

average: 2.17

total participants: 70

3rd International Conference Hamburg, 26 – 27 September 2011

SHIP EFFICIENCY





The German Society for Maritime Technology Schiffbautechnische Gesellschaft e.V.

standard deviation: 1.01

average reached points: 0

In total 70 participants (from 170) answered the questions

| | nt because of: (Single, must answer) | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--|--|--|
| answers | answers | | | percentage of all votes | votes | | | |
| 1) Flyer action | | | 12.9 | 12.9% | 9 | | | |
| 2) Mailing action | | | 22.9 | 9% 22.9% | 16 | | | |
| Technical magaz | ines 💻 | | 14.3 | 3% 14.3% | 10 | | | |
| 4) Internet | | | 17.1 | .% 17.1% | 12 | | | |
| 5) Colleagues | | | 32.9 | 32.9% | 23 | | | |
| average: 3.34 | average deviation: 1.31 | | standard deviation: 1.45 | | | | | |
| total participants: 7 | average answering time: 28 sec. | | average reached points: 0 | | | | | |
| 2. What was your or | verall impression of the event? (Single, must answer) | | | | | | | |
| answers | | | erc. of all rticipants | percentage of all votes | votes | | | |
| 1) Good | | | 34.3% | 34.3% | 24 | | | |
| 2) Answer 2 | | | 42.9% | 42.9% | 30 | | | |
| 3) Answer 3 | | | 17.1% | 17.1% | 12 | | | |
| 4) Answer 4 | _ | | 4.3% | 4.3% | 3 | | | |
| 5) Answer 5 | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | C | | | |
| 6) Poor | | | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1 | | | |
| average: 1.97 | average deviation: 0.67 | | standard dev | viation: 0.96 | | | | |
| total participants: 7 | average answering time: 8 sec. | | average reached points: 0 | | | | | |
| 3. How do you rate | the organisation of the event? (Single, must answer) | | | | | | | |
| answers | | | erc. of all rticipants | percentage of all votes | votes | | | |
| 1) Good | | | 58.6% | 58.6% | 41 | | | |
| 2) Answer 2 | | | 30.0% | 30.0% | 21 | | | |
| 3) Answer 3 | | | 10.0% | 10.0% | 7 | | | |
| 4) Answer 4 | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0 | | | |
| 5) Answer 5 | | | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1 | | | |
| 6) Poor | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | С | | | |
| average: 1.56 | average deviation: 0.65 | standard deviation: 0.79 | | | | | | |
| total participants: 7 | o average answering time: 8 sec. | | average read | hed points: 0 | | | | |
| 4. How is your overa | Ill rating of the Presentations did you like best? (Single | e, mu | st answer) | | | | | |
| answers | | | erc. of all rticipants | percentage of all votes | votes | | | |
| 1) Good | | | 25.7% | 25.7% | 18 | | | |
| 2) Answer 2 | | | 44.3% | 44.3% | 31 | | | |
| 3) Answer 3 | | | 21.4% | 21.4% | 15 | | | |
| 4) Answer 4 | _ | | 5.7% | 5.7% | 4 | | | |
| 5) Answer 5 | | | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1 | | | |
| | | | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1 | | | |

average deviation: 0.75

average answering time: 15 sec.

