	0,00% 0

3b. In parallel sessions the discussion was led by a chair and then followed by comments and discussion from the floor. Do you think that: (select one)

Percentage of responses 98,11%

This format was effective and should be kept as it is;	86,54% 45
It would be preferable to have both a chair and a pre-assigned discussant, followed by discussion from the floor	13,46% 7

3c. Was there sufficient time for discussion at each session? (select one)

Percentage of responses 96,22%

Yes	80,39% 41
No	19,61% 10

3d. What topics would you like to see addressed at next years' conferences? (indicate two top choices)

List of Topics	Quantity of Mentions
Behavioral economics	1
Biodiversity	1
Biodiversity loss	1
Bioeconomy and efficiency of natural resources	1
Business models for eco-innovation	1
Carbon leakage	1
Carbon tax	1
CGE models for climate change	1
Circular Economy	1
Climate Change	1
Climate Change Adaptation	1
Climate Change and Human Health	1
Climate Change and Sustainability	1
Consequences of the Paris agreement	1
Cooperation in climate change	1
Costs and benefits of renewable energies	1
Costs and benefits of sustainable mobility	1
Eco-innovation dynamics and policy	1
Economic assessment of ecosystem and natural capital	1
Economic impact assessment of climate change	1
Ecosystems services	1
Emission Trading	1
Environmental awareness campaigns	1
Environmental behavioral experiments	1
Environmental macroeconomics	1
Environmental Valuation	1
Experimental economics	1
Foreign direct investment and natural resources	1
Global green new deal	1
Green consumerism	1
Green employment	1
Green Public Procurement	1
Growth and Environment	1
Health and the Environment	1
Health effects of environmental negative externalities	1
Land grabbing	1
Marine litter	1
Open eco-innovation	1

Payment for ecosystem services	1
Political economy and natural resources	1
Soft instruments	1
Technology innovation and multilateral governance	1
Waste Management	1
Water and food security	1
Water management	1

3e. Any other suggestions or comments you would like us to know about the conference's logistics and organization, scientific contents and format?

- Add poster sessions.
- All plenary speakers were man.
- Climate change/energy are hot topics, but I think we should try to maintain a balance between these and other crucial issues of global and local environmental change.
- The time allocated to presentation is fair, if the chairs respect it.
- I have one comment concerning the young best paper award. From an Italian Association, I expected an award assigned to a researcher working at an Italian Institution. I perfectly know that this implies a certain degree of "discrimination". The reality is that (Italian) young researchers working in Italy have more constraints in terms of poorer research funds than other foreign colleagues, and the award comes from money collected by the IAERE by means of the conference fee. If we consider that the majority of the researchers attending the conference are based at Italian Universities and Institution, the award is mainly paid by Italian research funds. Therefore, I would suggest to partially modify the conditions under which this grant is assigned. At least, the institution with which the researcher is affiliated (the physical place where she carries out her research - the paper presented) should be an Italian institution.
- Invite guest speakers not necessarily from the environmental economics area, but from outside areas to stimulate debate with other disciplines. I don't think I have learnt much from v.d. Bergh's presentation that "carbon price" is important.