

2008 PROCESS DEVELOPMENT SYMPOSIUM CONFERENCE

EVALUATION SUMMARY

(# of 2003 Respondents-49; # of 2004 Respondents-33; # of 2006 Respondents-43 # of 2008 Respondents-21)

RATINGS AND MOTIVATION:

1) Why did you attend?

- To keep up-to-date on this developing area 40%
- To network with colleagues 30%
- To hear from specific speakers 12%
- I was asked to speak 10%
- Other 7%

2) Overall how would you rate the Symposium?

- Excellent 29%
- Good 62%
- Fair 9%
- Poor 0%
- Very Poor 0%

3) How did you find the Symposium?

- Better than what you expected 19%
- About what you expected 76%
- Not as good as what you expected 5%

4) How would you rate the overall content/information/format of the program?

- Excellent 38%
- Good 53%
- Fair 9%
- Poor 0%
- Very Poor 0%

Documented reasons for low rating: (2 comments)

- 1) To much patent focus.
- 2) Needs to have more modern focus.

5) How would you rate the networking opportunities provided?

- Excellent 53%
- Good 48%
- Fair 0%
- Poor 0%
- Very Poor 0%

6) The exhibits were

- An added value 71%
- Neither Helpful nor distracting 19%
- Not useful 10%
- A distraction 0%
- Did not view displays 0%

HOUSING AND REGISTRATION:

7) Were you satisfied with the pre-registration/on-site registration process?

- Yes 95%
- No 5%
- No Answer 0%

Documented reasons for “No”: (2 comments)

- 1) Registration started a bit late
- 2) More information concerning check in would have been helpful

8) Were your housing accommodations handled correctly?

- Yes 95%
- No 0%
- No Answer 5%

9) Resort facilities

- Exceptional 30%
- Good 50%
- Fair 15%
- Poor 5%

10) How was the meeting location (Berkshires, MA)?

- Exceptional 19%
- Good 33%
- Fair 33%
- Poor 14%

Documented reasons for low rating (9&10):

- 1) Far from airport and city
- 2) No GSM Facilities/Reception
- 3) No cell coverage
- 4) No internet in room
- 5) Isolated

11) How did you first learn about the Symposium?

- Event Web site 27%
- Advertisement in CEP 0%
- Word-of-mouth/business associates 45%
- Promotional E-mail 14%
- AIChE mailing 5%
- Other 9%

12) Was the on-site final program book useful?

- Yes 81%
- No 14%
- No answer 5%

13) Was the Symposium web page helpful?

- Yes 81%
- No 5%
- Did not use 14%
- No answer 0%

Documented reasons for "No" (12&13):

- 1) Would have liked slides to be included

DEMOGRAPHICS:

14) Please mark the choice which most accurately describes your position:

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| • CEO/President/Principal | 9% |
| • VP/General Manager | 0% |
| • Director | 9% |
| • Manager/Supervisor | 22% |
| • Consultant/Engineer | 22% |
| • Other | 39% |

FUTURE MEETINGS:

15) Based on your experience this year, would you consider attending a future meeting?

- | | |
|-------------|-----|
| • Certainly | 57% |
| • Likely | 43% |
| • Never | 0% |

OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS REPORTED FROM 2008 PDS CONFERENCE:

18) What did you like most about the meeting?

1. Networking
2. Product design discussions
3. Real world case studies
4. Availability of refreshments
5. Diversity of attendees
6. Panel discussions

19) What if any, suggestions do you have for improving future meetings?

1. CPE as new paradigm – too many scientists talking of their own experience. Suggest an interactive workshop featuring the major players.
2. Better communication, better speakers, more disciplines in approach
3. Topics on Process Equipment Design and Financing Product Development
4. Make sure there is cell service in the area selected
5. Pre-Print the proceedings
6. More attendees
7. Do as a short course at the AIChE meetings
8. Breakout session on how to apply a method to a simplified example