| 5. Which three of t | he papers d | id you like best? (M | ultiple, must answer) | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--|
| | answers | | | | | perc. of all participants | percentage of all votes | | |
| 1) Regulatory Step from International | | iciency - A View | | | | 12.9% | 4.5% | 9 | |
| 2) Can IMO Regula | ations Initiat | te Innovations? | | | | 22.9% | 8.0% | 16 | |
| 3) Efficiency of Maritime Transport - A System Approach from the Logistics Perspective | | | | | | 14.3% | 5.0% | 10 | |
| 4) Three Years of Experience with the Becker Mewis Duct - A Contribution to Ship Efficiency | | | | | | 18.6% | 6.5% | 13 | |
| 5) STX Advanced T | echnologies | for GREEN DREAM | | | | 11.4% | 4.0% | 8 | |
| 6) Energy Saving D for Decision Making | | tions - A Framework | | | | 25.7% | 9.0% | 18 | |
| Performance Mo Operational Impro | | Analysis for | | | | 27.1% | 9.5% | 19 | |
| 8) DSME Green-Shi ECONOLOGY | ip Technolog | y - BUILD | | | | 15.7% | 5.5% | 11 | |
| 9) Green Bulkers N | low and in th | ne Future | _ | | | 10.0% | 3.5% | 7 | |
| 10) Marorka - Emp | owering Sus | tainability Winners | | | | 18.6% | 6.5% | 13 | |
| 11) Development of the Marine Fuel Market - An Overview | | | | | | 15.1% | 30 | | |
| 12) Gas as Fuel - Storage and Bunkering | | | | | | 25.7% | 9.0% | 18 | |
| 13) Latest Developments and Operational Experience with Dual Fuel Engines | | | | 15.7% | | | 5.5% | 11 | |
| 14) Exhaust Gas Recirculation on 2-stroke Engines - An Efficient Solution for Emissions Compliance | | | | 2.9% | | | 1.0% | 2 | |
| 15) Engine Performance Optimization by Permanent use of Holistic Expert Condition Monitoring System | | | 5.7% 2.09 | | | | 2.0% | 4 | |
| 16) Efficient Turbo | chargers - La | stest Developments | . | | | 4.3% | 1.5% | 3 | |
| 17) Energy Efficient Gas Propulsion System with Hybrid Shaft Generator | | | | | | 10.0% | 3.5% | 7 | |
| total participants: | 70 | average answering | time: 137 sec. | | averag | e reached po | oints: 0 | | |
| 6. Were you able t | o establish | new business contac | ts at this event? (Single | e, mu | st answer |) | | | |
| answers | | | | | perc. of a | | entage Il votes | votes | |
| 1) Yes | | | | | 62 | 2.9% | 62.9% | 44 | |
| 2) No | | | | | 17 | 7.1% | 17.1% | 12 | |
| 3) No statement | | | | | 20 | 0.0% | 20.0% | 14 | |
| average: 1.57 | | average deviation | : 0.72 | | standard | d deviation: | | | |
| total participants: | 70 | average answering | g time: 9 sec. | | average | reached poi | nts: 0 | | |
| 7. How do you rate | STG's on-s | ite management of | the event? (Single, mu | st an | swer) | | | | |
| answers | | | | | erc. of all articipants | | entage votes | votes | |
| 1) Good | | | | | 52. | 9% | 52.9% | 37 | |
| 2) Answer 2 | | | | | 34. | 3% | 34.3% | 24 | |
| 3) Answer 3 | | | | | 8. | 6% | 8.6% | 6 | |
| 4) Answer 4 | | | | | 1. | 4% | 1.4% | 1 | |
| 5) Answer 5 | | | | | 1. | 4% | 1.4% | 1 | |
| 6) Poor | | | | | 1. | 4% | 1.4% | 1 | |
| average: 1.69 average deviation: | | | : 0.72 | | standard | d deviation: 0.96 | | | |
| total participants: | 70 | average answering | time: 8 sec. | | average | reached poi | nts: 0 | | |

| 8. How do you rate t | he service: | s of Hotel Ha | fen Hamburg? (Single, must an | swer) | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--|--|
| answers | | | | perc. of all participants | | percentage of all votes | votes | | |
| 1) Good | | | | | 37.1% | 37.1% | 26 | | |
| 2) Answer 2 | | | | | 47.1% | 47.1% | 33 | | |
| 3) Answer 3 | | | | | 14.3% | 14.3% | 10 | | |
| 4) Answer 4 | | | | | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1 | | |
| 5) Answer 5 | | | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0 | | |
| 6) Poor | | | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0 | | |
| average: 1.80 average deviation: 0.59 | | | eviation: 0.59 | standard deviation: 0.73 | | | | | |
| total participants: 70 average ans | | | nswering time: 7 sec. | | average read | hed points: 0 | | | |
| 9. Did the event me | et your ex | pectations? (| Single, must answer) | | | | | | |
| answers | | | | | erc. of all articipants | percentage of all votes | votes | | |
| 1) Completely | | | | | 28.6% | 28.6% | 20 | | |
| 2) Answer 2 | | | | | 48.6% | 48.6% | 34 | | |
| 3) Answer 3 |) Answer 3 | | | | 14.3% | 14.3% | 10 | | |
| 4) Answer 4 | | | | 4.3% | 4.3% | 3 | | | |
| 5) Answer 5 | i) Answer 5 | | | | 4.3% | 4.3% | 3 | | |
| 6) Not at all | | | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0 | | |
| average: 2.07 average de | | | eviation: 0.68 | | standard dev | iation: 0.99 | | | |
| total participants: 70 average an | | | nswering time: 8 sec. | | average read | ached points: 0 | | | |
| 10. What did you lik | e best / W | hat bothered | d you? (Text) | | | | | | |
| answers | | | filled in | | perc. of all participants | | | | |
| 1) Answer 1 (volunta | ry answer) | | | | | 44.3% | 31 | | |
| total participants: 70 |) | average ans | swering time: 115 sec. | | average rea | ched points: 0 | 0 | | |

10. What did you like best / What bothered you?

1) Answer 1

- + Atmosphere, location, catering None
- + Meeting old friends and colleagues. Speech during dinner
- very interesting presenations the content of the conference was well selected timing of the conference
- -Excellently organised Conference -No presentations from German shipyards, Why? -Monday and Tuesday are not really suitable working days for a conference. International Guests have to travel on Sunday in their free time. -Hotel room in Hotel Hafen Hamburg needed renovation,
- -Missing: position of Authorithies on LNG bunkering projects world wide with Ing bunkerbarges/operations

all good

ambient condition ok some presentation not interesting and not well selected

Best was the speach of Prof. Rulfs Bothering were all the sales Presentations of the speakers.

Best: overview and state of affairs regarding energy saving activities bothering: a few too long and too engineered presentations

Difficult to differentiate as the Conference as a whole was above expectation. Bothering was only the lack of discipline of the participants to adhere to time schedule

Distance between chair rows could be at bit more to avoid kicking tables behind when getting up.

Duration of the conference was OK. Not too long, not too short. Most speakers were experienced and subjects were innovating and interesting.

Excellent presentations and all relevant aspects of the topic were covered. Great location. Nothing bothered me.

Good presentations ideas and on the other hand very bad presentations

Good think was the balance between expierence based presentations and research presentation

I am somewhat bothered as the conference was too much profiled as an GL event (STG profile was too low). Why not using an independent questionaire provider but again GL?

I wanted to hear presentation from European and Japanese yard too.

It was more a "green ship" rather than "ship efficiency!

Like: get overall picture of developments within this field Dislike: not that much new has developed (repetition of what has been said before) Too much focus on regulations, instead of solutions.

Many good papers (.ppt's)- full of substance, but not so good presentations. Too much variation of papers - quality and content (substance)wise. The non-appearence of shipping companies and their paper contributions!

More presentations with a deeper technical backgroung and not "sales presentations" of different companies.

new contacts and the wide overview of green ideas for marine tecnology

overall picture of optimzation potential was presented / the wartsila presentation was polemic and too many slides and a sales event also the ABB prsentation all other presentation gave ovaerll information with only a little sales intention

Presentations giving an independant scientific and serious technical information is assumed to be good e.g. market analysis of marine fuel market. Those presentations containing more than less advertising elements and partly agressinve bench mark elements to competitors are found to be negative such as Wärtsilä presentation of Dual fuel - this presentation made me upset due to the presentation atitude, not because of technical content.

Presentations were on time and informative.

The setting. The location of the hotel is excellent - the hotel however appears worne -

The big international participation

The chairmen of the workshop sections and the STG chairman Dr. Klein I liked best, Mr. Horch's English could not be well understood.

the different approaches of the different companies of saving energy. Some were to much like advertising speeches and some speekers were very hard to understand.

The hotel was excellent and position for a maritim conference is perfect. Some problems with brakes and getting people to their places in time.

The majority of the presentations looked like company presentations. The technological novelties were not very highlighted.

| 11. Would you atte | end anoth | er Ship Efficiency event in the future? (Sing | le, must | answer) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|---|----------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--|--|
| answers | | | | erc. of all rticipants | percentage of all votes | votes | | |
| 1) Yes | | | | 67.1% | 67.1% | 4 | | |
| 2) No | | | | 2.9% | 2.9% | | | |
| 3) Perhaps | | | | 30.0% | 30.0% | 2 | | |
| average: 1.63 average deviation: 0.84 | | | | standard deviation: 0.91 | | | | |
| total participants: | 70 | average answering time: 6 sec. | | average reach | ned points: 0 | | | |
| 12. Did you attend | other STO | 3 events in the past? (Single, must answer) |) | | | | | |
| answers | | | | perc. of all participants | percentage of all votes | votes | | |
| 1) Yes | | | | 52.9% | 52.9% | 3 | | |
| 2) No | | | | 42.9% | 42.9% | 3 | | |
| 3) No statement | | | | 4.3% | 4.3% | | | |
| average: 1.51 average deviat | | average deviation: 0.54 | | standard deviation: 0.58 | | | | |
| total participants: 70 averag | | average answering time: 5 sec. | | average reached points: 0 | | | | |
| 13. Are you planni | ng on atte | ending other STG events in the future? (Sin | gle, mus | t answer) | | | | |
| answers | | | | perc. of all participants | percentage of all votes | votes | | |
| 1) Yes | | | | 80.0% | 80.0% | 5 | | |
| 2) No | | | | 0.0% | 0.0% | | | |
| 3) No statement | | | | 20.0% | 20.0% | 1 | | |
| average: 1.40 average | | average deviation: 0.64 | | standard deviation: 0.80 | | | | |
| total participants: 70 averag | | average answering time: 12 sec. | | average reached points: 0 | | | | |